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Abstract

A Rhetoric of Colonial Exchange: 
Time, Space, and Agency in Canadian Exploration Narratives (1760-1793)

My study analyzes the language used to represent and to enact the multiple forms of exchange that occur in colonial relationships. Specifically, I examine three canonical narratives of Canadian exploration literature: Alexander Mackenzie’s Voyages from Montreal, on the River St. Lawrence, through the Continent of North America, to the Frozen and Pacific Oceans; in the Years 1789 and 1793; Samuel Hearne’s A Journey from Prince of Wales’s Fort in Hudson’s Bay to the Northern Ocean in the Years 1769, 1770, 1771, and 1772; and Alexander Henry’s Travels and Adventures in Canada and the Indian Territories Between the Years 1760 and 1776. Because the texts arise out of, and are meant to transform, real, lived social exigencies, they are sites of symbolic action, and, consequently, are rhetorical. To develop a rhetoric of colonial exchange, I examine how the texts’ particular selections and combinations of grammatical and narrative features realize the symbolic actions of colonial exchange, and how the texts’ discursive choices, in turn, are governed and constrained by the social contexts and ideological structures in which they operate.

The study consists of six chapters: an introduction, a theory and methods chapter, three chapters of close analysis (one on each of the major explorers), and a conclusion. The first two chapters — “Introduction: Analysis in the Contact Zone” and “Theoretical Framework and Critical Methodology” — introduce my understanding of Mary Louise Pratt’s contact zone. The first chapter establishes the importance of the contact zone to the postcolonial study of explorer narratives. The second chapter (iv)
develops a systematic, comprehensive, and applicable theoretical framework — drawing on discourse, narrative, rhetorical, and postcolonial terms and concepts — one capable of producing theoretically-informed, contextually-sensitive close readings of the primary works. I will show how the features of time, space, and agency play a crucial role in all the texts, and, especially, how one of these three terms dominates the other two in distinctive ways for each text, establishing a pattern of emphasis central to understanding its rhetorical and ideological dimensions.

Chapters 3, 4, and 5 each focus on one of the principal texts and its key narrative feature, although comparisons among the texts are made throughout. In Chapter 3, “Alexander Mackenzie: Narrative Constructions of Heroic Time,” I argue that Mackenzie develops a narrative ratio in which time dominates space and agency; that he uses discursive structures of time to maintain representative and ideological control over the contact zone in which he finds himself; and, finally, that he relies on temporal manipulations consistent with the heroic paradigm to present ideologically fissured ethnography. In Chapter 4, “Samuel Hearne: Exchanging Bodies in Space,” I argue that Hearne depends on a narrative ratio in which space dominates agency and time; that he uses spatial distinctions of agency to map culture onto geography when contradictions in the contact zone become overwhelming; and that he uses spatial distinctions to reinscribe the gendered exchange economy operative in the zone to stabilize his own loss of cultural agency. In Chapter 5, “Alexander Henry: Gothic Hero of Commodity Adventure,” I argue that Henry depends on a narrative ratio in which agency dominates time and space; that he deploys the cultural coherence of narrative forms, specifically in their gothic manifestations, to tell his story of a body in crisis; and that his text’s dominant narrative forms suppress ethnographic context and
reinscribe European mercantilism in exclusively valourized terms.

Finally, in Chapter 6, I conclude my study by showing how differences among the texts reflect their discursive negotiations of bodies in crisis, their characteristic selections from language resources to do so, and their distinctive production of ‘uncanny commodities.’ By doing so, my study functions as a strategic attempt to rethink Canada’s colonial history and to imagine forms of analytical resistance to contemporary structures of neo-colonialism.
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Chapter 1  Introduction: Analysis in the Contact Zone

‘Writing home’

To undertake what she calls her “dialectic and historicized approach to travel writing,” Mary Louise Pratt ‘manufactures’ and names several concepts, one of which, “the contact zone” (*Imperial* 6-9), figures as a key term in my thesis. As Pratt coins the term, ‘contact zones’ refer to the spaces of colonial encounter in which people who have been geographically and historically separated come into contact with one another and establish ongoing relations, usually improvising on their different cultural traditions in order to communicate (6). I like Pratt’s “idiosyncratic” concept; it turns out that I’ve been ‘writing home’ from contact zones all my life.

My thesis explores an interest I’ve had for a very long time in encounters between people who are ‘placed’ very differently from one another in relation to the world’s metropolitan centres of power. That interest comes out of, and speaks to, the choices I made to train as a secondary school teacher and to teach in locations far from my urban roots. In the mid-80s, ‘fresh out of university,’ I taught junior high school in Lynn Lake, Manitoba, a mining town of about 1500 people, 1000 km northwest of Winnipeg, surrounded by what seemed to be immeasurable stretches of forest and lake. The road, literally, ends in Lynn Lake: in the isolation and apparent cultural limitedness at the end of the road, I learned astonishing things about identity negotiation, the wielding and deferral of power and authority, communication, and community. My students told me I had a Winnipeg accent. I thought I was the normal one. When I left three years later, I still didn’t entirely understand how different I had been or how different I had become.

I left because I’d made a three-year commitment to teach at Lady
Irene Teacher Training College in Ndejje, Uganda. Among many other things, I learned in Uganda that white people bear striking visual similarities to one another in some contexts. Although I could have described a hundred differences between my colleague and me, almost everyone else we knew thought the two of us — blonde muzungu of approximately the same height — looked exactly alike. Indeed, the young boys who carried our market bags (for a price) thought we looked so much alike that they distinguished between us by calling her “the large one” and me “the small one.” (It’s worth noting that she was, therefore, considered the beautiful one.) In Uganda, though, the difference of white skin wasn’t the ground of the greatest cultural difference.

In Uganda, some things were so shocking I don’t think I registered them as shock. I learned, for instance, that when they’re an integral part of the village’s recent history, you simply get used to the stacks of carefully cleaned skulls you pass on your way to school. And I learned not to flinch when our friends and neighbours and students would remember details of the war; if I flinched, people would stop talking out of politeness and concern. The summer I’d spent as an RCMP special constable in Thompson, Manitoba had prepared me, inadvertently, for some of the smaller shocks. I wasn’t as distressed by the ubiquity of guns in Uganda as most of my Canadian counterparts were, for instance, although I never got used to the sight of boys as young as nine or ten toting AK-47s almost as tall as they were. But the armed soldiers at the numerous roadblocks were easier to deal with because I’d had some experience with the psychology of uniforms and authority ‘from the inside.’ The armed soldiers who wanted to marry us could be put off with a gentle joke. The armed soldiers who’d had too much to drink were another matter. In the story I tell myself about Africa, though, the only time in three years that I was afraid was
when a soldier pointed his machine gun at my friend and me at a roadblock in Botswana, close to the border with South Africa.

Before that trip, I’d realized intellectually but not viscerally that the white skin that classified me as a generic national guest in Uganda converted me, in what were then the Frontline States, into an uncannily dangerous sign.

Contacting theory

From my perspective, ‘theory’ had happened to English sometime during the seven years I’d spent teaching, travelling, negotiating various levels of cross-cultural encounter, and grappling with an extended illness. I didn’t quite know what to make of theory, so I fell back on my early social gospel training: “If it doesn’t make any difference in the way you act in the world,” I concluded stubbornly, “it hasn’t made any difference.” (Even though I’d heard about difference.) It took me a long time to get to the point where I could theorize my bafflement with theory. I think my resistance was the result of a profound conviction that, in the final analysis, what mattered was what happened in specific situations. From my perspective on the contact zone of grad school, what mattered was falling between theoretical cracks.


I was particularly curious about the link between the actual language of a text — its grammatical structures, its syntactic patterns, its micro-structural choices — and how texts mean in their social and political contexts of use. That texts as apparently disparate in their generic composition as personal letters, epic poems, and computer ads mean in
social and political contexts of use seemed clear. It also seemed clear that texts were made up of hundreds and thousands of choices at all sorts of different levels of meaning-making. But what was the link — or, more likely, what were the links — between them? And how were those links inflected when texts’ social and political contexts of use implicated their authors in acknowledged and unacknowledged complexities of cultural encounter and cultural difference?

I became intrigued by the inventories that discourse analysis provides for fine-grained examinations of language. And I wondered, was it possible to do relevant rhetorical and cultural readings of texts far removed from us in time and space? The texts that interested me were texts about travel, about exploration, about encountering other worlds, other cultures, other characters, personalities, perspectives, discovering other ways of being alive. Those were the texts that raised questions I recognized from life before grad school, some of the same questions that had provoked my quest for contact zones in the first place: What happens to perception and representation when you’re away from home? What happens to theory and analysis when more than one culture is implicated in the discursive context?

Canadian literature had always appealed to me for a quality I thought I recognized, perhaps only because I knew it so well: a lot of writing in Canada is, I think, a kind of ‘writing home,’ both in the sense of sending missives back to the place of one’s origins and in the sense of creating a discursive space of cognitive and emotional plausibility. Canadian literature was appealing to me now for its long tradition of ‘encounter’ and exploration — which is not exactly the same discursive place from which one ‘writes home.’
Making difference

Barbara Herrnstein Smith’s observations about the socially-contextualized and motivated nature of narrative strike me as peculiarly apt to my story of my study. “For any given narrative,” she explains, there are always multiple basic stories that can be constructed in response to it because basic-ness is always arrived at by the exercise of some set of operations, in accord with some set of principles, that reflect some set of interests, all of which are, by nature, variable and thus multiple . . . . The form and features of any ‘version’ of a narrative will be a function of, among other things, the particular motives that elicited it and the particular interests and functions it was designed to serve. (217; italics in text)

When I first began dreaming this study, I fantasized about the possibility that women disguised as men had participated in early Canadian exploration and that my project would bring their work and lives to the forefront of our historical knowledge and imaginations. The only woman I could find who fit my predetermined category was Isabel Gun. Gun spent the first half of her three-year contract with the Hudson’s Bay Company disguised as the common labourer, John Fubbister. The birth of her child at Pembina, on 29 December 1807, however, tipped some people off about her actual sex (Harding 57-60).

Fascinating as it was, Gun’s story provided insufficient meat to flesh out the bones of my proto-feminist remapping of Canadian exploration history. For some time afterward, I considered focusing on less-well known explorers, James Isham, perhaps, or Peter Fidler, or Daniel Harmon, men whose names haven’t been attached to rivers and schools and parks. (Or, at least, not big rivers or well-known schools or much-frequented parks.) I based my decision to focus on three of the best known
Canadian explorers (and I discover again and again how vaguely known even the best known of them are) on the fact that my analytical method would itself require a certain motivation on the reader's part. It seemed counter-productive to expect people to be interested both in a new, and sometimes painstakingly detailed, way of reading texts and also in reading unfamiliar texts in such a detailed, analytical way. What I needed to show was a new way of reading texts that had already been read in some ways before.

The three explorers' texts I chose, I chose, therefore, in part because of their established status within the genre (Warkentin, "Exploration" 245; Hopwood 25), in part because of their historical contiguity, and in part because of their overlapping geographical focuses. Taken as a group, Alexander Mackenize, Samuel Hearne, and Alexander Henry 'covered' most of what is now Canada between Montreal and the Pacific Coast (if you can cover a country by making dotted lines across it). If even one of them had started in the Maritimes, they would have spanned the country 'from coast to coast to coast.' Importantly for this study, they also shared the experience of travelling through, not around, the country. It would be fascinating, in that regard, to compare any one of their texts to George Vancouver's, who necessarily writes from the dramatically different spatial perspective aboard his ship. Finally, as I examine in some detail in the thesis itself, the three shared the mercantile interests of their times, interests that took the specific form of participation in the fur trade.

Their texts, however, also differ in many and important ways. My study aims, in part, to show how differences among the texts i) illustrate the multivalent uses to which colonial discourse is put, ii) illustrate the range of resources that colonial discourse draws on for its various functions, and iii) differentiate them one from another within the generic
category, 'Canadian exploration literature.'

Not surprisingly, given my politics and my experiences overseas, postcolonial theory was theory that made sense to me. My analysis of the texts proceeds from the assumption that, individually and generically, they constitute colonial discourse. I believe that my approach, which links theory with a specific methodology for reading colonial texts, addresses creatively the concerns that various critics, Stephen Slemon in particular, express about the possibility that colonial history has become, for academic theorists of postcolonialism, 'a shimmering object of desire' ("Mount Everest"). Although my study could be accused of focusing on "deadwhitemales," it resists the antagonism of that accusation by modelling a way of re-reading instances of colonial discourse that were directly influential in their time, have had subtle but multivalent effects over time, and continue to have effect, primarily in excerpted form, as generic instances of Canadian exploration narratives. My study adds to the current postcolonial conversation a model of analysis that is valuable for its concurrent applicability to historical and contemporary texts.

The study makes several key claims, principally i) that language is a form of social and symbolic action, ii) that Canadian history and Canadian literary history have tended to take early exploration accounts for granted, as 'transparent' signifiers of experience whose truth-value has an a-historical guarantee, iii) that the textual features through which colonial discourse negotiates the "contact zone" can be identified, iv) that those textual features function in multi-layered contexts to effect specific negotiations, v) that those negotiations have short- and long-term consequences, and vi) that re-reading these texts for evidence of discursively negotiated contact zones may provide insight into the ways that social and cultural assumptions are coded into contemporary contestations
of space (aboriginal land claims, immigration policies, deportation policies, separatist referenda, and, indeed, the way each of the items in this unfinished list is complicated by proximity with any one of the others).

In many ways, the study identifies itself as the kind of analysis that Diana Brydon calls for in her examination of postcolonial studies in Canada. “Paradoxically,” she explains, “guilt allows some English Canadians to continue to feel like victims even when they have decided that they are no longer the colonized . . . but are now the colonizer . . . . It is much harder,” she adds,

to imagine oneself outside the binary of oppressor versus oppressed, as complicit in a system that can be analysed and changed, in which it is not too late to make a difference. Postcolonial criticism in Canada has approached this awareness of complicity several times, but we have always drawn back from the precipice it has revealed before us: the possibility, indeed the necessity, of initiating a radical change in the way our society is organized and understood. This kind of postcolonialism does not allow Canadians to be merely observers, academic students of a phenomenon that happens elsewhere. This kind of postcolonialism is about all of us: whether we have inherited identities as First Nations, Métis, Québécois, invader-settler, immigrant, or ‘ethnic.’ If we wish to understand the complexities of these emerging postcolonialisms, then we must proceed with the postcolonial analysis of invader-settler societies. (8)

My study, that is, links my inherited identities with the textual inheritances of Canadian colonial history in an effort to initiate change in the way we understand and organize our society.

In its specific methodology, my study responds to Heather Murray’s suggestion that we read texts in colonial space not for their coherence but
for their contradictions ("Reading" 78). In the close analyses that make up this study, I examine the texts both as discrete texts and in their contexts of reception. I read for both large narrative patterns and for interruptions of narrative pattern. Similarly, I read for both recurring and singular grammatical features and constructions, and for the silences and erasures that signal the contradictions that Murray describes. Each of the three middle chapters focuses on one of the narrative features identified in the study's title (time, space, or agency) as it is expressed, manipulated, negotiated, and transformed in one of the exploration journals under discussion. Although each chapter focuses on one narrative feature in one of the journals, the chapters are not free-standing units, but form a close-knit conversation with one another, so that, for instance, my discussion of time in Alexander Mackenzie's journals is not really complete until I discuss time and its relation to agency in Alexander Henry's text. Even then, of course, the conversation is far from over.

I begin with Alexander Mackenzie because his text presents itself superficially as the epitome of rational and objective report. Fissures and contradictions in Mackenzie's text, however, provide rare glimpses into the mechanisms by which colonial discourse recuperates its representative power in threatening circumstances. Mackenzie's journals contrast effectively, moreover, with Samuel Hearne's, particularly when the material conditions of the two men's respective journeys are taken into account. Hearne's journals, which articulate the various means by which threatened authority re-figures itself within the unfamiliar space of the contact zone, inflect, in their turn, Alexander Henry's text. Henry struggles with what are, perhaps, even more dangerous threats against his visceral person than those that are levelled at Hearne, but he represents his experience of bodily crisis in significantly different ways.
I have tried to maintain consistent forms of reference for the indigenous people whom the explorers encountered. Especially when I refer specifically to the language of the journals themselves, I often reiterate the explorers' typical use of "Indian/s" or "native/s." I have tried in all other situations to use the phrases "aboriginal people" or "indigenous people." On occasion, when the text in question emphasizes that the people encountered are inhabitants of the space/place, I have sometimes used the phrase, "local inhabitants."

The possibility of contact

In the introduction to what he calls his "study on patriarchal forms of imperial violence," Eric Cheyfitz describes a terrifying place. "Those of us who live within the privilege of Western patriarchy," he claims, live in an increasingly narrow psychic and social space. For we cannot afford to enter most of the social spaces of the world; they have become dangerous to us, filled with the violence of the people we oppress, our own violence in alien forms we refuse to recognize. And we can afford less and less to think of these social spaces, to imagine the languages of their protest, for such imagining would keep us in continual conflict, in continual contradiction with ourselves, where we are increasingly locked away in our comfort. Terrorizing the world with our wealth and power, we live in a world of terror, afraid to venture out, afraid to think openly. Difference and dialogue are impossible here. We talk to ourselves about ourselves, believing in a grand hallucination that we are talking with others. (xx)

What I hope this thesis is not is a 'grand hallucination' from the grimly narrow space that Cheyfitz describes. The easiest thing in the world would
be to sit back and criticize the writers and certain of their critics for their limitations, their racism, and their various collaborations with the global imperialist project. The three writers have, instead, taken on surprisingly human dimensions for me. When my students respond to them (in the inevitably truncated excerpts in which they read them) with statements true enough to their limited reading — “I can’t believe Hearne would just stand there and let people kill the Inuit!” or “It seems as if Alexander Mackenzie really liked the people he visited with,” or, “Does Henry really have to tell us that the Indians drank the blood of the people they murdered?” — it is often all I can do to stop myself launching into a defense, in one case, a discussion of the political dimensions of excerpting text in another, and a lecture on narrative technique in the third. Sometimes I give in to the temptation.

As I’ve become more familiar with the texts, I’ve begun to differentiate the human beings I imagine very much in terms of their typical grammatical and narrative choices. ‘Ah,’ I think to myself, reading Hearne’s contradictory assessments of the indigenous practice of killing more game than was necessary to supply the needs of the group: ‘Mackenzie would have represented himself as strictly disallowing the practice and would never have mentioned it again. Henry, on the other hand, might have fashioned a story of conflict, crisis, and resolution around the issue, figuring himself throughout as the sympathetic hero.’

And despite my grave misgivings about many of their discursive constructions of reality, I find myself profoundly sympathetic with their experiences of what I call ‘vast de-familiarization.’

My hope is that this thesis addresses several different academic communities and enables cross-talk among them. Specifically, I hope to show that the resources of discourse analysis animate a neglected but
significant genre within the Canadian canon. The analyses that make up this study identify how texts typically associated with one another because of their generic similarities draw very differently on grammatical, narrative, and rhetorical resources to achieve different effects within their social-ideological contexts. The study’s findings, both about the individual texts and about the genre of exploration literature will, I hope, demonstrate the usefulness of these and related analytical methods within the general purview of postcolonial studies.

As I indicate above, Chapters 3, 4, and 5 each focus on close analyses of one of the three exploration texts under consideration. Chapter 3, “Alexander Mackenzie: Narrative Constructions of Heroic Time,” examines the grammatical basis of Mackenzie’s overwhelming concern with time and traces the effects of those grammatical structures on the text’s narrative and rhetorical choices and functions. Chapter 4, “Samuel Hearne: Exchanging Bodies in Space,” explores the way Hearne’s often contradictory discourse is grounded in his ambiguous relationship to the geographical and cultural space through which his body moves. Chapter 5, “Alexander Henry: Gothic Hero of Commodity Adventure,” examines the way narrator agency draws on culturally sanctioned forms and structures to attribute coherence to a story fissured by grammatical inconsistencies and ideological blindesses. Chapter 2 describes the theoretical framework — which draws on discourse analysis and narrative, rhetorical, ideological, and postcolonial theories — as well as the specific methodology I use to examine the range and effects of the textual features evident in the three accounts. Chapter 6 summarizes the findings of the three analytical chapters in relation to their discursive negotiations of bodies in crisis, their characteristic selections from language resources to do so, and their distinctive production of ‘uncanny commodities.’
The thesis, then, develops a rhetoric of colonial texts as they function as sites of exchange in 'the contact zone.'
Chapter 2  Theoretical Framework and Critical Methodology

Introduction

According to Diana Brydon, "postcolonialism proves itself most useful as a locally situated, provisional, and strategic attempt to think through the consequences of colonialism and to imagine nonrepressive alternatives to its discursive regime . . . . [I]t is an activist and interventionary politics and a thinking process more than a static object of inquiry" (10). Throughout the thesis, I engage the narratives of colonialism — specifically in their manifestation as exploration accounts — in a theoretically-informed, contextually-sensitive, close-analysis as part of the activist and interventionary politics and thinking process that Brydon describes. I consider exploration narratives to constitute colonialist discourse as Peter Hulme defines the term: "an ensemble of linguistically-based practices unified by their common deployment in the management of colonial relationships" (2).

Exploration narratives are also exemplary documents of what Mary Louise Pratt calls the contact zone, "the space of colonial encounters" (Imperial 6). "By using the term 'contact,'” Pratt explains, “I aim to foreground the interactive, improvisational dimensions of colonial encounters so easily ignored or suppressed by diffusionist accounts of conquest and domination.” Pratt proposes to identify and analyze points of contact between different cultures with a view to understanding the effects that one group has on another. Her case studies, however, focus almost exclusively on European-produced texts to the exclusion of aboriginal texts, a one-sidedness that my study repeats. I believe that my detailed method of text analysis significantly increases the epistemological potential of Pratt’s “contact zone.” I make no claims, however, that my analyses
of European texts can make the aboriginal cultures that the three explorers encountered meaningfully visible and interpretable. Such a study would require much more extensive knowledge of specific aboriginal languages and cultures than I currently possess.

Adding to Pratt's concept, I propose that contact zones are dynamic open systems characterized by a multiplicity of exchanges with their environments (Lemke 110), including discursive, material, semiotic, symbolic, and social-ideological exchanges. The contact zone, I propose, is not merely 'interactive' and 'improvisational,' but is characterized by semiotic instability, reflexivity, and contradiction. Multiple, unexpected, and unregulated exchanges in the contact zone threaten the stability and the authority of the representing system by unsettling the meanings of the signs that are produced and exchanged. Threatened, the representing system invokes grouping and dividing practices in an attempt to become meta-stable (i.e., to persist through change). The representing system, that is, responds to instability by reasserting the terms of exchange so that, ideally, its codes, values, and symbolic order are reproduced, or, at least, the system with which it has contact is kept outside its boundaries.

Exploration narratives, I argue, function as textual products of i) the contact zone's multiple exchanges, ii) the semiotic instability that those exchanges initiate, and iii) the representing system's response to threats of instability. Exploration narratives also function as textual processes enacting those multiple exchanges, their semiotic instability, and the resulting attempts at meta-stability. Operating as colonialist discourse, exploration narratives interpellate colonial subjects "by incorporating them in a system of representation" (Tiffin and Lawson 3). Exploration narratives, however, do not 'operate' in one direction only — as the processes of colonialism — but are simultaneously the products of colonial
encounter. As textual and cultural products and processes, exploration accounts draw on a range of resources to exchange social meaning. The close textual analyses that form this study's core proceed, therefore, from the social semiotic perspective that Robert Hodge and Gunther Kress describe. "Meaning," Hodge and Kress explain, is produced and reproduced under specific social conditions, through specific material forms and agencies. It exists in relationship to concrete subjects and objects, and is inexplicable except in terms of this set of relationships. Society is typically constituted by structures and relations of power, exercised or resisted; it is characterized by conflict as well as cohesion, so that the structures of meaning at all levels, from dominant ideological forms to local acts of meaning will show traces of contradiction, ambiguity, polysemy in various proportions, by various means. So for us, texts and contexts, agents and objects of meaning, social structures and forces and their complex interrelationships together constitute the minimal and irreducible object of semiotic analysis. (Semiotics viii)

In keeping with the analytical range encompassed by social semiotics, my study examines how exploration narratives produce and enact meanings at grammatical, narrative, rhetorical, and social-ideological levels.

As Hodge and Kress point out, the interrelationships that obtain among texts, contexts, agents of meaning, objects of meaning, and social structures and forces are complex. Consequently, the grammatical, narrative, rhetorical, and social-ideological levels of analysis brought to bear on these interrelationships are not simple either, and, indeed, form a complex series of meta-redundant relationships. The levels of analysis, that is, exist in a hierarchical relationship characterized by the co-occurrence of formations from the different levels of textual structure. At one end of the
hierarchy, grammatical forms are drawn on by, and enable, the meaning of narrative forms, which are themselves drawn on by rhetorical structures. Rhetorical meanings and 'motives' are, in turn, drawn on by the requirements of the social-ideological realm. Particular grammatical choices — passive constructions, for example — may be the discursive sign of 'flat' narrative characterization. Flat characterization, in turn, may function rhetorically to initiate identification and division in specific ways, directly linked to socially-situated motives and ideological perspectives.

The meta-redundant relationship can be traced by working 'down' the hierarchy as well, since social-ideological power structures determine in great part who can engage in which rhetorical activities, with what means, and to what ends. The rhetorical constraints that govern a given circumstance increase the likelihood that particular narrative forms and structures will be selected and not others. Particular narrative forms and structures, moreover, constrain the selection of specific grammatical articulations.

Interaction and the representation of interaction, however, never can be explained as tidily as the preceding description might suggest. Hodge and Kress are quick to note that the scope they describe for social semiotics undoubtedly creates "a complex and demanding object of analysis" (viii-ix). The complexity that they acknowledge increases exponentially when the interactions being analyzed occur between members of different cultures but are recorded only in one culture's terms. My discussion below, of colonial discourse and postcolonial theory, identifies some of the fraught issues and questions such a study raises. Homi K. Bhabha's apt description of the hybrid threat to colonialist authority as, "finally uncontainable because it breaks down the symmetry and duality of self/other, inside/outside" ("Signs" 116), calls attention, moreover, to the semiotic
elements in a contact zone that are not recuperated by dominant systems of meaning making. Exploration narratives, I will argue, enact the uncontainability that Bhabha describes by producing unrecoverable ‘waste’ when systems clash, waste that I re-name ‘uncanny commodities.’

This chapter begins by examining the need for, and usefulness of, a theoretical framework and an analytical methodology. I go on to outline the study’s theoretical framework, specifically its grounding in rhetorical theory, narrative theory, and functional grammar, and the inter-relationship among those theoretical modes. I then examine the social-ideological effects and motives of rhetoric and link that consideration with the specifically colonial context within which the texts and the journeys they represent came into being. I show how postcolonial theory is uniquely animated by the social structurationist view of language that I have outlined, and I end the section by describing how the theoretical framework accounts for the multivalent exchanges of the contact zone and the presence, in the texts, of ‘uncanny commodities.’

I go on to describe the methodology I use to examine the texts and I conclude the chapter with a brief preview of the specific texts and the textual features examined in Chapters 3, 4, and 5.

**Theoretical framework**

A theoretical framework establishes a particular ‘cut through’ the vast number of critical terms, and possible connections among terms, available to us. Generally speaking, a theoretical framework is systemic (the terms are integrated into an explicable system of relations), applicable (the terms can be used to identify actual patterns in the texts), and significant (the observations about, or reading of, these patterns make claims worth communicating and defending). The theoretical framework I
develop identifies and defines key terms from the terministic screens of discourse, narrative, rhetorical, and postcolonial studies, and describes the relationships that obtain between and among them. By doing so, it constrains and enables a methodology for identifying and analysing textual elements, features, and patterns in the texts in question. The process of identification and analysis reanimates those texts individually, in relation to one another, and in their context as generic instances of ‘Canadian exploration literature.’

i) rhetoric

The title of this study, “A Rhetoric of Colonial Exchange: Canadian Exploration Narratives 1760-1793,” identifies the key areas of inquiry which I bring to my analyses of the texts. To examine the rhetorical nature of the texts, I adopt Kenneth Burke’s definition of “language as symbolic action” and consider texts to be sites of symbolic action which respond to, and are meant to transform, real, lived social exigencies. Language and texts, that is, both represent reality and social relations and enact reality and social relations. “Rhetorical analysis . . . ,” Glenn Stillar explains, focuses on our dual relationship to symbolic action and symbolic systems . . . . [S]ymbol systems enable us to construct a world of experience and orientation. Through symbols, we actively shape and interpret worlds and orient ourselves to those represented worlds and the other agents in them . . . . At the same time, the symbol systems and symbol-using patterns of our cultures define us as social agents. (60-1)

Rhetorical analysis is thus dually oriented, both toward the linguistic, textual symbols with which we articulate reality and toward the social context from which we receive symbolic systems and in which we are
enabled to function as active meaning-makers.

According to Burke’s rhetorical model, symbol-users engage in symbolic action fundamentally in order to establish ‘identification’ and ‘consubstantiation.’ People identify with other people, entities (such as a nation), or ideas when they feel that they share constructions of ‘the real,’ that they are united by similar substance. “A,” says Burke,
is not identical with his colleague, B. But insofar as their interests are joined, A is identified with B. Or he may identify himself with B even when their interests are not joined, if he assumes that they are, or is persuaded to believe so . . . . In being identified with B, A is ‘substantially one’ with a person other than himself . . . . Thus he is both joined and separate, at once a distinct substance and consubstantial with another. (Motives 20-1; italics in text)

People’s representations of the world — how they call attention to some things and minimize or marginalize others — fundamentally determine their identification with others and others’ identification with them. Burke’s description of language as contingent and contextual elaborates the fact that identification occurs as a result of the selections people make to represent reality. “Men [sic],” he explains, “seek for vocabularies that will be faithful reflections of reality. To this end they must develop vocabularies that are selections of reality. And any selection of reality must, in certain circumstances, function as a deflection of reality” (Symbols 13; italics in text). People’s selections and deflections of reality inform processes of identification and division at the same time that identification and division fundamentally inform people’s selections and deflections of reality. In turn, selections and deflections of reality initiate ‘congregation’ and ‘segregation’ in social orders based on shared constructions of symbolic reality (Stillar 59).
Burke's concept of the consubstantiality focuses attention on his philosophy of language as social and symbolic action. "A doctrine of consubstantiality," he suggests, "either explicit or implicit, may be necessary to any way of life. For substance, in the old philosophies, was an act; and a way of life is an acting-together; and in acting together, men have common sensations, concepts, images, ideas, attitudes that make them consubstantial" (Motives 21; italics in text). Burke's dramatistic pentad, moreover, provides a 'grammar' with which to explicate the function of specific language units in particular instances of symbolic action (Stillar 63). "Dramatism," Burke explains,

is a method of analysis and a corresponding critique of terminology designed to show that the most direct route to the study of human relations and human motives is via a methodical inquiry into cycles or clusters of terms and their functions . . . . Dramatism centers on observations of this sort: for there to be an act, there must be an agent. Similarly, there must be a scene in which the agent acts. To act in a scene, the agent must employ some means, or agency. And it can be called an act in the full sense of the term only if it involves a purpose . . . . [T]he aim of calling attention to [these five terms] . . . is to show how the functions which they designate operate in the imputing of motives . . . . The pattern is incipiently a hexad when viewed in connection with the different but complementary analysis of attitude. (Symbols 135-36; italics in text)

According to Burke, texts select and deflect the resources of the pentad in particular ways that he calls ratios. Identifying a text's ratio makes it possible to speculate on motives and orientations. A text that deploys a scene:act ratio, for instance, constructs a reality in which acts are motivated and determined by the scene in which they occur. A scene:agent ratio, by
comparison, would suggest that scene fundamentally motivates the possibility of particular kinds of characters or persons. An agent:act ratio, moreover, would present reality as fundamentally established by a correspondence between kinds of persons and their behaviours (Symbols 135-38).

The pentad thus provides a method for marking how a given representation selects and deflects from among the available choices for representing reality. The method, that is, makes it possible to examine how a group sees one thing in terms of another and how it effects social congregation and segregation on the basis of those shared ‘seeings.’ This study examines grammatical and narrative selections and deflections in the texts under consideration from Burke’s perspective on the contingent nature of language-use. It considers further how the text’s characteristic selections of forms and elements effect particular kinds of identification and division and motivate specific social congregations and segregations.

ii) narrative

Narrative is the name for the general, shared social and cultural resource of forms and patterns for representing actors and events. “A narrative text,” Mieke Bal explains, elaborating her specific use of narratological terms, “is a text in which an agent relates a narrative. A story is a fabula that is presented in a certain manner. A fabula is a series of logically and chronologically related events that are caused or experienced by actors. An event is the transition from one state to another state. Actors are agents that perform actions” (5; italics in text). This study particularly emphasizes Bal’s attention to i) the narrator’s presence and agency, ii) the agentivity of actors, and iii) the fact that narrative events represent transitions or transformations from one state to another.
Working with an adaptation of Bal’s terminology (Bal 7), Michael Toolan lists the main processes by which a narrative is realized textually:

1. The events are arranged in a sequence which can differ from the chronological sequence.
2. The amount of time which is allotted in the text to the various elements of the story is determined with respect to the amount of time which these elements take up in the story.
3. The actors are provided with distinct traits. In this manner, they are individualized and transformed into characters.
4. The locations where events occur are also given distinct characteristics and are thus transformed into specific places.
5. In addition to the necessary relationships among actors, events, locations, and time other relationships may exist among the various elements.
6. A choice is made from among the various ‘points of view’ from which the elements can be presented. (Narrative 47)

Toolan’s list calls attention to the way that i) events, ii) character agency, iii) time, and iv) location or space, constitute a narrative. Indeed, ‘time,’ like ‘space’ and ‘agency,’ is one of the main structuring features of a narrative’s textual realization.

“Events,” Bal elaborates, “have been defined as processes. A process is a change, a development, and presupposes therefore a succession in time or a chronology. The events themselves happen during a certain period of time and they occur in a certain order” (37-8; italics in text). Toolan’s description of time as both structuring and structuralist, can be applied generatively to a consideration of narrative time. Time, Toolan claims, is structuring “because it asserts and articulates relations between particular states or changes of state, and structuralist, in so far as it relies on our
recognition of particular similarities and particular differences between specified states” (48; italics in text). In much the same way, narrative time, realized principally by structures of order, duration, and frequency, illuminates distinctions between narrative states and relations among them.

Toolan’s observation about the dual nature of time applies equally to narrative space. Like narrative time, narrative space asserts and articulates relations between particular states and changes of state, and it relies on our recognition of particular similarities and differences between specified states. “Events happen somewhere . . . .” Bal explains, and adds that “it is not surprising that spatial elements play an important role in fabulas. It is, for instance, possible to make a note of the place of each fabula, and then to investigate whether a connection exists between the kind of events, the identity of the actors, and the location” (43). “The subdivision of locations into groups is a manner of gaining insight into the relations between elements,” she elaborates; “A contrast between inside and outside is often relevant . . . . When several places, ordered in groups, can be related to psychological, ideological, and moral oppositions, location may function as an important principle of structure” (44; italics in text). Bal also notes that the boundaries between opposed locations may play important narrative roles (45).

Both Toolan and Bal outline Algirdas Griemass’s actantial model of giver/receiver, subject/object, and helper/opponent (Bal 26-31; Toolan 93 ff), which, although most applicable to traditional folk and fairy tales, is nevertheless a useful model of narratological structure. In Griemass’s model, a subject or hero seeks a particular object; he is assisted in this quest by a helper-figure but deterred by the actions of an opponent or opponents. Narrative resolution occurs as the result of intervention by the giver, who lends divine or magical powers to ensure that the subject or receiver
realizes his goal.

As Toolan and Bal both make clear, the ‘characters’ of narrative are actors who act and are realized textually as having specific degrees and kinds of agency, the ability to effect change. Bal specifies the actors of narrative texts as those who cause or undergo functional events (25), while Toolan’s explication of narrative agency animates the Hallidayan model of functional grammar that I discuss below. “[G]rammar,” says Toolan, “is often an index to, and matches with, the nature or conditions of characters” (112). “The reward,” he adds, “for carefully analyzing character portrayals in relation to this semantic grammar should be clear. We rapidly obtain a preliminary picture of who is agentive, who is affected . . . whether characters are doers or thinkers, whether instruments and forces dominate in the world represented” (115). Thus narratives are formed of agentive characters whose actions are doubly framed by the specific locations (spaces) in which they act and by the particular chronologies and successions (time) in which are effected the changes, transitions, and transformations that count as narrative events.

Ian Reid specifically links narrative analysis with notions of exchange. “We crave narrative,” he asserts, “and we crave exchanges. Both compulsions seem inherent in human culture: to interpret our experience as story-shaped and to interpret it as reciprocally transactional” (1). Reid’s model of narrative exchanges proposes to bring narrative paradigms in the humanities together with paradigms of exchange in the social sciences. “A text,” Reid explains,

is, axiomatically, a negotiated framing of sign-values — but this occurs in an interpersonal context and therefore cannot be perfectly stable. One potentially destabilising factor in a narrative text is its capacity to shuffle its deck of tropes in order to extend options as to
how and where the story will move and stop . . . . Another factor that can contribute to the renegotiation of semantic control is . . . a textual strategy for pre-empting or usurping interest as to whose side of the story will be heard . . . . Whereas ‘exchange’ normally (and too simply) indicates a mutual giving-and-taking of signs by two or more parties, ‘substitution’ will refer to an altering of the value of the signs and ‘dispossession’ will refer to a wresting or arresting of control over the relative positions of the parties. (27)

Reid’s work thus provides a way of identifying points at which a narrative selects and combines possibilities (“substitution”) and a way of tracing the consequences and the meanings of those selections and combinations (“dispossession”). His analytical framework is particularly useful, therefore, to this text-based analysis of narrative accounts of multiple and simultaneous discursive, semiotic, symbolic, material, mercantile, and ideological exchange.

iii) narrative as a resource of rhetoric

Narrative provides a range of socially and culturally recognized forms and patterns for representing actors and events, forms and patterns from which selections and combinations can be made to represent a version of ‘reality.’ Selections, we know from Burke, are always also deflections, and therefore function as invitations to congregation and segregation. Reid’s discussion of narrative framing elaborates the connections between Burke’s famous dictum and the ways in which value is ascribed to narrative exchanges:

The general basis for regarding acts of reading as acts of framing is quite simple: when a text is made to mean something, it is always by being both separated from and joined with a variety of references.
The metaphor of framing aptly indicates that in order to perceive and understand anything . . . one must provisionally distinguish it from other things while also relating it to them . . . . Framing is the process of demarcating phenomena in a double-edged way that is simultaneously inclusive and exclusive. (44)

Narrative is thus a resource for rhetoric in that it both i) provides a range of socially recognized forms for representing human action and ii) incorporates into its instantiations, frames within which values can be ascribed to its representations. Narrative, that is, both represents and enacts reality and social relations.

Robert Hodge and Gunther Kress identify how narrative forms function both rhetorically and ideologically. "Narrative," they say, is a culturally given way of organizing and presenting discourse. The characteristic structures of narrative themselves carry important meanings. Narrative links events into sequential and causal chains, and gives them a beginning and an end. These features are transparent signifiers of coherence, order, and closure. One effect of the use of these persuasive transparent signifiers is to naturalize the content of the narrative itself. By presenting various contingent cultural categories in a narrative frame, the categories themselves take on the appearance of naturalness, and come to seem as inevitable as nature itself. (Semiotics 230)

In general terms, narrative is ideological because i) it pre-sets potentiality — some things are more likely to come up, and be chosen, and be combined in certain ways — and because ii) its form ascribes coherence, order, and closure. Hodge and Kress argue, moreover, that narrative is specifically ideological because its form "serves to signify the stability of the status quo." "As [Aristotle] glossed [his famous definition of
narrative," they explain,
it masked an ideologically loaded progression, from an initial state of equilibrium, through complication or disturbance, to a crisis and resolution, leading to a new equilibrium . . . . Ideologically this structure acknowledges that the state of affairs can be disturbed and unsettled, but it promises that they will return to a state of equilibrium which is prior and natural and therefore inevitable. Narrative is therefore an effective and flexible strategy which particular societies can use to reproduce their value systems. Narrative takes flux, incessant activity, insoluble problems, and turns them into stability, coherence, solution. It puts boundaries around disruptive processes and events, and often breaks them up further into discrete steps or stages, again limiting their disturbing force.

(230)
The ideological potential that Hodge and Kress identify in generic narrative forms is particularly evident in storied instantiations of narrative. As a composite of selections and combinations from among narrative forms and patterns, that is, a given story’s particularity is motivated by the exigencies of the local rhetorical situation in which the tale gets told. The representations of a specific story will enact specific relations vis-à-vis the implied audience, for specific reasons, in a specific context, by a specific narrator. “[N]o narrative version can be independent of a particular teller and occasion of telling,” Barbara Herrnstein Smith asserts, “and, therefore . . . we may assume that every narrative version has been constructed in accord with some set of purposes or interests” (215). Narrative selections and combinations thus always realize the symbolic actions of identification and division in their particularized social contexts of use.

Dennis Mumby, though he recognizes narrative’s ideological
potential to reproduce the discursive forms with which the status quo sends social messages of correctness, coherence, and order, cautions that narrative is not merely acted on by the forces of social ideology. “Narrative,” he explains in his introduction to *Narrative and Social Control*,

is a *socially* symbolic act in the double sense that (a) it takes on meaning only in a social context and (b) it plays a role in the construction of that social context as a site of meaning within which social actors are implicated . . . [T]here is no simple isomorphism between narrative (or any other symbolic form) and the social realm. In different ways, each of the chapters belies the notion that narrative functions monolithically to create a stable, structured, social order. (5; italics in text)

“Indeed,” he adds, identifying a crucial issue that the discussion of grammar and discourse elaborates below, “one of the prevailing themes . . . is the extent to which social order is tenuous, precarious, and open to negotiation in various ways. In this sense, society is characterized by an ongoing ‘struggle over meaning’” (5). Narrative thus rhetorically responds to, and addresses, social situations. Because specific stories are always constructed of particular selections and combinations of language forms, they always potentially exceed the limits of narrative forms and categories. Specific stories, that is, not only reflect social systems but are always potentially reinterpreting those social systems.

*iv) grammar as a resource of narrative, a resource of rhetoric*

Following Stillar (20), I consider texts to be dynamic processes of continuous selection from meaning-making resources, such that choices at one stage or level affect choices at other stages or levels. The ideational,
interpersonal, and textual resources of language enable an infinite range of grammatical selections and combinations. Text, however, is constructed of specific grammatical selections and combinations, and any specific realization of text groups and divides the social world in particular ways. The grammatical choices that realize text, therefore, constrain and enable, in their turn, particular kinds of narrative representations of actors, agency, time frames, and locations. Narrative in its turn, as the discussion about ideology indicates above, has a vast array of resources for representing the symbolic identifications and divisions exchanged in texts.

Teun van Dijk explicitly situates his analysis of racist stories in the local details of discourse analysis, their instantiations of particular narrative patterns and forms, and the rhetorical effects of those patterns and forms at the level of social and structural orders of discourse. "Discourse analysis," he explains, usually focuses on local . . . communicative interaction . . . ('texts') . . . and the . . . meanings or interpretations of such discourse . . . . [A]t a more global level of analysis, we may also distinguish structural 'orders of discourse,' that is, complex, societal, political, or cultural systems of text and talk. These systems include, for instance, the recurrent or preferred topical or thematic structures, lexical inventories, conventional text schemata, or stylistic and rhetorical strategies of groups, organizations, or whole cultures . . . . [S]ocietal orders of discursive practices are in turn complemented by a high level of socially shared social cognitions, such as the norms, values, and ideologies of these social formations. (122-23)

Thus, discursive analysis of narrative instantiations connects both 'down' the hierarchy to the specific grammatical selections and combinations that make up text and 'up' the hierarchy to the rhetorical structures and
strategies that articulate social-ideological norms, values, perspectives, and evaluations.

v) grammar

I specifically adopt Michael Halliday’s notion of a functional grammar in which, as he explains, “[a] language is interpreted as a system of meanings, accompanied by forms through which the meanings can be realized.” According to Halliday, the central question of a functional grammar is, ‘how are meanings expressed?’ “This,” he says, “puts the forms of a language in a different perspective [from traditional linguistics]: as means to an end, rather than as an end in themselves” (Introduction xiv). Like Burke’s interest in the social use and function of language, Halliday stresses that a functional grammar is designed to account for how a language is used in context/s. “Every text . . . ,” he explains, everything that is said or written — unfolds in some context of use; furthermore, it is the uses of language that, over tens of thousands of generations, have shaped the system. Language has evolved to satisfy human needs; and the way it is organized is functional with respect to these needs — it is not arbitrary. A functional grammar is essentially a ‘natural’ grammar, in the sense that everything in it can be explained, ultimately, by reference to how language is used. (xiii)

Halliday’s functional grammar hypothesizes three linguistic metafunctions, or fundamental functional components of meaning around which all languages are organized. According to Halliday, these components, the ideational, the interpersonal, and the textual, are the manifestations in the linguistic system of the general purposes that underlie all uses of language (xiii).

As Stillar explains, the ideational function refers to the resources
with which language constructs content: “Language represents things, concepts, relations, and events and their circumstances: Text is always ‘about something.’” Similarly, the interpersonal function refers to the resources with which language shapes interaction: “Language constructs social relations between participants in situations of its use. The interpersonal resources of the language enable users to assign roles to their addressees and to express their attitudes toward addressees and toward the content of their messages: Text is always ‘to and from somebody.’” The textual function, finally, refers to the resources with which language realizes ideational and interpersonal meanings in cohesive and contextually coherent texts: “Text always exhibits structure and organization” (Stillar 20-1).

Text, discourse, and context are key concepts in a functional grammar. Following Halliday, Hodge and Kress, Norman Fairclough, Stillar, and Lemke, I use the term discourse to refer to the social processes and activities involved in making meaning with language or other symbolic systems. Discourse, which includes the various participants involved in the meaning-making processes and activities (Lemke 6), is always social, communicative, and rhetorical. “Discourse,” says Stillar, “is ‘action’: It does things for social agents in the real contexts of their living. No discourse takes place outside the situated, embodied experiences and interests of the participants involved in an exchange. Discourse is an integral part of the complex goings-on that make up social life” (5).

Stillar, Lemke, Fairclough, and Hodge and Kress also identify social orders of discourse, which are produced as the result of particular social habits of a community (Lemke 7). Particular subjects are talked about in particular ways as parts of particular sorts of social activity. Stillar, for instance, describes the various discourses that make up a complex social construction
of education (12) while Lemke enumerates the biological, religious, medical, literary, psychoanalytic, and pornographic discourses that contribute to a social order of discourse about sexuality (7).

Discourse and discourses thus exist in a dual relationship to social life. Discourse, that is, is both determined by and reflects social systems and structures at the same time that it functions as one of the crucial means by which social relations are articulated and realized (Stillar 6). Echoing Mumby's observations about narrative above, Hodge and Kress note that discourse's dual relationship has the potential to disrupt established social meaning. "Discourse . . .," they explain, "is the site where social forms of organization engage with systems of signs in the production of texts, thus reproducing or changing the sets of meanings and values which make up a culture . . . . In these interactions and the texts that they produce, the set of meanings is constantly deployed, and in being deployed is at risk of disruption" (Semiotics 6). Because instantiations of language always potentially exceed their intended semantic limits, they are always negotiating their relationship to the social systems they simultaneously reflect and reinterpret.

Texts are specific instantiations of discourse (Stillar 6), and include any spoken or written messages produced by human beings engaged in discourse (Lemke 7). Stillar explicates both the socially-situated and inherently rhetorical nature of text when he calls it "symbolic exchange between real social agents in situations bearing tangible consequences." As symbolic exchange, he elaborates, text "always embodies motive and interest — not (simplistically) the motives and interests of the 'individuals' involved, but those of the whole host of social systems and structures with their attendant resources 'speaking through' social agents. The dynamism and tension inherent in this variety of motives and interests is created by
and marked in textual practice” (6; italics in text). Like discourse, that is, text exists dually, as a specific articulation that reflects social structures and as a specific articulation that re-interprets or re-negotiates social structures. Clearly, text and discourse can only be understood in the context of the complex surrounding environment of social system and structure.

vi) the social-ideological effects and motives of rhetoric

A particular rhetorical choice can be seen as drawing on the resources of narrative at the same time that it is itself being drawn on as a resource for social and ideological systems and structures. Just as narrative forms and patterns constrain discursive choices, however, extant social and ideological systems and structures constrain the range of legitimate rhetorical expressions and functions, by enforcing covert and overt restrictions on who can engage in what kind of symbolic action, with what resources, and to what ends.

Lemke provides a useful description of the socially constructed nature of text, discourse, and the social meanings and relationships that they negotiate rhetorically. “Every text or event,” says Lemke, takes its meaning in part from being seen in the community as an instance of one or more formations [or genres]. We interpret it against the background of other instances of the same formations to see how it is distinctive and we contrast it with instances of other formations. Different formations (codes, genres, registers, voices of heteroglossia, discursive formations) are not just different, however. They have systematic relations to one another, and those relations define and are defined by the larger social relationships of classes, genders, age groups, political constituencies, and significant social divisions of every kind. The model is recursive; each level is
defined by its relations to the other levels in the model. So, for instance, social class is defined by the fact that not all activities in the community are equally likely to be practiced by all people. People are defined by the activities in which they participate, and significant social categories of people by the intersections of groups of related activities, including the discourse practices by which we label people as members of social categories. (32)

Texts, thus, are not merely relevant or meaningful at different levels of analysis, but the levels of analysis exist in a discursive relationship to one another. A rhetoric of colonial exchange understands particular rhetorical choices as drawing on the resources of narrative drawing on the resources of grammar — at the same time that those rhetorical choices are themselves drawn on as a resource for social and ideological systems and structures. A rhetoric of colonial exchange also posits that the inter-relationships of these various levels of meaning reflect the re-negotiations of social reality that language choices make possible.

vii) colonialism and postcolonialism

The description of postcolonialism with which this chapter begins constitutes part of Brydon’s argument for defining Canada as a postcolonial country. “Economically and politically,” Patrick Williams and Laura Chrisman claim, from a differing perspective on invader-settler societies like Canada, Australia, and New Zealand, their relation to the metropolitan centre bore little resemblance to that of the actual colonies. They were not subject to the sort of coercive measures which were the lot of the colonies, and their ethnic stratification was fundamentally different. Their subsequent history and economic development, and current location within
global capitalist relations, have been very much in a metropolitan mode, rather than a (post-) colonial one. (4)

By contrast, Brydon asserts that precisely because colonialism and imperialism fuelled the development of capitalism, their relationship needs to be understood. “[I]f postcolonialism does not investigate the range of historical relations of colonies to colonialism,” she claims, “it will never gain a full perspective on colonialism and how to counter its negative effects” (10).

Although the texts I examine and the journeys they represent are historically prior to the late nineteenth-century timeframe typically associated with colonialist expansion (Williams and Chrisman 2), the geographically immense, culturally influential, and economically lucrative fur trade in North America was unarguably an early manifestation of the specifically colonial forms that global imperial domination would take. It certainly meets the criteria Williams and Chrisman enumerate in their description of colonialism as a phase in imperialist history characterized by “the globalisation of the capitalist mode of production, its penetration of previously non-capitalist regions of the world, and destruction of pre- or non-capitalist forms of social organisation.” Their additional note, that the colonial phase “represents the need for access to new (preferably captive) markets and sources of raw materials, as well as the desire to deny these to competitor nations” (2), further clarifies the aptness of the categorization.

The social structurationist view of language described above sees discourse and texts and the stabilities they engender and destabilities they make possible as crucial dynamics in both the deployment of colonial relationships and in the activist intervention by which they are dismantled. Although Brydon cautions against critical histories that identify Edward Said as the initiator of postcolonial analysis (6), Said’s *Orientalism* marks a
crucial development of ‘colonial discourse analysis’ as an activity of academic inquiry into “the variety of textual forms in which the West produced and codified knowledge about non-metropolitan areas and cultures, especially those under colonial control” (Williams and Chrisman 5). As Williams and Chrisman describe, Said’s introduction of colonial discourse analysis into the field catalyzed an enormous range of related scholarship; certainly Peter Hulme, whose work informs this study both methodologically and ideologically, cites Said as a direct influence (xv).

The theoretical framework and methodology described here add to the tradition of ‘colonial discourse analysis’ a systematic way of theorizing the relationship between the identifiable forms of colonial texts and the meaning-values they constrain and enable as one goes ‘up’ or ‘down’ the levels of the system. A systematic analysis of the inter-dependent functions and effects of the grammatical, narrative, and rhetorical levels of colonial texts enables a politically-engaged rethinking of how language forms deploy the ideologies of colonialism in their contexts of use. At its best, such a systematic analysis also sets the ideologies of colonialism and neo-colonialism at risk.

viii) commodity exchange in the colonial contact zone

Texts, as instantiations of discourse, draw on and replicate the social systems and structures of which they are an expression. Every instantiation of discourse, however, sets the multifarious meanings of language loose in a particular way and so potentially puts the established terms of the social system at risk. As articulations of the multivalent contact zone, exploration narratives record both destabilization, and discursive efforts to recuperate destabilization, in discernible textual structures. Destabilization and recuperation, moreover, leave evidence that un-recouperable waste is
produced when cultural systems clash. I call the ‘signs’ that are left over when dominant sense has been made, discursively, of the instabilities of the contact zone, “uncanny commodities.”

The ‘uncanny commodity’ is related, conceptually, to the commodities, material and intangible, exchanged in the space of the contact zone. The record-keepers of these exchanges were on the scene specifically to effect mercantile exchange according to European economic forms and structures. The semiotic instability of the contact zone, however, renders that exchange both more multiple and less controlled than would be ideal, at least from the perspective of the recorders. Threatened by the resulting instability, the representing system invokes grouping and dividing practices designed to reproduce its codes, values, and symbolic order and to keep the other system outside its boundaries. In rhetorical terms, the system not only selects the reality it wishes to represent about the zone but it attempts to deflect from view those elements which are incommensurable with its values.

As the discussion above has established, rhetorical selections and deflections are enabled at the narrative level by frames within which value is ascribed to the exchanges. “Anyone who exchanges things is thereby deeming them to be valuable,” Ian Reid explains. “But what value, exactly, gets attributed to the content of an exchange will depend on how it is framed” (13). Framing, however, as Reid also explains, is always subject to reframing “in terms of the rhetorically substitutive movement of figures (whether tropes, characters or situations) and by the power-charged interplay between narrator and narratee” (39). Framing, moreover, and reframing, too, are also always processes of both inclusion and exclusion (44), congregation and segregation.

In situations of great instability, narrative frames can be and are
shifted in order to accommodate or eliminate incommensurable elements. Framing thus both creates and tries to deflect from view, the waste-products of the dominant system’s dividing practices. The waste-products remain, however, in repressed form, and when they reappear, they do so in much the way of Sigmund Freud’s “uncanny,” which I read, following Alan Lawson, as something which is not so much frightening because unfamiliar, as frightening because it is the familiar de- and then re-contextualized by processes of repression (“Zeugma” 4). I refer to the waste elements as uncanny commodities, moreover, because i) in pre-repressed form, they appear in the texts according to their commodity-value in the operative exchange-economy, ii) their repression has a particular commodity-value within the textual economy in which it occurs, and iii) their repression has had commodity-value both in subsequent reinscriptions of particular texts and, more generally, in representations of the genre within the Canadian literary canon.

The commodities are uncanny, that is, because they disappear when their repression has more value in the dominant system’s textual economy than they had in the exchange-economy in which they originally circulated. The uncanny is commodified, moreover, when its repression continues to accrue value in the context of the text’s reception and evaluation.

ix) uncanny commodities and the Canadian literary tradition

Williams and Chrisman reject the idea of Canada as a postcolonial society on the grounds that i) the country was not subject to the coercive measures that ‘true’ colonies experienced and that ii) our history, economic development, and relation to global capitalism have been in a “metropolitan mode” not a postcolonial one (4). By doing so, they articulate a dangerous but tempting elision between participation in global economic politics and
independent national existence. One has, however, only to think of the North American Free Trade Agreement or the still-threatening Multilateral Agreement on Investment and their effects and potential effects on the possibility of an autonomous Canadian political culture to understand how thoroughly economically colonized we are as a country. As Anthony Wilden points out throughout The Imaginary Canadian, the erasures and mystifications that insist on Canada’s independent status as a developed, industrial, and technological nation are precisely the erasures and mystifications by which the nation Canada, Canadian people, and Canadian texts have remained in colonial relations to their political and economic masters. “The British now see mainly to the exploitation of our traditions,” says Wilden;

the Americans attend to most of the economic and ecological exploitation of the country. But many Imaginary Canadians in positions of power insist that Canada is an independent, industrialized, democratic state. Others, a little less ignorant perhaps, but no less cynical, declare that if Canada is a colony, then that is what Canadians want. Others yet more extremist will say that this is the best Canadians can hope for or deserve. But we are not by birth or nature ‘colonials.’ We were not born with a ‘colonial mentality.’ We were brought up and trained to be this way, in our collective history as in our personal lives . . . . [I]t is not enough to recognize that Canada is a colony . . . . The bullet we have to bite is that we are colonized—historically, economically, socially, politically, and personally.

Colonized peoples are taught Imaginary histories in which they play the role of the ‘natural’ inferiors. The result is a country of amnesia victims. We cannot know who we are unless we know what
our domestic and ‘external’ relations actually were at different times in our history—the record of our social memory—and how those relations changed over time. (2)

Wilden’s text, of course, constitutes an extended re-membering of Canadian social and cultural memory, flawed as it has traditionally been by what he calls imaginary histories. Wilden takes on, that is, the business of what Robert Kroetsch calls, in a somewhat more celebratory context, ‘unhiding the hidden’ (58-63). To do so, Wilden traffics in the ‘uncanny commodities’ whose ‘unhiding’ may be our only means of recovering memory and reversing amnesia.

In his 1965 “Conclusion” to the Literary History of Canada, Northrop Frye claims that, “There is no Canadian writer of whom we can say what we can say of the world’s major writers, that their readers can grow up inside their work without ever being aware of a circumference” (821). Frye makes several of his other famous claims in the same article: that the writings of the early explorers are “as innocent of literary intention as a mating loon” (822); that Canadian literature, even “in its orthodox genres of poetry and fiction . . . is more significantly studied as a part of Canadian life than as a part of an autonomous world of literature” (822); and, perhaps most famously, that Canadian sensibility “is less perplexed by the question ‘Who am I?’ than by some such riddles as ‘Where is here?’” (826). Several decades of poststructuralist, marxist, feminist, and postcolonial criticism have thoroughly called into question the assumption that an autonomous, circumference-less, world of literature exists free of contextual and contingent social and ideological values. Canadian literary history has, nevertheless, inherited a tradition that once reinscribed wholesale the social and ideological values and erasures that — politically, economically, culturally, and textually — perpetuate colonial
relations.

Because we have been invited to despise our cultural productions in much the way that we have been invited to imagine that we benefit personally and politically from the machinations of the multi-national status quo, we have been invited not to read the records of how we came to be in this place nor to read those records for evidence of an ongoing negotiation with multivalent space. Not only does Frye’s infamous, “Where is here,” depend on what Richard Cavell calls, “an abstract notion of space in which social constructions are absent” (110), his question reinscribes the defensively culture-centric position from which explorers of Canadian space attempted to erase the effects of semiotic instability in the contact zone.

This study, therefore, which begins in a textual analysis of the language of Canadian exploration narratives, proposes to use that analysis to rethink the colonial relationship between Canada’s political and economic allegiances and Canada’s cultural history. It models a locally situated, provisional, and strategic attempt to think through the consequences of colonialism, in part by reading the texts, as Heather Murray proposes, for their contradictions and not for their coherences (“Reading” 78). Indeed, this study hopes to contribute to the analysis of “the discursive organization of culture and cultural study” that Murray considers essential in helping us understand “why and how we believe and know the things we do” (81). Because the methodology demonstrated is not just applicable to texts of Canadian exploration narratives, moreover, nor limited to texts overtly characterizable as colonial or imperial, it provides a powerful tool for reading literary and historical texts for their multivalent linguistic and socially-contextualized meanings.

The various vocabularies and academic communities drawn on by,
and implicated in, this study are brought together as part of Brydon’s “activist and interventionary politics” and in relation to the current intellectual and political context. The study reiterates, for instance, Robert Young’s call for further analysis of discursive forms of racism. “[W]hat should be emphasized,” Young asserts,
is the degree to which analysis of colonialism has shown the extent to which such relations of power and authority are still endemic in current social and institutional practices . . . . Analysis needs to be extended now to the discursive forms, representations and practices of contemporary racism, together with their relation to the colonial past and to nineteenth-century forms of knowledge . . . showing in particular how they sustain and intervene in contemporary practices of the state which legitimize racism, such as immigration and nationality law or educational institutions. (175)
The study proposes, moreover, to model a way of examining discursive forms, representations, and practices that, at its best, enables both analysis and intervention.

The study also calls attention to the profoundly destructive global economic policies that are potentially obscured by the term “post-colonial.” “[O]rienting theory around the temporal axis colonial/post colonial makes it easier not to see, and therefore harder to theorize, the continuities in international imbalances in imperial power,” Anne McClintock warns, for instance (“Angel” 295; italics in text). Like Peter Hulme, McClintock identifies the current global economy, dominated by multi-nationals and premised on the value of currency-exchange in the absence of material production or benefit to human lives and communities, as an obscured form of neo-colonialism whose control we need to resist. According to Hulme,
Foucault’s work has suggested that what counts as truth will depend on strategies of power rather than on epistemological criteria. To meet this challenge the starting point for any radical writing of history must be the political agenda set by the present. In this instance that would involve the observation that international politics is clearly still moulded by the recent era of the great colonial empires . . . . Equally obvious is that the ‘end of empire’ has concealed signal continuities in the power-relationships still pertaining between different parts of the world — in a word, neo-colonialism. (6)

Young’s, McClintock’s, and Hulme’s concerns with the lived political dimensions of theory and analysis, concerns which are inflected in our national context by Wilden’s passionate de-mystification of imaginary Canadian histories, require forms of analysis that link the details of texts with their profound ideological effects. And they call for analysis that catalyzes resistance to exclusively economic versions of the world.

Methodology

i) theory and methodology

A theoretical framework outlines, at a conceptual level, the metalanguages engaged in a study, and the interrelationships, functions, and structures of those metalanguages, in order to provide a systematic and comprehensive body of knowledge. A methodology, however, makes selections from among the framework’s resources in order to identify, explain, and critique particular relevant instances. This study’s theoretical framework specifically engages the metalanguages of discourse, narrative, rhetoric, and social-ideological theory and analysis. The methodology described below provides a way of identifying, explaining, and critiquing
language patterns and their functions and consequences, as those patterns occur in particular instances of text and as they are shaped by, and give shape to, particular social, historical, and cultural contexts.

As a selection of theoretical resources, a methodology is less concerned with giving a general, conceptual account than a detailed, illuminative reading. In each of the readings presented in Chapters 3, 4, and 5, the texts' own language-selections crucially determine the salient points of analysis, the features examined, and the analytical links elaborated. The individual readings do not always use all the resources available, nor do they outline all the possible connections between language selections and their functions and consequences at each of the levels of analysis. In Chapter 6, however, I reposition and elaborate the individual readings in relation to one another and in terms of the larger theoretical framework.

**ii) the role of transformation in the methodology**

The concept of 'transformation' functions as a key term in discourse, narrative, and rhetorical theory and is central to the methodology I outline below. Various theorists propose "transformation" — 'the action of changing in form, shape, or appearance' or 'the action of changing in character, condition, function, or nature' — as a term to describe the textual dynamics and effects they identify. In social semiotics, for instance, Hodge and Kress describe transformation as the processes of interpretation, reorganization, and reworking that go on in the presentation of linguistic 'reality' and in the interpretation of linguistic 'reality' (Language 15). Their refinement of that description, which posits something they call, "a sequence of material texts or forms of texts as the explanatory core of the concept of transformation, with prior texts or structure not 'deeper' but
simply ‘earlier’” (Semiotics 34), incorporates a more explicitly — and complexly — social dimension. In social semiotic terms, transformation is the multifaceted social process by which signs are created and interpreted.

Mieke Bal and Seymour Chatman consider transformation to be a defining characteristic of narrative, marked by process, change, and development (Bal 37, Chatman 21). Ian Reid’s identification of the substitutions and dispossessions that characterize narrative exchange mark, moreover, the points at which a narrative is transforming. At a rhetorical level, transformations are evidence that symbolic action has changed an attitude and an orientation toward identification. “Rhetorical analysis, in general, seeks to understand the transformations in perspectives that the symbolic action of text initiates,” Stillar explains. “Transformation,” he adds, “is the central act of rhetoric. For identification to occur, a change in attitude and orientation must occur, and a change in attitude and orientation amounts to a change in the ways we are likely to act” (6). In the terms of this study, the concept of ‘transformation’ exchanges meanings and resonances among the various levels of analysis, marking the complex social processes by which signs are produced and interpreted, the narrative effects of shifting sign-values, and the shifts in attitude and orientation that symbolic action initiates.

Following Burke’s recognition that transformations in symbolic identification (or division) effect changes in social action, Stillar emphasizes the social and political ramifications of rhetorical transformations. “Discourse,” he explains, “involves rhetorical action because it constitutes a major means through which we link ourselves to one another and to the social environments of which we are a part” (5). “The act of participating in discourse is also . . .,” he adds, “a social act . . . . [I]nstances of discourse, by symbolically framing, enacting, and
organizing experience, are linked inextricably with the social systems and structures through which we interact with one another” (6). Hodge and Kress similarly recognize the ideological dimensions of semiotic transformations and the analysis of semiotic transformations (Language 15-29). “A materialist theory of transformation,” they explain, “regards transformations as social/material processes, linking socially/historically situated texts, in processes which have historically and socially located agents” (Semiotics 164).

The political dimensions of transformation have particularly acute resonances in the specific contexts of colonial discourse. According to Abdul R. JanMohamed,

The imperialist is not fixated on specific images or stereotypes of the Other but rather on the affective benefits proferred by the manichean allegory, which generates the various stereotypes . . . . [T]he manichean allegory, with its highly efficient exchange mechanism, permits various kinds of rapid transformations, for example, metonymic displacement—which leads to the essentialist metonymy . . . and metaphoric condensation . . . . Exchange-value remains the central motivating force of both colonialist material practice and colonialist literary representations. (87)

When dominant discursive powers use forms of transformation to recuperate “Others” challenges to their ideological values, those transformations — of sign-values, narrative forms, and symbolic action — potentially serve intimately related ideological and exchange purposes.

**iii) transformation and exchange in the contact zone**

Transformation is always both the medium and the outcome of exchange. Symbolic transformations of value, for instance, are necessary
to make exchange possible, plausible, and meaningful. Exchange, in turn, always results in literal and symbolic transformations of value and evaluation. The dialogical relationship between transformation and exchange is heightened and sharpened by the exigencies of the contact zone. Contact zones are exemplary ‘places’ in and at which colonial discourse attempts to marshal only those exchanges and only those transformations sanctioned by authoritative versions of reality. Contact zones are, that is, in Kenneth Burke’s terms, ‘scenic’: they establish the conditions of colonial exchange as acts with motives and consequences. They also, therefore, constrain and enable the kinds of transformations which can occur in the space.

Just as exchange involves the ‘setting of the terms’ of exchange, transformation proceeds by selections, substitutions, deflections, and displacements that have a particular trajectory. As a result, some changes of form are more likely to happen, given the context of situation, than others. Changes in form, of course, implicate changes in meanings, possibilities, connections, desires, and motivations. Transformations can be characterized by identifying the dominant term that establishes the form in which changes occur, the term according to which other terms take on their particular inflections, emphases, and de-emphases.

Time, space, and agency are the key narrative terms that characterize transformation and exchange in the texts I examine. The narrative structures that those terms uniquely inflect draw, of course, on grammatical structures and, specifically, on the interactions of those grammatical structures. As Stilar explains about the interaction of the ideational, interpersonal, and textual metafunctions,

Texts in use (real texts) realize the potential of all three types of function simultaneously. Although analyzing the linguistic patterns
of texts requires us to speak about one function at a time, we must recognize that the three functions are interdependent. For specific analytical purposes, we may focus on a particular function in a text or part of a text, but all the message-carrying units of the language exhibit the three types of functional meaning. (21)

Time, for instance, is realized textually by a range of features that potentially includes grammatical tense (is the activity in question construed as being before-now, now, or after-now?), circumstantial roles (at what time is the activity occurring?), and “the semantic relations constructed from the text’s point of writing or speaking” (is the activity ongoing or completed?) (Stillar 26-7).

Similarly, space is realized textually primarily by circumstantial roles (at what place does the action occur), but also potentially by the semantic function of structures of perspective (where is the action happening in relation to the point of narration), and concept taxonomies (the clustering and arrangement of lexical items referring to space and location) (Stillar 26-8). And although agency is primarily realized linguistically by process and participant roles (respectively, the events and relations represented in language, and the entities involved in those events and relations), it is also realized by speech functions (statement, question, command, or exclamation), modality (the lexical and grammatical resources that construct a writer’s attitude toward the ideational content), and attitudinal lexis (subclasses of adjectives, adverbs, and verbs that realize mental and relational processes) (Stillar 34-8).

Narrative realizations of time, space, and agency thus draw on specific grammatical resources. Narrative itself, of course, becomes a resource for the dramatistic ratios, hence, the selections and deflections of reality, that appear in texts. Selections and deflections of reality, that is,
are made in terms of the dominant narrative term. So that, for instance, in a text in which time dominates, time as 'scene' determines what kinds of acts, actors, agencies, and purposes can effect rhetorical transformations. Similarly, a narrative in which space dominates may create a ratio in which space as 'scene' determines the kinds of acts, actors, agencies, or purposes that can effect transformations in attitude and orientation. And agency as a dominant narrative term operates as rhetorical agency to determine what kinds of acts, actors, scenes, or purposes can effect symbolic transformations and exchanges.

As we know from Burke, selections and deflections create the possibilities of identification and division and, hence, congregation and segregation. Since we tend to congregate with those whose language enacts transformations that construct the world in the same terms — and terms in the same relationships — that we do, we are inclined to 'believe in' discursive worlds dominated by particular rhetorical ratios. If we believe, for instance, that "everything happens for a reason," we might be particularly inclined to accept as true, discourse dominated by a purpose:act ratio. All texts, moreover, invite participation and 'belief in worlds,' participation and beliefs which cannot fail to have ideological dimensions because they are intimately implicated in our social actions and interactions.

Preview

My discussion so far has dealt with the method in general. In the study’s three central chapters (Chapters 3, 4, and 5), I show the method in operation. This preview, however, outlines the general progress of my argument, namely that each of the three explorer narratives I examine enacts characteristic transformations based on the predominance of one of
the key narrative terms, *time, space, or agency*. Each narrative draws on particular grammatical resources to do so, and is motivated rhetorically to enact particular kinds of identifications and divisions, which affect and are affected by, their social and political contexts. To the extent that the three narratives share similar exigencies, resources, and goals, they evidence similarities in the patterns and motives of transformations and exchange. To the extent that they differ, however, they evidence significant differences in discursive, narrative, and rhetorical transformations, and, consequently, in their ideologies of exchange.

My thesis divides the discussion into three chapters, each one focusing (though not exclusively) on a different explorer based on the narrative feature predominant in that explorer's text. I argue that all three terms (time, space, agency) play an important role in all three narratives, but, as I describe in the previous section, one term emerges 'on top' in each case and so forms a ratio with the other terms. In each case, the pattern of predominance is central to understanding the underlying rhetorical actions and ideological dimensions of colonial exchange as they are represented in the text.

*i) Alexander Mackenzie*

Mackenzie's text is dominated by the ratios that time forms with space and agency. Time functions ideationally in Mackenzie’s text as ‘content,’ what the text is about, primarily as a result of the extremely numerous temporal markers of circumstance. Because those temporal markers of circumstance often appear in the grammatically thematic position, time also acts as a fundamental structuring resource of the text. The text, that is, relies powerfully on ‘thematized’ time structures to realize what Stillar calls the ideational function of “time and perspective” (26-7),
to convey ‘what the sentences are about’ (46), and to realize the textual function of structuring the flow of information and linking the text with its context (46-8). Frequency, of course, is also a narrative category (Toolan, Narrative 49). The sheer number of temporal markers in Mackenzie’s text establish a very particular narrative rhythm. Crucially, particularly in Mackenzie’s construction of himself as a hero, those temporal markers also frame specific narrative episodes.

Mackenzie’s semantic and grammatical focus on time typically creates a scene:act ratio that describes reality in terms of the acts possible in particular scenic dimensions. As my analysis demonstrates, this selection of reality powerfully deflects from view i) the possibility of other-than-European exchange-meanings, ii) other ways of marking time, and iii) the meaningfulness of the other actors in the scene, particularly the indigenous actors. This selection of reality also solicits powerful rhetorical identification with the singular heroic persona of the narrator and the exclusive meaningfulness of his acts. Mackenzie’s rhetorical selection of reality aligns itself with an ideology of efficiency based on equivalences among linear temporal progress, spatial mastery, and mercantile ownership.

**ii) Samuel Hearne**

Hearne’s text is dominated by the ratios that space forms with time and, particularly, with agency. By contrast with Mackenzie, who constructs the space of his narrative primarily through concept taxonomies, Hearne constructs distinctly social space by using circumstantial markers of ‘relative location’ and circumstantial markers that pertain directly to the people with whom he shares the space. Grammatical differences create very different narrative spaces in the two texts. In Mackenzie’s case,
narrative space appears as something pre-given, a function of nouns or 'thing-ness.' Narrative space in Hearne’s account is, by contrast, created grammatically as a complex and shifting circumstance that both affects human action but is also affected by human action. The circumstantial role that space plays in Hearne’s narrative creates a scene:agency ratio in which space powerfully determines what acts can be effected and by what category of person. Hearne’s scene:agency ratio is significantly inflected, moreover, by Matonabbee’s narrative presence and the narrative’s focus on Matonabbee’s various wives.

Hearne’s thematic focus on the way social-geographical space creates the possibility of acting creates fundamental tensions between i) European and indigenous exchange values and practices and ii) his European body’s textual value and its value within the indigenous cultural space. Hearne’s rhetorical constructions of a space of exchange fundamentally separate from European systems of value, therefore, selects a reality segregated from the usual terms of approbative European congregation. Within that space, Hearne describes reality in terms of the values of that space. He also, simultaneously, deflects attention away from his absolute dependence on the efficacy of the gendered nature of those labour- and exchange-values.

iii) Alexander Henry

Henry’s text depends much more strongly on ‘storied’ form than do either of the other two texts. Henry’s text is dominated by the ratios that agency, specifically narrative agency, forms with time and space. Agency in the text is constructed grammatically by process and participant functions embedded in co-text remarkable for its layering of circumstantial markers. The text’s numerous and layered circumstantial markers
emphasize the narrator’s simultaneous distance from, and intimacy with, his narration of events and the events of his narration. Grammatical negotiations of distance and intimacy take the form of pronoun slippages that mark the narrator’s shift in identity from agent of exchange to object of exchange at and after the point of the attack on Michilimackinac.

The text’s dependence on the cultural audibility and comprehensibility of narrative forms and structures is underscored by its reliance on specifically gothic versions of those forms and structures. Negotiations of distance and intimacy are, moreover, supported powerfully by the text’s evocations of gothic temporal-spatiality. Semantic, grammatical, and narrative realizations of agency create an agent:agency ratio focused on the narrating persona as a representative of threatened European identity. Henry’s rhetorical construction of dramatically threatened European identity selects reality exclusively in stark storied terms of good and evil and solicits exclusive identification with himself in his role as ideal agent of European mercantilism. In the interests of an audible and efficacious ‘story,’ that is, the text deflects from narrative and ideological view all evidence of the complex, non-European economic and political context of the storied situation.

As a group, the three texts form a fascinating instance of colonial discourse in negotiation with the kinds of contact zones that invader-settler activity created at the end of the eighteenth century in northern North America. Considered separately and in comparison with one another, the texts tell us much more again about the complex ways in which the ideologies of colonialism perpetuate themselves. Barbara Herrnstein Smith’s observation about stories is relevant in this context. “For any given narrative,” she explains, elaborating her theory of the socially-
contextualized and motivated nature of narrative,

there are always *multiple* basic stories that can be constructed in
response to it because basic-ness is always arrived at by the exercise
of some set of operations, in accord with some set of principles, that
reflect some set of interests, all of which are, by nature, variable and
thus multiple . . . . The form and features of any ‘version’ of a
narrative will be a function of, among other things, the particular
motives that elicited it and the particular interests and functions it
was designed to serve. (217)

Like stories generally, the three exploration accounts examined here can be
thought of as instantiated versions of a basic plot-line of heroic exploration,
progress through space, and successful return. Each text, however,
demonstrates a different narrative ratio, achieves different narrative
effects, and selects differently from discursive resources to do so. The
analyses that follow identify how particular grammatical, narrative, and
rhetorical selections in the texts, and the ideological functions those
selections serve, distinguish the texts one from another. The distinctions
that the analyses foreground signal the range of, and fine discriminations
among, the rhetorical and ideological purposes that colonial texts are made
to serve. In my concluding chapter, Chapter 6, I summarize the
differences that Chapters 3, 4, and 5 identify, and I speculate on the
differences that these differences make to our understanding of the rhetoric
of colonial exchange, particularly from a postcolonial perspective and in
the contemporary context of neo-colonial global economics.
Chapter 3: Alexander Mackenzie: Narrative Constructions of Heroic Time

Introduction

Alexander Mackenzie’s is one of the most readily recognized names associated with Canadian exploration. Born at Stornoway, on the Isle of Lewis, Mackenzie has been described as “the very type of pushing Scot who has contributed much to Canadian development” (Hopwood 29). Mackenzie applied his peculiar entrepreneurial talents to expanding the Montreal-based fur trade across the breadth of North America (Warkentin, Exploration 260). His two journeys, the first accidentally to the Arctic Ocean, the second deliberately to the Pacific Ocean, were motivated by a desire to discover an efficient trade route through the northern part of the continent, an iteration in the series of famous and infamous searches for the Northwest Passage. His Voyages from Montreal, on the River St. Lawrence, through the Continent of North America, to the Frozen and Pacific Oceans; in the Years 1789 and 1793, published in 1801, gained him widespread public interest, fame, and knighthood (Warkentin, “Exploration” 246).

Despite the fact that neither of Mackenzie’s journeys discovered the much-sought-after Northwest Passage, they are typically re-presented in heroic terms, and his text is hailed as a paradigmatic example of exploration literature, unwavering in its forward motion and scrupulous in its objective observations. Readers praise the energy and the impetus of the journeys and the heroically-focused persona at the centre of Mackenzie’s text. Many of the assessments explicitly assume that the text’s ostensible objectivity guarantees its truth-value, and they note no discrepancies between the text’s focus on superficial details and the accuracy of its
ethnographic information. Critics rarely problematize Mackenzie’s heroic stature, and, in fact, frequently represent it in terms of his exclusively mercantile goals and activities. Similarly, though readers note that Mackenzie is the only discernible character in his narrative, they only rarely interrogate either the source or the effects of that focus.

I argue that time is the narrative feature that governs Mackenzie’s discursive choices, including his heroic self-representation, and that linguistic constructions of time form a pattern of predominance that structures the text’s rhetorical and ideological representations of colonial exchange. The chapter’s first three sections — Exploration heroics, Temporal heroics, and The economies of time: exchange in the contact zone — examine the relationship between critics’ attributions of objectivity and heroism and Mackenzie’s discursive construction of ‘the contact zone.’ They demonstrate that linguistic markers of time i) frame the text’s narrow visual focus and its rigid report of geographic movement and ii) constrain the exchanges which are represented as permissible in the space of contact. The next section — The densely inhabited space of exchange — examines an extended series of ‘encounters and exchanges’ in the first journal that exemplify i) Mackenzie’s contradictory representations of his need for exchange, ii) the multivalent nature of the exchanges that contact precipitates, and iii) the threat that unauthorized exchanges pose to Mackenzie’s monadic, mercantile identity. This examination identifies a first manifestation of ‘the uncanny commodity’ left over when systems clash, a form of textual and cultural repression that haunts Canadian literary and historical imaginations.

The first examination also exemplifies the paradoxical representation of time in Mackenzie’s text. On the one hand, Mackenzie explicitly represents time as negative in its association with interruption, delay,
obstacle, impediment, and disruption; on the other hand, only in time can commodity-value be extracted from the space. The chapter’s final section — Heroic exchanges — therefore goes on to examine how Mackenzie manipulates time to recuperate discursive representations according to a heroic paradigm. The second examination focuses on Mackenzie’s extended stay with a small group of Sekani people during the second journey, and demonstrates that appropriations and manipulations of textual time exhibit a form of control consistent with the heroic paradigm. It shows how those appropriations and manipulations — especially of narrative order, duration, focalization, and frequency — distinguish between authorized and unauthorized exchange, and have profound ideological effects on the text’s ostensibly ethnographic facts.

I argue that heroic self-representation in Mackenzie’s text asserts ideological control over i) the multivalent exchanges repressed in the space of the narrative and ii) the value of narrative representation in the exchange-economy in which the text circulates. This first analysis raises fundamental questions about the social and systemic function of objective report, narrative embedded in objective report, and the ideological uses of narrative in the production and reproduction of economic, ethnographic, and gender values and valuations.

Exploration heroics

More than twelve years elapsed between Mackenzie’s first journey in 1789 and the publication of his account in 1801 (Riffenburgh 13-14). As a partial result of the curiosity generated by that time-lag, Mackenzie garnered immediate interest in, significant praise for, and cultural influence as a result of, his written record (MacLulich, “Mackenzie” 20). “There is something in the idea of traversing a vast and unknown
continent," an anonymous writer for the *Edinburgh Review* mused, in a first assessment of Mackenzie’s 1802 publications of his *Voyages from Montreal*,

that gives an agreeable expansion to our conceptions; and the imagination is insensibly engaged and inflamed by the spirit of adventure, and the perils and the novelties that are implied in a voyage of discovery . . . . [T]he whole work bears an impression of . . . veracity, that leaves no unpleasant feeling of doubt or suspicion in the mind of the reader. (141-42)

Curiously and crucially, this first review draws a direct line from a text’s heroic qualities (“perils and novelties”), through its aesthetic effects on a reader (“inflamed by the spirit of adventure”), to its truth-value (“an impression of veracity”). The causes of aesthetic effects in this imperial text are prized because they are both invisible and consequential: invisible, because they “insensibly engage” the reader’s imagination; consequential, because they “agreeably expand the reader’s conceptions.” Carefully protected from the negative effects of imperialist contact, Mackenzie’s readers are invited to feel the appropriate aesthetic responses to, and adopt the ideological stance of, the text of heroic expansionism. The text, that is, in tandem with its author, has its colonizing work to do. The *Review* implies, moreover, that a text, by creating the appropriate aesthetic responses in the reader, can be incorporated into the known world as accurate information.

This appeal to the ideologically-coded aesthetics of heroic adventure recurs repeatedly in subsequent receptions of Mackenzie’s text. In 1904, for instance, Agnes Laut reiterated the potent attraction of a solitary explorer active in an unknown realm, exulting that though the sub-arctic region to which Mackenzie was “exiled” was “not a likely field to play the
hero . . . [he] emerged from the polar wilderness bearing a name that ranks with Columbus and Cartier and La Salle” (276). Two years later, in 1906, George Bryce’s account of Mackenzie, Selkirk, and Simpson, proposed the relevance of Virgil’s, “I sing arms and the hero,” to the three men’s lives, arguing that, “The picturesque and heroic are . . . characteristic in a peculiar degree of the early days of occupation of the American continent” (1). And in 1927, M. S. Wade insisted that “[u]ntil Alexander Mackenzie lifted the veil that had hitherto concealed from the eyes and knowledge of civilised man the mysteries of the unknown country that lay to the west and north of the trading posts . . . no attempt worthy of note had been made” (33).

With rare exceptions, historians and critics in the second half of the twentieth century have persistently read Mackenzie’s journals as if the aesthetic satisfaction of heroic narrative constituted a formal claim to truth. In an early 20th-century contribution to the literary reception of Mackenzie’s text, Roy Daniells declares that Mackenzie fulfils . . . magnificently the requirements of the Jason figure, the adventurous far-seeker, as the Western world has conceived his image . . . . Returning to his original starting point, he sets off again, a veritable Odysseus in the skill and craft of his voyaging and his ability to endure and survive; doing better than Odysseus, in that he never lost a man, or forfeited a loyalty or harmed an Indian. (“Relevance” 22)

“The Voyages,” Daniells adds, “below their level of surface detail, possess immense narrative strength, derived directly from the energy of heroic achievement” (23). In a more recent survey of exploration literature, Germaine Warkentin asserts that, while he was an entrepreneur like his contemporary, Alexander Henry, Mackenzie was an entrepreneur on a

In the post-colonial context, reinscriptions of a masterful hero-figure provoke critical questions about the relationship between cultural ideologies and specific narrative structures (Said, *Culture* 80; Hulme 7; Simms xvi ff; Scollon and Scollon 128 ff; Jameson 105). "How is it," Alan Lawson asks, in an analysis of racist political rhetoric in contemporary Australia, "that we know how to read this" ("Zeugma" 2). 'How is it,' we might echo Lawson, 'that we still respond to the appeal of narrative heroics?' The question is particularly pointed when reinscriptions of the heroic trope are linked, by way of the aesthetic response they generate, to assumptions and attributions of 'veracity.' Of Mackenzie's contemporary critics, however, only Parker Duchemin deliberately challenges the established heroic paradigm. By analyzing the explorer's accounts of the Indians he encountered on his journeys, Duchemin demonstrates how deeply Mackenzie's text is steeped in imperialist racism. He does not, however, ask how such ideologically interested discourse re-presents and reproduces itself through heroic conventions. In this chapter, I challenge Daniells's claim and MacLulich's reiteration of the claim that it is below the level of surface detail that Mackenzie's accounts possess the narrative strength they derive from heroic achievement.
Temporal heroics

Various readers comment on time in Mackenzie's account, often observing that the narrative's tempo matches that of the journey. There are, according to Daniells, for instance, "no digressions . . . no delays . . . no hesitations . . . no back-tracking. It is this simple, continuous linear drive that gives impetus to the narrative" ("Relevance" 21). MacLulich describes both Mackenzie and Simon Fraser as "almost as single-minded in their literary pursuits as they are in their actual voyages" ("Hero" 61), while Bruce Greenfield notes more specifically: "One of the ways by which Mackenzie conveys a sense of his determination is in his recording of the passage of time" (Discovery 47). Warkentin describes the journals subtly and accurately as, "characterized by an acute tension between the drama of real events surrounding [Mackenzie] . . . and the compression and terseness with which he reports what transpired" ("Exploration" 246). I make the stronger claim that a sense of unremitting temporal crisis characterizes both of Mackenzie's journals. In both, I argue, Mackenzie sets time, counts time, calculates time, marks time, loses time, races against time, and regrets the time that he has lost. I argue further that i) discursive creations of temporal crisis mask the fact that the exchanges on which Mackenzie's enterprise depends cannot occur except within a temporal framework, and ii) that covert and overt references to time work together powerfully to support the text's representation of the heroic explorer.

Mackenzie's temporal anxieties are readily and repeatedly apparent. Three weeks into the first voyage, on 26 June 1789, in a stylistically typical entry, he records: "We continued our route at five o'clock, steering south-east for ten miles across two deep bays . . . . We then proceeded south-west four miles, and west-south-west among islands: on one of which our Indians killed two rein-deer, but we lost three hours aft wind in going for
them” (153; my emphasis throughout). Mackenzie’s equation of crisis and time elapsed is not reserved exclusively for geographical resistance, but often also inflects descriptions of the narrative’s actors. “One of my Indians having broken his paddle,” he relates of his party’s encounter with a group of native people approximately four weeks later, on 24 July, “attempted to take one of theirs, which was immediately contested by its owner, and on my interfering to prevent this act of injustice, he manifested his gratitude to me on the occasion. We lost an hour and a half in this conference” (204). And although Mackenzie’s text ostensibly disparages the deliberate use of alcohol to influence the Indians (13-14, 102), he records using such manipulations, sometimes specifically to speed his progress. Approximately three weeks into the second journey, for example, on 31 May 1793, he notes: “At nine the men were so cold that we landed, in order to kindle a fire, which was considered as a very uncommon circumstance at this season; a small quantity of rum, however, served as an adequate substitute; and the current being so smooth as to admit of the use of paddles, I encouraged them to proceed without any further delay” (294).

Mackenzie’s recurring temporal references typically figure the conditions that ‘cost’ him time as actively oppositional. The weather, the current, precipitation, the lack of game, the aboriginal people encountered, his men’s discomfort, etc., are all figured as acting against his project of progress. On one level, these figurings mark a pragmatic and comprehensible anxiety about the journey’s success and the party’s continued well-being. Within an ideology that equates temporal efficiency with both literal spatial progress and metaphorical human progress, however, expenditures of time signal the inherently negative possibilities of deceleration or interruption. By comparison, the less time events take
Curiously, textual markers of time also suffuse Mackenzie’s idiosyncratic accounts of movement through space. Appendix 1 reproduces two of these passages, each of which contains numerous deictic markers. Deictic markers specifically orient a reader to the writer’s temporal-spatial location and occur regularly in simple forms like, “this”, “that”, “here”, “there”, “now”, “then”, “yesterday”, or “today” (Toolan, Narrative 263-64). In general terms, Mackenzie’s records of movement could be considered extended deictic markers, textual expressions of his intense desire to orient his readers to his spatial location.

Especially in the larger context of his reiterated concern with the passage of time, however, Mackenzie repeatedly uses the temporal marker when where a reader might logically expect the spatial marker where, highlighting the peculiar effects of his obsession with time. I have italicized all the deictic markers in the two passages reproduced in Appendix 1 and added ‘bolding’ to the temporal markers. Despite Mackenzie’s obsessive recording of spatial location, only in the midst of the most laborious efforts — to transport the canoe through the mountains during his second journey — does he record the distance the party has travelled instead of the time it has taken them (289; 289-90). The temporal markers that appear in the midst of accounts of movement through space seem, thus, not simply aberrations but indices of thematic focus below the level of surface content.

Eminently comprehensible in pragmatic terms, the journals’ temporal anxieties (and pragmatism, generally) betray a very particular, ideological, perspective on the geographical space and the people in the space. Mackenzie’s idiosyncratic ‘word-maps’ suggest that his ideal text might have been a list of the geographical coordinate points denoting his
movement through pure Cartesian space (Lefebvre 14) uncomplicated by the temporal exigencies of human life, behaviour, history, or community. Both of Mackenzie’s journals are characterized by lists of details about the immediately visible physical environment. Indeed, as frequently as critics describe the ‘heroic’ qualities of Mackenzie’s account, they describe its factual, pragmatic, and objective qualities (MacLulich, “Hero” 64, 65; “Mackenzie” 17; Duchemin 63). In Appendix 2, I provide participant analyses of typical passages from Mackenzie, Hearne, and Henry, in order to demonstrate Mackenzie’s marked focus on his immediate situation.

In an apparently objective account like Mackenzie’s, in which progress through space has been pre-defined as preeminently meaningful, reported details assume a kind of tautological importance: they must be important because they were important enough to be noticed and noted. “Mackenzie . . .” Bruce Greenfield claims benignly, “though a remarkably acute observer, was so devoted to his plan that, with a few exceptions, he only reported those details that impinged directly on the safety and progress of his expedition” (Discovery 43). Warkentin inflects this observation slightly differently. “Though Mackenzie is a painstaking observer of externals, his trader’s eye always measuring and counting,” she notes, “the heroic scale of his exploration clearly depended on the ruthless elimination of other kinds of insight” (“Exploration” 246). From a contemporary critical perspective, ‘objective’ and ‘heroic’ texts raise questions, in part because of the ideological nature of objectivity; in part because heroic tropes so palpably draw on rhetorical, hence ideological, literary and cultural resources; and in part because the easy collocation of heroism and objectivity obscures their potentially destructive effects.

In Mackenzie’s text, temporal exigencies contaminate abstract, rational space. In an attempt to establish metastability, Mackenzie uses
representations of time to protect the space against contamination; as part of that attempt, Mackenzie uses time specifically to flatten his representations of the indigenous inhabitants and, consequently, to take over their space. In Mackenzie’s representation of them, the inhabitants of the space are recast as a-historical Others who are meaningful only because and while they appear to European view. Discursive dispossession of this sort is central to the imperial enterprise of geographical dispossession and a prelude to geographical re-possession (Hulme 156-58). “The actual geographical possession of land is what empire in the final analysis is all about . . . .” Edward Said explains:

Imperialism and the culture associated with it affirm both the primacy of geography and an ideology about control of territory. The geographical sense makes projections — imaginative, cartographic, military, economic, historical, or in a general sense cultural. It also makes possible the construction of various kinds of knowledge, all of them in one way or another dependent upon the perceived character and destiny of a particular geography. (Culture 78)

In Said’s terms, the cartographic projections of Mackenzie’s text make it possible to know geographies primarily or exclusively for the temporal progress they admit or enable. Paradoxically, Mackenzie’s enterprise depended fundamentally on exchanges that required human contact in shared time. In the chapter’s next section, I examine the suppressed relation among time, progress, exchange, and economic value in Mackenzie’s text. I argue that precisely the contaminations of abstract time provide a resource for extracting commodity value from the space. Commodity-value in the space buttresses the imperial economy when it can be extracted exclusively in the pre-set terms of European mercantilism and
with maximum efficiency and minimum contact. Occasionally, however, commodity-value in the space directly challenges the meanings of European exchange. To prevent the resulting contradictions from becoming overwhelming, the text draws on the heroic paradigm, enabled variously by temporal frames of objective detachment and narrative agency, to stabilize interpretive control.

**The economies of time: exchange in the contact zone**

Critics typically read temporal anxiety in Mackenzie’s text ‘straight,’ as if the text’s anxiety about time makes sense because it makes mercantilist sense. Warkentin, of course, proposes the potent link referred to above, between “the ruthless elimination of other kinds of insights [than those that would benefit a trader]” and “the heroic scale of [Mackenzie’s] exploration” (“Exploration” 246). Greenfield similarly legitimizes Mackenzie’s temporal anxiety in terms of the mercantile concerns that motivated his journeys. “Commercial ambitions,” he claims, “pervade Mackenzie’s narratives, always hurrying him along toward his goal and subordinating the details of the actual passage to the discovery of the end” (Discovery 43). Certainly, in mercantilist terms, the anxiety is commonsensical: the more quickly Mackenzie could determine a plausible and lucrative route, the more quickly European goods could be dispatched for profit to the region. Reading the anxiety about time as commonsensical, however, requires a profound suppression of the text’s cultural, social, and economic contexts of production. As the past several decades of poststructuralist and postcolonial criticism demonstrate decisively, however, cultural commonsense always has source and history, influence and consequence.

Mackenzie figures time as something that interrupts and complicates the purely spatial ‘events’ of his story. Interruptions in time, interruptions
that require time, always, in Mackenzie’s rendering, jeopardize the journey’s commercial goals. This version of time, typically unchallenged by Mackenzie’s readers, betrays its capitalist bias by imagining mercantile concerns exclusively from the dominant perspective. European and British traders fantasized a trade route through the northern part of the continent that would enable them to transport furs out of the country much more efficiently and cheaply than had been possible, and would significantly increase the market for European goods. The expanded trade they imagined, however, depended fundamentally on the good will of the aboriginal hunters who would bring in the furs on which the plan was premised. Mackenzie’s plan, that is, required, without acknowledging, aboriginal people’s good will, their labour, and their willingness to trade, and it required a minimum level of political stability in the region. By figuring time as an impediment to mercantile goals, the text both i) decisively erases the multi-featured contexts and conditions of exchange, and ii) denies time’s use-value for extracting commodity value from the space.

In Mackenzie’s text, time marks the difference between ‘event’ as successive locations in space, and ‘event’ as the way elements in the space are related to one another, temporally, but also socially, ideologically, symbolically, politically. In Henri Lefebvre’s terms, time in Mackenzie’s account marks those points at which abstract space becomes social space, lived space. And though Mackenzie exerts heroic efforts to suppress the fact, events in time create the social space in which exchange can occur. Indeed, Mackenzie repeatedly demonstrates his ability to manipulate the representation of events in space according to pre-established heroic forms. Mackenzie’s disdain for the human beings he encounters belies both i) his often urgent need for contact with the aboriginal inhabitants, if only to
extract from them their knowledge of the surrounding country, and ii) his need to establish positive trading relations and positive inter-group relations in advance of ‘discovering’ a trading route. In a classic instance of colonial discourse’s ability to masquerade the real conditions of its existence, Mackenzie figures these crucial encounters as barely-tolerated interruptions. I speculate that the contradiction exists because the text has a vested interest in suppressing evidence of the multiple other kinds of exchange — cultural, ideological, discursive, semiotic, symbolic — that attend literal material exchange.

Ian Reid’s model of narrative exchanges as negotiations of sign-values characterized by substitutions (“altering of the value of the signs”) and disposessions (“wresting or arresting of control over the relative positions of the parties” [27]) provides a useful framework for text-based analyses of contested geographies and cultural dis- and re-possession. In the extended close reading that follows, I use Reid’s terms to contextualize the multiplicity of exchanges that Mackenzie’s narrative intentionally and unintentionally represents, paying particular attention to alterations in the values of signs and shifts in narratorial power.

The densely inhabited space of exchange

Although reports of exchanges pervade both journals, my examination focuses on a series of encounters in Mackenzie’s first journal, remarkable for — indeed, almost comical because of — its repetition of a basic form. The first repetitive series is replaced, however, after several days, by an equally repetitive, and equally numerous, series of missed or failed encounters. (Appendix 3 contains an extended description of both encounters and missed encounters.) Running ‘alongside’ Mackenzie’s account of both the encounters and missed encounters is a series of
marginal notes on the various ‘guides’ whom he engaged and who then either deserted or were exchanged for someone else. The second series ends with a potent, and potently clipped, description of Mackenzie’s encounter with the brother of the last of the disappearing guides. I examine that description for its relentless focus on material exchange from a European perspective, its record of cultural blindness to the contexted and contested meanings of encounter, Mackenzie’s inadvertently unsettled account (pun intended) of present and absent human commodities, and the fundamental narrative rhythm-of-exchange that it establishes.

This series of first-encounters exemplifies the substitutions and dispossessions that uniquely characterize the textual, symbolic, social, cultural, and ideological exchanges represented and suppressed in Mackenzie’s text. Taken as a group, they record both a clash of semiotic systems and the ways that a dominant semiotic system asserts itself when clash becomes crisis. I speculate, moreover, that the episode with which the series ends offers a first glimpse of ‘the uncanny commodity’ that clashing systems produce as waste-product. The human beings who guide Mackenzie through the space of contact and are dispensed with by him when he no longer needs them haunt his text as the simultaneously familiar and de-familiarized commodities of single-minded mercantile expansion.

In Mackenzie’s representation of them, these encounters and missed encounters form a discernible pattern: the exploring party’s arrival creates anxiety amongst the Indians, who send various members of their group into hiding; Mackenzie, ‘his’ men, and ‘his’ Indians then cajole the local Indians out of their anxiety and appease them with commercially insignificant European goods. Occasionally, the Indians prove their use-value by providing food and geographical information. After five days of regular contact, however, Mackenzie’s party goes for ten days without
encountering a single local person, though they observe various signs of their recent presence. The repeated pattern of coercing local inhabitants to join the party as guides, the dissatisfaction of these guides, and their eventual escape or release recurs throughout both series. Also scattered throughout are brief, apparently objective, ethnographic reports.

Curiously, the European goods exchanged in these encounters are both over- and under-valued, depending on whether Mackenzie stresses the insignificance of the Indians’ gifts or the Indians’ lack of bartering finesse. His note, moreover, on Tuesday, 7 July, on the twenty-six hares his party received — “We were not ungrateful for their kindness, and left them” — exemplifies both his predilection for forms of *litotes* and his reluctance to acknowledge the benefit to his party of these exchanges. What the natives give, exchange, or sell is never figured as having cultural value or worth or significance; it has, in Mackenzie’s representation, only the specific attributes of substance, quantity, and, occasionally, quality. In a telling instance of cultural bias, that is, Mackenzie tacitly represents his gifts, bribes, and bartering material as members of the cultural-economic category, “material items whose exchange will facilitate progress through space.” His representation of events, however, never raises the possibility that the material items his party receive from the Indians may also belong to a cultural category: “items with which to facilitate the white man’s departure,” or “the gifts one is obliged by culture and tradition to present to strangers” (I am borrowing Simms’s midrashic methods, which I describe below, 86-7).

Mackenzie consistently fails, moreover, to identify the particular persons engaged in these exchanges or the conversations in which the exchanges are negotiated, and he represents the exchanges themselves as if they took up no more time than the time required to read his account.
Significantly, too, Mackenzie consistently figures information in commodity-exchange terms: information is something he ‘obtains’ or hopes to obtain from the native inhabitants. And it is in the crucial terms of information-commodity that Mackenzie represents the series of guides. As my sketch of events in Appendix 3 indicates, only by very close reading can one guess with reasonable accuracy the number of indigenous guides whom Mackenzie coerces into joining his party and who later either escape or are exchanged for a replacement. The difficulty is an effect of the text’s “digital” record of the guides’ existence: once a guide has escaped or been exchanged, his value in the textual economy plummets to zero and he literally drops out of the text. On Tuesday, 21 July, however, the guides repressed by Mackenzie’s easy substitutions return, at least by implication, to unsettle the ostensibly simple account.

On the 21st, after the party has followed tracks in the sand for ten days, its luck turns: returning up the branch of the river they have recently come down, they once again encounter local inhabitants. Mackenzie’s report on that meeting follows:

In about an hour after our arrival, we were joined by eleven of the natives, who were stationed further up the river . . . . The brother of our late guide . . . was of the party, and was eager in his inquiries after him; but our account did not prove satisfactory. They all gave evident tokens of their suspicion, and each of them made a distinct harangue on the occasion. Our Indians, indeed, did not understand their eloquence, though they conjectured it to be very unfavorable to our assertions. The brother, nevertheless, proposed to barter his credulity for a small quantity of beads, and promised to believe every thing I should say, if I would gratify him with a few of those baubles; but he did not succeed in his proposition, and I contented
myself with giving him the bow and arrows which our conductor had left with us . . . . I requested the English Chief to ask them some questions, which they either did not or would not understand; so that I failed in obtaining any information from them. (197-198)

This account contrasts provocatively with the previous ones. In its record of discursive, symbolic, and cultural exchange, this account insists on the guide’s value, despite his absence and indeed because of it. Beyond his information-value to Mackenzie, that is, this absent guide provokes the exchanges of an account, tokens of suspicion, harangues, credulity, beads, baubles, and a bow and arrows. The “account,” of course, that Mackenzie’s party offers (the plural form may obliquely address Mackenzie’s dependence on translators) is not considered satisfactory. The Indians, for their part, “give tokens of their suspicion,” and each of them “makes a harangue,” though the harangues, condescendingly re-named “eloquence,” are not entirely comprehensible and therefore are discounted as legitimate exchange. The brother of the guide, then, in an offer unlike any other recorded in Mackenzie’s text, proposes to barter his credulity for a small quantity of beads: “[He] promised to believe every thing I should say, if I would gratify him with a few of those baubles.” I understand the text to mean that the brother proposes to believe Mackenzie for a price. Mackenzie records, however, that the brother “did not succeed in his proposition,” and that he, Mackenzie, “contented” himself by giving the brother the bow and arrows which the former guide had left behind.

In any given instance of exchange, the actual materials exchanged signify both as themselves but also at various levels of symbolic meaning. The “beads and baubles” in the excerpt above, for instance, presumably refer to real beads and baubles, but they are also signs, in European terms, of low value. Clearly, however, these particular, commercially
insignificant beads also carry symbolic meaning for the brother of the guide, who proposes to acquire them in exchange for his promise to believe Mackenzie. They also carry symbolic meaning for Mackenzie, who betrays the significance of the event by emphasizing that he did not engage in the proposed exchange, and by ending the account with a description of his action to regain control over the exchange. To ‘content’ oneself, that is, suggests that one alters for the positive a state of ‘not complete contentment’ or ‘discontentment.’ Exchange, in the various and multitudinous guises it takes in this episode, complicates the stability of the monadic persona Mackenzie heretofore represented in the text. ‘Monadic,’ that is, in the terms that Arthur Frank establishes to describe “the disciplined body,” particularly the disciplined body’s isolatedness from others’ bodies. “When such a body comes out of itself and does relate to others,” Frank explains, “the mode of that relation will predictably be force, since the disciplined body can only relate to others by projecting its regimen upon them” (55-56).

Up to this point, Mackenzie’s efficient account demonstrates little evidence of narrative form, in part because, in Reid’s terms, the ‘items’ exchanged in no way alter the system of values with which he proceeds. This is emphatically true of the items named “guides” in the text. Because the guides have value for Mackenzie only insofar as they can provide geographical information, the sign of ‘guide’ remains the same for Mackenzie regardless of the human person who happens to occupy that position at a given time. Only when the values of the signs are challenged by the appearance of the brother can the text enact what Reid calls dispossession. By offering to believe Mackenzie in exchange for some beads, the guide’s brother effectively calls into question the entire exchange structure on which Mackenzie premises his movement through space and
his encounters with the inhabitants of space. The observation — "he did not succeed in his proposition" — tacitly acknowledges that the brother’s proposal challenges Mackenzie’s authority and credibility.

The encounter as a whole exemplifies Jenny Sharpe’s reading of Homi Bhabha’s term, “sly civility” (“Figures” 101). Bhabha, says Sharpe, situates “the slippages of colonial authority in a native appropriation of its signs. The trope of ‘sly civility’ points to both the excess that a discourse of presence cannot contain as well as ‘a native refusal to satisfy the colonizer’s narrative demand’” (Bhabha “Civility” 99). “In turn,” Sharpe adds, “the native’s ‘hybrid demand’ seizes colonial power in order to redefine the terms of its knowledge. The ambivalence of colonial discourse that produces such colonial hybrids thus ‘enables a form of subversion, founded on that uncertainty, that turns the discursive conditions of dominance into the grounds of intervention’” (Bhabha “Signs” 119-120).

In this episode — one of the text’s most telling because least rational — Mackenzie reasserts control by reporting only that he gave the brother items that had belonged to the guide. In the clashing economies of the contact zone, Mackenzie stabilizes his identity against the possibility of dispossession by reasserting the terms of ‘proper’ exchange: the brother is given no more and no less than what is ‘rightfully’ his.

In a related series of uncanny exchanges, Mackenzie variously asserts his economic efficacy by substituting something of European manufacture for temporarily abandoned aboriginal items. These performances of exchange, in the absence of anyone with whom to exchange (reprinted in Appendix 4), become potent markers of Mackenzie’s desire to suppress the contact of the contact zone. Mackenzie obsessively exchanges commodities (including information-commodities named “guides”) in order to facilitate his movement through space, and he represents that exchange as if it always
occurred within his framework of values. Terry Eagleton’s description of the commodity as an entity simultaneously absent and present, an entity having a meaning and a value always eccentric to itself, an entity always in a state of deferred and displaced identity (Ideology 208), highlights the inherently uncanny nature of ‘the commodity.’ “The commodity,” Eagleton elaborates, “is a schizoid, self-contradictory phenomenon, a mere symbol of itself, an entity whose meaning and being are entirely at odds and whose sensuous body exists only as the contingent bearer of an extrinsic form” (209).

Like Freud’s ‘uncanny,’ Mackenzie’s commodities, particularly his information-commodities named ‘guides,’ function in the contact zone as the repressed familiar, accruing values and energies and significations as they are de- and re-contextualized. Mackenzie’s conflicting attitude toward time, especially as it is manifested in his paradoxical attitude toward representing exchange with other human beings, is an effect of his desire to repress the fact that ‘contact’ occurs in the contact zone. Homi Bhabha’s description of cultural difference illuminates the complexity that Mackenzie attempts to repress. “Cultural difference,” says Bhabha, does not simply represent the contention between oppositional contents or antagonistic traditions of cultural value. Cultural difference introduces into the process of cultural judgement and interpretation that sudden shock of the successive, non-synchronous time of signification, or the interruption of the supplementary question . . . . The very possibility of cultural contestation, the ability to shift the ground of knowledges, or to engage in the ‘war of position’, marks the establishment of new forms of meaning, and strategies of identification. Designations of cultural difference interpellate forms of identity which, because of their continual
implication in other symbolic systems, are always 'incomplete' or open to cultural translation. The *uncanny* structure of cultural difference is close to Lévi-Strauss's understanding of 'the unconscious as providing the common and specific character of social facts . . . not because it harbours our most secret selves but because . . . it enables us to coincide with forms of activity which are both *at once ours and other.*' ("Dissemination" 162-63; first italics mine)

Despite his desire to repress the fact, Mackenzie does experience contact — forms of activities which are simultaneously his and 'other.' Contact, of course, includes encounter with the multitudinous forms of exchange that represent cultural difference, and both contact and cultural difference threaten Mackenzie's autonomous monadic subjectivity and his narrative control. As I show below, Mackenzie's representations of his responses to crises of cultural difference illustrate how the heroic paradigm provides a culturally-sanctioned form in which vulnerable dominating subjectivity recuperates lost ideological ground.

In the close reading that follows, I examine how narrative and textual time-structures accommodate Mackenzie's horror of contact and create a framework for heroic agency. In direct opposition to Daniells and MacLulich, that is, I show that much of Mackenzie's heroic status is a social and ideological effect of the narrative forms and grammatical structures — the surface detail — that characterize the *Voyages*. My analysis identifies the relationship between textual structures and discursively generated ideologies, and develops Duchemin's argument that Mackenzie records, among other things, deeply racist assumptions and attributions radically ungrounded by ethnographic fact. Specifically, I show how the apparently transparent heroic qualities of Mackenzie's text and the ethnographic claims
they purport to guarantee are an effect of manipulations and appropriations of narrative categories of time.

Herotic exchanges

The extended close-analysis that follows examines the link between the preponderance of grammatical thematizations of time and the 'heroic' quality of Mackenzie's text. Mackenzie establishes his preference for leading with temporal markers in the 'objective reporting' sections of his text and refines the pattern for rhetorical effect in the text's more heavily narrativized episodes. Temporal thematization, moreover, creates a framework within which appropriations and manipulations of narrative order, duration, frequency, and focalization consistent with the heroic paradigm have profound ideological effects on the text's ostensibly ethnographic facts.

This portion of the analysis focuses specifically on one of the text's few extended narrative sections, the entries for Saturday, 8 June to Monday, 10 June 1793. This 90-sentence excerpt describes the events of the second voyage approximately a month and a half before Mackenzie and his party reached the most westerly point of their journey. The excerpt begins with Mackenzie's account of his unsuccessful two-day search for a crucial portage and his party's attempt to obtain useful information from a small group of Sekani people they encounter, most of whom disappear into the woods when approached. Mackenzie recounts being challenged by two of the men, and taking one of the two men captive, thereby forcing the others to return. Mackenzie records that when the others did return, they were plied with food in exchange for geographical information. Although he describes his first interrogation as a failure, he records success the next morning. Once in possession of the pertinent information, Mackenzie
recounts making ethnographic observations while his men prepared to continue the journey. An hour later he records that his party re-embarked on their journey (305-315).

Mackenzie devotes an unprecedented eight pages of text (306-314) specifically to his party’s interactions with the group of Sekani, an encounter which spans seventeen hours chronologically. His account of the encounter is particularly noteworthy because it includes i) his announcement of his unusual intention to exchange his time for the information that he believes the aboriginal inhabitants can provide him, ii) his record of staying in one place longer than his usual eight or nine hours overnight (Lamb Journals 16), and iii) one of his unusually extended ethnographic accounts, which he launches into precisely because no other, more urgent, activities engage him. The excerpt is noteworthy because it records a temporary shift in values: Mackenzie, that is, exchanges his pursuit of mercantile exchange for the possibility of information exchange, and he pays for his decision with time. The excerpt is also noteworthy because it marks Mackenzie’s decision to exchange reportage for story. The excerpt, moreover, derives analytic potency from the deep contradiction it embodies between form and content: at the level of overt expression, Mackenzie puts his concern with progress to one side; grammatically and narratively, however, he powerfully reinstates his control over time. The force of the contradiction exemplifies the powerful aesthetic effects of form: in this case, form simultaneously contradicts overt content and acts as surety for its authority.

i) thematized time, narrative time

As I have described above, Mackenzie’s overt focus on locations in abstract and rationalist space only partially disguises his preoccupation with
time and time’s passage. The extended narrative under scrutiny includes numerous markers of temporal deixis, a fundamental source of temporal anxiety in the text. The narrative begins with the sentence, “For the last two days we had been anxiously looking out for the carrying-place” (305), and maintains a pattern of leading with expressions of temporal deixis throughout. “[I]t was eight at night before we could discover a place to encamp” (305), Mackenzie records; “in a short time [we] heard people in the woods” (305); “At the same time this unexpected circumstance produced some little discomposure” (306); “before we were half over the river . . . two men appeared” (306); “at the same time I readily complied with their proposition” (306); “after some time had passed in hearing and answering their questions, they consented to our landing” (306); “when I stepped forward and took each of them by the hand, one of them . . . drew his knife from his sleeve” (306); “On our first hearing the noise of these people in the woods, we displayed our flag” (306-7); “In the mean time the canoe was unloaded” (307); “It was about three in the afternoon when we landed” (307); “at five the whole party of Indians were assembled” (307); “When I thought that they were sufficiently composed, I sent for the men to my tent” (308); “At one time I thought of leaving the canoe” (309); “a very brief course of reflection convinced me that it would be impossible” (309); “At another time my solicitude for the success of the expedition . . . incited a wish to remain” (309); “when the dawn appeared I had already quitted my bed” (310); “About nine, however, one of them . . . mentioned something . . . at the same time pointing significantly” (310); “while my people were making every necessary preparation, I employed myself in writing the following description of the natives around me” (311); “Previous to our departure, the natives had caught a couple of trout” (314); “At ten we were ready to embark” (315).
The text not only demonstrates a conspicuous preference for temporal deixis, it typically positions that deixis in the grammatically *thematic* position. In the terms of systemic functional linguistics, "theme" and "rheme" are the structures through which an independent clause signals 'what it is about' and 'what it is saying about what it is about.' The *theme* in English grammar always takes the first position in a clause and signals what the clause is concerned with, while the *rheme* constitutes the remainder of the message, the part in which the theme is developed (Halliday 37). In the clause, *We had been looking out for the carrying-place for two days*, for instance, the theme is "We," which is also, of course, the subject of the clause. A clause's theme, however, is not necessarily identical with its subject. In, *For the last two days we had been anxiously looking out for the carrying-place*, (Mackenzie's actual phrase), the theme is the adverbial phrase, "for the last two days," while the subject is, "we." In, *The last two days had been taken up looking out for the carrying-place*, the theme is the direct object, "the last two days," while the sentence's passive form obscures the subject. Thematic position is thus a rhetorical and an ideological resource, a grammatical feature capable of emphasizing, de-emphasizing, pre-empting, or otherwise modifying the reader's perception of the subject and/or agent of the clause. Theme-analysis can identify ways in which sentences that communicate apparently identical content, code that content in significantly variable ways. In Mackenzie's case, analysis reveals the fact that the text's grammatical themes structurally underpin its covert semantic theme: making time, marking time, losing time, saving time, and — most importantly — converting time into linear progress.

A close analysis of linguistic patterns suggests that when Mackenzie's readers comment on the breathtaking speed of his journeys, they are
responding in part to the unremitting anxiety about time that the text’s preponderance of temporal deixis maintains. Like Mackenzie’s discursive predisposition to report, apparently objectively, on the material details of his immediate context, covert temporal anxiety in the text functions rhetorically to produce very specific ideological effects. As the continued close reading indicates, narrative manipulations of temporal anxiety convey a very particular perspective on human contact. They also traffic, arguably dangerously, in ethnographic information. In a crucial contradiction that I elaborate and theorize below, for instance, the unusually extended ethnographic account that in part characterizes this narrative interlude does not exhibit a single instance of thematized temporal deixis.

ii) framing order

Ian Reid counters conventional definitions of narrative as simply a “succession of events” with the assertion that a narrative’s events are always framed in crucial ways (19). Framings, says Reid, “comprise several kinds of semantic evaluation, different ways of enclosing and controlling signs so as to confer a certain sense on them” (13). In Mackenzie’s narrative, markers of temporal deixis both reinforce the thematic concern with time and form a critical framework for enclosing and controlling the representation of actors, actions, and events. The excerpt under examination is framed in specific temporal ways to allow for a heroic resolution to the narrative of crisis. A brief outline of participants in Passage 1, for instance, reprinted in Appendix 5 (this excerpt immediately follows the extended passage reprinted in Appendix 1b), demonstrates how its focus differs from Mackenzie’s more usual concern with the specific details of his physical environment: we, a smell of fire, people in the
woods, which [state of great confusion], we, their discovery of us, this unexpected circumstance, some little discomposure, ourselves, our arms, we, I, they, we, them, they, it [pursuit], an act of great imprudence, the attempt. Even this simple form of analysis identifies qualitative differences between Mackenzie's typical focus and the concern here with the nature, the number, and the behaviour of human beings in the environment.

The passage's two grammatical thematizations of time — "in a short time [we] heard people in the woods"; "at the same time this unexpected circumstance produced some little discomposure" — and the compressed sensory experience of, "we perceived a smell of fire; and . . . heard people in the woods," are framed, moreover, to intensify and reflect Mackenzie's experience of crisis. Crisis, which results when too many things happen in too short a space of time, is intensified when two men appear on the facing riverbank a mere half sentence later, an episode reproduced as Passage 2 in Appendix 5. Once again, a brief list of participants clarifies that this account does not simply list elements in the immediate environment: we, two men, us, their spears, their bows and arrows, their hostile gestures, loud vociferations, My interpreter, them, we, white people, no injury, every mark of kindness and friendship, They, they, their arrows, us, This [behaviour], a decided kind of conduct, I, I, their proposition, their questions, they, very evident symptoms of fear and distrust, They, their weapons, I, each of them, one of them, his knife, it [his knife], me, a mark of his submission, my will and pleasure

As in Passage 1, the grammatical thematization of time, "before we were half over the river . . . two men appeared," underscores the urgency of the situation. In this case, the incomplete process that the temporal marker describes ("before we were half over the river") indexes danger,
since a situation that provides no cover creates risks no matter whether the party retreats or advances. In this second passage, however, grammatical thematizations of time also structure the response to the crisis ("at the same time I readily complied") and mastery of the crisis ("after some time had passed in hearing and answering their questions, they consented" and "when I stepped forward . . . one of them . . . drew his knife . . . and presented it to me"). Like the paradoxes of pleasurable anxiety and defensive mastery that Homi Bhabha identifies in the stereotypes of colonial discourse ("Difference" 202), thematizations of time formally frame both the representation of crisis and the representation of response to crisis.

Despite the surprise, for instance, that Mackenzie expresses at the indigenous men's actions, he links the clauses, "which I did not expect" and "I complied" by the deictic marker, "at the same time." If the two clauses were joined with "therefore" or "consequently," the indigenous men would be figured discursively as having agency over Mackenzie — their actions would be marked as causing a change in his. By linking the ideas temporally instead of causally, however, Mackenzie avoids representing himself as the patient or receiver of someone else's actions. Similarly, the deictic thematization, "after some time had passed in hearing and answering their questions," clearly represents Mackenzie's party's actions as structuring the time that elapses in negotiation. And by his apparently simple use of "when," in the phrase, "when I stepped forward and took each of them by the hand," he effectively encodes a powerful sense of authoritative norms. Handshaking, in Mackenzie's representation, is clearly the proper and singular gesture by which one authorizes one's presence in the space, a meaning which the only slightly altered construction, "I stepped forward and took each of them by the hand," would not convey. Within those authoritative norms, and without recourse
to any other interpretative apparatus, Mackenzie appropriates the right to explicate, in gratuitously self-aggrandizing terms, the Indian’s presentation of his knife, “as a mark of his submission to my will and pleasure.” Grammatical thematization thus frames and highlights the event’s significance, and enables the narrator to powerfully order a particular representation of crisis, crisis resolution, and the cross-cultural meanings negotiated in crisis.

iii) grammatical transitivity - narrative duration

Although Mackenzie temporarily eschews progress through time, he does not at any point forego control over narrative representation. I examine below how grammatical transitivity in Passages 1 and 2 marks racial distinctions and how those distinctions are reinforced by the manipulation of narrative duration. Transitivity structures identify the participants, processes, and circumstances of discourse: what is going on, who is involved, and under what conditions (Halliday 106). Clearly, Passage 1 focuses primarily on the actions of Mackenzie and his party: “we perceived,” the text asserts, “[we] heard”; “we . . . understood”; “we were . . . unable to ascertain”; “I considered.” In one case the exploring party’s weapons serve as the main participant: “our arms were not in a state of preparation.” And when the narrator considers the wisdom of pursuit, predicate structures delineate his alternatives: “it would be needless” and “it would be an act of great imprudence.” Twice, extended, abstract nominalizations function as the agents of the action: “which [state of great confusion] was occasioned . . . by,” and “this unexpected circumstance produced.” Nominalizations occur when a process is converted grammatically into either a single noun or a multi-word compound noun. “Requirements,” “examination,” “spirit of adventure,” and “association of
equals" are all common examples of nominalizations. Because nominalizations lack tense and modality, and are often deprived of the agent and/or the patient of the action, they function grammatically as diminished forms of processes (Fairclough 124). Very significantly, both of the nominalizations identified above ("state of great confusion" and "unexpected circumstance"), obscure and erase the specific actions of the aboriginal people whom Mackenzie’s party has encountered.

Edward Said’s admonition to read canonical European texts contrapuntally, in ways that "draw out, extend, give emphasis and voice to what is silent or marginally present or ideologically represented" (Culture 66-67), is peculiarly apt to this analysis, since a reading alert to the text’s erasures quickly discovers its fundamental grammatical and ideological distinction. Unlike European activity, which is represented primarily as a series of mental processes — "we perceived," "we heard," etc. — indigenous people’s actions in Passage 1 are, in fact, represented exclusively as the compressed nominalizations, "state of great confusion," "their discovery of us," and "unexpected circumstance." These expressions define events from an exclusively European perspective and in an exclusively European register, and they eliminate from narrative focus virtually every detail of the indigenous people’s actual physical and mental activities: everything about their persons has been reduced to the neutralized but hardly neutral category, ‘circumstance.’ The racial distinctions which are effected grammatically demonstrate the ideological power of ellipsis, in which a narrative moves with maximum speed, so much speed that, as Toolan describes it, "no text space is spent on a piece of story duration" (Narrative 56).

Like Said’s contrapuntal readings, Norman Simms’s midrashic methods imaginatively reconstitute aboriginal people’s experience of
contact with European explorers by “narrative enhancements of the text” (xiii) and “reconstructions . . . of perspective” (22). In Simms’s method, a reader calls narrative representations of aboriginal people as neutral commodities controlled by European discursive conventions into question by making ‘educated guesses’ about what the people un- or under-represented by European texts may have thought and felt (206, 208, and throughout). Ideally, such ‘educated guesses’ about Mackenzie’s representations would undercut the non-dialogic (Bhabha, “Signs” 115), reductive, and dehumanizing assertions about indigenous North Americans that characterize his journals (Duchemin 60, 61, 68). A midrashic interpretation of the noises in the woods might raise, for instance, amongst other potential explanations, the possibility that the noises were not the result of ‘confusion’ but the deliberate sounds of a practiced response to the sighting of strangers.

Precisely at this analytical point, however, concurrent layers of narrative structure demonstrate their ideological efficacy. “[H]ere,” Mackenzie has declared, “we perceived a smell of fire; and in a short time heard people in the woods, as if in a state of great confusion, which was occasioned, as we afterward understood, by their discovery of us.” The relative pronoun ‘which’ in this sentence, marks a crucial shift in modality that dramatically obscures the fact that the ‘confusion’ it refers to was originally invoked only as a possibility. Modality concerns the truth-value, probability, or usual-ness of an event or state, or the speaker’s attitude or intention regarding that event or state (Halliday 89; Fairclough 126-127; Toolan, Narrative 257). Inserted between the hypothetically descriptive phrase “as if in a state of great confusion,” and the narratively proleptic phrase, “as we afterward understood,” the modal shift from speculation to positive assertion (“a state of great confusion, which was occasioned”)

marks, and is powerfully authorized by, the narrator’s interpolation of superior knowledge. Like the adverbial phrase, “as yet,” to modify his uncertainty about the number of indigenous people in the group, Mackenzie’s, “as we afterward understood,” signals a truth-value based on knowing how the story turns out. Proleptic invocations of future knowledge not only assure the reader that the text’s account of current discomposure will be definitively recuperated for the narrative conclusion Mieke Bal calls “deterioration avoided” (22), but also authorize the peculiar representations provided: the representations must be true because we know their relation to the final state of events.

As Michael Toolan explains, prolepsis contributes strongly to narrative structure by simultaneously removing suspense and engaging the reader’s curiosity about how the story’s events will lead to the now-necessary conclusion (Narrative 53-54). In Mackenzie’s journals, proleptic invocations also emphasize, by contrapuntal and midrashic contrast, the asymmetric if predictable absence of narrative significance accorded the indigenous people. Although Mackenzie never elaborates the source of the understanding alluded to in the phrase, “as we afterwards understood,” that prolepsis effectively legitimizes his party’s “discomposure” and their consequent scrambling for arms. The Indians, by contrast, who do act in Passage 2, are characterized exclusively by their behaviour in the moment: they ‘appear,’ ‘brandish spears,’ ‘display bows and arrows,’ and ‘accompany’ “their hostile gestures with loud vociferations” and threats. Not long afterward, they also ‘betray’ “very evident symptoms of fear and distrust,” despite, but as an effective poetic balance to, the ‘white people’s demonstration’ of “every mark of kindness and friendship.” Thus the Europeans’ kind and friendly readying of their arms, and their clear intention to use those arms in pursuit of the Indians, are represented as
comprehensible, necessary, and appropriate. Deprived of any kind of meaningful narrative frame and the possibility of narrative duration, native apprehension and resistance are marked, by contrast, as excessive, savage, and provoking.

iv) focalizing the ethnographic ‘other’

Passages 1 and 2 thus reveal that crucial shifts in modality i) substitute a certainty based on future knowledge for what had been merely speculative interpretation and ii) create a realm of action and interpretation from which the indigenous actants’ past and future are diligently barred. In this section, I examine how modalization, focalization, and manipulations of narrative duration interact in potent ways to affect ethnographic representation.

In the nine sentences that follow the exchange of the knife with which Passage 2 ends, Mackenzie describes derisively what he calls the two men’s “minute and suspicious” examination of everything about his party, and indicates that while keeping one of the men with them, they sent the other to recall the rest of the group. “Here,” he announces, “I determined to remain till the Indians became so familiarized to us, as to give us all the intelligence which we imagined might be obtained from them” (307). In the next two sentences he enumerates his travelling options, and then records the account reproduced as Passage 3 in Appendix 5. As in the previous examples, grammatical thematizations of time in this passage frame the events recounted: “It was about three in the afternoon when we landed”; “at five the whole party . . . had assembled”; “When I thought that they were sufficiently composed, I sent for the men.” The phrase, “they displayed a most wretched appearance,” exemplifies a structure that Pratt identifies in colonial discourse, in which indigenous people or ‘foreign
lands' present themselves to European viewers (Imperial 60). Grammatically, of course, the construction attributes technical agency to the indigenous people ("they displayed") while in effect it conveys the viewer's opinion of them. Despite this duplicitous attempt to construct the Indians as agentive, the passage is clearly focalized by Mackenzie. Certainly three of the passage's four overtly modal constructions ("[the whole party] consisted only of three men, three women"; "which seemed to please them"; "in our opinion, at least, superior to their own provision") explicitly articulate Mackenzie's perspective on events. And the fourth, "which was not unwelcome," conflates the narrator's opinion with the presumed attitude of the people in receipt of the food. Paradoxically, however, because the passage's several passive constructions ("they were consoled"; "they had pemmican also given them to eat") obscure the agents of the action, they distance the narrator grammatically from the events he is ostensibly focalizing. Focalization is the perspective from which the events and situations of a narrative are seen, felt, understood, and assessed (Toolan, Narrative 68), or, in Bal's provocative formulation, "the relation between the vision and that which is . . . perceived" (100).

A midrashic reading of the passage's final sentence — "When I thought that they were sufficiently composed, I sent for the men to my tent, to gain such information respecting the country as I concluded it was in their power to afford me" (my emphases) — may explicate the apparent tension between modalized proximity and passive grammatical distancing. An imaginative reconstruction of perspective suggests that in this case, grammatical distancing may accurately signal real spatial distance from the events narrated: Mackenzie has quite possibly watched the people and the proceedings from the relative privacy of his personal tent, observed the 'wretchedness' from a distance and exempted himself from
any of the 'consolatory' action described. Significantly, Mackenzie records his interactions with the Indians as beginning when he deems the time appropriate to summon the men — who, of course, he has determined in advance, possess the information for which he has exchanged his time.

Despite their potentially contradictory meanings, then, the modal and passive structures in fact powerfully support the narrator's focalization to produce an apparently accurate, objective, and authoritative account. "Any 'vision' presented can have a strongly manipulative effect," Bal explains, "and is, consequently, very difficult to extract from the emotions, not only from those attributed to the focalizor and the character, but also from those of the reader" (102; my emphasis). "If the focalizor coincides with the character," she specifies, "that character will have a technical advantage over the other characters. The reader watches with the character's eyes and will, in principle, be inclined to accept the vision presented by that character" (104). In Mackenzie's text, focalization coincides with the narrator, who has already revealed his preference for temporally framing and controlling crisis, and for transitivity structures that bias perceptions of narrative events and actors.

v) narrative frequency, ethnographic accuracy

The journals' narrative and grammatical focus on time highlights Mackenzie's unusual decision, in the excerpt under analysis, to exchange his time and his progress through time for the information that he believes the local inhabitants can provide him. In textual terms, Mackenzie's extended description of the Sekani people with whom he proposes to stay is similarly uncharacteristic; his regular habit was to include much briefer observations at the end of his daily entries (Duchemin 59). By contrast, however, with the narrated quality of the early part of the excerpt, Mackenzie's
ethnographic observations are recorded in his characteristically ‘objective’ style. In this concluding section, I examine this ideologically disturbing shift and the text’s equally disturbing invitation to forget that Mackenzie is describing a group of no more than fourteen people after fewer than seventeen hours in their company.

Disappointed by the results of his first interrogation, Mackenzie deliberates on various alternative plans, then records getting up at dawn the next morning to renew his inquiries. Passage 4 of Appendix 5 spans four pages in the journal and begins when Mackenzie overhears a discussion about the river he has been searching for. After convincing one of the Indians to accompany him as a guide to this river, he orders his people to prepare for departure. While they do, he records the thirty-three sentences that constitute his ethnographic assessment. Very significantly, Mackenzie marks the time elapsed as almost exactly one hour. Of singular importance to this study of the relationship between textual structures, narrative control, and ethnographic devaluation, is the fact that the previously regular pattern of thematizing time is absent for the entire ethnographic account. Mackenzie describes the men’s physical appearance and clothing, goes on to describe the women’s physical appearance and clothing, enumerates the group’s weapons, their hunting and household utensils, and ends with a curious and temporally deceptive analeptic account of how they make canoes. Consistent throughout the sentences in which he does so is a thematic focus on the generic person or object under description: “they are of that meagre appearance which might be expected” (311); “All of them are ornamented with a fringe” (311); “A black artificial stripe crosses the face beneath the eye” (312); “Their arrows are well made” (312); “Their hooks are small bones” (313); “The bark is taken off the tree” (314).

In an extended critique of traditional anthropology, Johannes Fabian
scrutinizes both the forms that knowledges of “the Other” take and the peculiar time-structures on which those forms depend. Fabian particularly examines traditional anthropology’s preference for the present, a-historical tense, its obsession with the visual to the exclusion of information gained through the other senses, its paradigm of cultural difference as distance, and the contradictory praxis of fieldwork, which is carried out on the premise of meaningful communicative interaction with an Other and reported afterward in discursive forms that deny the lived experience of shared time. Although Mackenzie’s ethnography was written more than fifty years before anthropological method had established itself as at least quasi-scientific, it follows almost eerily the patterns that the discipline would later establish. He reports on a tiny sample of human beings without reminding his readers of the slight basis on which he is generalizing, describes a dazzlingly small range of human characteristics, and constructs, through his consistent use of present tense structures, a rudimentary world uncomplicated by the historicizing effects of agency, activity, subjectivity, pattern, and change, a world uncomplicated, that is, by the possibilities and the potential of narrative.

“They are low in stature” (311), Mackenzie announces of the fourteen or so Sekani, and maintains throughout the thirty-two sentences that follow a duplicitous objectivity. “[T]he cartilage of their nose is perforated, but without any ornaments suspended from it” (311) he notes, in a dehumanizing conflation of individual and type; “[the women] are in general of a more lusty make than the other sex, and taller in proportion, but infinitely their inferiors in cleanliness” (312), he pronounces in a generalization heavily coded with European preconceptions and preoccupations about the proper distinctions of gender (Duchemin 61; McClintock, Imperial 56, 105); “Necklaces of the grisly or white bear’s
claws, are worn exclusively by the men” (312), he determines conclusively from his sample of six adults. “This description . . . ,” Duchemin observes with deadly accuracy, “has a deceptively impartial appearance, skilfully blending a selection of ‘facts’ and value judgments” (60).

Noting the importance of spatial elements in narrative, Bal challenges readers to determine whether connections exist among the events of a narrative, the identity of the narrative’s actors, and the location in which the events occur (43). Located, as they are, in a geographical space remarkable primarily for its admission or restriction of temporal progress, the ‘actors’ of Mackenzie’s ethnographic observations do not, in fact, act, but simply ‘are,’ in a kind of timeless present, a cultural achrony permanently available to European scrutiny and description. “They have been captured in Mackenzie’s words at a particular moment of their own complex history,” Duchemin explains, “but the text expresses his belief that this is what they are, and what they have always been. Their past and their future are equally irrelevant” (61-2). It is deeply ironic that Mackenzie’s observations replicate so exactly the close observations that the Sekani men make of his party’s goods, a scrutiny that Mackenzie openly disparages. Mackenzie’s narrative focalization, ostensibly the relation between the vision and what is perceived (Bal 100), betrays itself as no relation at all, but a classically colonial dehistoricization and desocialization of the world it presumes to ‘see’ (JanMohamed 87). Inscribing his observations in the relentlessly a-temporal, quasi-scientific present tense, Mackenzie marks with dramatic grammatical precision the vast objective and cultural distances that separate the static objects visible in the space from his profoundly temporalized and therefore meaningful progress through the space.
Conclusion

Echoing the words of the *Edinburgh Review* quoted above (58-9), historian, John MacKenzie, describes the imperial British hero of the nineteenth century as "fearless, decisive and committed unto death, taking on forces . . . that called forth the exercise of an indomitable will, superhuman physical stamina and . . . an almost miraculous courage . . . in the extensive context of little-known continents" (113). Heroes of empire, heroes of national defence, and heroes of other countries' nationalist struggles, he explains, formed a nineteenth-century British pantheon based on a loose synthesis of mythological and historical models (111-13). The cults that specifically surrounded imperial heroes of exploration typically fused information from the explorers' own journals with imaginative popular interventions (Riffenburgh 7). In this cultural context of almost mystic appreciation for the much-fictionalized lives of explorers, Alexander Mackenzie's journeys accrued an air of public mystery (Riffenburgh 13-14).

According to John MacKenzie, the imperial hero's moral stature was particularly enhanced by the remoteness of the geography to and through which he travelled (113). Exotic, far-flung territories, he explains, formed a milieu in which the hero could lose contact with his own world, disappearing almost into another century as into a geography or society wholly unlike his own. Thus the imperial heroes shared with the figures of universal myth the encounter with, and the transformation by, the strikingly different, a primeval region coexisting with the progressive European world. (114) The notion of a startlingly primeval region of heroic action has, of course, both imaginative integrity and narrative appeal. Like the "zone unknown" to which mythological heros are summoned (Campbell 58), the strange
geographies through which explorers travelled presented them with an ongoing series of unfamiliar situations in which to wreak their heroic potential. Cultural projections of ambivalent modes of political action into a space geographically removed from the culture's 'real life' also, of course, have ideological, but not necessarily articulable, benefits (Green, Dreams 23; Phillips 56-7).

Juxtaposed with Pratt's formulation of 'the contact zone', discursive constructions of remote and primeval geographies quickly reveal the monologic character of imperial heroes' unknown worlds. By contrast with the exclusive imperial focus on the hero's actions and perspectives in the primeval region, the 'contact' of Pratt's contact zone specifically foregrounds "the interactive, improvisational dimension of colonial encounters . . . in terms of copresence, interaction, interlocking understandings and practices, often within radically asymmetrical relations of power" (Imperial 7). Pratt's 'contact zone' thus significantly unsettles the possibility of purely exemplary heroic action in conveniently remote adventurous realms (Phillips 58-9). It also highlights contradictory possibilities in the heroic paradigm itself, which traditionally postulates both the hero's superhuman abilities and his dependence on benefactive forces and persons (Campbell 22). In its imperial forms, the heroic model typically dispenses with clear attribution of outside assistance (Pratt 202), but it may be precisely the paradigm's simultaneous stability and scope for contradiction that offers itself irresistibly to subjects of power unexpectedly defamiliarized by the complexities of the contact zone.

Adventuring in the polymorphous instability of a little-known world, the imperial hero controls the 'perils and novelties' of that world by assuming narrative prerogative. "Explorers are doubly heroic . . .," Duchemin explains, "both as historical figures, and as protagonists in their
own books” (49). In the specific case of Alexander Mackenzie, narrative prerogative and narrative veracity are established in a discursive context characterized by the valourized terms of Western objectivity and rationality. Lists of facts — distances, temperatures, depths, numbers, items traded, and gifts received — dominate the text, and appeal, by their ostensible objectivity, to readers’ assumptions of accuracy and truth, particularly in a cultural context predisposed to understand the narrating explorer as a solitary actor exiled to the challenges of an unknown world (cf. Laut, above 59-60).

As I have shown, however, Mackenzie’s apparently objective, apparently scrupulously accurate account of his movement through, and exchanges in, the space suppresses crucial elements of the multidimensional exchanges that contact initiates and requires. Mackenzie’s preferred, non-narrative discourse represents exchange as occurring within a cultural and economic frame that rigidly controls both the signs and their values. As the first reading identified, Mackenzie responds textually to the threat of cultural difference by ruthlessly reasserting the exchange-value of the signs he recognizes — Mackenzie fills the space of the absent guide with the material goods he deems a proper substitute for presence.

Despite his attempt to suppress the fact, however, the contact zone in which he travels demands contact from Mackenzie. The marked presence of narrative elements in his extended accounts of contact acknowledge that the signs being exchanged are vulnerable to shifts in value. As I show in the second reading, Mackenzie manipulates temporal structures to assert narrative control and to reinforce the racial distinctions that organize his ethnographic digressions. Interlocking layers of temporal adjustment in Mackenzie’s account of the Sekani produce an appearance of seamless accuracy and objectivity. Despite its destabilizing possibilities, narrative’s
temporal manipulations operate overtly, in Mackenzie’s text, in the service of the dominant system’s heroic ideology.

Whether cultural expectations predisposed Mackenzie to understand the events of his journeys in particular ways, or whether he shaped his narrative accounts to conform to heroic models (MacLulich, “Literature” 73; White 7), his text represents him as very much the kind of courageously determined figure that met a European audience’s expectation of explorers. Mackenzie’s idiosyncratic improvisation on the theme of rational observer is to convert, textually and cognitively, the space of his experience into a time of crisis and a crisis of time. Naturalized in the apparently objective sections of the text, that improvisational technique acquires particular discursive power in the more overtly narrative sections of the text. Expressions and manipulations of time in the text critically shape its structure, content, and effect; regularly framed by grammatical thematizations of time, Mackenzie’s accounts of crisis and response call attention to anxieties about time at the same time that they establish firm narrative control over time. In this space of temporal urgency, heroic action is not just possible but necessary.

Sanctioned, moreover, by the convention of heroic control over situations beyond the ken of ordinary men, Mackenzie narrates authoritatively from perspectives both spatially and symbolically distant from the events and subjects he focalizes. In narrative and ethnographic terms, however, focalization in the absence of relation reveals the thoroughgoing, in some cases destructive, ‘interested-ness’ of the form. “[T]he image we receive of the object is determined by the focalizor,” Bal explains and adds, “Conversely, the image a focalizor presents of an object says something about the focalizor itself” (106). An exploration narrative that maximally de-humanizes the focalized object provokes the possibility
that the process Ian Reid calls *textual dispossession*, by which narratorial power is revealed as 'shifty' (17), is potently linked with the powerfully unstable 'in-place-ment' that Bhabha identifies in colonial stereotypes ("Question" 66) and with literal ethnographic dispossession. Effectively erased from the narrator's shifty vision, aboriginal inhabitants are dispossessed, by the narrative and grammatical structures of Mackenzie's text, of their humanity. Mackenzie's readers, moreover, wise in the cultural ways of heroes and narrative form, participate in that dispossession when they accept without resistance Mackenzie's co-present textual worlds, one delineated by thematized time, hence progress, the other characterized as a timeless state of pure, if degenerate being, rendered as objective, reputable,repeatable knowledge by the European viewer in less than one full day.
Chapter 4  Samuel Hearne: Exchanging Bodies in Space

Introduction

A member of the Royal Navy by age eleven, Samuel Hearne had seen considerable military action, particularly during the Seven Years' War, by the time he joined the Hudson's Bay Company (HBC) in 1766 (Mackinnon 339). Hearne spent most of the rest of his life in northern North America working in various capacities for the HBC. His journey overland, from the Prince of Wales's Fort to the mouth of the Coppermine River, remains one of the most extraordinary journeys recorded by a non-aboriginal person in what has become Canadian territory. His account of that expedition, A Journey From Prince of Wales's Fort in Hudson's Bay to the Northern Ocean. Undertaken By Order of the Hudson's Bay Company, For the Discovery of Copper Mines, A North West Passage, &c. In the Years 1769, 1770, 1771, & 1772, is considered a fundamental document of the Canadian canon, “the first great classic of Canadian exploration” (Warkentin, “Exploration” 245).

Like Mackenzie, Hearne substitutes the story he actually tells for the story he was originally commissioned to tell. Ideally, Hearne would have recorded the details of a single successful journey to the mouth of the Coppermine River, where a workable copper mine, ocean access, and evidence of the Northwest Passage would have been discovered. Instead, he records three attempts at the same goal, only the final one of which is successful. Some readers call even the final journey’s success into question, noting that the murderous intent with which the majority of Hearne’s aboriginal companions travelled, and the massacre they effected at the journey’s culmination, create irresolvable moral, cultural, and rhetorical dilemmas for Hearne and for his textual representations (Greenfield,
*Discovery 37*. Geo-politically and economically, Hearne's tripartite expedition was a qualified failure: it discovered no evidence of an inland passage, ocean access, or a workable copper mine. Considered in logistical terms and in terms of visceral endurance, however, Hearne describes an extraordinary bodily feat, the written account of which substitutes geographical and ethnographic information for economic and strategic value.

Recent textual, historical, ethnographic, and ideological studies situate Hearne's text at the centre of generative conflicts of interpretation. Generally, critics comment on Hearne's extraordinary physical accomplishment, and, sometimes by explicit contrast with Alexander Mackenzie, his ethnographic sensitivity (Tyrrell 13-14; Hamilton 12), and, occasionally, his lack of heroic presence (Hopwood 26). Various critics celebrate Hearne's capacity for at least temporary cultural assimilation (Hodgson 12; MacLulich, "Exploration" 81), and others specifically examine Hearne's articulation of the complexities and contradictions of cross-cultural contact (Hutchings; Harrison). Many critics reflect and reinscribe a canonical fascination with Hearne's account of the massacre at Bloody Falls. Some examine Hearne's version in the context of aboriginal accounts (McGrath; Warkentin, "History"), and others theorize textual and ideological differences among Hearne's various versions of the event (MacLaren, "Massacre").

In Mackenzie's text, time activates crisis and exchange. Hearne, by contrast, experiences crisis when movement through geographical space profoundly inflects the meanings of exchanges in the contact zone. Unlike Mackenzie, Hearne always figures space as both cultural and geographical. Indeed, as the previous chapter's preliminary ideational analysis demonstrated (Appendix 2b), Hearne's discourse typically focuses on the
people with him. Hearne’s cultural sensitivity is an effect, in part, of his profoundly ‘bodied’ movement through space, and an effect, in part, of his willingness to adapt and exchange systems of cultural classification. Like Mackenzie’s carefully considered exchanges of time for information, however, Hearne’s cultural sensitivity comes at a price. I argue that Hearne’s negotiations with the geographical and cultural space of the contact zone structure his rhetorical and ideological representations of colonial exchange. These negotiations take both a linguistic and a narrative form. The first two sections of the chapter — *Mapping culture onto geography* and *Making contact: bodies in space* — introduce Hearne’s complex and often contradictory expressions of his existence in the space of the contact zone and examine the peculiarly ‘bodied’ nature of his self-representations. The next two sections of the chapter — *Space, symbolic order, and distance* and *Negotiating the space of distance* — examine Hearne’s linguistic negotiations with the economic exigencies of shifting space. Despite his appreciation for aboriginal systems of exchange, Hearne responds to the press of contact by linguistically re-mapping space to privilege the values of his representative HBC body. The final three sections — *Substituting for the hero, Traffic and the traffic in women,* and *Heroic dispossession* — examine Hearne’s narrative substitutions for heroic self-representation. Hearne’s simultaneous focus on, and suppression of, women’s labour underscores the representational crisis he experiences when the value of European masculinity plummets to zero in the operative cultural economy.

*Mapping culture onto geography*

On 12 August 1770, likely on the plain west of Dubawnt Lake (Hearne 95n), a gust of wind smashed Hearne’s quadrant onto stony ground
and damaged it beyond repair. The event forced Hearne to give up his second attempt to reach the mouth of the Coppermine River and to return, reluctantly, for a second time, to the Prince of Wales's Fort. Four days before, on 8 August 1770, he had foreshadowed the accident in a journal entry memorable for its vitriolic criticism of his aboriginal companions, its expression of palpable personal fear, and its unselfconsciously privileged 'reading' of cross-cultural tensions. "The very uncourteous behaviour of the Northern Indians then in company," that entry begins, "gave me little hopes of receiving assistance from them, any longer than I had wherewithal to reward them for their trouble and expense" (92-3). The excerpt, reprinted in Appendix 6, articulates, more extensively than any other single example, the contradictions of Hearne's colonial body, simultaneously travelling through geographical space and fixed at the tense nexus of cross-cultural negotiation and economic exchange.

In its extended form, the excerpt demonstrates three significant ways in which movement through geographical space complicates the exchanges of exploration for Hearne. Specifically, movement through geographical space complicates i) the literal value of material exchange, ii) the cultural and symbolic assumptions underlying that exchange, and iii) the value of the representative and the visceral European body at the centre of the exchange. The excerpt identifies, for example, how the shifting ground of economic value benefitted native people to the detriment of Europeans at this distance from the Prince of Wales's Fort ("not one of them had offered to give me the least morsel . . . without asking something in exchange, which, in general, was three times the value of what they could have got for the same articles, had they carried them to the Factory, though several hundred miles distant"); how cross-cultural frustration increased as geographical movement shifted the implicit and explicit meanings of
exchange ("it is scarcely possible to conceive any people so void of common understanding, as to think that the sole intent of my undertaking this fatiguing journey, was to carry a large assortment of useful and heavy implements, to give to all that stood in need of them"); and how Hearne, as both a representative HBC body and as a material body, felt increasingly vulnerable as he travelled farther from the Fort ("when they found I had nothing to spare . . . they made no scruple of pronouncing me a ‘poor servant, noways like the Governor at the Factory’ . . . . This unaccountable behaviour . . . showed plainly how little I had to expect if I should, by any accident be reduced to the necessity of depending upon them for support; so that, though I laid me down to rest, sleep was a stranger to me that night").

Kevin D. Hutchings analyzes extensively both Hearne’s stereotypes of Amerindian ‘savagery’ and his comments about the impact of the fur trade on indigenous people. On the basis of his analysis, Hutchings argues that Hearne’s narrative inadvertently destabilizes the progressivist thrust of the ‘four-stages’ theory of cultural development, a theory central to Enlightenment social thought (54). "Samuel Hearne’s incompatible reflections," Hutchings claims, "concerning, on the one hand, his unquestionable ‘duty’ to his employers and, on the other, the appalling effects on Indigenous populations of performing this duty, point to an irreconcilable doubleness inhabiting the writing Self" (73). Hutchings proposes that from a postcolonial perspective, Hearne’s “narrative perplexity” can be read as an “early manifestation of critical self-reflexivity” and, as such, a potential basis for “sound cultural criticism, intercultural negotiation, and productive sociocultural transformation” (73; italics in text). I argue, by contrast, that Hearne’s “narrative perplexity” fails, in dramatic ways, to function so ideally.
In the chapter's first close reading, I examine one of the excerpts that Hutchings identifies as central to his argument (68) and propose that Hearne in fact reconciles certain, apparently incommensurable "disruptions of his cultural knowledge" (73) by means of what Daniel Clayton calls, in a slightly different context, "the physical and rhetorical demarcation of distance and difference between Europeans and Natives" (119). I argue specifically that the HBC’s Prince of Wales’s Fort functions as the symbolic, if absent, centre of Hearne’s text and that the text’s crucial symbolic classifications depend fundamentally on a shifting spatial value I call, ‘distance from the Fort.’ I examine the separate spatial worlds of Hearne’s text, analyze how the distance between those separate worlds is negotiated discursively, and theorize the travelling European body engaged in that negotiation. On the basis of my analysis, I argue that Hearne resolves critical ideological, social, political, and economic ‘disruptions’ by mapping culture onto geography. Despite his understanding of, and sympathy for, aboriginal values, Hearne responds to the possibility of traditional Indian lifeways encroaching on the symbolic centre of the HBC forts by re-classifying space in all the ways that his ideological, discursive, and bodily allegiance to a European economic worldview requires.

As Hearne moves through the space, cultural and economic values fluctuate in ways that he cannot anticipate. As he learns early in his first journey, they also fluctuate in ways that directly threaten his personal safety and survival. Jay Lemke’s claim that inflicting pain, or threatening to inflict pain, “is the pervasive and fundamental mode of social control” (13-14) casts into relief two closely related aspects of the bodily nature of crisis in Hearne’s text. The first is the text’s peculiarly ‘feminine’ figuring of the self as contingent, vulnerable, and potentially expendable in the dominant social economy. The second is the text’s suppression of
exploration heroics. Matonabbee’s arrival near the end of Hearne’s second journey relieves much of the latter’s concern for his personal safety. The text overtly constructs Matonabbee as the critical element that both guarantees Hearne’s bodily safety and makes successful journeying through the space possible. Covertly, however, and in deeply suppressed form, the text acknowledges that women’s presence and women’s traditional labour ensure the final journey’s ultimate success. In the chapter’s second close reading, I examine the way that Hearne’s focus on women’s subjugation within the geographically determined gender-economics stabilizes his dispossessed European male agency. I read the hero-less massacre scene as the point at which Hearne is doubly dispossessed — dispossessed, that is, of both Matonabbee’s heroic presence and of his feminine dopplegängers — a double dispossession that can only be recuperated by recourse to European literary structures of gothic representation.

Because geographical space and geographical distance in Hearne’s text are never separable from cultural reality, the ‘contact’ of the contact zone bears down, for Hearne, at the fragile join between his kinaesthetic and his representative body. Hearne’s contradictory discourse regularly calls received assumptions of racial and cultural superiority into radical question. At crucial points, however, this radical questioning poses visceral threats to his bodily identity. Because these threats interrupt his ability to create a convincing counter-discourse, his discourse ultimately reinforces the status quo. Critical and analytical attention to Hearne’s text responds covertly to a narrative momentum that mimics the contradictions and vulnerabilities of the human body. The text’s substitutive moves circle in and out, alternatively contradicting and reasserting one another, and calling attention to their profound instability by doing so. The text creates a sexual tension between openness and closedness that is ultimately
stabilized in dominant cultural, economic, and textual terms.

Making contact: bodies in space

Arthur Frank describes the body as “constituted in the intersection of an equilateral triangle the points of which are institutions, discourses, and corporeality” (49), and, by doing so, provides a provocative perspective on the institutional, ideological, and material dilemmas that Hearne’s body experiences in the contact zone. Dennis Denisoff proposes that the peculiar rhetorics sometimes evident in exploration journals articulate the liminal position the writers held, caught between their mercantile masters and the indigenous people with, and amongst whom, they travelled and traded (121). What Frank calls the discursive body can be thought of, then, as framed, in Hearne’s case, by the ‘doubled-body’ of exploration: the representative body of institutionalized mercantilism and the corporeal body of visceral contact. Just as the categories and the classifications of the social and symbolic order exist in a dual relationship to space and spatial divisions, spatial issues of proximity, location, distance, and difference inflect the value and the meaning of both Hearne’s institutional body and his material body in the contact zone.

Hearne’s description, for instance, of the various preparations he made in advance of his first journey, provides one of the few textual evocations of the institutional body. The excerpt is remarkable for various, related reasons, including its un-selfconscious and literal reinscription of the ‘empty land’ trope (Hulme 156-58). “I drew a Map,” writes Hearne, “on a large skin of parchment . . . and sketched all the West coast of the Bay on it, but left the interior parts blank, to be filled up during my Journey” (58). The excerpt also articulates the distance between the representative self of the institutional centre and the corporeal body
moving through space. “In consequence of my complying with the Company’s request, and undertaking this Journey,” Hearne recalls in a markedly passive and abstract formulation, “it is natural to suppose that every necessary arrangement was made for the easier keeping of my reckoning, &c., under the many inconveniences I must be unavoidably obliged to labour in such an expedition” (58; my emphasis). Hearne’s extraordinarily diffident description of his personal preparations underscores the distance between his bodies — and crucially contradicts the notion of an ‘empty’ land. “[A]s to myself,” he explains, “little was required to be done, as the nature of travelling long journeys in those countries will never admit of carrying even the most common article of clothing; so that the traveller is obliged to depend on the country he passes through, for that article, as well as for provision” (58-9; my emphasis).

Hearne’s stated intention, too, to precisely describe his daily movements is significant and particularly evocative. “I also prepared detached pieces on a much larger scale for every degree of latitude and longitude contained in the large map,” he explains, and adds, “On those detached pieces I pricked off my daily courses and distance” (58). In their ideal form, Hearne’s pinpricks are potent markers of distance, location, and extension, potent markers of institutionally ascribed difference. Ideally, that is, Hearne’s pinpricks are symbolic notation for an abstracted body’s travel through space already authoritatively classified in magisterial terms. Despite their efficacy at the centre, however, authoritative classifications can never entirely define or control the material body experiencing itself in space and through distance.

Hearne’s account is notable for its evocative and only sometimes euphemized references to bodily exigencies in the contact zone’s formidable geography. “None of our natural wants . . . are so distressing,”
he laments, for instance, about four months into his second journey, or hard to endure, as hunger... it not only enfeebles the body, but depresses the spirits, in spite of every effort to prevent it. Besides, for want of action, the stomach so far loses its digestive powers, that after long fasting it resumes its office with pain and reluctance. During this journey I have... more than once been reduced to so low a state by hunger and fatigue, that when providence threw any things in my way, my stomach has scarcely been able to retain more than two or three ounces, without producing the most oppressive pain. Another disagreeable circumstance of long fasting is, the extreme difficulty and pain attending the natural evacuations for the first time; and which is so dreadful, that of it none but those who have experienced can have an adequate idea. (84-5; my emphasis)
The abstract representative body that bureaucratic discourse assumes is radically displaced here by the urgent, material body, represented textually through concrete nouns and active verbs: “hunger... enfeebles”; “[hunger] depresses”; “the stomach... loses and... resumes”; “my stomach has scarcely been able to retain.” The non-deferrable crises of the contact zone provoke the material body to intrude itself textually in unfamiliar and compelling ways. In an especially vivid description, for instance, Hearne describes the state of his feet on the journey back from the Coppermine River:

I had so little power to direct my feet when walking, that I frequently knocked them against the stones... [T]he nails of my toes were bruised to such a degree, that several of them festered and dropped off. To add to this mishap, the skin was entirely chafed off from the tops of both my feet, and between every toe; so that the sand and gravel... irritated the raw parts so much, that for a whole
day . . . I left the print of my feet in blood almost at every step I took. (206)

As his body moves from the site of representative authority, Hearne's urgent materiality is juxtaposed with both the Fort's administrative abstractions and objective ethnographic observation. Participants in this discourse are body parts (feet, toenails, skin, and bloody footprints), and they undergo processes of either direct action (feet are knocked, and nails fester and drop off) or visceral attribution (nails are bruised, and skin is chafed). In the institutional, mercantile terms of the Fort, the land is empty and thus mappable; the moving, corporeal body, however, can only survive if it can both find what it needs in the space, and meet the visceral demands of the space. Pinpricks on parchment cannot, finally, predict, prevent, or assuage bloody footprints in sand and gravel.

However carefully represented on the "general Map," moreover, Hearne's moving body is increasingly incapable of commanding the Fort's authority. The excerpt reproduced in Appendix 6 precisely articulates Hearne's indignation when the people he encounters assume that his material body can perform exchange with the same meaning it would have at the Fort. "It is scarcely possible . . . " he deplores, "to think that the sole intent of my undertaking this fatiguing journey, was to carry a large assortment of useful and heavy implements . . . but many of them would ask me for what they wanted . . . with the same hopes of success, as if they had been at one of the Company's Factories" (93). Hearne's indignation not only reveals the contradictions inherent in European expectations of indigenous economic cooperation, but also articulates the crucial if covert conviction that some 'shifts in bodily meaning' are both legitimate and imperative in the contact zone.

As Hearne's material body encounters the realities of Indian
lifeways, he calls into question many of the symbolic, cultural, anthropophagic, and other dietary classifications which had until then defined his world (Hutchings 59-60, 66-7, and throughout). The body — simultaneously literal and symbolic, contingent and representative — complicates the economic and cultural negotiation of the contact zone. Especially in its evocation of the material body, Hearne’s text can be seen as a record of the ways that culturally sanctioned classifications of exchange give way to improvised exchanges of classification. The close reading of the deer-pounding excerpt that follows, however, reveals that despite Hearne’s understanding of, and sympathy for, aboriginal lifeways (Greenfield, Discovery 28; MacLulich, “Exploration” 81), incommensurabilities arise and are expressed discursively when his representative self imagines strange masses of bodies encroaching ever closer to the Fort. Hearne responds to the crisis of incommensurability by exchanging the flexible values of his contingent, material body for increasingly rigid re-classifications the closer he imagines the offending categories to the Fort.

Until Matonabbee’s arrival, Hearne’s physical body experiences much more direct and literal threat than he may originally have believed possible. The relationship that the two men develop on meeting, however, enacts one of the text’s central exchanges of classification. Matonabbee, that is, who plays the role of Hearne’s employee in the ostensible terms of European labour economics, in fact guarantees Hearne’s visceral and symbolic security in the cultural economy of the contact zone. Paradoxically, the exchange of classification that Matonabbee’s arrival enables and requires, frees Hearne up to complete the geographical survey commissioned by his HBC orders. Hearne’s resulting ethnographic focus on Matonabbee’s wives, and, by extension, on the gender-exchange
economy that makes his journey and his existence in the contact zone possible, underscores his simultaneously precarious and privileged cultural value. The instability of Hearne's ambiguous cultural positioning — between the authoritative masculine figure onto whom he has projected his personal autonomy and the women whose position in the exchange-economy most closely reflects his own lack of cultural agency — culminates textually in the gothic melodrama of the massacre scene.

**Space, symbolic order, and distance**

According to Homi K. Bhabha, colonial discourse depends crucially on the concept of 'fixity' in its ideological construction of otherness. "Fixity," he explains, as the sign of cultural/historical/racial difference in the discourse of colonialism, is a paradoxical mode of representation: it connotes rigidity and an unchanging order as well as disorder, degeneracy and daemonic repetition. Likewise the stereotype, which is its major discursive strategy, is a form of knowledge and identification that vacillates between what is always 'in place', already known, and something that must be anxiously repeated. ("Question" 66)

In a provocative instantiation of Bhabha's terms, Hearne's discourse pivots around his representation of two distinct sites of ambivalent fixity. The first is the HBC's Prince of Wales's Fort, which functions as the symbolic centre to which everything and everyone is assumed to be in relation. The second is the 'world of the Indians,' which appears at the farthest symbolic reaches from the Fort, and is reported — in the sanctioned terms of European ethnography — as a temporally static site of disorderly repetition. What Hutchings describes as the dynamism of cultural disruption and perplexity is, I argue, played out between these two very
differently 'fixed' sites. The following section examines the relationship between the two textual sites, particularly in terms of the ways in which spatial divisions are simultaneously produced by, and reproduce, the categories and classifications of social and symbolic order (Giddens 117). I conclude the analysis by examining how the travelling colonial body negotiates the literal and symbolic distance between the sites, and recoups social and symbolic categories destabilized by distance from the centre.

The 'world of the Fort' to which Hearne repeatedly refers almost never actually appears in the text. Except for his preparations for the first journey (58) and his brief sojourns there between attempts (70-1; 106-8), the Fort as a lived space is almost completely absent from the text. Like the monasteries, the fortresses, and the walled towns that Foucault describes as disciplinary enclosures, the Fort is a space “heterogeneous to all others and closed in upon itself” (Discipline 141-42). I argue, in fact, that precisely the Fort's textual absence denotes how thoroughly it has been naturalized as a site of authority: the Fort, in de Certeau's terminology, is the place of 'the proper' and therefore serves "as the basis for generating relations with an exterior distinct from it" (Practice xix). Hearne, of course, receives his instructions at the textually absent but symbolically powerful Fort, instructions which officially demarcate the nature and scope of his exploratory journey, and establish his representative identity on that journey. "Whereas the Honourable Hudson's Bay Company have been informed," those instructions begin,

by the report from Indians, that there is a great probability of considerable advantages to be expected from a better knowledge of their country by us . . . and as it is the Company's earnest desire to embrace every circumstance that may tend to the benefit of the said Company, or the Nation at large, they have requested you to conduct
this Expedition; and . . . you are hereby desired to proceed as soon as possible. (52)

At the Fort, operative social and economic distinctions are imagined as efficacious at a distance. “You are also,” Hearne’s instructions continue, “to persuade [such far-off Indians as you may meet with] . . . to exert themselves in procuring furrs and other articles for trade, and to assure them of good payment for them at the Company’s Factory” (53).

The Fort’s symbolic efficacy depends, however, on crucial spatial slippages, a point forcefully underscored by Hearne’s indignation at the native people. “So inconsiderate were those people,” he fumes, “that wherever they met me, they always expected that I had a great assortment of goods to relieve their necessities; as if I had brought the Company’s warehouse with me” (93). From Hearne’s perspective, the people he encounters assume, erroneously, that his representative body and his literal body are synonymous, and that the latter can ‘stand in’ for the meaning and the value and the material reality of exchange practices as they are performed at the Fort. His resulting indignation inadvertently reveals that he himself operates according to a critical, if unarticulated, distinction between ‘space’ and ‘distance’; according to this covert distinction, rules established at the centre of authority are allowed to shift as material bodies and representative selves move from the central site. Clearly, the resulting flux does not always benefit representatives of European economic exchange, though it is at least partly stabilized by the text’s other ambivalently fixed site.

The ‘world of the Indians’ exists at the farthest symbolic reaches from the Fort and appears textually whenever Hearne launches into ethnographic descriptions of Indian life. Unlike the referential but absent Fort, the text’s “Indian” interludes are immediately discernible, textually,
by their marked dependence on passive constructions. Almost exactly one month into his second journey, Hearne records a description of how the Indians set fish nets under ice which precisely exemplifies this grammatical dependence. “[I]t is first necessary to ascertain [the net’s] exact length” (73), he explains to begin, and continues almost without variation: “a number of round holes are cut in the ice”; “[a] line is then passed under the ice”; “a long light pole . . . is first introduced”; “this pole is easily conducted . . . under the ice”; “the pole is then taken out”; “a large stone is tied to each of the lower corners.” At each stage, Hearne describes the actions involved as if they occurred anonymously. According to Norman Fairclough, “the grammatical forms of a language code happenings or relationships in the world” (120). Grammatical expressions, that is, construct the processes and the participants represented by discourse: namely, the kinds of action and the specific agents responsible for those actions (120-25). In the net-setting excerpt, however, passive constructions re-order conventional subject/verb grammar so that the clause focuses on the action being performed to the exclusion of the agents responsible for those actions. Indeed, except when Hearne describes the net as being “made fast to one end of the line by one person, and hauled under the ice by a second,” his constructions are not merely passive but agent-less; they not only obscure the agents responsible for the actions, but erase them entirely (Hodge and Kress, Language 25).

In the context of colonial and ethnographic discourse, passive constructions and agent-less passives effectively obscure and erase the human agents responsible for the actions, the events, and the customs described. The net-setting excerpt described above exemplifies what Abdul R. JanMohamed calls colonial discourse’s predisposition to dehistoricize and desocialize the world it encounters (87). In Hearne’s ethnographic
world, focus rarely wavers from the details of the desocialized activity under description. “To pitch an Indian’s tent in winter,” he declares, for instance, “it is first necessary to search for a level piece of dry ground . . . . When a convenient spot is found, the snow is then cleared away” (74). And when Hearne describes traditional women’s work as virtually insignificant, the depersonalization borders on contempt. “To prepare meat in this manner,” he condescends to report in a footnote, “it requires no farther operation than cutting the lean parts of the animal into thin slices, and drying it in the sun, or by a slow fire, till, after beating it between two stones, it is reduced to a coarse powder” (89; my emphasis). The net-setting excerpt is particularly striking because its final comparison relies on two direct-action constructions. “The Europeans settled in Hudson’s Bay proceed much in the same manner,” Hearne explains at the end of his description, “though they in general take much more pains . . . ” (73). Conventional subject/verb grammar in both constructions not only clearly identifies the agents of the action, but it identifies them as European subjects to whom the positive term of the comparison is ascribed. The excerpt concludes, tellingly, with the judgmental passive clause: “but the above method is found quite sufficient by the Indians.” Unlike the European agents responsible for specific and valourized action in the two previous constructions, Indians’ methodology takes the focus of the final, deprecating, evaluation.

In this and other ways, the ‘world of the Indians’ is regularly set in spatial and cultural opposition to the ‘world of the Fort.’ The two ambivalently fixed worlds, however, are not represented equally in the text, since the aboriginal world is consistently described in terms of the textually absent Fort, as if the values and the classifications naturalized at the Fort in fact applied everywhere. The textual ‘world of the Indians’ is
thus, significantly, a world understood through the filtering lens of Hearne’s gaze, a discursive creation that communicates Hearne’s orientation to aboriginal lifeways under the guise of ethnographic truth. In much the contradictory way that Bhabha describes, ‘the world of the Indians’ functions textually and ideologically both to stabilize the fluctuating values of the Fort and to provide a dramatic alternative against which the Fort’s values can be seen to be clearly superior.

According to Allen Pred, “the production of space... is both the medium and the outcome of human agency and social relations, both the medium and the outcomes of... ‘structuration processes’... both the medium and outcome of... structuring processes” (26). Pred follows Anthony Giddens explicitly, and by extension, Henri Lefebvre, Michel Foucault, and Edward Soja, who argue for a greater awareness of space in political and cultural theory. By reinvoking Giddens’s notion of the duality of structure (Giddens 122), Pred identifies space and spatial divisions as simultaneously determiners of, and determined by, symbolic order. Spatial divisions and classifications both embody and enable cultural distinctions, symbolic practices, and social relations, and, as such, are social acts. At the symbolic centre of Hearne’s text, the Fort is not merely the static repository of European dividing practices but, in Pierre Bourdieu’s terms, the site where de facto differences are transformed symbolically into spatial, social, and economic distinctions through which the authoritative version of the world is legitimized and enacted (Language 238). As the textual, geographic, spatial, and symbolic centre of reference, the Fort is both ‘structured’ by dividing practices and attempts to ‘structure’ the worlds inside and outside its enclosure according to its dividing practices.

But Hearne’s story is not about maintaining the proper distinctions between ‘inside’ and ‘outside’ by remaining stationary at the site of
authority; Hearne’s story is fundamentally about movement between sites and spaces. As such, it is profoundly concerned with how changes in geographical context modify the literal and the symbolic value of inherited classifications. According to Foucault, who traces the evolution of western notions of space, “the problem of the human site or living space is . . . knowing what relations of propinquity, what type of storage, circulation, marking, and classification of human elements should be adopted in a given situation in order to achieve a given end. Our epoch is one in which space takes for us the form of relations among sites” (“Spaces” 23). Among many other things, Hearne’s text records his peculiar version of the ‘problem’ that Foucault identifies. Despite the Fort’s authority, values shift as ‘location’ is exchanged for distance and direction. And as those values shift, Hearne himself and all the other ‘human elements’ circulating between sites are in constant need of re-classification.

Hearne relies spatially and textually on a quality I will call ‘relative location’ to represent his movement through unfamiliar space. By contrast with Alexander Mackenzie, who represents himself in cartesian space as ‘the origin,’ the point with coordinates (0,0), and who locates himself textually in foreign terrain by creating the elaborate word-maps examined in Chapter 3, Hearne is far less likely to orient himself in terms of where he is than in terms of where he is in relation to something else. Hearne, that is, typically situates himself textually in other — and ‘other’s’ — terms. Three days into his first journey, for instance, on 9 November 1769, Hearne records the following attempt to locate himself in the country:

I asked . . . Chawchinahaw the distance, and probable time it would take, before we could reach the main woods; which he assured me would not exceed four or five days journey . . . . We continued our
course between the West by North and North West, *in daily expectation of arriving at those woods*. . . . [A]fter we had walked *double the time here mentioned*, no signs of woods were to be seen in the direction we were then steering; but *we had frequently seen the looming of woods to the South West*. (62-3; my emphasis throughout)

Throughout his journal, similar phrases of relativity and comparison recur: “our lodging was *much more comfortable* than it had been for many nights before, *while we were on the barren grounds*” (63); “we . . . set off with our new guide for his tent, which, *by a comparative distance*, he told us, was not about five miles from the place where we met him, but we found it to be nearer fifteen” (66); “[m]y guide having . . . determined to move toward the barren ground, this morning we took down our tent, packed up our luggage, and *proceeded to the Eastward*” (79).

On 30 November 1769, approximately three weeks into his first journey, Hearne’s text locates him for the first time at a geographical, symbolic, economic, cultural, and visceral distance from the Fort. Hearne has discovered that equipment and supplies have been stolen and confronts his guide, who denies knowledge of the theft but suggests that the journey be called off as a result of the loss. “[I]t would not be prudent, he said, for us to proceed any farther,” Hearne writes:

adding, that *he and all the rest of his countrymen were going to strike off another way . . . and after giving us a short account which way to steer our course for the nearest part of Seal River, which he said would be our best way homeward, he and his crew . . . set out toward the South West . . . and left us to consider of our unhappy situation, near two hundred miles from Prince of Wales’s Fort, all heavily laden, and our strength and spirits greatly reduced by hunger
and fatigue. (64-5)
Six days later, while struggling back to the Fort, Hearne encounters a group of Indians with whom he arranges to pay double the price for several joints of venison. When they decide to give the meat as a gift to one of his aboriginal companions instead, Hearne calls the decision, “a sufficient proof of the singular advantage which a native of this country has over an Englishman, when at such a distance from the Company’s Factories as to depend entirely on them for subsistence” (67).

Ideally, Hearne’s text imagines the values and the classifications of value at the absent, central Fort as efficacious even as far away as the ‘world of the Indians.’ Because the ‘world of the Indians’ is controlled textually by Hearne’s temporally static reporting practices, it functions within this imaginative scheme as a kind of cultural place-holder, one that distinguishes, by negative contrast, the supremacy of European practices and modes of exchange. The scheme of values is interrupted, however, when the travelling body finds itself circulating through the space of the distance between the worlds. While Hearne’s representative body enjoys the symbolic security of ‘the world of the Fort,’ his material body encounters ‘the world of the Indians’ with a kind of inevitable intimacy. The space of the distance between the worlds, and all the urgent demands in that space for symbolic, social, economic, and ideological re-classification, must be negotiated. The space under negotiation is, of course, the dynamic open system that I have been calling, following Pratt, ‘the contact zone.’

Negotiating the space of distance
The Fort and the fixed difference of the ‘world of the Indians’ are linked, textually, by the space of the distance between them. That link, however, is not easily, clearly, or simply delineated. Hearne’s account of a
winter deer-pound. for instance, demonstrates i) how his discourse lurches stylistically when worlds necessarily separate within European cultural ideology, violate one another’s boundaries in the context of European economic exchange, and ii) how, by strategic textual slippages, his discourse maps cultural difference onto spatial distance and ‘solves’ the ideological, social, political, and economic dilemmas he has inadvertently set for himself.

Understandably, Hearne experiences enormous pressure to account legitimately for the conflicts, the complications, the contradictions, and the incompatibilities of his journeys through the contact zone. Hutchings’s analysis identifies crucial points at which Hearne’s text either betrays its uncertainty about the efficacy of received cultural beliefs or embraces cultural values incongruent with European expectations (57, 59, 59-60). By doing so, Hutchings identifies both how classification schemes determine the nature of exchange practice and, more potently, how the multiple pressures of the contact zone can provoke the exchange of classification schemes. Hutchings does not, however, consider the complex strategies that Hearne’s text mobilizes at points of particular threat to maintain authoritative classification schemes in the face of contradiction, ambiguity, and unintelligibility. The excerpt examined in detail below exemplifies the textual ways in which ideological contradictions in the contact zone can be deflected, obscured, mutated, and — sometimes — erased entirely by the judicious, improvisational application of dominant spatializing divisions. In the analysis that follows, I trace how Hearne’s classifications and re-classifications map culture onto geography in an anxious repetition of colonial stereotypes inflected by the exigencies of proximity and distance.

The excerpt in question begins about two-and-a-half months into
Hearne’s third journey, just after Matonabbee has proposed that they continue killing and eating the deer they encounter while they wait for better travelling weather (119). The journal excerpt begins when the party arrives at a camp of people surviving the winter on deer they have caught in their pound, proceeds to a detailed description of deer-pound construction, and evolves from there into an internally contradictory debate between the merits of traditional Indian lifeways and the trading activities that British-European interests require. The excerpt as a whole is particularly useful because it so explicitly invokes ‘the world of the Indians,’ ‘the world of the Fort,’ and the contact zone between them.

Considered in grammatical terms, the excerpt is dominated throughout by passive constructions which focus on the action being described. As the discourse shifts, however, from the ‘world of the Indians,’ to the economic world of the contact zone in which the Indians have been obliged to participate, to the hypothetical ‘world of the Fort,’ participants in the discourse shift correspondingly, from simple, often inanimate entities, to multiply-modified phrases which identify groups of human beings, to sparse but repetitive abstract concepts and nominalizations which obscure economic transactions.

“The pound,” Hearne explains, for instance, in a typical example of the prose with which he describes the world of the Indians, “is built by making a strong fence with brushy trees, without observing any degree of regularity, and the work is continued to any extent . . . . The door, or entrance of the pound, is not larger than a common gate, and the inside is so crowded with small counter-hedges as very much to resemble a maze” (120). As in the net-setting excerpt, the human beings who have built the pound are discursively eliminated in favour of an exclusive focus on the inanimate objects under observation. Phrases like, “These poles . . . are
placed at the distance of fifteen or twenty yards from each other... growing gradually wider in proportion to the distance they extend from the entrance of the pound, which sometimes is not less than two or three miles” (121), sweepingly erase the human beings whose ingenuity and labour have provided the extraordinary construction that Hearne describes.

As Hearne’s account shifts to speculate on the relative merit of different lifeways in the shared world of trade, specific groups of human beings do appear, though they consistently appear in constructions like: “[I]t cannot be supposed that those who indulge themselves in this indolent method of procuring food can be masters of any thing for trade; whereas those who do not get their livelihood at so easy a rate, generally procure furs enough during the Winter to purchase a sufficient supply of ammunition” (122). By contrast with the apparently uninhabited ‘world of the Indians,’ actual human beings inhabit the world of the contact zone, though they are naturalized there into one of only two existential realities: “the industrious” and “the indolent.” The “industrious” are clearly those Indians who participate in the European fur trade, while “the indolent,” “the miserable beings,” and “the unambitious” are the Indians who survive the winter off the proceeds of the deer-pound. “[T]he more industrious among them...” Hearne explains, “of course, are of most importance and value to the Hudson’s Bay Company, as it is from them the furs are procured which compose the greatest part of Churchill trade” (122). Significantly, the two categories of persons are not only patently imposed by a European economic worldview, but they are assumed to account adequately for all the Indians of the area.

In grammatical terms, classifications, like “the unambitious” (122), are labels that reduce participants to attributes (Hodge and Kress, *Language* 103). Very similarly, nominalizations are processes which have been
reduced grammatically into either a single noun or a multi-word compound noun (Fairclough 124). The nominalization "Churchill trade" above, for instance, reduces to a single phrase all the details — the tense (past, present, future), modality (the truth-value, probability, obligation, or usualness of the event), participants (who is involved), processes (what activities occur), and forms of exchange (what goods are exchanged, how often, under whose control, and to whose benefit) — that might be included in the meaning. As Robert Hodge and Gunther Kress point out, nominalizations are a linguistic process which, with their resulting forms, "are the reflection in language of a particular habit of mind, which inclines to categorize and subcategorize an object of enquiry, dividing and subdividing it in a neat and orderly fashion. Such a cast of mind," they claim, "is often associated with bureaucracies, and . . . strongly represented in the language produced by administrators" (Language 105).

The economic, administrative, and bureaucratic terms that covertly delimit Hearne's discussion surface discursively when the excerpt acknowledges the existence of European agents in a series of abstract constructions resolutely focused on commercial transaction. "[I]t is undoubtedly the duty of every one of the Company's servants to encourage a spirit of industry among the natives," Hearne admonishes, for instance, "and to use every means in their power to induce them to procure furrs and other commodities for trade, by assuring them of a ready purchase and good payment for every thing they bring to the Factory" (123-24). Here, formulaic constructions and the redundant pairing typical of legal discourse effectively increase the scope and the apparent potency of the abstractions: scope, because a phrase like, "every means in their power," seems to cover all possible exigencies; potency, because the repetitive structure of a phrase like, "a ready purchase and good payment," adds crucial emphasis.
Importantly, too, and despite the fact that it is one of the few non-passive constructions in the excerpt, the thoroughly abstracted clause, “it is . . . the duty . . . to encourage . . . and to use,” effectively separates specific European human beings from the particular activities to which their ‘duty’ ostensibly compels them.

The text’s discursive styles thus index a fundamental tension between levels: on one level, the timeless abstractions of the Europeans and the timeless dehistoricization of the Indians appear to be similar; on another level, however, abstraction and dehistoricization demonstrate dramatically different ideological and social effects. The timeless abstractions, for instance, that delineate the Fort’s imperative power and its bureaucratic authority also grant it an omniscient point of observation. At the other extreme, grammatical passivity so thoroughly dehistoricizes the world of the Indians that its subjects become mere objects of observation. However much Hearne might have intended to give fair hearing to the value of traditional forms of life, his text betrays the hierarchy of values he indeed assumes, in part by consistently obscuring the fact that European economic involvement happens because specific European agents act in specific ways, and in related part, by situating the economic tensions that destabilize the text’s value-system in the world of the Indians. Expressions like, “those whom they call indolent and mean-spirited” (123) and “those who are called the annual traders” (124), which are structured grammatically and positioned textually to suggest that the ‘opposing’ group of Indians is doing the naming, not only naturalize the economic distinctions within the world of the Indians, but invite the reader to imagine that the thematic ‘conflict of lifeways’ exists independently of European involvement.

The excerpt’s final eighteen sentences are included in Appendix 7 to allow a direct reading of the text’s ‘solution’ to the cultural and ideological
dilemma it has inadvertently, but perhaps unavoidably (Greenfield, Discovery 27), got itself into. Sentence 5 operates as the excerpt’s pivot, the point at which the text’s established values — the superiority of European over indigenous economic practices — are precisely reversed without any discernible motivation and to an end apparently incommensurable with the writer’s assumed goals. At Sentence 5 ("And what do the more industrious gain by giving themselves all this additional trouble?"), the writer switches from a series of criticisms of ‘deer-pounding’ to what might be considered an extended encomium for exactly that traditional way of life. Not surprisingly, this contradiction eventually manifests itself as the ‘textual crisis’ of Sentence 12: “But I must at the same time confess, that such conduct is by no means for the real benefit of the poor Indians; it being well known that those who have the least intercourse with the Factories, are by far the happiest.”

Close examination of discursive shifts is peculiarly appropriate to exploration texts, especially given Bhabha’s invocation of the ambivalent slippage in colonial stereotypes and JanMohamed’s cogent observations of the infinite substitutions and transformations by which colonial discourse renders and re-renders indigenous Others inferior (83, 87). Hearne’s text generally, and this excerpt specifically, relies on the oppositional classifications, ‘the values of the Indians,’ and ‘the values of the Hudson’s Bay Company.’ In the section reprinted in Appendix 7, however, the phrase, “the real wants of these people” (my emphasis) appears for the first time in Sentence 6 and dramatically signals the fact that the first of the two classifications is itself subdivided into, ‘the inauthentic needs of the Indians’ and ‘the real needs of the Indians.’ Because HBC representatives are obscured by abstract constructions, the text’s primary participants have been, until now, the two carefully distinguished groups of Indians, and the
debate has been able to focus on the conflict between the latter two sets of values as if it existed purely as a consequence of Indians’ choices. The ‘repressed’ value returns, however, to create the crisis of Sentence 12, specifically, the first textual contact of ‘the values of the Hudson’s Bay Company,’ and ‘the real needs of the Indians.’

In systems terms, the textual crisis records a bifurcation. According to Lemke, “bifurcations in the material dynamics of an ecosocial system generally lead to a breaking of the symmetries that existed in prior states of the system, so that new differences are potentially distinguishable; what was formerly one single context may now be separable into two somewhat different contexts. This difference of contexts may now be used to ‘pry apart’ a formerly unitary social practice, if distinguishable variations in the enactment of the practice begin to co-occur regularly with the difference in contexts” (122). As the final section of the analysis demonstrates below, Hearne fails to distinguish meaningful variations in the practice, but responds instead to the crisis of bifurcation by reasserting discursively the pre-eminence of apparently unified European social and economic practices.

Hearne’s reassertion relies, however, on victimizing the Indians specifically in terms of their proximity to the Fort. Because “happiness” functions explicitly as the ultimate term of the comparison begun at Sentence 6, Sentence 12 is a potent expression of what could be called Hearne’s covert Inverse Rule of Geographical Distance: ‘Indians are better off the further they can stay from the Fort.’ Because Sentence 12 immediately follows the excerpt’s only clear expression of the Company’s presence and intentions (“It is undoubtedly the duty of every one of the Company’s servants”), however, it dramatically highlights the conflict that the text is attempting to mitigate. The textual crisis that results is therefore
promptly succeeded by an efficient set of re-classifications: as “the poor Indians” of Sentence 12 are imagined in ever closer proximity to the Fort, they are transformed, first back into “people of this easy turn” (a powerful echo of the excerpt’s second sentence, “those who indulge themselves in this indolent method”) and people who “beg and steal” (Sentence 14), and ultimately into the previously unknown category, “a parcel of beggars” (Sentence 15). Threatened by the prospect of the people he calls “great philosophers” (Sentence 8) too near the sanctity of European space, Hearne’s discourse invokes a rapid system of spatial re-classification designed to recoup the dangerous exchange of values in which he has himself indulged.

Discursive evidence of Hearne’s cultural and ideological dilemma supports Hutchings’s observation that Europeans typically belied the ‘four-stages’ theory’s assertion that culturally ‘inferior’ people would improve through contact with ‘superior’ Europeans (68). Indeed, Hearne’s stylistic conundrums reveal the potent colonial anxieties that attended and surrounded notions of progress and contact. The excerpt’s final three sentences, for instance, provide an important coda of colonial “overkill.” Having definitively established the undesirability of the deer-pound Indians at the Fort, Hearne elaborates a further justification based on the exceedingly low quality of the skins that the people at these distances would in fact be able to provide (Sentence 16). Not entirely satisfied that he has made his point, he argues additionally that, even if the skins were of a better quality, precisely their extreme distance from the Fort would prevent the people in question from engaging directly in trade (Sentence 17). By doing so, Hearne balances his incongruous early criticism of the people, for not bringing in furs because they live in an area that produces few furs (Sentence 4), with his final sally: even if furs of a sufficiently
high quality could be procured, the exigencies of travel would deter the people from making the trip.

"[T]he force of ambivalence," says Bhabha, "... gives the colonial stereotype its currency: ensures its repeatability in changing historical and discursive conjunctures; informs its strategies of individuation and marginalization; produces that effect of probabilistic truth and predictability which, for the stereotype, must always be in excess of what can be empirically proved or logically construed" ("Question" 66). Caught in a debate he cannot justly win, Hearne resorts to discursive stereotyping well in excess of the empirically provable in order to ensure that the incommensurable bodies of the contact zone will never meet at the Fort.

"[T]he progressivist thrust of the four-stages theory," says Hutchings, "influences Hearne’s general assumptions regarding the cultural distance that separates ostensibly ‘primitive’ Indigenous societies from the ‘developed’ culture of English ‘civilization’" (62; italics in text). Hearne’s journal records improvisational classifications and re-classifications which simultaneously presuppose difference, and social, cultural, spatial, bodily, and/or geographic distance. By doing so, the journal traces Hearne’s shifting response to the peculiar pressures of moving through the geography. At particular points of crisis, it also traces how the visceral body recuperates the discursive and ideological contradictions of the contact zone by relocating itself within the categories of its representative double.

Substituting for the hero

Neither Hearne’s representative nor his visceral body, however, can ultimately guarantee either his efficacy or the efficacy of his value-systems in the space of contact. Movement from the fort so profoundly disorients
his representative authority that his corporeal body is under constant threat from the exchange system's operative in the zone. Until Matonabbee arrives. On Matonabbee’s arrival, Hearne is fed, clothed, sheltered, and provided the closest thing to an intellectual equal that the country affords. Although Hearne occasionally records less than flattering details about the Chipewyan leader, he is most often enthusiastic in his praise of “the great man,” whose importance he marks textually in a chapter devoted to Matonabbee’s biography.

Hearne first encounters Matonabbee on 20 September, 1770, on his second forced return to the Fort. Hearne’s mood at the time is one of extreme depression mixed with a sense of personal threat at the subtle hostility of the people with whom he was travelling. He records being “plundered . . . of almost every useful article we had” (96) by a group of Indians they encounter the day after the quadrant breaks, and rails, on 31 August, in eloquent if disgusted terms, about his growing discomfort for lack of proper winter clothing, a direct effect of shifting material and symbolic values in the contact zone. That extended lament acknowledges for the first time how profoundly women’s presence and women’s labour inflect his experience of shifting value. “[A]fter I had carried [my load of deer skins for winter clothing] several weeks,” he writes,

it proved of no service; for we had not any women properly belonging to our company, consequently had not any person to dress them; and so uncivil were the other Indians, that they would neither exchange them for others of an inferior quality already dressed, nor permit their women to dress them for us . . . . The truth was, they were too well informed of my poverty to do any acts of generosity, as they well knew I had it not then in my power to reward them for their trouble. (98-9; my emphasis)
Hearne’s change of attitude on encountering Matonabbee is thus dramatic, a change he marks grammatically with the series of active processes that he ascribes to Matonabbee:

The courteous behaviour of this stranger struck me very sensibly. As soon as he was acquainted with our distress, he got such skins as we had with us dressed for the Southern Indians, and furnished me with a good warm suit of otter and other skins. . . . [H]e directed us to a little river which he knew, and where there was a small range of woods, which . . . would, he said, furnish us with temporary snow-shoes. . . . [H]e made a grand feast for me in the Southern Indian style, where there was plenty of good eating, and the whole concluded with singing and dancing. (100-01)

Matonabbee’s actions contrast markedly with Hearne’s lack of agency and they literally make all the difference in the world. “[H]e got . . . skins . . . dressed,” Hearne recounts, “[he] furnished me with a good warm suit,” “he directed us,” “he made a grand feast for me.”

Hearne’s account of his second meeting with Matonabbee is no less effusive. “[O]n the sixth [of November we] came up with Matonabbee and his gang,” he writes, “. . . when I found my new acquaintance, on all occasions, the most sociable, kind, and sensible Indian I had ever met with. He was a man well known, and, as an Indian, of universal knowledge, and generally respected” (102). Matonabbee’s presence and his cultural agency, marked in terms of grammatical agency, neutralize the negative effects of space and distance on Hearne’s symbolic cultural value and re-establish his identity on the scene. Recognized and protected by Matonabbee, Hearne is no longer waste in the cultural system. And when Matonabbee agrees to lead Hearne’s third attempt, the account gives initial indications that it will focus extensively on this extraordinary man (107). Indeed, except for two
encounters with Keelshies, Matonabbee is the only person Hearne identifies by name for the extent of his third journey and the only person with whom he reports detailed conversations.

Hearne’s attachment to Matonabbee clearly exceeds mere gratitude for services rendered. Hearne, for instance, mitigates his observation that Matonabbee was the only Northern Indian he knew who was guilty of attempting murder, by proposing that Matonabbee must have been tainted in this regard by his long association with ‘Southern Indians’ (144-45). And in the chapter he devotes to Matonabbee — a singularly uncharacteristic appendix in the genre of exploration literature — he includes an extended footnote which proposes to exonerate the leader for the attack on the Copper Inuit on the grounds of his otherwise characteristic racial tolerance (330). Various critics call attention to Matonabbee’s prominent role in Hearne’s narrative (Hamilton 11; Hodgson 11) and Keith Harrison goes as far as to claim that “male bonding” between Hearne and Matonabbee corresponds to Leslie A. Fiedler’s analysis of cross-racial masculine friendship in *Love and Death in the American Novel* (653). Bruce Greenfield notes astutely that Matonabbee’s competence “allows Hearne to devote himself to his astronomical observations and his journals,” and he speculates that “the long intimacy with Matonabbee’s ‘family’ must have contributed to his remarkably detailed and sympathetic descriptions of Indian life in this region” (“Narrative” 202).

Despite Greenfield’s additional note, that Hearne’s narrative of this part of the journey “takes on an almost domestic tone” (202), he fails to remark that much of what the text actually records about Matonabbee is mediated by a focus on Matonabbee’s wives, Matonabbee’s relationship to his wives and his behaviour toward them, and the women’s indirect but powerful effect on the journey’s advancement and success. I argue that
Hearne, like one of Eagleton's 'desiring commodities,’ exchanges his authority and his autonomous male subjectivity for the benefit of Matonabbee’s protection and the pleasure of his company. Crucially, as it turns out, for Hearne’s literal survival, the cultural figure, Matonabbee, enters Hearne’s text inextricably accompanied by women, sexuality, gender roles, and the gendered exchange economy. Among the critics who comment accurately and admiringly on Hearne’s ethnographic sensitivity, Warkentin calls attention to his particular interest in women’s lives (Exploration 111); what goes unremarked is that Hearne’s ethnographic interest obscures the fundamental ways in which women’s presence and women’s work ensure the success of his third and final journey.

Hearne explicitly records, as part of one of their first conversations, Matonabbee’s criticism of the decision not to bring women along on his second journey (reprinted in Appendix 8), an inclusion Harrison considers evidence of Matonabbee’s “dialogic presence” in the text (652). Because Hearne has commented only two pages earlier that Matonabbee “had acquired several words of English” (100), and because this account is the text’s only instance of direct, attributed speech, Matonabbee’s dialogic presence raises fraught issues of authenticity, translation ethics, racial representation (Cheyfitz xvii-xxvi), narrative perspective and identity substitution. Of these, I will consider only the latter two. Matonabbee’s argument for women’s inclusion establishes, very early in his relationship with Hearne, the pragmatic necessity of including women (Sentence 1), an equivalence between women and necessary labour (Sentences 2 and 3), and the fact that women’s labour makes it possible for men to travel through the space (Sentences 1 and 3). Curiously, this first discussion of women’s labour also attributes to Matonabbee the phrase “in this country” (Sentence 3), a resonant echo of, and precursor to, the various phrases with which
Hearne situates his narrative focus on the cultural geography (Appendix 7, Sentences 1, 2, and 4: “on the ground which is entirely barren, or at least what is so called in those parts”; “those parts of the country are almost destitute”; “this wretched part of [the world]”).

Particularly because Hearne uses similar deictic phrases in each of his later elaborations of women’s economic labour — “in a country like this” (Appendix 9, Sentence 1); “in this part of the world” (Appendix 12, Sentence 3); “so well adapted to their situation and manner of life,” “no race of people under the Sun,” “so remote from any European settlement,” and “in this country” (Appendix 13a, Sentences 1, 2, 3, and 4) — its first occurrence ostensibly on Matonabbee’s lips suggests that early in their joint narrative, the two characters are constructed to share a point of focalization. Matonabbee’s deixis alludes to travel in countries where gender-labour distinctions would not take the forms he describes. Of the two men, of course, only Hearne would have had such travelling experience.

Curiously, therefore, the only part of Matonabbee’s speech that Hearne comments on is Matonabbee’s claim that women help themselves to food not rightfully theirs, a cultural crime he describes later as punishable by severe physical violence (Appendix 9, Sentence 10). Hearne reiterates Matonabbee’s claim but in a heavily modalized form that doubly inscribes the possibility of ‘appearance.’ “[H]owever odd it may appear,” he hedges, “[i]t is but too true a description,” “it is at least so in appearance,” and “it is more than probable” (Sentence 5). Although these modal structures appear to call Matonabbee’s claims into question, Hearne does not anywhere elaborate alternative possibilities, so that his hedges effectively, rhetorically, reinforce Matonabbee’s gendered allegations. In the absence of the counter-discourse that he hints at but never engages in, Hearne thus
obligingly reinscribes the gender-economy from the dominant masculine perspective, the perspective for which he has exchanged the possibility of his own heroic self-representation.

Gayle Rubin’s groundbreaking anthropological analysis of gendered economics takes the perspective that, in Eve Kosofsky Sedgwick’s terms, “patriarchal heterosexuality can best be discussed in terms of one or another form of the traffic in women: it is the use of women as exchangeable, perhaps symbolic, property for the primary purpose of cementing the bonds of men with men” (Between Men 25-26). Rubin’s lucid interrogation of gender-economies and theories of gender-economies and her radical exposure of the particular gendered biases and blindesses that underpin Lévi-Strauss’s and Freud’s theories of women’s cultural function provide this study a framework in which to consider how and why Hearne substitutes a textual focus on Matonabbee with a textual focus on Matonabbee’s wives. Matonabbee, apparently willingly and apparently rather grandly, marshals the women’s labour that he commands to guarantee both the success of Hearne’s third journey and Hearne’s visceral survival in the space. Hearne, however, has insufficient cultural capital to repay the debt that accrues and, in fact, incurs further debt by requiring Matonabbee’s literal, corporeal protection. Hearne repays the debt, but only in small part, when he shelters Matonabbee from the censure of European audiences by neutralizing evidence of his violent outbursts and textually suppressing his involvement in the attack on the Copper Inuit. Perhaps inadvertently, then, perhaps as an instance of what Frantz Fanon calls, in a very different context, “occult instability” (qtd. in Bhabha, “Dissemination” 152), Hearne articulates his debt-ridden cultural precariousness by simultaneously foregrounding and denigrating the women whose presence and labour ensure his corporeal survival in, and the
completion of his representative mission through, the space of contact.

Traffic and the traffic in women

Although Hearne lays the textual groundwork for representing Matonabbee in heroic terms, Matonabbee, in fact, appears only obliquely in a narrative that focuses instead on his many wives. A double form of narrative dispossession thus results, in which the hero-figure for whom the narrator exchanges his autonomous self-representation is himself dispossessed in favour of the women whose cultural existence, identity, and legitimacy he ostensibly secures.

Despite having unproblematically reinscribed Matonabbee’s description of women’s subservience in the gender-economy operative in the space (Appendix 8), Hearne begins the account of his third journey by focusing on a woman’s effect on ‘his’ party’s progress. “One of Matonabbee’s wives being ill,” he writes, “occasioned us to walk so slow, that it was the thirteenth before we arrived at Seal River . . . Matonabbee’s wife,” he adds, “was so ill as to be obliged to be hauled on a sledge” (110). This opening observation indeed sets the tone for the entire journey to the Coppermine River: when Hearne comments on specific human and cultural behaviour, he almost always attaches his observations in some way to Matonabbee’s wives; much less often does he comment specifically on Matonabbee himself. The party is beset, for instance, by a shortage of food, which is finally relieved on 30 December, when they kill two buck deer (112). For the next several days, however, until 3 January, Hearne repeatedly records that Matonabbee was either too ill to move, or so ill “as to be obliged to be hauled on a sledge the whole day” (114). On 22 January, however, he records encountering “the first strangers whom we had met since we left the Fort,” “an Indian, who had one of Matonabbee’s
wives under his care” (116), and on 7 February, he spends a long paragraph describing, in general terms, a gruellingly cold crossing of Cossed Whoie Lake and, in specific terms, the frostbite one of Matonabbee’s wives suffered on her thighs and buttocks as a result (118).

Not quite one month later, on 3 March, the expedition encounters the “deer pound” Chipewyan Indians, Hearne’s account of which I have described extensively above. Hearne does not report again on specific human action until 18 April, when he notes Matonabbee’s purchase of another wife from a group of Northern Indians at the Thelewey-aza River. “[H]e now had no less than seven, most of whom would for size have made good grenadiers,” Hearne records, and adds, “He prided himself much in the height and strength of his wives, and would frequently say, few woman would carry or haul heavier loads; and though they had, in general, a very masculine appearance, yet he preferred them to those of a more delicate form and moderate stature” (128). Hearne follows this observation with one of his extensive commentaries on the physical appearance and cultural place of native women (Appendix 9). As I note above, this commentary explicitly situates the gender-economy in its geography (Sentence 1), focuses throughout on women’s value as labourers (Sentences 3-5), and, crucially, represents women’s labour as occurring within a framework of physical coercion (Sentence 6). Curiously, moreover, because apparently gratuitously, it also reiterates Matonabbee’s earlier allegation, that women can naturally be assumed to help themselves to food to which they are not entitled (Sentence 10). Rubin’s observations on the socially constructed domain of what she calls ‘the sex/gender system’ provide an apt counterpoint to Hearne’s easy reinscription of the gendered status quo. “[A]ny society,” Rubin explains,

will have some systematic ways to deal with sex, gender, and babies.
Such a system may be sexually egalitarian, at least in theory, or it may be ‘gender stratified,’ as seems to be the case for most or all of the known examples. But it is important . . . to maintain a distinction between the human capacity and necessity to create a sexual world, and the empirically oppressive ways in which sexual worlds have been organized . . . . [O]ppression is not inevitable in that domain, but is the product of the specific social relations which organize it. (168)

In much the way, of course, that women have been obliged by cultural ‘sex/gender systems’ to seek literal and symbolic legitimacy and protection from men, Hearne looks to Matonabbee for the protection he cannot guarantee himself as his cultural value shifts in the contact zone. Curiously, then, perhaps in great part because his value in the zone is as paradoxically privileged and precarious as it is, Hearne’s narrative focus rarely wavers from the women whom he represents as being controlled by the fear they feel for the men who authorize and order their existence.

The pattern of marking progress and ethnographic information in terms of Matonabbee’s wives is particularly evident when the company stops at Clowey (Chapter V, 133 ff). The chapter begins with an extensive account of canoe-building (134-35) and Hearne’s second record of the distinct advantage of being under Matonabbee’s protection, reprinted as Appendix 10. This excerpt reiterates the threat that shifting exchange-values pose for Hearne, but figures both shifting values and threat as neutralized by Matonabbee’s protection (Sentence 1). From an exchange-perspective, the excerpt explicitly clarifies how Matonabbee’s possessions guarantee both Hearne’s possessions and his personal safety (Sentences 2, 5, and 6). Hearne’s resonant articulation of his almost complete dependence on Matonabbee’s cultural status and literal strength also, I argue,
inadvertently acknowledges that he is now positioned, symbolically, in the culture as one of Matonabbee’s wives. That symbolic positioning is deeply paradoxical, however, since Hearne is always simultaneously more and less valuable, and more and less vulnerable, than are any of the wives. Although he cannot be exchanged within the gender-economy, he cannot be exchanged precisely because he has no cultural value in the space.

Having begun by establishing Hearne’s dependence on Matonabbee’s status, Chapter V continues with a resonant focus on Matonabbee’s wives. “In the night,” Hearne records on 28th May, one of Matonabbee’s wives and another woman eloped: it was supposed they went off to the Eastward, in order to meet their former husbands, from whom they had been sometime before taken by force. This affair made more noise and bustle than I could have supposed; and Matonabbee seemed entirely disconcerted, and quite inconsolable for the loss of his wife . . . . She had not . . . appeared happy in her late situation; and chose rather to be the sole wife of a sprightly young fellow of no note . . . than to have the seventh or eighth share of the affection of the greatest man in the country. (139-40)

Hearne continues with an analeptic account of Matonabbee’s attempt to murder this wife’s previous husband (140-41) and proceeds to a two-and-a-half-page description, reprinted in Appendix 11, of the customary wrestling matches by which women are won and lost. That description evolves into a brief commentary on the rarity, among Northern Indians, of murder (144), and includes the startling observation — especially given Hearne’s expressions of sympathy for particular women (131, 218-19) — “The women, it is true, sometimes receive an unlucky blow from their husbands for misbehaviour, which occasions their death; but this is thought
nothing of” (144).

Chapter V goes on to note Keelshies’s return (145), after which Hearne records that another of the Indian men who had joined the company “insisted on taking one of Matonabbee’s wives from him by force,” an event that so distressed Matonabbee that he almost gave up on the journey (reprinted in Appendix 12). “This dispute . . .” Hearne records, “had like to have proved fatal to my expedition; for Matonabbee, who at that time thought himself as great a man as then lived, took this affront so much to heart, especially as it was offered in my presence, that he almost determined not to proceed any farther toward the Copper-mine river, and was on the point of striking off to the Westward, with an intent to join the Athapuscow Indians” (146). In a classically feminine move, Hearne waits until “Matonabbee’s passion had a little abated” (146) and flatters his ego sufficiently that after “a good deal of intreaty, he at length consented to proceed, and promised to make all possible haste” (146).

In Hearne’s text, movement through space radically reduces the representative European body’s authority and subsequently threatens the visceral European body’s survival. The bodies’ crises recall Lemke’s suspicion of the belief that “discursive, ideological modes of power are modern alternatives to the use of material force and physical violence.” “The implied separation,” Lemke counters, of words from deeds, of discourse from material action, of deceit from cruelty, fits too closely with the Cartesian separation of mind from body . . . . Ideology supports violence and is critically shaped by[,] and in a context of[,] violence in social relationships. Inflicting pain on others is the pervasive and fundamental mode of social control. Its primary victims are well aware of this; only those relatively insulated from violence by their privileged social positions
have the luxury of underestimating its importance. (13-14)

Dispossessed almost entirely of personal autonomy, Hearne is protected from the possibility of violent social relationships only by his ambiguous role as ‘wife of Matonabbee,’ an ambiguous role that verges on cultural taboo. “Taboo,” says Susan Stewart, “can be seen in terms of the states of anomaly, ambiguity, and ambivalence . . . . The ambiguous is that which cannot be defined in terms of any given category; it threatens the integrity of individual categories, being ‘either this or that or something else’” (61). Apparently innocent of the fact that his representations of women figure their actions and their relationships as influential and efficacious, Hearne situates himself liminally between Matonabbee, who he trusts will not inflict or threaten pain in the way his other guides have, and women in the culture, whom he represents as always in danger of having pain inflicted on them or being exchanged in violent ways.

Because the existing gender-economy dovetails expediently with the labour-requirements of European-style exchange practices (Appendix 13a, Sentence 3) but contradicts explicit European notions of appropriate gender relations (Meek 167), Hearne’s discursive reinscriptions paradoxically imagine that economy as both naturalized by geographical requirements (Appendix 13a, Sentences 1 and 4) and morally defunct (Appendix 13b). The liminal, if deeply contradictory, position in which Hearne enjoys relative cognitive, ideological, and corporeal comfort, however, is itself threatened as the party and the text draw closer to the massacre scene.

*Heroic dispossessio*

Hearne’s narrative substitutions of Matonabbee’s wives for Matonabbee compensate textually for the explorer’s radical and multi-dimensional disposssession. Hearne survives the literally threatening
dislocations of the contact zone by symbolically re-figuring himself as one of Matonabbee’s wives. What becomes difficult for him to negotiate is the textual and symbolic requirement of Matonabbee’s absence. Up to the point where Hearne is obliged to persuade Matonabbee to continue with the journey, he has referred to him specifically fifty times (“Matonabbee . . . had laid up some provisions” (110); “Matonabbee was taken very ill” (113); “what [Matonabbee] distributed was all his own” (136)). Of these fifty times, thirty-one are connected directly with Matonabbee’s wives. In quantitative terms, the journey thus far has taken up thirty-seven pages of text. In the sixty-one pages that follow, up to the end of Chapter VI, “Transactions at the Copper-mine River,” in which the massacre is described, Hearne refers to Matonabbee by name only thirty-one times. Indeed, supporting Hearne’s footnoted absolution of Matonabbee that I refer to above, the text mentions Matonabbee only once in Chapter VI before the attack.

Significantly, Matonabbee is entirely absent from the massacre narrative and is not mentioned again by name until Hearne is well into the sixteen-page “account of the river, and the country adjacent” (187) which follows. Even at this point, Matonabbee is merely named as the source of an embedded analeptic story and then appears briefly as the principal actor in an embedded proleptic story (203). Neither story has anything to do with the events at the Coppermine River, and indeed, the latter focuses on Matonabbee’s courage in aiding a Copper Indian who would otherwise have been left to die. Matonabbee does not re-surface as a discernible character and an active agent until 5 August, twenty-three pages after the massacre narrative ends, at the very end of Chapter VI, when he re-encounters the wife who had eloped at Clowey (207-08).

Ironically, of course, if Hearne had been able to figure himself in
Mackenzie’s heroic terms, the massacre episode would likely never have taken place. “In relating the circumstances of this part of his journey,” Greenfield observes, “he must convey that he was successful in attaining his goal and yet avoid any appearance of complicity in the Indians’ designs” (“Narrative” 203). Additionally ironically, therefore, particularly from a narrative perspective, Hearne’s substitute hero fails to appear as a recognizable agent for the duration of the text’s climactic scene. Because the massacre episode occurs after the masculine cultural system has dispensed with all the markers and tokens of femininity, it, more than any other, represents Hearne at his most culturally abandoned.

In anticipation of the attack on the Copper Inuit, Matonabbee and other of the men with multiple wives, leave all or most of their wives, all their children, and as much of the luggage as possible on the north side of Peshew Lake (147-48). In traditional terms, that is, they exorcise the feminine element from the system of masculine identity, force, prestige, and solidarity that their imminent war party now represents. The challenge Hearne receives (reprinted in Appendix 14), when he attempts “to persuade them from putting their inhuman design into execution” (149), underscores his precarious position in the gendered war zone. As an ambiguous element in this instantiation of masculine system, Hearne is in grave danger of being classified as ‘other’ in relation to it (Appendix 14, Sentence 1) and waste in it (Sentences 2 and 4).

And as a cultural entity defined by his need for protection, Hearne is now doubly dispossessed: not only is Matonabbee, on whose masculine identity he depends, no longer part of the narrative, but Hearne’s quasi-feminine role been declared superfluous to the activities at hand. In a further ironic twist, therefore, readers familiar with any part of Hearne’s text are most likely to be familiar with that section of the text from which
Hearne has been emphatically dispossessed of cultural status or value. Within the terms of European textual practices and economies, however, the massacre episode (a portion of which is reprinted in Appendix 15) evidences for posterity Hearne’s sensational narrative control. Rampant with the inconsistencies, contradictions, and apparent irrelevancies (McCarthy 156-57; Harrison 653-54) that characterize a zone of profound destabilization, the account makes cultural capital of its various gothic elements: horror, terror, violence, sadism, torture, pathos, excess, suggestions of sexuality, and the suffering narrator’s outpouring of emotion (MacLaren, “Massacre” 36-9; Warkentin, “History” 18).

Slippage in Hearne’s terms for the men with whom he was travelling betrays, for instance, the profound narrative confusion essential to gothic horror (Sedgwick, Gothic 13). “[M]y crew” (177), he calls them at points, “an undisciplined rabble” (177) at others, and variously, “the murderers” (179), “these savages” (180), “the savages” (181), and “the wretches of my crew” (183). His spatial self-positioning, moreover — an effect of his strongly marked narration of events (MacLaren 38; Warkentin 18) — evocatively illustrates the vulnerable body literally caught in cross-cultural crossfire. Because Hearne defines himself spatially as almost absent when the attack commences (“I stood neuter in the rear”), the vivid action his detailed description represents appears to have come up with precisely the horror to which he attests, to surround and contaminate his body’s ostensible neutrality. Hearne marks this account as dramatically different, moreover, from the rest of his text by explicitly positioning his writing-self as removed in time and space. “[E]ven at this hour,” he asserts, “I cannot reflect on the transactions of that horrid day without shedding tears.” The text’s literary and dramatic climax is thus marked as a point of great rhetorical complexity, in which multiple geographical and temporal
scenes simultaneously determine both bodily and emotional agency.

Significantly, of course, as MacLaren demonstrates, virtually every detail of the much-reproduced version of the massacre episode was interpolated into the original field note account (32ff). Questions of absolute factual accuracy aside, ethno-historical and theoretical interpretations of the massacre scene reiterate its use of the iconic, open feminine body as a central site of cultural and narrative crisis. According to aboriginal knowledge specialist, Robin McGrath, for instance, “Hearne, like many other non-native explorers, aided in the construction of the contrasting images of the violent, savage (male) Indian and the peaceful, sensuous (female) Eskimo” (97). Terry Goldie reads the scene in more thematic terms, as a paradigmatic example of imperialist images of ‘the indigene.’ “In terms of the standard commodities,” Goldie claims, alluding to Said’s analytical categories (Orientalism 190),

the passage incorporates both sex and violence. As the girl clings to Hearne she becomes the indigene maiden, the embrace of the land which Hearne is entering so cavalierly. The Indians’ suggestion that he might want ‘an Esquimaux wife’ shows a certain sensitivity to the needs of such an indigenization. It also shows their recognition that Hearne’s claim to be neuter, with its sexual implication, is questioned by her grasp . . . . The structural image of potent and impotent narrator is reinforced by the potent and impotent sexual figure. The unacknowledged subtext of attraction shows the white approach/avoidance reaction to the sexual indigene, both as succubus of the land and as potential liberation from repression. (“Signs” 88)

Goldie’s exclusively literary interpretation, while useful and provocative, does not address the dimension of ‘lived’ contact that Hearne’s account ostensibly provides. MacLaren’s and Warkentin’s readings, therefore,
contribute more directly to the troubled gender-value trajectory that I trace in this chapter.

“The figure of the girl,” MacLaren proposes, “whom perhaps Hearne saw as only one of many at the time, becomes his doppelgänger, in whom he realizes and articulates his own paralysis in the face of such barbarity” (34). Warkentin makes explicit MacLaren’s implicit reference to Hearne’s deeply sympathetic accounts of particular women, specifically Mary Norton, his country-wife (Hearne 158-60n), and the remarkable Dog-ribbed woman whom his party discovers living alone on the Barrens (263-67) (Warkentin 20-21). “In Hearne’s narrative,” Warkentin concludes,

there are no escapes; the Chipewyan triumph, and the white man looks on in horror. He is thus, like Marlowe, neuter in the middle of the never-ceasing conflict between The People and the Other, an eiron who is allowed to see, and indeed to speak, what we, who participate in that conflict cannot be permitted to see or speak. His only act can be a lie, a footnote, as it were, to the carnage . . . .

Hearne’s particular lie is to have told us that the Chipewyan were brutal and the Inuit were victims, and his way of doing so is through a story — long practised in the telling, I suspect, in which he slowly becomes the centre of the narrative of a victimized woman and a helpless observer. (21-2)

In much the way that Hearne recuperates the instabilities of the ‘deer-pound’ encounter by mapping culture onto geography, he re-values the events at “Bloody Fall” according to authorized forms of European narratives of race and gender. Hearne’s contradictory narrative focus on women’s cultural efficacy/inefficacy creates a kind of dramatic gender-value momentum that culminates in the textual-sexual climax of the massacre scene. Ironically, given his precarious position ‘on the ground,’
Hearne recuperates the European use-value of his text by recourse to the sign of the female body vulnerable to imminent and gothically menacing destructive forces — precisely the forces that women’s labour has, literally and symbolically, protected him from in his journey to this place.

**Conclusion**

Lemke’s claim that the threat of pain is the radical source of social control points up the visceral immediacy that characterizes Hearne’s existence in the contact zone. “Even withholding cooperation, withholding resources we control can be a direct cause of pain, or even death (withholding food, needed medicines),” Lemke explains. “Death is an abstraction none of us have experienced,” he adds,

> We fear it by proxy, by reputation only. Pain, on the other hand, we have all experienced. Pain and the threat of pain are powerful, direct, material, bodily modes of social control. Our bodies are vulnerable to pain, and the deliberate inflicting of pain on bodies is, I believe, the primary and fundamental mode of social control . . . . We do not, we cannot participate in processes of social control purely in terms of the meanings of our actions. Their physical effects must also function in the material ecosystem of the community. (133)

Ironically, much of the tension of Hearne’s text is a consequence of the real and unmediated threats he experienced to his physical body and his corporeal existence. Ironically, that is, because precisely Hearne’s openness to the situation makes him vulnerable to the shifts in cultural value that his moving body undergoes. In the theoretical terms of this study, Hearne’s text offers a direct reading of the ways in which the contact zone reorganizes economic exchange in cultural terms unpredictably threatening
to European value systems — and to the European bodies representative of those value systems.

Ostensibly authorized by his symbolic role as representative of the Hudson’s Bay Company’s economic power (Greenfield, *Discovery* 27), Hearne moves through geographical space intimately proximate with people whose lifeways directly contradict his assumptions of exchange practice. Movement through space, he discovers, complicates i) the literal terms of material exchange, ii) the cultural and symbolic assumptions underlying material exchange, and iii) the value and the vulnerability of the visceral and the representative European body at the centre of the exchange. Regularly confronted by activities, attitudes, behaviours, and beliefs vastly unlike his own, Hearne finds himself torn between his ideological allegiance to European ways and the positive value he ascribes to aboriginal cultural practices. When he encounters a group of people surviving the winter on the deer trapped in their pound, Hearne embarks on a debate with himself that, committed as he ultimately is to the primacy of a fixed cultural and mercantile centre, he cannot win.

The analogy — “indigenous labour is to European labour-requirements as female indigenous labour is to the male indigenous system of exchange” — though not exact, provides a framework for understanding the destabilization that Hearne continues to experience, even when his safety is guaranteed by Matonabbee’s presence. In much the way that Matonabbee, Hearne’s ‘employee’ within the framework of European labour-economics, guarantees Hearne’s survival and the success of his journey, women’s traditional labour guarantees Matonabbee’s cultural existence. Because he can access none of the signs by which European exchange-value marks itself, Hearne functions as a kind of symbolic parasite. His curious double-displacement of self, first onto the ostensible
hero-replacement figure, but in real textual terms, onto the multiple feminine-system that attends that hero-figure, betrays his precariously liminal symbolic status. Hearne’s early linguistic negotiations with the scene of the contact zone, that is, give way — as he exchanges his autonomous masculine status for a symbolic status as wife-of-Matonabbee — to a narrative negotiation of representations of agency in the cultural space. Provisionally stabilized by his carefully-guarded liminal position, Hearne enters the massacre scene doubly-dispossessed of his substitute heroic representations. The gothic representations of that massacre, as much a product of Hearne’s imagination as of his experience, evidence the power of European textual practices to recuperate the semiotic abysses of the contact zone.

Contradictions and fissures in Hearne’s text distinguish it dramatically from Mackenzie’s text, in part because they foreground the way that the cultural and gendered pressures of contact bear down on the physical — but not exclusively or autonomously masculine — body. Fissures and contradictions in Hearne’s text also foreground the powerful ways in which the representational system generally, but the representational system of exploration narratives in particular, suppresses the feminine (Van Kirk 8; Brown, “Fur Trade” 83). Despite their apparent rationalist and objective perspective, early accounts of ‘Canadian’ history, ‘Canadian’ geography and ‘Canada’s’ First Nations represent an economic-mercantile world by way of an ideological-rhetorical system that takes the suppression of the feminine as a necessary and uninterrogated basis of its work.
Chapter 5  Alexander Henry: Gothic Hero of Commodity Adventure

Introduction  
Born in New Jersey, Alexander Henry was one of the first non-French traders to enter the Great Lakes fur trade business at the end of the Seven Years’ War. Unlike Hearne and Mackenzie, Henry was not officially affiliated with one of the large fur trading concerns until later in his career, and initially arrived on the scene to take independent advantage of the newly opened markets. Henry’s journals, Travels and Adventures in Canada and the Indian Territories Between the Years 1760 and 1776, were written several decades after the events they describe and were published in 1809, almost fifty years after the story’s opening incidents (Greenfield, Discovery 57). It is not clear to what extent Henry relied on notes that he had made at the time and to what extent he worked primarily from memory (Warkentin, Exploration 78). Although Henry undertook his travels before either Hearne or Mackenzie, his text was published after he had read both their works (Greenfield 57).

Henry’s account did not have the extensive and ongoing effect of either Mackenzie’s or Hearne’s, but is, nevertheless, considered an important account in both Canadian history and in Canadian literature, primarily because it presents the only known eye-witness account of the attack on Fort Michilimackinac during Pontiac’s campaign against the British in 1763 (Greenfield 63; Warkentin 78). Victor Hopwood notes that Francis Parkman’s history of the Pontiac war incorporates “[Henry’s] most exciting sections . . . almost word for word” (27), and John Richardson’s recreation of the attack in his novel Wacousta is believed to have been based on Henry’s account (Cronk xx). When Henry’s journal is anthologized, the account of the massacre is typically reprinted (A. J. M
Smith 69-85; Daymond and Monkman 45-8; Warkentin *Exploration* 78-97; Moyles 22-32).

The journal is composed of two distinct “Parts.” The first deals with Henry’s career as a trader in the area of the Great Lakes, and includes his account of the infamous attack. “Part the Second” describes the extended trading expedition Henry took as far west as what would become Saskatchewan. Henry’s text has received very little scholarly attention, but his account of the attack on Michilimackinac is typically reprinted without reference to the questions of accuracy that it raises. Germaine Warkentin registers a notable exception when she remarks that “Henry . . . is not always clear on the facts, but he had a born gift for story-telling” (Warkentin, *Exploration* 78). Implicit ascriptions of accuracy are unsettling, especially given the time that elapsed between the events described and the publication of Henry’s account, as well as the numerous errors of fact that Henry’s editor notes in the second part of the account (231-32, 237, 238-39, 245, 250-51, 291).

Henry’s text provides a fascinating comparison with, and a striking contrast to, Mackenzie’s and Hearne’s. Like Mackenzie, Henry stabilizes his narrative, as well as his narrative self, by constantly drawing on his capitalist function, role, and goal. Very differently from Mackenzie, however, Henry stabilizes his textual identity as capitalist against a series of disguises in which he is further and further removed, literally, from the body in which that identity can be manifest. Like Samuel Hearne’s, the first part of Henry’s narrative evocatively recounts the perilous maintenance of bodily identity in the contact zone. By contrast with Hearne’s narrative, however, Henry’s narrative relies for its effects of legitimacy and verisimilitude on a peculiar, simultaneously distant and intimate narrator. Especially in the context of Mackenzie’s and Hearne’s
journals, Henry’s text provides an extreme test-case of the threatened visceral body stabilized by narrative evocations of mercantile social identity.

I argue that the heavily narrativized form of Henry’s text functions rhetorically and ideologically to represent colonial exchange according to dominant versions of history and ethnography. Constructions of narrative agency and perspective are specifically exploited to construct a gothic environment in which the hero can be simultaneously threatened with ultimate annihilation and rendered unassailable. The first section of the chapter — *Telling stories* — compares levels of narration in Henry’s first and second parts, and compares the narrative qualities of Henry’s account with those of Mackenzie’s and Hearne’s. It goes on to examine the apparent contradiction between the text’s high level of narrativization and narrator-presence and the narrator’s predilection for prolonged grammatical structures which defer the action of the clause. Structural features, that is, that typically encourage readers’ identification with the narrator potentially vie with features that obscure the narrative’s action. In the next three sections — *Deferred and deferential narration, Re-tale-ing the gothic, Inside and outside the gothic self* — I argue that the text’s coherence is an effect of thematic and grammatical choices that construct a strategically intimate and simultaneously distant narrator, a strategic construction which is supported by the gothic spatio-temporal evocations that pervade the text’s account of events at the point of, and immediately following, the attack on the fort.

Henry’s shifting identity emphasizes his peculiarly unstable experience in the contact zone, particularly in the hours between the point of the attack and his eventual capture. In the chapter’s next section — *Pronoun-slippage: the unstable self* — I trace the pronoun slippages that
mark identity destabilization when an agent of exchange becomes an object of exchange. The chapter's next two sections — *Economies of gothic narrative* and *Identity chained, live burial, uncanny prisons* — demonstrate how the central theme of cannibalized identity is reflected in, and supported by, the text's gothic evocations of space and time. Henry's text retains its appeal and its apparent credibility, I argue, by simultaneously constructing a perilously vulnerable heroic body and preventing that body, grammatically and narratively, from actually being breached.

The analysis identifies how narrative stabilizes imperial agency and political ethnography within the multiple fissures of the contact zone. Because the text's comic structure is resolved when Henry's personal identity and his mercantile agency are simultaneously re-established, the chapter's final section — *Narrative endings* — concludes by speculating, in a very provisional way, on i) the relationships between capitalist identity and forms of gothic narration, specifically, the relationship between commodification and cannibalism, and on ii) the body as the mediating signifier between cultural systems of meaning.

*Telling stories*

Alexander Mackenzie's text accounts precisely for his movements in time through pure, cartesian, mappable space. Samuel Hearne's text describes the exigencies that movement through unfamiliar geo-cultural space creates. By distinct contrast with both, Alexander Henry's text tells a story. Henry's text, that is, relies much more strongly on establishing temporal and spatial frameworks within which identifiable characters — but more especially Henry himself — work out particular conflicts. In important ways that neither of the other two accounts share, Henry's story
satisfies Aristotle’s requirements that a story have a beginning, a middle, and an end.

Unlike chronicle, ‘story’ does not merely repeat occurrences in their ostensibly chronological order, but draws on the resources of narrative to shape those events into a particular form, to frame them in a particular way, and to present them from a particular point of view (Smith, “Narrative” 217). Less concerned with the factual details of an event than the ‘truth’ of the story-form in which events can be recounted, narrative provides the resources of flexible time-structures, scenes framed in peculiar ways for peculiar purposes, and the development of characters, including narrators. Precisely because it eschews a purely chronological inventory of events, moreover, narrative is characterized by the frames that its beginnings and endings provide.

The episode reprinted as Appendix 16a) exemplifies the narrative qualities that characterize “Part the First” of Henry’s journal and distinguish it decisively from the second. The episode, which begins 3 1/2 pages and approximately six months into Henry’s account, is memorable for the detail with which it represents immediate, unexpected, disorienting, and distinct threats to Henry’s body and existence. Together with the early description of the fatal accident on the St. Lawrence (2-3), it constitutes the second account of life-threatening experience within the first six pages of Henry’s text. Significantly, although stories of the hero barely escaping with his life recur repeatedly throughout the first part, they disappear almost completely from the second part. The brief excerpt reprinted as Appendix 16b), for instance, is the first quasi-narrative to appear in “Part the Second” and is notable, by comparison, for its brevity and its lack of dramatic development or detail. Indeed, characteristic of much of “Part the Second,” this passage readily evidences a thematic focus on the proper
maintenance of, and the propriety of properly maintaining, property.

What decisively distinguishes the first part from the second part of Henry’s text, as well as from the other two texts, is its carefully shaped comedic story of mercantile identity heroically maintained in the face of multifarious threats, mercantile identity lost to undefinable and malevolent forces, and mercantile identity regained to enjoy its previous agency within the structure of European commerce. Unlike either its own second part or the other two journals examined, the first part of Henry’s narrative is dominated by what Michael Toolan calls a “narrative trajectory” — the sense that the story is going somewhere and will be resolved into a recognizable conclusion (Narrative 4-5). This trajectory is established in Henry’s text by the narrative series of “successfully vanquished threats against the hero’s life” and the momentum that series creates, and by the careful construction of a simultaneously intimate and distant narrator, elements which neither of the other two texts exhibit.

Henry’s description of his first encounter with the Chipeways of Michilimackinac, reprinted in Appendix 17a), demonstrates how much more use he makes, than do either Mackenzie or Hearne, of narrative techniques of introduction, scene-setting, control over focalization, extensive character description, foreshadowing, and narrator/character development through internalized scenes. What particularly distinguishes Henry’s account of his first meeting with previously unknown Indians from the others’, however, is its cohesive focus on the narrator’s view of the Indians and its detailed account of increasing dramatic tension. (I am comparing Henry’s account with the Mackenzie-excerpt reprinted in Appendix 17b and the Hearne-excerpt reprinted in Appendix 10) Cohesive features of a text cue connections between one sentence and another (Fairclough 130). Cohesion in the Mackenzie-excerpt is thus clearly a
function of the agentive "I" which repeatedly takes the focus of sentences, though reports very little dramatic development. Cohesion in the Hearne-excerpt is created by the list of trading goods and their ownership/exchange value. Henry's excerpt, by contrast, begins an account of the Indians' actions, including their discursive actions, that goes on for another 4 1/2 pages to tell its story of dangerous conflict heroically averted.

Clearly, Henry's participation in the events he recounts distinguishes his narrative from both Mackenzie's and Hearne's. Mackenzie tends to report his response to crisis or to provide ostensibly factual lists of geographical and ethnographical detail. Hearne tends to describe those features of the situation that affect his security and his cultural value rather than his actions, and, consequently, his accounts of native life take the form of lessons in cultural practice. Henry, however, tends to construct a riveting tale with himself as one of the main protagonists or observers. Michael Toolan claims that it is precisely the noticeable-ness of tellers that distinguishes narrative from generic speech events. "Tellers of long narratives," he explains, "are often surprisingly present and perceptible even as they unfold a tale that ostensibly draws all our attention to some other individual or individuals" (Narrative 1). Like Toolan's, Mieke Bal's definition of narrative stresses the function of the narrator. "A narrative text," she explains, apparently straightforwardly, "is a text in which an agent relates a narrative" (5; italics in text). Henry's account explicitly draws on the structural resources of the narrator-figure, representing himself as the quintessentially present narrator around whom the story revolves, even when the story is overtly about something else entirely. Indeed, Henry's specific and peculiar exploitation of the narrator-function renders his text both as memorable and as problematic as it is.

At the same time, that is, that Henry is the most 'present' of the three
narrators examined here, grammatical structures in his text create a polite
distance between narrator and audience as well as between the narrator and
the effects of the events he describes so compellingly. Because Henry’s
story is a story about his body becoming a literal signifier of exchange, the
content of his story dramatically belies the autonomous, masculine heroics
that his narrative form invites. The first part of Henry’s text is a
precarious but sensational negotiation of the contradiction that results: it
simultaneously relates the substitutive disguises that successively distance
the narrator from threats against his “Englishman” persona and it reiterates
the trope of ‘hero surviving against all odds.’ Henry’s story, that is,
represents him as a hero serially removed from the possibility of heroic
agency and as the paradoxically agentive centre around which the narrative
revolves. In the analysis below, I examine the peculiar grammatical forms
that construct the contradictory hero-narrator of Henry’s text and reinforce
readers’ close identification with that narrator.

*Deferred and deferential narration*

An idiosyncratic preponderance of circumstantial markers
characterizes Henry’s discourse. The first five sentences of “Part the First”
are reprinted in Appendix 18 as examples of the formidably extended
series of embedded and enchained clauses by which Henry defers
identifying real subjects and completing real actions. In Sentence 3, for
instance, Henry first uses two distinct clauses (“It happened” and “that in
this voyage”) to delay identifying the real subject — *one of the few fatal
accidents* — and then separates the subject from the real verb — *befel the
British army* — by four subordinate elements (“which are remembered to
have occurred,” “in that dangerous part of the river,” “below Lake Saint-
Français,” and “called the Rapides des Cédres”), each of which adds
additional circumstantial detail to his description.

Henry’s laboured syntax in the lengthy final sentence describing the debacle of Bodoine’s rum (Appendix 16a) creates a similar effect:

The result was very different from that of the one which had preceded it; for, after relieving my thirst with melted snow, and my hunger with a plentiful meal of venison, of which there was a great quantity in the lodge, and which was liberally set before me, I resumed my journey, full of sentiments of gratitude, such as almost obliterated the recollection of what had befallen me, among the friends of my benefactors. (6)

Henry focuses initially on a summary of events ("The result was very different"), but delays the action of the sentence ("I resumed my journey") with clauses that variously describe his intermediate actions ("[A]fter relieving my thirst, and my hunger"), scenic details ("a plentiful meal of venison, of which there was a great quantity in the lodge"), and other people's passive actions ("which was liberally set before me"). He elaborates the completed action, moreover, by describing both his emotional state ("full of sentiments of gratitude") and the efficacy of those emotions ("such as almost obliterated") to revise his narrative evaluation of the previous scene ("what had befallen me, among the friends of my benefactors").

A somewhat different example occurs just a little later in the journey:

We were now at the head of the Longue Sault, one of those portions of the river, in which it passes over a shallow, inclining and rocky bed, and where its motion consequently prevents it from freezing, even in the coldest part of the year; and my guide, as soon as he had made his discovery, recommended, that we should go by water down
the rapids, as the means of saving time, of shortening our journey, and of avoiding a numerous body of Indians, then hunting on the bank below. (7)

Alexander Mackenzie would likely render a version of the same information as, “At seven in the evening we reached the head of the Longue Sault, when I determined to lose no time but go down the rapids by water.” Henry’s series of enchained clauses, by contrast, creates a much more detailed and much more complex narrative world. Typically, Henry’s constructions either defer articulation of the sentence’s real focus, often adding so much detail that the real focus is obscured, or put the logic of grammatical function at risk by introducing new possibilities for pronoun reference. These layered clauses thus variously defer readers’ access to information, logical relation, sequence, forward motion, and, significantly, proximity with, and knowledge of, the narrator. In this way, they make it possible for the narrator to distance himself from both the events that he is narrating and from his narration of events.

Henry’s layered clauses not only defer, but they are also deferential. Their inherent negative politeness, that is, conveys the sense of a narrator who has his readers’ interests at heart. According to Penelope Brown and Stephen Levinson’s “politeness theory,” communicative efforts are motivated by two main goals: first, to communicate rationally and efficiently, and secondly, to maintain both positive and negative face. Brown and Levinson define “face” as the self-image an individual would like to claim for her- or himself. “Positive face,” more specifically, is the expression of a desire to be appreciated and approved of, while “negative face” is the expression of a desire for autonomy, privacy, and the freedom both to act and to not be imposed on (61). Brown and Levinson’s model identifies five main groups of strategies from which speakers choose,
ranging from i) going baldly on record, ii) using ‘positive politeness,’ iii) using ‘negative politeness,’ iv) going off record, and v) choosing not to do the “face-threatening-act.” The model goes on to explicate the wide range of sub-strategies that exist within and among these main choices.

Of these numerous sub-strategies, “hedging” best explains the effect of Henry’s deferential grammatical structures. “[A] ‘hedge’,,” Brown and Levinson explain, “is a particle, word, or phrase that modifies the degree of membership of a predicate or noun phrase in a set; it says of that membership that it is partial, or true only in certain respects, or that it is more true and complete than perhaps might be expected” (145; italics in text). “[O]rdinary communicative intentions,” they elaborate, are often potential threats to cooperative interaction.

Communicative intentions are regulated and encoded in speech acts, and if one looks at the conditions on the felicitous use of speech acts, the sources of threat became clear. For to ask someone to do something is to presuppose that they can and are willing to do it, and have not already done it; to promise to do something is to admit that one hasn’t already done it, to assume that the addressee wants it done and would prefer you to do it — and so on . . . . Consequently, to hedge these assumptions — that is, to avoid commitment to them — is a primary and fundamental method of disarming routine interactional threats. (145-46)

Hedges, that is, replicate linguistically the various disguises Henry assumes in response to threats to his safety, autonomy, life, and authority. Literal disguises in Henry’s text form a series of narrative substitutions that, like their linguistic counterparts, repeatedly mark the instability of the contact zone.

In the space of contact, Henry is obliged, literally, to avoid
commitment to his personal and authoritative identity in order to disarm the much-more-than-routine threats of physical pain and death that he receives. Physical and grammatical disguises, however, ensure his survival and permit him to have effect in situations that otherwise threaten to annihilate his identity. Indeed, grammatical distance and physical disguise function in much the way that gothic spatio-temporal evocations do: to underscore the artificiality of the disguise-persona and thus to reassert the legitimacy of the disguised-persona. In the next section, I juxtapose the narrative momentum of 'the hero saved from danger' trope in Henry’s text with the series of disguises by which that hero is successively dispossessed of agency and efficacy.

_The narrative hero in disguise_

Like Mackenzie’s, Henry’s narrative reiterates the mythology of the self-sufficient, autonomous hero. In Henry’s case, the dominant sub-trope is the survival of the individual hero, often by extraordinary, unexpected, or quasi-supernatural means. Typically, few details of the external forces effecting the miraculous rescues are provided. As I note above, Henry records two occasions on which he was rescued from imminent death within the first six pages of his text, the first of which (Appendix 18, Sentence 4) is the remarkably terse account of the shipwreck. Not atypically for Henry, that account focuses primarily on the mercantile effects of the shipwreck — _Several boats, loaded with provisions and military stores, were lost_ — and only secondarily remarks on the human casualties — _together with upward of a hundred men_. The second occasion of rescue from death is the narrative account recorded in Appendix 16. Although the two events are chronologically separated by approximately half a year, their narrative contiguity, especially so early in
the account, establishes both the narrator’s vulnerability and his intrepid heroics.

Indeed, the trope of the hero saved variously by fortuitous natural events, lucky accidents of timing, his own bravery, intelligence, or cunning, or a range of ‘helper’ figures like the old woman above (Toolan, *Narrative* 14-16; Campbell 97; John MacKenzie 111) is well-established by the time the narrative arrives at its account of the attack on Fort Michilimackinac. Very early in the narrative, for instance, on the same first journey, Henry claims barely to have survived his first excursion in a fragile bark canoe (8) and records “narrowly escap[ing] a fatal accident” (21) as a result of not having drawn his canoe sufficiently far aground.

Although Henry’s early account defines the contact zone in stubbornly European mercantilist terms (Greenfield, *Discovery* 56), his narrative increasingly notes the destabilizing effect of his identity in the zone. His arrival at the Lake des Châts, for instance, marks the beginning of a series of encounters with Indians who stress his vulnerability as an Englishman in the region. “[B]eing told I was [an Englishman],” he writes, “they observed, that the English were mad, in their pursuit of beaver, since . . . they, ‘the Upper Indians will certainly kill him,’ meaning myself” (23). Similarly, on the first of September, he records finding the island of La Cloche inhabited by Indians with whom he bartered until they learned that he was an Englishman, and who then, in his words,

told my men, that the Indians, at Michilimackinac, would not fail to kill me, and that, therefore, they had a right to a share of the pillage. Upon this principle, as they said, they demanded a keg of rum, adding, that if not given them, they would proceed to take it. I judged it prudent to comply; on condition, however, that I should experience, at this place, no further molestation.
The condition was not unfaithfully observed; but the repeated warnings which I had now received, of sure destruction at Michilimackinac, could not but oppress my mind. (34)

At this point, Henry, having determined that the threatened danger is an exclusive effect of his cultural-political identity, records employing his first disguise (reprinted in Appendix 19a), a disguise that registers a traditional complication of the trope of intrepid hero — the hero who survives precisely because he cannot be identified as the hero (Toolan, Narrative 16). Henry reports no further brushes with danger until his party reaches the island of Michilimackinac:

On the island, as I had been previously taught to expect, there was a village of Chipeways, said to contain a hundred warriors. Here, I was fearful of discovery and consequent ill-treatment; but after inquiring the news, and, particularly, whether or not any Englishman was coming to Michilimackinac, they suffered us to pass, uninjured. One man, indeed, looked at me, laughed, and pointed me out to another. This was enough to give me some uneasiness; but, whatever was the singularity he perceived in me, both he and his friend retired, without suspecting me to be an Englishman. (38)

Henry’s admission, “I was fearful of discovery and consequent ill-treatment,” highlights the contradictions in his situation. By his own volition, he has entered the peculiar historical, political, and economic zone where, at the same time that he may be discovering new lands (and particularly, new markets) for the English (but more specifically himself), circumstances oblige him — in order to maintain his free European male prerogative to engage in mercantile activity — to disguise his identity and to viscerally fear, as a result, another kind of discovery entirely.

In the series of encounters and missed encounters traced in Chapter
3, Mackenzie parenthetically acknowledges that his specific identity may be having a detrimental effect on the success of his expedition, though he does not alter the conditions or attitudes or behaviours that characterize his presence in the context. Though Hearne never has the option of disguising himself, his identity as a representative of the HBC, troubling as it sometimes is, nevertheless acts as a cognitive release valve when the apparently nonsensical pressures of the contact zone overwhelm him. Henry, by contrast, recognizes the immense value of mis-recognition — in this case, the mis-recognition of the sign of his body — in order to re-establish or maintain his commercial activities. The stages through which Henry abandons his cultural-political identity form a series of narrative substitutions by which he is also, however, increasingly dispossessed of mercantile agency.

He assumes his second disguise immediately on his party's arrival at Fort Michilimackinac. "I put the entire charge of my effects into the hands of my assistant, Campion," he explains, "between whom and myself it had been previously agreed, that he should pass for the proprietor; and my men were instructed to conceal the fact, that I was an Englishman" (39). His third disguise is less a disguise than an imposition of identity. Discovered in M. Langlade's garret by several of the Indians, Henry is initially threatened by Wenniway, who then unexpectedly drops his knife, announces his decision not to kill Henry, and adds, according to the narrator, "that, on a certain occasion, he had lost a brother, whose name was Musinigon, and that I should be called after him" (86). Henry takes on his fourth and final disguise a short time after his adoption into Wawatam's family and marks his dramatic transformation into a Chipeway (Appendix 19b).

Significantly, Henry repeatedly reinscribes the resumed 'rightness' of
the world in terms of mercantile agency and the possession of ‘rightful’
property. He records his first meeting with Minavavana (Appendix 17a) as
having ended satisfactorily, for instance, because he is able to resume
mercantile activities without impediment (Appendix 20a). The new
dangers to which he refers at this point are the demands of the Otawas for
goods on the threat of violence. For reasons that are never revealed in the
text, the Otawas, however, depart of their own accord after a two-day
standoff, and are replaced by three hundred British troops (49-52), an
episode Henry concludes by noting, “The Indians . . . came to pay their
respects to the commandant; and the merchants dispatched their canoes”
(53). Henry’s most dramatic disguise as a Chipeway, however, signals how
profoundly this particular shift in identity dispossesses him of meaningful
mercantile agency and literal material property (Appendix 20b). Although
the episode initially records success (“He did not fail to comply,” “I
succeeded in finding”), it rapidly contrasts that success with the melancholy
repetition, “but . . . I obtained nothing;—and nothing, or almost nothing, I
now began to think, would be all that I should need, during the rest of my
life.” Henry’s final thematization of the limited series of activities available
to him — “To fish,” “to hunt,” to collect,” to “exchange” — underscores,
moreover, the dramatic shift he registers in personal agency.

The series of dangers averted, mastered, or defused (Appendix 21)
that characterizes the early part of “Part the First,” establishes both a
thematic focus on the hero’s survival and an initially pleasantly distressing
narrative rhythm. The focus and the rhythm also create an interpretive
context in which the melodramatically bloody and vengeful but always
thwarted attempts on Henry’s life, during and after the attack on
Michilimackinac, achieve a status of narrative accuracy disproportionate to
historical fact. In the next section, I examine how gothic evocations of
time and space enable Henry’s narrative agency in the face of almost overwhelming threat.

**Re-tale-ing the gothic**

One of the few critical commentators on Henry’s narrative, Germaine Warkentin has invoked the notion of ‘gothic’ to describe Henry’s narrative on at least two occasions (“Exploration” 246; *Exploration* 78). “Gothic,” explains Fred Botting, confirming the appropriateness of the epithet, signifies a writing of excess. It appears in the awful obscurity that haunted eighteenth-century rationality and morality. It shadows the despairing ecstasies of Romantic idealism and individualism and the uncanny dualities of Victorian realism and decadence . . . . If not a purely negative term, Gothic writing remains fascinated by objects and practices that are constructed as negative, irrational, immoral and fantastic . . . . Gothic excesses . . . the fascination with transgression and the anxiety over cultural limits and boundaries, continue to produce ambivalent emotions and meanings in their tales of darkness, desire and power. (1-2)

David Punter emphasizes that *fear* is a crucial element that both motivates ‘gothic’ writing and appears in texts that evince ‘gothic’ qualities. “Fear,” says Punter, “is not merely a theme or an attitude, it also has consequences in terms of form, style and the social relations of the texts . . . [E]xploring Gothic is also . . . seeing the various ways in which terror breaks through the surfaces of literature, differently in every case, but also establishing for itself certain distinct continuities of language and symbol” (Vol. 1, 18).

Henry’s text exemplifies the strong connection that exists among heroic adventure narrative, the gothic resources on which they draw, and
the political and economic realities they suppress. Especially in an ostensibly accurate historical account, gothic form allows the narrative to focus on the lasciviously vulnerable European body that rational, authoritative political and economic versions of reality necessarily suppress. “The terrors and horrors of transgression in Gothic writing,” Botting explains, “become a powerful means to reassert the values of society, virtue and propriety: transgression, by crossing the social and aesthetic limits, serves to reinforce or underline their value and necessity, restoring or defining limits” (7). Punter makes a more specific association between the original advent of gothic articulations and the shifting and deeply paradoxical economic and political structures that characterized the eighteenth century:

The conflict of interests [between workers and government] shifted somewhat during the century as emergent capitalism made home markets more important, but also made it preeminently important that the capitalist should make a profit out of his labour force. The result was a laissez-faire economy, in which the laws of economic activity and even personal success and failure were utterly mysterious to most of the population, a situation which is bound to increase the alienation of the individual from his or her socioeconomic environment . . . . Emergent capitalism in theory encouraged individual self-improvement and individual profit, whereas in practice it was and remained very difficult for most people to take advantage of these apparent opportunities. (Vol. 2, 194)

Punter’s links, moreover, between Marx’s enumeration of the various alienations manifest in the new international-industrial economy and the recurring themes of gothic fear (Vol. 2, 197), illuminate Henry’s peculiar
reinscription of gothic conventions to stabilize his precariously visceral mercantile self. These reinscriptions are most evident at, and immediately following, the point of the attack on the fort, the point at which Henry’s identity as an “Englishman” assumes its undisguisably fatal resonance. Unlike Hearne’s null value in the space of contact, Henry’s ‘English’ body is the sign of absolute liability. Curiously and apparently paradoxically, therefore, Henry is most inclined to construct himself as agentive at some of the narrative’s most critically threatening points. I examine Henry’s reinscriptions of gothic conventions in the section that follows and speculate that the cultural validity of gothic form lends his account an emotional and aesthetic coherence that it does not technically possess.

*Inside and outside the gothic self*

According to Eve Kosofsky Sedgwick, major gothic conventions share the following general spatial model:

It is the position of the self to be massively blocked off from something to which it ought normally to have access . . . . Typically . . . there is both something going on inside the isolation . . . and something intensely relevant going on impossibly out of reach. While the three main elements (what’s inside, what’s outside, and what separates them) take on the most varied guises, the terms of the relationship are immutable. The self and whatever it is that is outside have a proper, natural, necessary connection to each other, but one that the self is suddenly incapable of making. The inside life and the outside life have to continue separately, becoming counterparts rather than partners, the relationship between them one of parallels and correspondences rather than communication. And the lengths there are to go to reintegrate the sundered elements —
finally, the impossibility of restoring them to their original oneness — are the most characteristic energies of the Gothic novel. (12-13)

The spatio-temporal conventions of Gothic are, that is, peculiarly recognizable as narrative frames. As narrative frames, they are also crucial determiners of the value of the exchanges that are possible, and that occur, within those frames. Sedgwick’s description applies peculiarly aptly to Henry’s narrative at, and following, the point of the attack.

From the very beginning of his account of the attack (excerpted in Appendix 22a and b), Henry traces his movement through space almost cinematically (“not . . . more than twenty paces from my door,” “Going instantly to my window,” “in the room in which I was,” “there was only a low fence, over which I easily climbed,” “She brought me to a door,” “through an aperture,” “the garret was separated from the room below”), identifying the location of his threatened body at every point. He not only calls attention to the various barriers that sometimes negatively, sometimes positively, create ‘insides’ and ‘outsides’ of the self, moreover, but emphasizes the nightmare-like qualities of his experience by foregrounding diffuse, imprecise, and shifting time-structures (“Going instantly to my window,” “I immediately seized,” “In this dreadful interval,” “At length,” “This was a moment for despair,” “I was . . . anxious to know what might still be passing without,” “At the same instant,” “the Indians no sooner in, than they inquired,” “a few moments were thus allowed me,” “Still, I remained undiscovered”).

Despite the fact that the passage describes an increasing sense of fear and disorientation, Henry constructs himself grammatically as agentive. Of the sixty-two processes represented in Appendix 22a (“It . . . happened”; “Mr. Tracy had . . . gone”; “who . . . scalped”; “a Pani woman . . . beckoned”), Henry positions himself as agentive in twenty-nine, or almost
half, of them ("I . . . remained," "I had," "I seized," "I found"). Henry's agency, however, often takes a voyeuristic form: of the twenty-nine processes in which he is agentive, nine are processes of sensory activity that call attention to his spatially distanced perspective on the urgent events transpiring ("I heard," "I saw," "I witnessed," "I saw," I observed," "I beheld," I heard," I could . . . hear," I heard,"). And though he typically underscores the restrictedness of his view, he also emphasizes — in great part by the absence of lengthy hedges — the accuracy of his perceptions. Henry both figures himself as 'looking', moreover, and repeats a scene in which he watches others watch (Sentences 9, 11, 12, 30), thus recreating, in narrative content and positioning, the deferral of position that his embedded and enchained clauses effect grammatically.

As the short excerpt in Appendix 22b) illustrates, Henry continues to exploit time-structures in his description of his continued evasion of, and eventual capture by, the Indians ("The respite . . . was put an end to," "At sunrise," "presently after," "I now resigned myself," "At length, after some seconds, of the most anxious suspense"). Having determined to give himself up, moreover, he promptly reproduces a generically appropriate monster in the form of Wenniway, "who was upward of six feet in height, had his entire face and body covered with charcoal and grease, only that a white spot, of two inches in diameter, encircled either eye." And as part c) of the same Appendix illustrates, Henry maintains the practice of figuring himself as viewing the action from a distance, from behind some form or other of barrier that separates him from the action going on in an 'outside' to which he does not have access or would be fatally threatened if he did.

Henry also explicitly reiterates various narrative gothic clichés, including the 'horror and the fear' (Sentence a18), the pounding heart which threatens to give away the hiding place (Sentence a29), the sensations
the reader must guess at because they are too extreme to be described (Sentences a24 and 32), ‘the rack of apprehension’ (Sentence b2), the figuring throughout of impending doom as the effect of a distant and undefinable malevolent agency (Sentences a13, 19, 28 and b4), and the maintenance of diffuse spatial and temporal markers, repeating in various forms the crucial separation of ‘inside’ from ‘outside.’

Once Henry is captured by the Indians, however, his gothic narrative reveals an unprecedented level of break-down. In the next section, I trace the pronoun-slippage that marks a narrative of almost complete identity destabilization and I theorize the functions of narrative in resuscitating personal and cultural threats to the system.

Pronoun-slippage: the unstable self

Unlike Hearne’s and Mackenzie’s more typical records of exchange in the contact zone, Henry’s narrative, after his capture by the Chipeways, attempts to make sense not just of a decisive disruption of European-style exchange, but of his own body’s transformation into the material of exchange. Although Hearne’s text, for instance, includes numerous explicit expressions of personal vulnerability, the ‘writing-body’ of the text is never at risk of becoming an object of exchange in an unfamiliar economy. By contrast, Henry’s account after his capture reflects the discursive crisis of a writing-self who cannot function as an agent of exchange because he has become an object of exchange. Disturbances to the narrator’s politely distant presence can be traced in the pronoun-slippages that mark Henry’s account of events during and after his capture. The extended excerpt I analyze in this section spans Chapters 11-14 and includes Henry’s abduction, with the Chipeways’ other prisoners, by the Otawas; the Otawas’ relinquishing the prisoners to the Chipeways; Henry’s adoption by
Wawatam and his family; Henry’s assumption of his Chipeway disguise; his unsuccessful attempt, in disguise, to regain his trading merchandise at the fort; and his return, on reconciling himself to his new existence, to participate in the daily life of Wawatam’s family (94-114).

I argue that the established rhythm of substitutive disguise offers formal stabilization when the story’s events threaten to eradicate Henry’s identity completely. Henry’s body registers, manifests, and literally embodies the contact between foreign ‘systems.’ In textual terms, the narrating body survives the visceral body’s terror by a carefully sustained grammatical distance from itself, occasioned, in moments of particular extremity, by a literal slipping of pronoun signifiers. I use A. J. Griemš's actantial model to show how the text’s fissured narrative structure reflects the chaotic world the writing body must negotiate, and I examine participant and process functions to demonstrate the close relationship among narrative instability, identity confusion, and the text’s obsession with cannibalism. Despite the numerous discernible structural fissures, the text functions with powerful narrative effect and by so doing, signals the profoundly stabilizing function of narrative form, perhaps especially in an acutely non-sensical and incoherent world. In the text’s terms, ultimate stability is re-established when capitalist identity and the textual autonomy/economy of the masculine subject are re-established. I end, therefore, by speculating on the relationship between discursive exchange, economic exchange, and the political functions of narrative form.

As the previous section elaborated, a thematic concern with disguised and shifting identity pervades the first half of Henry’s text and highlights the unstable associations and dissociations provoked by his peculiar experience of the contact zone (Greenfield, *Discovery* 62). The excerpt very rapidly betrays its confusion about identity/ies. “The soldier...”
Henry records, for instance, about being taken with the Chipeways' other prisoners to the Isles du Castor, "was made fast to a bar . . . as is the manner of the Indians, in transporting their prisoners," and then he adds, "The rest were left unconfined; but a paddle was put into each of our hands" (94). The confusion expressed here is about when the prisoners are "the prisoners" and when the prisoners are "us." This confusion continues when Henry is adopted into Wawatam's family: sometimes the Indians are "the Indians" and sometimes they are "we," just as sometimes "I" am 'Henry' and sometimes "I" am one of "us." "This resolution fixed, they prepared for a speedy retreat," Henry notes, for instance, about the Chipeways' decision to move to the Island of Michilimackinac to avoid an attack by the English, but adds, "At noon, the camp was broken up, and we embarked, taking with us all the prisoners that were still undisposed of" (106). Susan Stewart's explication of taboo-states suggests that Henry's account might be usefully understood as an articulation of his deeply ambivalent experience of the non-sense of the contact zone. "The anomalous," says Stewart,

stands between the categories of an existing classification system; it threatens the integrity of text and context by being neither one nor the other. The ambiguous is that which cannot be defined in terms of any given category; it threatens the integrity of individual categories, being 'either this or that or something else.' The ambivalent is that which belongs to more than one domain at a time and will not fix its identity in any one member of this set of domains; it is 'both this and that.' (61)

Precisely because he cannot fix his identity, Henry belongs to more than one domain at every point in the text — he is always simultaneously both an Englishman and an adopted Indian, and is therefore always, in Stewart's
terms, an ambivalent being. “Had an enemy appeared,” he speculates poignantly if confusedly from the island, “all the prisoners would have been put to death; and I suspected, that as an Englishman, I should share their fate” (107).

Greimas’s actantial analysis provides an illuminating perspective on the excerpt’s narrative and syntactic instabilities. According to Griemias, narratives can be analyzed in terms of three basic actant-pairs: subject-object, helper-opponent, and sender-receiver. In very general terms, the narrative’s ‘subject’ strives after some desired ‘object,’ and in this endeavour s/he is thwarted by the ‘opponent’ and assisted by the ‘helper.’ The narrative is resolved when the ‘giver,’ typically someone of higher status than the subject, intervenes to award the object to the ‘receiver,’ the ultimate beneficiary (Tooian, Narrative 93-94). In Greimas’s terms, Henry is clearly the ‘subject’ of his own narrative. The narrative’s ‘object,’ however, might equally reasonably be considered life or freedom to pursue normal trade relations, and that potential multiplicity promptly confuses the narrative and its teleology. As a direct result of having two distinct objects, the narrative in fact operates simultaneously according to what Bal (22) calls a logic of “deterioration avoided” (Henry is not killed) and a kind of qualified “improvement achieved” (Henry’s life is spared, but he may never be able to resume living as a free English-American trader). “[N]othing, or almost nothing, I now began to think, would be all that I should need, during the rest of my life,” Henry writes in the passage examined above, “to fish and to hunt, to collect a few skins, and exchange them for necessaries, was all that I seemed destined to do, and to acquire, for the future” (112-13).

Greimas’s actantial model discovers similar confusion over the text’s ‘helper,’ since the ‘helper’ category could, in this narrative, be filled by the
Otawas who briefly release the European traders from their Chipeway guards (95-96), or by Wawatam, the Chipeway man who consistently works for Henry’s best interests (73 ff), or, after Henry’s adoption, it could more generally include Wawatam and the rest of the Chipeway group. Similarly multiple, the ‘opponent’ category could be filled by ‘the Indians’ generally, ‘the Indians minus the Otawas,’ or, after Henry’s attempts to recover his trading goods at the fort (112), ‘the Indians plus the double-dealing French traders.’ The complexity is somewhat eased when the Otawas reveal their readiness to collaborate with the Chipeways (97) and thereby betray their illusory status as helpers. The narrative is not significantly stabilized by this elimination, however, since once Henry is freed into Wawatam’s custody (101 ff), the Chipeways function simultaneously as both ‘helper’ and ‘opponent’: although Henry’s status has shifted from prisoner to adopted son/brother, his identity is now symbolically defined within the world of the Chipeways, who are, of course, precisely the agents who prevent his return to the world of European trade.

Like its ‘subject,’ the narrative’s ‘receiver’ is also clearly Henry himself. The narrative’s ‘sender,’ however, could be variously defined as ‘the Chipeways,’ since they directly control the possibility of Henry’s release; it could be defined as ‘the shifting balance of political control over the region,’ since that, in fact, underlies even the Chipeways’ apparent control; more pragmatically yet, it could be defined as ‘the will/intention/sobriety of the Indians,’ since according to the text, even Wawatam’s best intentions cannot guarantee Henry’s safety among other members of the group (108 ff). The narrative’s ‘sender’ is at least as indeterminate as are its ‘helper,’ ‘opponent,’ and ‘object’; an investigation into the category reveals, moreover, how little of the indigenous cultural and political reality
Henry's text records. Curiously, that is, especially considering the time that elapsed between the events and his recounting of them, Henry offers almost no information about, and no analysis of, the complex political situation that resulted in the attack on the fort and that continued to inflect his value and safety in the zone. As I elaborate below, those textual absences, particularly in an ostensibly historical text, underscore Henry's rhetorical reliance on the cultural categories that narrative forms both draw on and reinscribe.

An analysis of participant and process functions in Henry's text reveals a predominance of passive constructions especially noticeable where the text accounts for the Chipeways' behaviour, and where the text refers to Henry himself. Initially, both patterns seem counter-intuitive. Narratological analysis, however, readily explains the first pattern. Precisely because the Chipeways operate in the unholy narratological cross-over zone of 'helper' and 'opponent,' the narrative proceeds under a self-imposed censoring of direct Chipeway action, especially negative action with respect to the 'subject.' The pattern of reporting Chipeway action in passive constructions and in relation to what might be called 'cultural instrumentality,' is evident in the first sentence of Chapter 11 — "The soldier . . . was made fast to a bar of the canoe . . . as is the manner of the Indians" — and is only broken in a description of traditional behaviour: "Every half hour, the Indians gave their war whoops, one for every prisoner in their canoe" (95). An extended passive construction near the end of Chapter 12 records a Chipeway attack on an English trading canoe and perhaps most obviously exemplifies how the form obscures agency and mitigates direct responsibility. "The canoe," Henry writes, "suspecting nothing, came boldly to the fort, where the passengers, as being English traders, were seized, dragged through the water, beat, reviled, marched to
the prison-lodge, and there stripped of their clothes, and confined" (103).

Especially because Henry functions unambiguously as the narrative’s ‘subject,’ the pattern of passive self-reference is more unexpected. It too is potentially explicable, however, in terms of the shifting and precarious identities that actantial analysis elucidates. “[A] paddle was put into each of our hands, and we were made to use it” (94), Henry records, for instance, as a ‘subject’ acted on by the narrative’s decidedly ambivalent ‘opponent-helpers,’ and similarly, “I was again reduced to an old shirt . . . the blanket which I had received . . . having been taken from me among the Otawas” (98). Not surprisingly, given its thematic resonance, the most provocative instance of passive construction recounts Henry’s striking transmutation into a Chipeway (reprinted in Appendix 19b). Of the various disguises that Henry reports himself assuming, only this one is described in the passive voice.

Although the disguise itself attempts to mitigate the fact, passive grammatical constructions underscore how, in the disrupted cultural economy, Henry’s body has been transformed into an object of exchange. Linguistic constructions of a passive body acted on by indeterminate agents to effect identity translations are especially resonant given the text’s numerous references and allusions to cannibalism. Cannibalism, and an overwhelming anxiety with the possibility of cannibalism, appear in various forms throughout this section of Henry’s text (Greenfield, *Discovery* 61). “[The Otawas],” Henry records, for instance, “added that what they had done was for the purpose of saving our lives, the Chipeways having been carrying us to the Isles du Castor only to kill and devour us” (96), and protests, when returned to the Chipeways, “the Otawas . . . had themselves declared, that the latter designed no other than to kill us, and make broth of us” (97; italics in text). Later, from the vantage point of
Wawatam’s lodge, Henry describes how the body of a slain Englishman was divided into several pieces, how each piece was placed in a separate kettle and how Wawatam returned from the ensuing feast with a human hand and a large piece of flesh in his dish (Appendix 22c). Finally, after spending a night alone in a cave filled with human bones (Appendix 23), Henry explicitly rejects various of the Chipeways’ explanations. “For myself,” he insists, “I am disposed to believe, that this cave was an ancient receptacle of the bones of prisoners, sacrificed and devoured at war-feasts” (110).

Like the poignant confusion discussed above, over whether he is agentive or merely an object to be acted on (“I suspected, that as an Englishman, I should share their fate”), multiple shifts in the following description can be read as representing Henry’s chaotic experience as the apparent object of an attempt at forced cannibalism:

I confess, that in the canoe, with the Chipeways, I was offered bread—but bread, with what accompaniment!—They had a loaf, which they cut with the same knives that they had employed in the massacre—knives still covered with blood. The blood, they moistened with spittle, and rubbing it on the bread, offered this for food to their prisoners, telling them to eat the blood of their countrymen. (98)

As the Chipeways shift from passive obscuration (“I was offered”) to active agency (“They had a loaf which they cut”), the subject-Henry shifts from agent (“I confess”) to passive recipient (“I was offered”) — and then drops out of the narrative entirely. “The blood,” he writes, “they . . . offered . . . for food to their prisoners, telling them to eat the blood of their countrymen.” Henry’s fractured language here performs what Peter Hulme calls “the meaning” of cannibalism, an “image of ferocious consumption of human flesh . . . used to mark the boundary between one
community and its others” (86). In Henry’s case, the writing-self that has become an object of exchange, records logically inexplicable shifts in focalization and pronoun identification at moments of extreme narrative tension and, by doing so, compellingly inscribes both the dispersal of the bodily self that cannibalism threatens and the absence of the community in which he might have stabilized himself.

Belying its conceptual definition — and, in Henry’s case, its grammatical reinscription — as the process by which human beings are irremediably reduced to non-identity, however, cannibalism is the story that makes sense of vast destabilization in terms comprehensible to a European audience. “‘Cannibalism,’” says Hulme, “is a term that has no application outside the discourse of European colonialism: it is never available as a ‘neutral’ word” (84). “What was involved,” he explains in his discursive history of the term, “was a comprehensive ritual purging of the body of European Christendom just prior to, and in the first steps of, the domination of the rest of the world: the forging of a European identity” (85-6). “Semantically,” Stephen Slemon elaborates, “cannibalism connotes a body that consumes another human body; discursively, cannibalism enables mobility for the imperial subject and permits the political production of meaning” (“Bones” 166; italics in text). Henry’s text’s obsession with cannibalism can be read, therefore, as both an expression of pervasive European cultural anxiety and an expression of Henry’s experience of the profound threat of personal annihilation. It also can be read as evidence of the efficacy of narrative forms and categories to recuperate threats of symbolic and literal dis-memberment.

Entirely despite the range of analytically discernible fissures, that is — the simultaneous and undecidable narratological possibilities, for instance, and the related confusions of identity and association — Henry’s
text functions strikingly as coherent narrative. “[S]imultaneity,” Stewart explains, “works as other nonsense operations do, bringing attention to form, to method, to the ways in which experience is organized” (147). Despite its myriad markers of ambivalent identity, despite its profound expression of chaotic nonsense, and the discursively reiterated threat of ultimate, cannibalistic exchange, the narrative’s form as gothic tale lends Henry the coherence necessary to stabilize his representations of world, identity, and existence in the contact zone.

Colonial economies of cannibalism

If Mackenzie’s recalcitrant native guides, reduced to zero in his textual economy, remain to trouble his journey and its representation; if Hearne skirts, discursively, the fact that women’s labour in the gender-exchange economy secures his existence in the space; Henry’s text struggles to represent the destabilized and destabilizing sign of his visceral body, the body defamiliarized by its signification in an exchange-economy over which he has no control. Michel de Certeau calls cannibalism “an economy of speech, in which the body is the price” (Heterologies 75; italics in text). Slemon elaborates the historical, colonial complexities of that economy. “British colonialism,” he explains, “is itself an apparatus that quite literally consumes — that cannibalizes — its Other. In this context, ‘cannibalism’ is a tropic reversal of an operation within European colonialist management of resources: it is a figure in which colonialism’s own internal economy is marked out by representation, disavowed, and then projected onto colonialism’s Other” (“Bones” 167; italics in text). Henry’s discourse takes absolutely for granted the rightness of European mercantilism, and in the space of contact, Henry neutralizes threats and challenges to the world he represents by noting the resumption of mercantile activity. Ironically,
Henry’s potent anxiety about the survival of a self he has figured almost exclusively in mercantile terms provokes him to tell and re-tell the much-told European story (Hulme 83-6) of an ‘Other’ hungering and thirsting to dismember the body on which that self depends.

Henry’s storied gesture is, of course, far from innocent. “Each time what comes to be textualized as the truth of the native culture is a part that becomes ambivalently incorporated in the archives of colonial knowledge . . . .” says Bhabha.

What emerges in these lies that never speak the ‘whole’ truth, come to be circulated from mouth to mouth, book to book, is the institutionalization of a very specific discursive form of paranoia, that must be authorized at the point of its dismemberment . . . . Its strategy . . . is a partial incorporation; a form of incorporation that deprives the object of a part of its body in that its integrity may be attacked without destroying its existence . . . . The existence of the disabled native is required for the next lie and the next and the next — ‘The Horror! the Horror!’ Marlow, you will remember, had to lie as he moved from the heart of darkness to the Belgian boudoir. As he replaces the words of horror for the name of the Intended we read in that palimpsest, neither one nor the other, something of the awkward, ambivalent, unwelcome truth of empire’s lie. (“Archaic” 138)

As we saw at the end of Chapter 4 (146 above), Warkentin uses the same passage from *Heart of Darkness* to elucidate the ‘lie’ that Hearne’s narrative choices tell at the extreme point of his text’s horror. Paradoxically, the colonial ‘lies’ of cannibalism, if they are lies, function, as Bhabha reminds us, pun-like, to in-corporate cultural difference for the benefit of European discursive — and mercantile — economies.
Before the attack on Michilimackinac, Henry is predominantly concerned to extend his commercial influence in the area, and he typically reports on dangers and threats to his safety in terms of their effects on his ability to pursue trade. The attack on the fort, however, and events that follow, dramatically curtail his mercantile agency in the space of contact, and his attempt to reassert his commercial identity after his transmutation into a Chipeway has very unsatisfactory results. Indeed, as the preceding analysis demonstrates, after the point of the attack, Henry’s textual identity — as trader, Englishman, and viable living body — is disguised, threatened, prohibited, erased, and dispersed, in almost every imaginable way. Henry’s bodily self, threatened throughout with annihilation as a form of fair cultural exchange for Indian deaths at the hands of the English (23, 45, 111), becomes an exchange-token at Langlade’s mercy (79ff), in Wenniway’s possession (86ff), in the possession of the murderous, unnamed Indian (87-9), a prisoner of the Chipeways (89-95), a hostage of the Ottawas (95-7), once again a prisoner of the Chipeways (97-101), a ward of Wawatam’s (101ff), a guarantee of English leniency if returned to its rightful owners (146), and a potential meal (148).

Although the disorienting and narratively illogical pronoun-shifts disappear from the text after the acute post-capture chaos, Henry remains acutely alert to the Chipeways’ ambiguous ‘helper/opponent’ role in his narrative for the duration of his captivity/adoption. On June 9th, for instance, in the course of a retreat to the island of Michilimackinac, two of the women begin, in Henry’s terms, “to utter melancholy and hideous cries.” “Precarious as my condition still remained,” he recalls, “I experienced some sensations of alarm, from these dismal sounds, of which I could not then discover the occasion” (106). And when liquor is discovered in the English canoe that the Chipeways ambush (referred to
above 176-77), Henry notes that “Wawatam, always watchful of my safety, no sooner heard the noise of drunkenness . . . than he represented to me the danger of remaining in the village . . . . That I might escape all mischief, he therefore requested that I would accompany him to the mountain, where I was to remain hidden, till the liquor should be drank” (108). And Wawatam’s family disguises Henry as a Chipeway, of course, after Menehwehna expresses his concern that Indians who were arriving from Detroit, “some of whom had lost relations or friends in the war . . . would certainly retaliate on any Englishman they found” (111). Henry records Wawatam’s proposal to remove to their wintering-ground as “a subject of the greatest joy to myself, on account of the frequent insults, to which I had still to submit, from the Indians of our band or village; and to escape from which I would freely have gone almost anywhere” (121). But he laments the situation on hearing of the approach of vengeful Indians from Detroit: “I doubted not, but, taking advantage of the solitary situation of the family, they would carry into execution their design of killing me” (150).

As I suggest above, Henry’s failure to include information about indigenous political structures, inter-group power balances, and cultural forms of power-negotiation betrays his reliance on received forms of cultural narrative. Rhetorically, of course, vested mercantile European interests are much more effectively served by formal mystifications of political processes, effectively served by textual figures of autonomously and generically malevolent forces and effects, effectively served, that is, by an erasure of the political and economic conditions that contextualize Henry’s story of gothic disorientation. In the section that follows, I trace Henry’s allusions to i) the self as a destabilized site of meaning, ii) live burial, and iii) ambiguously inaccessible prisons as evidence of his textual reassertion of a comprehensible European model of controlled exchange.
“[T]exts become increasingly ‘formless’ or antiformal,” says Stewart, “as they move away from a given system of order, for form is defined only in terms of congruence with the existing system of order . . . Thus the disorder of nonsense may be seen as a not-yet-incorporated form of order, an order without a context, without a place in the everyday lifeworld” (61). Henry’s disjunctive grammar at the point of his capture reflects the writing-self put radically into question by being turned into an object of exchange. Forms of gothic narrative, however, frame that disorderly nonsense and by doing so, lend it discursive value. Forms of gothic narrative, that is, provide the ordering resource with which Henry both communicates the perilous non-sense that surrounds him and reasserts the value of his communicating self.

Identity chained, live burial, uncanny prisons

Throughout Henry’s narrative of escape, capture, and adoption, he reiterates the destabilizing effects of an uninterpretable context. Various of his gothic allusions to pervasive malevolence have been referred to above (171). Having escaped the wrath of the unnamed Indian (88-9) while ostensibly a captive of Wenniway’s, Henry waxes briefly optimistic: “Preserved so often, and so unexpectedly, as it had now been my lot to be, I returned to my garret with a strong inclination to believe, that through the will of an overruling power, no Indian enemy could do me hurt” (89). That optimism is rapidly replaced, however, by further ominous threats: “new trials . . . were at hand, when, at ten o’clock in the evening, I was roused from sleep, and once more desired to descend the stairs” (89). The destabilization is represented in dramatically gothic terms in the midst of the prisoners’ disorienting abductions. “The reader’s imagination is here distracted by the variety of our fortunes,” Henry exclaims, interrupting his
description of the Otawas’ attack on the Chipeways’ canoes, “and he may
well paint to himself the state of mind of those who sustained them; who
were the sport, or the victims, of a series of events, more like dreams than
realities, more like fiction than truth!” (96). “The real vertigo,” says
Sedgwick of the gothic experience, is in “its postulating of a semiotic
situation of dizzying instability, one in which the pure fact of meaning
exists in the absence of any reason to mean or to interpret, or any context
for meaning or interpreting” (53).

The continuity and generalized forms of gothic terror ultimately,
according to Sedgwick, function to undermine the distinctions that the self
draws between what is inside and outside of itself. “[E]ven on a descriptive
or phenomenological level,” she says specifically about the spatial
dimensions of the gothic trope of live burial, “the ‘special’ qualities of the
place of live burial are its vastness and extensiveness — qualities that
equate it with, rather than differentiating it from the surrounding space”
(24). Henry’s description of the mountain cave in which he hides while the
Indians consume liquor (Appendix 23) is a classic reinscription of the self
threatened by live burial. “[W]hen day-light visited my chamber,” Henry
expostulates, “I discovered, with some feelings of horror, that I was lying
on nothing less than a heap of human bones and skulls, which covered all
the floor!” “As night approached,” he adds, “I found myself unable to
meet its darkness in the charnel-house”. Significantly, Henry reiterates yet
again the fear of cannibalism that has haunted him since he was first taken
prisoner.

Despite the Indians’ various explanations for the bones in the cave,
that is, he insists on his own explanation. “For myself,” he maintains, “I
am disposed to believe, that this cave was an ancient receptacle of the bones
of prisoners, sacrificed and devoured at war-feasts.” “I have always
observed,” he adds decisively, “that the Indians pay particular attention to the bones of sacrifices, preserving them unbroken, and depositing them in some place kept exclusively for that purpose.” In this instance, the modal expressions “always,” “particular,” “unbroken,” and “exclusively” inscribe the certainty of cannibalism at the same time that Henry’s attitudinal expression, “for myself,” and the positional value of his verb forms (“I am disposed to believe” and “I have always observed”) assert the boundaries between himself and his context. Apparently paradoxically, that is, Henry repeatedly reinscribes the ubiquitous threat of annihilation and reasserts his unassailable identity.

Later, for instance, while a ward of Wawatam’s, and despite having acknowledged that he has regained a strong sense of personal freedom (123), Henry indulges in a gothic fantasy of escape from his nebulous prison. “By degrees, I became familiarized with this kind of life; and had it not been for the idea of which I could not divest my mind, that I was living among savages, and for the whispers of a lingering hope, that I should one day be released from it — or if I could have forgotten that I had ever been otherwise than as I then was — I could have enjoyed as much happiness in this, as in any other situation” (127). Despite its conformity to the gothic prisons that Sedgwick describes as having “neither inside nor outside” and therefore no possibility of escape, Henry’s description, inflected by its poignant — “if I could have forgotten that I had ever been otherwise than as I then was — repulses the prison’s function to undermine the centeredness of the ‘self’ (27).

“Of all the Gothic conventions dealing with the sudden, mysterious, seemingly arbitrary, but massive inaccessibility of those things that should normally be most accessible,” says Sedgwick, “the difficulty the story has in getting itself told is of the most obvious structural significance” (13).
Ironically, Henry uses literary tropes and conventions that trade in the salience of language-loss in order to powerfully reinscribe, as trustworthy narrator, his own control over the cultural destabilization. Bhabha’s description of the articulation of cultural difference curiously reiterates concepts that Sedgwick associates with the gothic, specifically the slippage of signification, and the spatial designations ‘inside’ and ‘outside’ to describe the dubiously stabilizing function of language. “Too often,” says Bhabha,

it is the slippage of signification that is celebrated in the articulation of difference, at the expense of this disturbing process of the overpowering of content by the signifier. The erasure of content in the invisible but insistent structure of linguistic difference does not lead us to some general, formal acknowledgement of the function of the sign. The ill-fitting robe of language alienates content in the sense that it deprives it of an immediate access to a stable or holistic reference ‘outside’ itself. It suggests that social significations are themselves being constituted in the very act of enunciation, in the disjunctive, non-equivalent split of énoncé and enonciation, thereby undermining the division of social meaning into an inside and outside. Content becomes the alienating mise-en-scène that reveals the signifying structure of linguistic difference: a process never seen for itself, but only glimpsed... in the brush between the similitude of the symbol and the difference of the sign. (“Dissemination” 164)

Ironically, Henry employs established European conventions of gothic horror and identity annihilation in order to stabilize the authority of the writing-self signified textually by the imprisoned body. In a kind of half-reversal of the dynamic that Bhabha identifies in cultural difference, Henry’s recursion to specific narrative techniques guarantees a comedic
resolution in exclusively European textual terms. In cultural difference, language, says Bhabha, deprives content of an immediate access to a reference outside itself. Henry's preferred narrative forms, however, allow him to construct a narrating-hero securely autonomous from the threatening, referential 'outside' of cultural difference and different cultural values. "It is only by engaging with... the sign as anterior to any site of meaning," Bhabha continues, that the reality-effect of content can be overpowered which then makes all cultural languages 'foreign' to themselves. And it is from this foreign perspective that it becomes possible to inscribe the specific locality of cultural systems — their incommensurable differences — and through that apprehension of difference, to perform the act of cultural translation. In the act of translation the 'given' content becomes alien and estranged; and that, in its turn, leaves the language of translation Aufgabe, always confronted by its double, the untranslatable — alien and foreign. (164)

Henry employs the forms of gothic narration — forms that themselves trade in tropes of irremedial identity loss, permanent social and cultural mis-recognition, and desolating disruptions of communication — in order to trade in a story of heroic mercantile activity comedically restored. Cultural translation occurs exclusively in the terms of European narrative and the story that results is offered up for consumption within the European exchange-economy. Gothic spaces negotiate the possibilities and the values of narrative exchange to ensure a comedic, not an alienated or an estranged ending to the story.

*Narrative endings*

Especially in its simultaneously literal and symbolic role as an
exchange-token, Henry's body operates with a faint but discernible feminine inflection that jars against the masculine identity required by heroic narrative form. Because the resulting dissonance is resolved when Henry regains his Euro-american 'liberty,' his text raises important theoretical questions about the relationship between capitalist identity, masculine subjectivity, and forms of gothic narration; the relationship, more specifically, between capitalism and cultural anxieties about cannibalism, and the gendered body as the mediating signifier between cultural systems of meaning.

Henry's two separate endings to the account he labels "Part the First" foreground, in slightly different ways, his re-assumption of a mercantile body/identity stabilized by the commodities properly belonging to it. "At dawn," he writes of his body's return to the British political domain at Fort Niagara,

the Indians were awake, and presently assembled in council, still doubtful as to the fate they were to encounter. I assured them of the most friendly welcome . . . . A few minutes after, I crossed over to the fort; and here I was received by Sir William Johnson, in a manner for which I have ever been gratefully attached to his person, and memory.

Thus was completed my escape, from the sufferings and danger which the capture of Fort Michilimackinac brought upon me; but, the property which I had carried into the upper country was left behind. The reader will therefore be far from attributing to me any idle or unaccountable motive, when he finds me returning to the scene of my misfortunes. (172-74; my emphasis)

In this first description, Henry explicitly foregrounds his narrator-role and uses positive politeness to directly solicit readers' complicity with his over-
arching mercantile narrative trajectory. Apparently unsatisfied, however, with this attempt at an ending, Henry adds another a few pages/weeks later and in greater proximity to the material goods that restore his identity to him.

On our arrival at Michilimackinac, the Otawas of L’Arbre Croche were sent for to the fort. They obeyed the summons, bringing with them some Chipeway chiefs, and peace was concluded with both.

*For myself, having much property due to me at Sainte-Marie’s, I resolved on spending the winter at that place.* I was in part successful; and in the spring I returned to Michilimackinac.

The pause, which I shall make in my narrative might with some propriety have been placed at the conclusion of the preceding chapter; but, it is here that my first series of adventures are brought truly to an end. What remains, belongs to a second enterprize, wholly independent on the preceding. (180; my emphasis)

Return, for Henry, is explicitly a return to the political space of British authority, a re-collection of legitimate material property, and a resumption of mercantile agency. Sedgwick’s description of the final impossibility of restoring the elements dis-integrated by gothic energies (above, 168-69), underscores the fundamentally comic form into which Henry shapes and concludes the famous first part of his narrative.

**Conclusion**

Anticipating Pratt, JanMohamed describes colonialist literature as “an exploration and a representation of a world at the boundaries of ‘civilization,’ a world that has not (yet) been domesticated by European signification or codified in detail by its ideology” (83). The boundaries
JanMohamed describes, and the conditions of coercion, inequality, and conflict that characterize them, are, of course, the focus of Pratt’s investigation of the contact zone. Like contact languages’ evolution in the context of trade, contact zones are indelibly marked by cultural, economic, ideological, and discursive exchange. Precisely, moreover, because the writers who account for this space are caught between the truth-claims of their originating culture and their own experiences of vast de-familiarization, their texts become records of the literal and symbolic slippages that occur as multiple and deeply-held assumptions about exchange-practice are challenged, reversed, ignored, or denied. Textual analysis provides an illuminative re-reading of the interactive, improvisational ways in which speakers enact those differences in language. Alexander Henry’s text, challenged when the subject himself is reclassified from agent of exchange to object of exchange, records, in a simultaneously lucid and deeply fissured form, how narrative categories enable a writing-self to wrest cultural and personal coherence from the profound threat of ultimate bodily ex-change.

Differences in narrative levels reflect the different ‘exchange-values’ that the two parts of Henry’s account — the first the dramatic account of Indian massacre, the second, a steady diurnal report on travel and commodity exchange — would have had in the European cultural and political economy. Strong narrative form, thematic focus on the hero surviving against all odds, and distancing grammatical structures characterize the text’s first part, and function inter-dependently to establish the idiosyncratic narrator-effect on which that part depends. Careful reading of the gothic elements of Henry’s text demonstrates, moreover, how the ambivalences and ambiguities of the contact zone can themselves be recouped for use in the dominant literary and cultural economy.
"Gothic terrors and horrors emanate from readers’ identifications with heroes and heroines," Botting explains; "after escaping the monsters and penetrating the forest, subterranean or narrative labyrinths of the Gothic nightmare, heroines and readers manage to return with an elevated sense of identity to the solid realities of justice, morality and social order" (Botting 7). The stabilizing forms of gothic narrative provide rhetorically for both a profound bodily identification with the narrating-hero repeatedly threatened by annihilation — at the same time that they authoritatively reinscribe unassailable masculine identity and the dubiously rational business of mercantile exchange.

Punter summarizes his analysis of gothic by calling it, ‘paranoiac fiction’ “in which the ‘implicated’ reader is placed in a situation of ambiguity with regard to fears within the text, and in which the attribution of persecution remains uncertain” (Vol. 2, 183). He thus inadvertently echoes Bhabha’s description of institutionalized colonial lies as discursive paranoia, “authorized at the point of its dismemberment” (“Archaic” 138). “Gothic . . .” Punter adds tellingly, particularly in the context of postcolonial analysis, “is intimately to do with the barbaric,” bringing its readers “up against the boundaries of the civilised, who demonstrate to us the relative nature of ethical and behavioural codes” (183-84). Finally, he notes that gothic is characterized by a “wide-ranging concern . . . with the nature of taboo . . . areas of socio-psychological life which offend, which are suppressed, which are generally swept under the carpet in the interests of social and psychological equilibrium” (184). Punter’s lucid politicization of the concept of taboo, moreover, underscores the use-value of gothic narrative forms, particularly in an account that desires to reinscribe, in the space of cultural difference, the values and the narrative categories conducive to European mercantilism. “The central problem,”
Punter suggests, associated with writing in the area of the Gothic brings us back again to this question of taboo. It is the function of ideology to naturalise the presented world, to make its consumers think that the cardinal features of the world they inhabit are natural, eternal, unchangeable. Essential features, for instance, of capitalist ideology are that it presents family, monogamy, heterosexuality, as enduring norms, despite anthropological and psychological evidence to the contrary; that it presents industrial labour as psychologically permissible, despite, again, overwhelming evidence to the contrary; that it offers rights and satisfactions to the individual which prove on investigation to be wholly illusory. (200)

As Henry's text — particularly the much-reproduced adventure comedy of the first part — demonstrates, exploration literature explicitly serves multiple socio-economic, political, and scientific functions in its culture of origin, and simultaneously records the experiences of a self in profound cultural, geographical, and bodily dis-location. Paradoxically strong and fissured narrative form functions rhetorically and ideologically to represent colonial exchange according to dominant versions of history, gender, and ethnography. The narrating-hero, strategically present to, and distant from, the action, exploits received forms of cultural narratives to foreground the alien threat of taboo — cannibalism among the natives — on which the ideological illusions of autonomous masculine mercantile identity and agency depend.
Chapter 6  Conclusion

Introduction

The study of a rhetoric of colonial exchange examines how language is used to represent — and by representing, enacts — exchange and the conditions of exchange in all the various forms that they take in a colonial relationship. At one level, such a rhetoric studies the narrative and discursive selections and combinations — the particular stories of exchange — that realize a colonial text's symbolic actions. Broadly speaking, of course, those symbolic actions are identification and division. Writers of colonial texts specifically solicit readers' identification with their ways of grouping and dividing the world, their ways of selecting representations of reality. Simultaneously, they invite their audiences to share the distance they mark from rival articulations of reality or the terms they wish to leave out of their representations. At another level, a rhetoric of colonial exchange examines the contexts in which social and ideological structures govern who can engage in what kind of symbolic action with what resources and to what ends.

The texts examined in this study are frequently anthologized together, or in some combination, and are made to serve similar functions within Canadian literary studies, namely as examples of a common genre, as historical artefacts, and as cultural paradigms (A. J. M. Smith, Daymond and Monkman, Brown and Bennett, Warkentin, Moyles). There are, of course, good reasons for such groupings: the texts share similarities of context, situation, motivation, and audience, and therefore evidence many similarities in selection from among discursive resources. The process of anthologizing itself, however, often 'frames out' the nuanced differences in situations that provoke writers to make specific and sometimes
unconventional choices from the range of discursive, narrative, and rhetorical resources available to them. Anthologies, by their own generic construction, are not inclined to foreground the differences among texts that might distinguish them ‘out’ of the category for which they were chosen. The thesis throughout is structured to bring out both the features that group Mackenzie’s, Hearne’s, and Henry’s texts together and the features that distinguish them one from another. In this chapter, I examine how differences in contexts result in textual variety, and at key points, I theorize the ideological functions and consequences of the textual patterns I identify.

*The body in crisis*

Despite the range of general similarities that can be traced and speculated for the three explorers under consideration — their origins in the lower middle classes, their personal inclinations for travel and trade, their existence within the general social climate of mercantile expansion — their texts, as the preceding chapters have identified, articulate crucial differences in grammatical, narrative, and rhetorical choices, and crucial differences in effect and in ideological positioning.

Much of the difference, I speculate, is a result of the different writers’ negotiations with bodily crisis. In much the way that whiteness, masculinity, and British/western European ethnicity have typically been bracketed out as meaningful categories of identification, contingency, and contextualization, these writers’ whiteness, their masculinity, and their British origins are defining but unacknowledged features of their discursive selves. In the contact zone, however, all the elements of one’s cultural conditioning potentially require re-negotiation, and perhaps none require more negotiation than those that typically go unrecognized in order
to guarantee positions of power. Unaccustomed to the implications of minority status, the possibility of dissolution within cultural difference, or the decipherable and indecipherable threats to autonomy, forward-motion, and moral and bodily integrity, each of the writers negotiates the contact zone's unfamiliarity in a characteristic way.

I speculate that the writers' different discursive negotiations reflect crucial differences in the specific contact zones in which they find themselves, differences in their personalities and outlooks, and differences in their pragmatic goals, both for the journeys but also for their texts. Their specific and different experiences of bodily and personal threat do not necessitate the choices that they make to focus on particular narrative elements and to represent their journeys in the rhetorical and ideological terms that those choices effect. The particular choices, however, do reflect some sense of how they understand the zones, and their bodily predicaments in the zones, of contact. All three writers, I argue, negotiate the semiotic instability of the contact zone using a characteristic strategy of control. I call Mackenzie's strategy “scheduling,” Hearne’s strategy “improvising,” and Henry’s strategy “scripting.” As I describe below, each of the three strategies presupposes a different and specific relation to, and distance from, the things being controlled.

'Scheduling control'

Although Mackenzie regularly represents himself as experiencing threats to the efficiency of his project (“the project on which my heart was set”), occasional threats to the possibility of its completion, and, apparently much more rarely, direct threats against his person, he maintains throughout a discursive representation of himself ‘making the threats disappear.’ Mackenzie keeps the imperial space of his text pure by heroic
interventions in time. Despite the rare textual fissures that betray the limits of his authoritative representations, his text typically refuses the possibility that his autonomous, masculine body might be implicated in the threats that differences in cultural value and valuation create. Mackenzie, that is, uses strategies of ‘scheduling’ — by which temporal categories ‘place’ things and people in their ‘proper’ sequence and relation to one another — to impose control over the semiotic instabilities, and the possibility of semiotic instabilities, in the zone of contact. Of the three writers, Mackenzie chooses strategies that most effectively create distance between himself and the human and geographic environment through which he moves.

Mackenzie uses representations of time — and a narrative ratio in which time determines the effects of space and agency — to keep his autonomous, masculine, monadic body safe, literally and cognitively, in the space of contact. Mackenzie’s peculiar discursive representations of time are, of course, also crucially implicated in his construction of himself as the narrative’s hero, a conventional cultural inscription of the unassailable male self. Mackenzie’s discursive choices, moreover, typically deflect attention away from the other human beings with whom he shares the journey and the zone of cultural contact, and so powerfully minimize the efficacy of threats in the space that he categorizes and controls.

‘Improvising control’

By dramatic contrast with Mackenzie, Hearne experiences his encounters in the contact zone as a series of unexpected and literal threats to his physical safety and his corporeal survival. Unlike Mackenize, who is positioned to make decisions about the speed, tempo, and direction of his journey, Hearne cannot escape the threats because the threats are a defining
feature of shifting cultural values in the space through which he moves. Hearne’s strategies of ‘improvisation’ effect a kind of minimum control over the semiotic instability he experiences in the zone of contact. Unlike Mackenize’s temporal strategy of ‘scheduling,’ that is, Hearne’s strategies reflect the shifting human and geographical spatial contexts that his presence in the zone obliges him to negotiate. Unlike the distance that Mackenize’s ‘scheduling’ effects, moreover, Hearne’s improvisations reflect and enact the fact that he has almost no distance — in some cases, not even the distance of his discrete physical body — from the context of contact.

Perhaps precisely because he cannot literally affect the nature of the space or the cultural circumstances in which he moves through the space, Hearne represents the space discursively as powerfully determinative of human agency. Because his own agency is so dramatically affected — primarily constrained — by the motives and the attitudes of the other people in the space, Hearne’s representation of his own and others’ agencies reflects the profound vulnerability that he experiences ‘on the ground.’ His improvisations take both local and broader forms, the latter particularly at the point that Matonabbee enters the text. Hearne re-assigns agency, efficacy, and heroic possibilities by projecting them onto Matonabbee. Those projections, however, require further negotiations with his own lack of agency, negotiations that manifest themselves in his improvisational narrative focus on Matonabbee’s wives.

‘Scripting control’

Of the three men, Henry ostensibly faces the greatest bodily threats. Only Henry, of course, is actually taken prisoner by the indigenous people whom he encounters in the peculiar zone that he describes. Only Henry is directly threatened with death, not just on one but on many occasions, most
often because he functions as the representative token, "Englishman."

Importantly, however, Henry produces his account of these experiences fifty years after the events he describes and, allegedly, in an effort to recreate his adventurous youth (Armour 318). Henry recounts events in a narrative style marked, particularly at points of extreme tension, by its use of gothic forms and features. His discursive choices maintain a focus on himself as the agentive narrator and highlight his extended experience of imminent peril, underscored throughout by his reiterated, and culturally evocative, references to the possibility of cannibalism.

Henry uses strategies of 'scripting' to both control the semiotic instability of the contact zone in which he finds himself and to reinforce the possibility of his body's imminent destruction, annihilation, dispersion. Henry 'scripts' into established narrative structures particular roles and conflicts between roles which he then plays out in his text. And although Henry scripts himself into the main role in the drama — thus ostensibly creating proximity with the zone of contact — he also retains the directorial function throughout. That dual role constructs a 'character Henry' intimately proximate with the narrative's events and a 'directorial Henry' fifty years distant in time.

**Discursive choices and control**

Exploration narratives, as I have argued, function as textual *products* of, and as textual *processes enacting*, the multiple exchanges of the contact zone and the semiotic instability that those exchanges initiate. As textual and cultural products and processes, exploration accounts draw on a range of resources to exchange social meaning. Consequently, this study proceeds from a social semiotic perspective that draws its analytical methodology from the resources of grammatical, narrative, rhetorical, and
social-ideological theory. The levels of analysis form a meta-redundant relationship, a relation of relations, such that selections at any one level affect the probabilities of what might be selected elsewhere. Rhetoric, for instance, draws on narrative, which itself draws on discourse. At the same time, however, the "motives" of rhetoric feed into, are themselves draw on by, the requirements of the social-ideological realm. This study's close analyses attest to the usefulness of such a meta-redundant analytical framework, since they demonstrate repeatedly that choices at one level of textual expression directly affect, and are directly affected by, choices at other levels.

As Chapters 3, 4, and 5 have identified, each of the three texts examined demonstrates a discernibly different, and an analytically significant, narrative ratio. All three terms, time, space, and agency play an important role in all three narratives, but in each case, one term emerges "on top." The term that emerges 'on top' forms a ratio with the other terms and becomes the "in terms of" that governs them. The pattern of predominance that results is central to understanding the underlying rhetorical actions and ideological dimensions of colonial exchange as they are represented in that text. Linguistic constructions of time form a pattern of predominance that structure Mackenzie's text's rhetorical and ideological representations of colonial exchange. In Hearne's text, negotiations with the geographical and cultural space of the contact zone structure rhetorical and ideological representations of colonial exchange. And Henry's text relies on culturally sanctioned representations of narrative agency to reinscribe colonial exchange exclusively according to dominant versions of history and ethnography.

Each of the texts examined selects differently from discoursal structures to establish different narrative ratios and to effect rhetorical
identification in particular ways. The terms that dominate in each text are terms that are notable for their preponderance, their prominence, and/or their predominance. Textual features that occur frequently are preponderant. Textual features that occupy initial or final positions (in clauses, sentences, paragraphs, chapters) are prominent. Textual features that occupy the highest end or intensity along a variable scale are predominant. Examining a text’s preponderant, prominent, and/or predominant features helps to mark differences among the texts. In the section that follows, I review the findings of the preceding chapters and particularly examine the differences among the texts, since these differences identify the highly variegated means by which ideology manifests itself through rhetorical, narrative, and discoursal structures.

"Voyages from Montreal"

Mackenzie’s text recounts a heroic narrative of one dominant man’s maximally efficient progress through space. On the surface, Mackenzie’s text appears to be primarily concerned with ‘pure’ space. Textually, however, his discourse reveals a much greater concern, bordering on an obsession, with time. Indeed, as the analyses in Chapter 3 showed, Mackenzie’s precise representations of his use of the commodity time stabilize his monadic, masculine, cultural agency in maximally ‘pure’ cartesian space.

At the grammatical level, markers of time are preponderant, prominent, and predominant. Ideationally, temporal markers occur preponderantly, as circumstantial processes. Because circumstantial markers of time also often occupy grammatically thematic positions in Mackenzie’s text, they are additionally both prominent (they appear first in clauses and sentences) and predominant because they are fundamentally
involved in the basic textual structuring of the material. Time, in Mackenzie’s text, is also thematically, or narratively, predominant: time plays a central role — arguably the central role — in determining the outcome of events, and is typically the primary, and often the only, explanation for why things happen as they do. Time, that is, transforms the meaning of events in Mackenzie’s text. At a narrative level, grammatical markers of time establish narrative rhythm and frame narrative episodes. Because of their framing function, of course, temporal markers also attribute and transform value and valuations.

The temporal frames attribute two main values. First, the temporal frames attribute value to exchange generally and to specific, local instances of exchange. Secondly, the temporal frames attribute value to the persona of the conquering hero. The narrative frames that characterize Mackenzie’s text are premised, rhetorically, on a scene:act ratio in which the scene, defined as time, determines what kinds of actions can occur. That ratio undergirds Mackenzie’s construction of himself as the singular character of the text, a manifestation of cultural hero. Mackenzie’s textual efforts to maintain the efficacy of European exchange dynamics are a powerful effect of the mercantile interests with which he aligns himself ideologically. Those textual efforts not only draw on language in particular ways, but they also have effects far beyond merely reproducing a conceptual equivalence between abstract tempo-spatial linear progress and mercantile success. Interestingly, of course, although Mackenzie appears to have strict control over the narrative frames underlying the dramatistic ratios of his text, his discourse bears faint traces of the necessary misrecoginations that his framing devices require but do not necessarily guarantee.
"A Journey from Prince of Wales's Fort"

In its basic form, Hearne's text tells a story about a European body viscerally threatened by its movement through unknown space. As in Mackenzie's text, the terms that dominate Hearne's text are notable because of their preponderance, their prominence, and their predominance. In specifically grammatical terms, Hearne's text is marked, ideationally, by a sustained, and therefore preponderant, focus on the other people in the space with him. As the comparisons in Chapter 3 and the analysis in Chapter 4 demonstrated, Hearne's text involves many more human beings as participants than does Mackenzie's. Circumstantial markers of space are also both preponderant and prominent in Hearne's text; preponderant, because they occur frequently, and prominent because they frequently take an initial or a final position within clauses and sentences. While Mackenzie constructs the space of the narrative primarily through concept taxonomies, Hearne constructs 'relative space' using circumstantial markers that often pertain to other persons in the space with him. Narratologically, the grammatical difference creates space in Mackenzie's text as pre-given, a function of nouns or 'thing-ness.' By contrast, grammatical space in Hearne's account functions as a narrative feature affecting human action but also affected by human action. As my analysis of the deer-pounding excerpt illustrates, Hearne differentiates the complex human geography of his text by collocating specific participants and processes with specific spaces.

Hearne's narrative is propelled forward by what Ian Reid calls 'narrative substitution,' the altering of the values of the signs. Certainly the shifting values of the sign of Hearne's body fundamentally determine the unsuccessful outcomes of his first and second journeys. The value of the sign 'Matonabbee,' however, makes the narrative of the third journey
possible; Matonabbee takes on the narrative function of hero and symbolically transforms the sign-Hearne into one of his wives. Narratively, of course, as the analysis in Chapter 4 revealed, Matonabbee's actual wives are, in fact, predominant in the text, being the elements or persons most likely to be singled out for commentary, explication, or elaboration.

In rhetorical terms, Hearne typically creates scene:agency ratios in which scene as space is the primary means by which agency is ascribed or disallowed. Hearne's fluctuating discourse i) reflects his covert realization that human action — specifically European human action — has created a space that did not previously exist, and ii) negotiates the liminal zone in which the efficacy of European values vacillates. Hearne's lack of storytelling is reversed and his resonant focus on women's lives significantly inflected in the much-reproduced 'massacre scene.' Hearne's multiply-framed story of massacre depends for its cultural efficacy on received images of iconic, open feminine bodies as the site of cultural and narrative crisis. Ironically, given Hearne's precarious cultural position at this point in his narrative, he recuperates the European use-value of the massacre by re-signing female bodies to inescapably malevolent forces.

"Travels and Adventures in Canada"

As the analysis in Chapter 5 demonstrates, narrative and linguistic constructions of, and negotiations with, agency form a pattern of predominance that structures Henry's rhetorical and ideological self-representations and his representations of colonial exchange in a context marked by cultural difference. Like Mackenzie, Henry prefers to tell a story about European economic practices uncontaminated by alien exchange systems. Like Mackenzie, Henry relies on culturally-sanctioned
heroic narrative forms to tell his version of the story. Unlike Mackenzie, however, who manipulates narrative elements when a simple record of uninterrupted progress through mappable space is impossible, the famous first part of Henry’s text relies almost exclusively on narrative forms and patterns to accommodate a story in which the narrator as agent of exchange is transformed into an object of exchange.

Like Hearne, Henry experiences the contact zone as a place that threatens repeatedly the possibility of physical pain or death. Unlike Hearne, however, Henry does not respond to those threats by re-framing the place of contact as an improvisational zone separate from Euro-British values and dividing practices. Instead, Henry uses narrative form to insist on his story’s coherence, comprehensibility, and reliability. Narrative form specifically creates a reliable narrator around whom the story revolves despite that narrator’s experience of acute threats of bodily exchange. Indeed, Henry’s text specifically exploits representations of narrative agency and perspective to transform literal, bodily danger into a gothic environment in which the hero can be simultaneously threatened with ultimate annihilation and rendered unassailable. Though the narrative structure evidences paradoxes, contradictions, and instabilities, it functions rhetorically and ideologically to recuperate colonial exchange practices according to dominant versions of history and ethnography.

At the grammatical level, preponderant series of enchained clauses i) defer the action of the narrative, and ii) create a deferential narrator distanced from both his narration of events and from the events of his narration. Those initial contradictions of form are complicated at the narrative’s account of the attack on Michilimackinac. At that point, active grammatical structures give way to dramatic pronoun slippages, as the narrator negotiates the transformation of his identity. Semantic,
grammatical, and narrative negotiations of agency in Henry’s text create an agent:agency ratio focused on the narrating persona as a representative of threatened European identity. In rhetorical terms, the text’s simultaneously distant and intimate narrator enables a complex system of identification with the narrator trapped in gothic frames and division from the political and economic realities discursively ‘framed out’ by the text’s narrative choices. Powerfully inflected at the cultural level by Henry’s predominant reinscriptions of the possibility of cannibalism, his text’s story-form is deeply implicated in European systems and structures of colonial cultural and material abuses.

Uncanny remainders

Canada has, arguably, always been a contact zone between indigenous inhabitants and explorers, invaders, colonists, settlers, immigrants, and tourists. In an essay with the same title, Northrop Frye reiterates Earle Birney’s claim that Canada is ‘haunted by a lack of ghosts.’ “There are gods here,” says Frye, “and we have offended them. They are not ghosts: we are the ghosts, Cartesian ghosts caught in the machine that we have assumed nature to be” (“Ghosts” 29). It may be that the naturalized economic terms in which Canadians have been taught to understand ourselves ‘haunt’ histories of Canadian identity and traffic in ‘uncanny commodities’ because they misrecognize, deliberately or otherwise, the multivalent meanings of exchange in the contact zone. Euro-British explorer-traders, prototypes of Anthony Wilden’s “imaginary Canadians,” symbolically misrecognized the violence of the economic system within which they functioned and replicated that violence in their dealings with, and discursive representations of, the space and its inhabitants. Their attempts to represent the early contact zone exclusively in mercantilist
terms and structures, however, leave traces of the waste-products that result when systems clash.

As I have argued throughout, the semiotic instability of the contact zone renders exchange both more multiple and less controlled than would be ideal from a European mercantilist perspective. The narrative frames within which the multiple exchanges are ascribed a value shift in order to accommodate or eliminate the incommensurable elements. Those elements remain, however, in repressed form, as the waste-products of the exchanges deemed legitimate. When the repressed elements reappear, they do so in much the way of Freud’s ‘uncanny,’ “in reality nothing new or alien, but something which is familiar and old-established in the mind and which has become alienated from it only through the process of repression” (Freud 241). The uncanny, that is, is frightening not because it is unfamiliar, but because it is the familiar de- and then re-contextualized by processes of repression.

Terry Eagleton describes the commodity as — like the uncanny — a deeply paradoxical concept, schizoid and self-contradictory. I combine the terms to refer to the ‘waste products’ of colonial encounter as uncanny commodities. In pre-repressed form, the waste-products appear in the texts according to their commodity-value in the operative exchange-economy; repression of the waste-products has a particular commodity-value within the textual economy in which it occurs; and the waste-product’s invisibility itself has had commodity-value both in subsequent reinscriptions of the particular texts and, more generally, in representations of the genre within the Canadian literary canon.

Mackenzie’s description of his unexpected encounter with the brother of one of his absent guides acknowledges many more exchanges than merely material exchanges, though even material exchanges are never, of
course, *just* material exchanges. That description also records the brother’s extraordinary offer, to believe Mackenzie’s explanation for the guide’s absence *in exchange for some beads*. Mackenzie emphasizes the offer’s singularity by calling textual attention not to the offer’s outrageousness but to his own refusal to barter in the proposed terms, and, additionally, to his presentation of the guide’s possessions to his brother. In Mackenzie’s representation of events, the guide’s brother is given exactly and only those material goods that he is ‘owed.’ In Homi Bhabha’s terms, Mackenzie resists the hybridity of the space by constantly reasserting discursive control over the exchanges that happen and the way that exchanges happen. Mackenzie’s unexpected encounter provides a brief glimpse, however, of the way his text is haunted — despite its apparently unrippled, objective surface — by the repression of these guides. Mackenzie’s efficient recuperation of the brother’s ‘sly’ challenge in the mercantilist terms of European economic exchange betrays the value that repressing cultural complexity has in the text’s economy. The subsequent invisibility of the guides, like the narrative’s ‘flattening’ of ethnography generally, is powerfully useful in the reception history that canonizes Mackenzie’s text and its author as a singular, autonomous, authoritative hero who, in Daniells’s resonant words, “never lost a man, or forfeited a loyalty or harmed an Indian” (“Relevance” 22).

Hearne’s reinstallation of iconic, open, vulnerable female bodies in his text’s infamous ‘massacre scene’ functions with powerful irony. Hearne’s story up to that point has consistently ‘framed out’ the fact that women’s bodies’ labour has literally and symbolically protected him on his journey to the Coppermine. If Mackenzie’s recalcitrant indigenous guides remain to trouble his journey and its representation, Hearne, by skirting discursively the fact that women’s labour in the gender-exchange economy
secures his existence in the space, renders those women the ‘uncanny commodities’ of his text. Hearne’s lack of cultural agency in the space repositions his perspective to align with that of his hero, Matonabbee; from that narrative perspective, dominant masculine illusions of economic value typically degrade women’s labour. Hearne’s selective representation of gendered exchange in the space thus simultaneously bolsters ‘naturalized’ narratives of exploitative economies and garners for him the sign of sympathetic and observant cultural recorder of women’s lives (Warkentin, *Exploration* 111).

Henry’s text’s overt obsession with cannibalism, especially mediated as it is by forms and structures of gothic narration, buries alive its own uncanny commodity. Mackenzie needs, and discursively erases his need for, the indigenous guides who appear in, and disappear from, his text exclusively as commodity-exchange tokens. Hearne’s existence in the literally threatening space of contact is enabled, literally and metaphorically, by the women’s labour that he denigrates in the dominant terms of the space. By contrast, in great part because Henry relies differently on culturally efficacious narrative forms, Henry’s autonomous male body becomes the uncanny commodity of his discursive journey. Dramatic visceral threats are both a requirement of the overwhelmingly malevolent gothic story that Henry tells and a culturally sanctioned way in which he can represent the possibility of annihilation of the autonomous white male body.

“[D]espite his reverses,” David Armour muses, in a sentimental reinscription of Wawatam’s family’s approval of Henry’s appearance in Chipeway disguise (Henry 112), “[Henry] maintained a secure place in Montreal’s mercantile society . . . . A middle-sized man, easy yet dignified, Henry had been called by the Indians, ‘the handsome Englishman.’ At age
85 he died in Montreal, esteemed by all who knew him” (Armour 318). Henry’s use of narrative, first to create credible, gothic horror and then to erase the possibility of masculine vulnerability and ethnographic complexity, provides an almost perfect test-case of Hodge and Kress’s cautions about the ideological potential and function of narrative form.

Conclusion

As I outline above, different discursive choices in the texts redound through the various levels of meaning-making to create significantly distinct ideological effects. Those different choices also allow us to speculate on the writers’ different motivations. In each of the three texts, narrative forms are selected to enable specific transformations and strategic identifications and divisions. Those narrative forms draw on language in particular ways to effect the desired slippages or transformations. Mackenzie’s textual efforts to maintain the efficacy of European exchange dynamics are a powerful effect of the mercantile interests with which he aligns himself ideologically. Hearne’s rhetorical constructions of a space of exchange fundamentally separate from European values, allow him to adopt the values of that space while simultaneously erasing his absolute dependence on the efficacy of those values in the dominant exchange-economy. Henry’s rhetorical construction of a threatened European identity allows him to solicit reader-identification and simultaneously obscure the economic-political context of his situation in the interests of an audible and efficacious ‘story.’

“All literature is contradictory,” Heather Murray asserts, “Canadian literature is intriguingly and perhaps uniquely so” (“Reading” 81). “[T]hese countering and encountering criticisms,” she adds, of the various forms she proposes from which contradictory readings of Canadian writing
in colonial space might be initiated, "may help us to read [Canadian literature] on its own terms" (81). This study's close examination of the discursive forms and patterns of three canonical texts of Canadian exploration literature discovers in those texts discernibly different forms in which the writers negotiate cultural difference and, sometimes, grievous bodily threat in the space of contact. It reads those texts against their traditional position as documents of nationalist foundations and finds in their accounts of encounter evidence of the 'uncanny commodities' repressed in the interests of dominant textual economies and nationalist reception histories. By describing a rhetoric of colonial exchange and its waste product, 'the uncanny commodity,' the study functions, in Diana Brydon's words, as a locally situated, provisional, and strategic attempt to rethink Canada's colonial history and to imagine forms of analytical resistance to contemporary structures of neo-colonialism.
a) On Monday, 10 June 1793, approximately a month and a half before Mackenzie and his party reached the most westerly point of their second journey, he records:

"We now pushed off the canoe from the bank, and proceeded east half a mile, when a river flowed in from the left, about half as large as that which we were navigating. We continued the same course three quarters of a mile, when we missed two of our fowling pieces, which had been forgotten, and I sent their owners back for them, who were absent on this errand upwards of an hour. We now proceeded north-east by east half a mile, north-east by north three quarters of a mile, when the current slackened: there was a verdant spot on the left, where, from the remains of some Indian timber-work, it appeared, that the natives have frequently encamped. Our next course was east one mile, and we saw a ridge of mountains covered with snow to the south-east. The land on our right was low and marshy for three or four miles, when it rose into a range of heights that extended to the mountains. We proceeded east-south-east a mile and an half, south-east by east one mile, east by south three quarters of a mile, south-east by east one mile, east by south half a mile, north-east by east one mile, south-east half a mile, east-north-east a mile and a quarter, south-south-east half a mile, north-north-east a mile and an half: here a river flowed in from the left, which was about one-fourth part as large as that which received its tributary waters. We then continued east by south half a mile, to the foot of the mountain on the south of the above river. The course now veered short, south-west by west three quarters of a
b) Just one day earlier, on Sunday, 9 June, 1793, he records the following almost complete collapse of narrative space into grammatical time:

"The rain of this morning terminated in an heavy mist at half past five, when we embarked and steered south-east one mile and an half, when it veered north-north-east half a mile, south-east three quarters of a mile, east by south three quarters of a mile, east-south-east a quarter of a mile, south-south-east a quarter of a mile, south-east by east one mile, north-east by east half a mile, south-east by east half a mile, south-east by south three quarters of a mile, south-east three quarters of a mile, east by south half a mile, south-east by east half a mile, east-north-east three quarters of a mile, when it veered to south-south-east half a mile, then back to east (when a blue mountain, clear of snow, appeared a-head) one mile and an half; north-east by east half a mile, east by north one mile, when it veered to south-east half a mile, then on to north-west three quarters of a mile, and back to north-east by east half a mile, south by west a quarter of a mile, north-east by east to north-north-east half a mile, south-south-east a quarter of a mile, and east by north half a mile." (315-16)
Appendix 2

a) Mackenzie 13 to 17 October, 1792

1. We continued our voyage, and I did not find the current so strong in this river as I had been induced to believe, though this, perhaps, was not the period to form a correct notion of that circumstance, as well as of the breadth, the water being very low; so that the stream has not appeared to me to be in any part that I have seen, more than a quarter of a mile wide.

2. The weather was cold and raw, so as to render our progress unpleasant; at the same time we did not relax in our expedition, and, at three on the afternoon of the 17th we arrived at the falls. 3. The river at this place is about four hundred yards broad, and the fall about twenty feet high: the first carrying-place is eight hundred paces in length, and the last, which is about a mile onwards, is something more than two-thirds of that distance. 4. Here we found several fires, from which circumstance we concluded, that the canoes destined for this quarter, which left the fort some days before us, could not be far a-head. 5. The weather continued to be very cold, and the snow that fell during the night was several inches deep. (240-41)

A simple examination of the participants in the discourse effectively illustrates Mackenzie’s textual reinscription of the strictly visual and measurable. “Participants” are defined in systemic linguistics as the animate and inanimate entities involved in the events and the relations of an example of discourse (Halliday 107-09; Stillar 22). In the passage above, textual focus shifts with each sentence, from the current of the river, to the width of the river, to the height of the water, to the temperature, to details about the falls and their location, to the length of the portages, and to
evidence that the preceding party had passed by the place.

Participants in this excerpt include: *We, our voyage, I, the current, I, a correct notion of that circumstance, the breadth, the water, the stream, me, The weather, our progress, we, our expedition, we, the falls, The river, the fall, the first carrying-place, the last [carrying-place], we, several fires, we, the canoes destined for this quarter, the fort, us, The weather, the snow.* Repeated use of the demonstrative pronoun, “this” (“this river”, “this place”, “this quarter”), further emphasizes Mackenzie’s strict focus on his immediate situation.

b) In a corresponding excerpt from Samuel Hearne’s journals, approximately three weeks into his first journey, on 26 November, 1769, Hearne reports on the difficulties he experienced with his first guide. By contrast with Mackenzie’s frequent shifts in limited focus, Hearne’s description of Chawchinahaw’s actions and the consequences of those actions, continues for several pages:

1. By this time I found that Captain Chawchinahaw had not the prosperity of the undertaking at heart; he often painted the difficulties in the worst colours, took every method to dishearten me and my European companions, and several times hinted his desire of our returning back to the factory: but finding I was determined to proceed, he took such methods as he thought would be most likely to answer his end; one of which was, that of not administering toward our support; so that we were a considerable time without any other subsistence, but what our two home-guard (Southern) Indians procured, and the little that I and the two European men could kill; which was very disproportionate to our wants, as
we had to provide for several women and children who were with us.

2. Chawchinahaw finding that this kind of treatment was not likely to complete his design, and that we were not to be starved into compliance, at length influenced several of the best Northern Indians to desert in the night, who took with them several bags of my ammunition, some pieces of iron work, such as hatchets, ice chissels, files, &c., as well as several other useful articles. (64)

A specific examination of participants readily indicates how differently Hearne's account is pitched: *I, Captain Chawchinahaw, the prosperity of the undertaking, he, the difficulties, every method, me, my European companions, his desire, he, such methods, he, his end, one of which [methods], we, any other subsistence, what [subsistence], our two home-guard Indians, the little [game], I, the two European men, which [provision], we, several women and children, who [women and children], us, Chawchinahaw, this kind of treatment, his design, we, several of the best Northern Indians, who [Northern Indians], them [Northern Indians], several bags of my ammunition, some pieces of iron work, hatchets, ice chissels, files, several other useful articles. By contrast with Mackenzie's consistent focus on the tangible elements of the objective world before him, Hearne's account quickly demonstrates a much greater concern with the complexity of human agents and their ability to affect the material success of the journey.*

c) By contrast with the other two, Alexander Henry's journal is not broken down even loosely into a diurnal record and is most likely to range from large, epic sweeps, to detailed accounts of individual incidents. An early account of his actions between August 1760 and January 1761 reveals
Henry's much greater focus on European-centered political events and on the prospect of mercantile activity:

1. It happened, that in this voyage, one of the few fatal accidents, which are remembered to have occurred, in that dangerous part of the river, below Lake Saint-François, called the Rapides des Cédres, befel the British army. 2. Several boats, loaded with provisions and military stores, were lost, together with upward of a hundred men. 3. I had three boats, loaded with merchandize, all of which were lost; and I saved my life, only by gaining the bottom of one of my boats, which lay among the rocky shelves, and on which I continued for some hours, and until I was kindly taken off, by one of the general's aides-de-camp.

4. The surrender of Montréal, and, with it, the surrender of all Canada, followed that of Fort de Levi, at only the short interval of three days; and, proposing to avail myself of the new market, which was thus thrown open to British adventure, I hastened to Albany, where my commercial connections were, and where I procured a quantity of goods, with which I set out, intending to carry them to Montréal. 5. For this, however, the winter was too near approached; I was able only to return to Fort de Levi, to which the conquerors had now given the name of Fort William-Augustus, and where I remained until the month of January, in the following year. (2-3)

Participants in the excerpt include: It, one of the few fatal accidents, which [fatal accidents], the British army, Several boats, provisions and military stores, upward of a hundred men, I, three boats, merchandize, all of which [boats], I, my life, the bottom of one of my boats, which [boat], which [boat], I, I, one of the general's aides-de-camp, The surrender of Montréal,
it [the surrender], the surrender of all Canada, that [surrender] of Fort de Levi, myself, the new market, which [new market], British adventure, I, my commercial connections, I, a quantity of goods, which [goods], I, them [goods], this [endeavour], the winter, I, the conquerors, the name of Fort William-Augustus, I.

Comparisons among the three texts illustrate how Mackenzie’s apparently objective focus differs both from Hearne’s regular attention to the effect of the other human beings in the environment and from Henry’s narrative constructions of himself at the centre of action.

**Appendix 3**

On Tuesday, 23 June, 1789, twenty days into his first journey, Mackenzie records his party’s first encounter with native inhabitants, specifically, three lodges of Red-Knife Indians (149). Mackenzie’s extended account the next day describes various levels of material and symbolic exchange, ranging from M. Le Roux’s “purchase” of more than eight packs of skins from these Indians, to the fact that “the English Chief” “got” more than a hundred skins as payment for debts he was owed, “gave” forty of those skins in payment for his own debts, and then “exchanged” (presumably with Mackenzie himself) the rest for “rum and other necessary articles.” Mackenzie notes as a kind of coda that he “added a small quantity of that liquor as an encouraging present to him and his young men.” Mackenzie also reports that despite several “consultations” with the people in question, he could “obtain no information that was material to our expedition,” and that he had engaged a local guide for whom he purchased clothing and a canoe (150).
He also records assembling the Indians to inform them that although he was leaving the next day, (European) people would return to build a fort at the location if sufficient furs were brought in “to make it answer” and if the people “should be found to deserve it.” Although Mackenzie reports no direct speech, he claims that he was assured by the people that they would consider such an event a great encouragement, that they promised to “exert themselves to the utmost to kill beaver, as they would then be certain of getting an adequate value for them,” and that they said that they had hitherto been discouraged from trapping more beaver than was necessary because “the Chepewyans always pillaged them; or, at most, gave little or nothing for the fruits of their labour” (150-51). This relatively extended account demonstrates how exclusively Mackenzie records encounter in mercantilist terms, an ostensibly logical focus, but one which reminds us that the journal’s putative accuracy has a severely limited scope.

Not until a week and a half later, at about seven in the morning on Sunday, 5 July, does the party again encounter inhabitants of the country, whom, according to Mackenzie, they “discovered . . . running about in great apparent confusion.” “We acquired a more effectual influence over them,” he adds, “by the distribution of knives, beads, awls, rings, gartering, fire-steels, flints, and hatchets; so that they became more familiar even than we expected, for we could not keep them out of our tents: though I did not observe that they attempted to purloin anything” (162-63; my emphasis throughout). I emphasize Mackenzie’s use, here, of litotes, a form that often appears in his writing. “Litotes” is a kind of understatement, often ironical, which expresses the affirmative by the negative of its contrary, and works through the reader’s recognition and reversal of its effect (Dupriez 262). In this passage, for instance,
Mackenzie appears to record the natives’ honest dealings, but does so using a form which expresses the strong possibility of the reverse being true.

"The information which they gave respecting the river, had so much of the fabulous, that I shall not detail it," Mackenzie notes as well of these people. He also records for the first time that 'his' Indians were already tired of the voyage and inclined to accept as true the local Indians’ account of river monsters. "It was with no small trouble," he writes, "that they were convinced of the folly of these reasonings; and by my desire, they induced one of those Indians to accompany us, in consideration of a small kettle, an axe, a knife, and some other articles" (164). He makes no mention, however, of the Red-knife Indian guide whom they had engaged a mere twelve days before.

Mackenzie records further that at three in the afternoon, he ordered the canoes to be reloaded. "As we were ready to embark," he reports, "our new recruit was desired to prepare himself for his departure, which he would have declined; but as none of his friends would take his place, we may be said, after the delay of an hour, to have compelled him to embark" (164). Into the textual space of that hour, Mackenzie inserts a 4 1/2 page quasi-ethnographic report (presumably based on only his eight hours of observation) of people he has described earlier as "twenty-five or thirty persons . . . of . . . Slave and Dog-rib Indians" (163), and records embarking at four in the afternoon (169). Before the excerpt for that day ends, Mackenzie observes that the new guide pretended to be very ill in order to be permitted to return. "To prevent his escape," he notes without inflection and in a passive construction, "it became necessary to keep a strict watch over him during the night" (169).

Over the next four days, Mackenzie records nine encounters with local inhabitants; on four of these occasions, the indigenous people abandon
their encampments or evince hostile reactions when they become aware of the exploring party’s approach. On Tuesday the 7th, for instance, Mackenzie reports that his guide persuaded the only man who remained behind, of a group who had fled at his party’s approach, to call back the others, “whom,” he writes, “I reconciled to me on their return with presents of beads, knives, awls, &c., with which they appeared to be greatly delighted. They differed in no respect from those whom we had already seen; nor were they deficient in hospitable attentions; they provided us with fish, which was . . . cheerfully accepted by us” (170). Later that same day, he records finding a group of about thirty-five people, “who gave us an ample quantity of excellent fish.” “We gratified them with a few presents,” he notes, “and continued our voyage” (171). Later yet the same day, at an encampment of twenty-two people, he records: “We obtained hares and partridges from these people, and presented in return such articles as greatly delighted them. They very much regretted that they had no goods or merchandise to exchange with us” (171-72). Mackenzie also reports the presence, at this camp, of a young man he calls a slave, whom he “invited to accompany” them, but who, he says, “took the first opportunity to conceal himself, and we saw him no more” (172). Still later, they encounter a group of seven people, though Mackenzie notes his belief that others were hiding. “We received from them two dozen of hares, and they were about to boil two more, which they also gave us,” he writes, and adds, “We were not ungrateful for their kindness, and left them” (172).

The next day, Wednesday, 8 July, he records putting ashore at two lodges of nine Indians shortly after embarking at two thirty in the morning: “We made them a few trifling presents, but without disembarking” (172). Only a short distance further, he describes
encountering a group of twenty-five people who were leaving their campsite but were persuaded to return: “A small quantity of our usual presents were received by them with the greatest satisfaction” (173). “Here we made an exchange of our guide,” Mackenzie adds tellingly, who had become so troublesome that we were obliged to watch him night and day . . . . The man, however, who had agreed to go in his place soon repented of his engagement, and endeavoured to persuade us that some of his relations further down the river, would readily accompany us, and were much better acquainted with the river than himself. But, as he had informed us ten minutes before that we should see no more of his tribe, we paid very little attention to his remonstrances, and compelled him to embark. (173)

Several hours later, after twelve noon, he records finding a group of eight persons who had been hunting, but notes: “we did not deviate from our course, but left these people with the usual presents, and proceeded on our voyage” (174).

On Thursday, 9th, he records that the guide “deserted” and that “we therefore compelled another of these people, very much against his will, to supply the place of his fugitive countryman” (175). A short time after embarking at half past three in the morning, he describes a particularly hostile response from a group of fifteen people, but indicates that they were “appeased . . . . with beads, awls, &c., and when the women and children returned from the woods, they were gratified with similar articles” (176). Mackenzie also records purchasing several large moose skins, shirts, and “many curious articles, &c.” (177) from these people, and that his party “prevailed on the native, whose language was most intelligible, to accompany us” (178). That afternoon at about four, Mackenzie’s party’s arrival causes, from his perspective, a great uproar
amongst a group of about forty people. "At length we pacified them with the usual presents," he reports, "but they preferred beads to any of the articles that I offered them; particularly such as were of blue colour; and one of them even requested to exchange a knife which I had given him for a small quantity of those ornamental baubles. I purchased of them two shirts for my hunters; and at the same time they presented me with some arrows, and dried fish" (179). "Our guide," he adds, "like his predecessors, now manifested his wish to leave us . . . . Our Indians, however, assured him that we had no fears of any kind . . . . so that he consented to re-embark without giving us any further trouble" (179-80).

Of the Indians among whom his party encamped that evening, Mackenzie writes, employing litotes once again, "These people do not appear to harbour any thievish dispositions; at least we did not perceive that they took, or wanted to take, anything from us by stealth or artifice" (180). Once again, Mackenzie emphasizes the possibility, though not the fact, that the indigenous inhabitants are untrustworthy.

After five days of encountering numerous groups of people every day, Mackenzie suddenly and repeatedly encounters the problem of vacated space. The local inhabitants, his sole source of geographical information about the area, vanish, often just before his party arrives, leaving only traces of their presence. On Saturday, 11th, for instance, Mackenzie describes landing at two locations at which natives had clearly recently camped, and writes, "We expected, throughout the day, to meet with some of the natives. On several of the islands we perceived the print of their feet in the sand, as if they had been there but a few days before" (184). On Sunday, 12th, at four abandoned huts: "we had reason to think that some of the natives had been lately there, as the beach was covered with the track of their feet" (186).
By Tuesday, 14th, Mackenzie records his determination to "take a more particular examination of the islands, in the hope of meeting with parties of the natives, from whom I might be able to obtain some interesting intelligence" (191). On Thursday, 16th, however, he reports: "We now embarked, and steered under sail among the islands, where I hoped to meet with some of the natives, but my expectation was not gratified" (192). Friday, 17th: "We . . . passed four encampments; which appeared to have been very lately inhabited" (193). Saturday, 18th: "[W]e passed several encampments. As the prints of human feet were very fresh in the sand, it would not have been long since the natives had visited the spot" (195). Sunday the 19th offers no close encounters and is, indeed, the occasion on which the current guide deserts. "It rained . . . till eight in the morning," Mackenzie reports, "when we discovered that our conductor had escaped. I was, indeed, surprised at his honesty, as he left the moose-skin which I had given him for a covering, and went off in his shirt, though the weather was very cold. I inquired of the Indians if they had given him any cause of offence" (196). Monday, 20th: "We now passed the river, where we expected to meet some of the natives, but discovered no signs of them" (196-97).

Appendix 4

a) On Tuesday, 28 July, for instance, Mackenzie records: "We landed shortly after where there were two more lodges . . . without any inhabitants. . . . My Indians . . . found several articles which they proposed to take; I therefore gave beads and awls to be left as the purchase of them; but this act of justice they were not able to comprehend, as the people themselves were not present. I took up a net and left a large knife in the
place of it” (213).

b) And on Thursday, 13 August: “The articles which the fugitives had left behind them on the present occasion, were bows, arrows, snares for moose and rein-deer, and for hares . . . . In the place, and as the purchase of them, I left some cloth, some small knives, a file, two fire-steels, a comb, rings, with beads and awls. I also ordered a marten skin to be placed on a proper mould, and a beaver skin to be stretched on a frame, to which I tied a scraper. The Indians were of opinion that all these articles would be lost, as the natives were so much frightened that they would never return. Here we lost six hours.” (226; my emphasis)

c) And this account, Wednesday, 19 June, 1793, from the journal of the second voyage:

“On my return, I found my people indulging their curiosity in examining the bags and baskets which the natives had left behind them. Some of them contained their fishing tackle, such as nets, lines, &c., others of a smaller size were filled with a red earth, with which they paint themselves. In several of the bags there were also sundry articles of which we did not know the use. I prevented my men from taking any of them; and for a few articles of mere curiosity, which I took myself, I left such things in exchange as would be more useful to their owners.” (339; my emphasis)

Appendix 5

Passage 1: “[H]ere we perceived a smell of fire, and in a short time heard people in the woods, as if in a state of great confusion, which was
occasioned, as we afterwards understood, by their discovery of us. At the same time this unexpected circumstance produced some little discomposure among ourselves, as our arms were not in a state of preparation, and we were as yet unable to ascertain the number of the party. I considered, that if they were but few, it would be needless to pursue them . . . and if they were numerous, it would be an act of great imprudence to make the attempt.” (305-06)

Passage 2: “Before we were half over the river . . . two men appeared on a rising ground over against us, brandishing their spears, displaying their bows and arrows, and accompanying their hostile gestures with loud vociferations. My interpreter did not hesitate to assure them, that . . . we were white people, who meditated no injury, but were on the contrary, desirous of demonstrating every mark of kindness and friendship. They . . . actually threatened . . . that they would discharge their arrows at us. This was a decided kind of conduct which I did not expect; at the same time I readily complied with their proposition, and after some time had passed in hearing and answering their questions, they consented to our landing, though not without betraying very evident symptoms of fear and distrust. They . . . laid aside their weapons, and when I stepped forward and took each of them by the hand, one of them, but with a very tremulous action, drew his knife . . . and presented it to me as a mark of his submission to my will and pleasure.” (306)

Passage 3: “It was about three in the afternoon when we landed, and at five the whole party of Indians were assembled. It consisted only of three men, three women, and seven or eight boys and girls. With their scratched legs, bleeding feet, and dishevelled hair, as in the hurry of their flight they had
left their shoes and leggins behind them, they displayed a most wretched appearance: they were consoled, however, with beads, and other trifles, which seemed to please them; they had pemmican also given them to eat, which was not unwelcome, and in our opinion, at least, superior to their own provision, which consisted entirely of dried fish.

When I thought that they were sufficiently composed, I sent for the men to my tent, to gain such information respecting the country as I concluded it was in their power to afford me. (307-08)

Passage 4: “About nine, however, one of them, still remaining at my fire . . . mentioned something about a great river . . . . While my people were making every necessary preparation, I employed myself in writing the following description of the natives around me:

They are low in stature, not exceeding five feet six or seven inches . . . . Their faces are round, with high cheek bones; and their eyes, which are small, are of a dark brown colour; the cartilage of their nose is perforated, but without any ornaments suspended from it; their hair is of a dingy black, hanging loose and in disorder over their shoulders . . . .

Their dress consists of robes made of the skins of the beaver, the ground-hog and the rein-deer . . . . Their garments they tie over the shoulders, and fasten them round the middle . . . . Their leggins are long, and, if they were topped with a waistband, might be called trowsers . . . . The organs of generation they leave uncovered.

The women differ little in their dress, from the men . . . . They are in general of a more lusty make than the other sex, and taller in proportion, but infinitely their inferiors in cleanliness. A black artificial stripe crosses the face beneath the eye, from ear to ear, which I first took for scabs, from the accumulation of dirt on it . . . .
Their arms consist of bows made of cedar, six feet in length . . . . Their arrows are well made, barbed, and pointed with iron, flint, stone, or bone . . . . They have two kinds of spears, but both are double edged, and of well polished iron . . . . They have also spears made of bone. Their knives consist of pieces of iron, shaped and handled by themselves . . . . They have snares made of green skin, which they cut to the size of sturgeon twine, and twist a certain number of them together . . . . Their nets and fishing-lines are made of willow bark and nettles . . . . Their kettles are also made of watape . . . . They have spruce bark in great plenty, with which they make their canoes . . . .

At ten we were ready to embark.” (311-15)

Appendix 6

The very uncourteous behaviour of the Northern Indians then in company, gave me little hopes of receiving assistance from them, any longer than I had wherewithal to reward them for their trouble and expense; for during the whole time I had been with them, not one of them had offered to give me the least morsel of victuals, without asking something in exchange, which, in general, was three times the value of what they could have got for the same articles, had they carried them to the Factory, though several hundred miles distant.

So inconsiderate were those people, that wherever they met me, they always expected that I had a great assortment of goods to relieve their necessities; as if I had brought the Company’s warehouse with me. Some of them wanted guns; all wanted ammunition, iron-work, and tobacco; many were solicitous for medicine; and others pressed me for different articles of clothing: but when they found I had nothing to spare, except a
few nick-nacks and gewgaws, they made no scruple of pronouncing me a
"poor servant, noways like the Governor at the Factory, who, they said,
they never saw, but he gave them something useful." It is scarcely possible
to conceive any people so void of common understanding, as to think that
the sole intent of my undertaking this fatiguing journey, was to carry a
large assortment of useful and heavy implements, to give to all that stood in
need of them; but many of them would ask me for what they wanted with
the same freedom, and apparently with the same hopes of success, as if they
had been at one of the Company's Factories. Others, with an air of more
generosity, offered me furs to trade with at the same standard as at the
Factory; without considering how unlikely it was that I should increase the
enormous weight of my load with articles which could be of no more use
to me in my present situation than they were to themselves.

This unaccountable behaviour of the Indians occasioned much serious
reflection on my part; as it showed plainly how little I had to expect if I
should, by any accident be reduced to the necessity of depending upon them
for support; so that, though I laid me down to rest, sleep was a stranger to
me that night. (92-4)

Appendix 7

1. This method of hunting, if it deserves the name, is sometimes so
successful, that many families subsist by it without having occasion to move
their tents above once or twice during the course of a whole winter; and
when the Spring advances, both the deer and Indians draw out to the
Eastward, on the ground which is entirely barren, or at least what is so
called in those parts, as it neither produces trees or shrubs of any kind, so
that moss and some little grass is all the herbage which is to be found on it.
2. Such an easy way of procuring a comfortable maintenance in the Winter months, (which is by far the worst time of the year), is wonderfully well adapted to the support of the aged and infirm, but is too apt to occasion a habitual indolence in the young and active, who frequently spend a whole Winter in this indolent manner: and as those parts of the country are almost destitute of every animal of the furr kind, it cannot be supposed that those who indulge themselves in this indolent method of procuring food can be masters of any thing for trade; whereas those who do not get their livelihood at so easy a rate, generally procure furr enough during the Winter to purchase a sufficient supply of ammunition, and other European goods, to last them another year. 3. This is nearly the language of the more industrious among them, who, of course are of most importance and value to the Hudson’s Bay Company, as it is from them the furr are procured which compose the greatest part of Churchill trade. 4. But in my opinion, there cannot exist a stronger proof that mankind was not created to enjoy happiness in this world, than the conduct of the miserable beings who inhabit this wretched part of it; as none but the aged and infirm, the women and children, a few of the more indolent and unambitious of them, will submit to remain in the parts where food and clothing are procured in this easy manner, because no animals are produced there whose furr are valuable. 5. And what do the more industrious gain by giving themselves all this additional trouble? 6. The real wants of these people are few, and easily supplied; a hatchet, an ice-chissel, a file, and a knife, are all that is required to enable them with a little industry, to procure a comfortable livelihood; and those who endeavour to possess more, are always the most unhappy, and may in fact be said to be only slaves and carriers to the rest whose ambition never leads them to any thing beyond the means of procuring food and clothing. 7. It
is true, the carriers pride themselves much on the respect which is shewn them at the Factory; to obtain which they frequently run great risques of being starved to death in their way thither and back; and all that they can possibly get there for the furrs they procure after a year’s toil, seldom amounts to more than is sufficient to yield a bare subsistence, and a few furrs for the ensuing year’s market; while those whom they call indolent and mean-spirited live generally in a state of plenty, without trouble or risque; and consequently must be the most happy, and, in truth, the most independent also. 8. It must be allowed that they are by far the greatest philosophers, as they never give themselves the trouble to acquire what they can do well enough without. 9. The deer they kill, furnishes them with food, and a variety of warm and comfortable clothing, either with or without the hair, according as the seasons require; and it must be very hard indeed, if they cannot get furrs enough in the course of two or three years, to purchase a hatchet, and such other edge-tools as are necessary for their purpose. 10. Indeed, those who take no concern at all about procuring furrs, have generally an opportunity of providing themselves with all their real wants from their more industrious countrymen, in exchange for provisions, and ready-dressed skins for clothing.

11. It is undoubtedly the duty of every one of the Company’s servants to encourage a spirit of industry among the natives, and to use every means in their power to induce them to procure furrs and other commodities for trade, by assuring them of a ready purchase and good payment for every thing they bring to the Factory: and I can truly say, that this has ever been the grand object of my attention. 12. But I must at the same time confess, that such conduct is by no means for the real benefit of the poor Indians; it being well known that those who have the least intercourse with the Factories, are by far the happiest. 13. As their whole
aim is to procure a comfortable subsistence, they take the most prudent methods to accomplish it; and by always following the lead of the deer, they are seldom exposed to the griping hand of famine, so frequently felt by those who are called the annual traders. 14. It is true, that there are few of the Indians, whose manner of life I have just described, but have once in their lives at least visited the Prince of Wales’s Fort; and the hardships and dangers which most of them experienced on those occasions, have left such a lasting impression on their minds that nothing can induce them to repeat their visits; nor is it, in fact, the interest of the Company that people of this easy turn, and who require only as much iron-work at a time as can be purchased with three or four beaver skins, and that only once in two or three years, should be invited to the Factories; because what they beg and steal while there, is worth, in the way of trade, three times the quantity of furrs which they bring. 15. For this reason, it is much more for the interest of the Company that the annual traders should buy up all those small quantities of furrs, and bring them in their own name, than that a parcel of beggars should be encouraged to come to the Factory with scarcely as many furrs as will pay for the victuals they eat while they are on the plantation.

16. I have often heard it observed, that the Indians who attend the deer-pounds might, in the course of a Winter, collect a vast number of pelts, which would well deserve the attention of those who are called carriers or traders; but it is a truth, though unknown to those speculators, that the deer skins at that season are not only thin as a bladder, but are also full of warbles, which render them of little or no value. 17. Indeed, were they a more marketable commodity than they really are, the remote situation of those pounds from the Company’s Factories, must for ever be an unsurmountable barrier to the Indians bringing any of those skins to
trade. 18. The same observation may be made of all the other Northern Indians, whose chief support, the whole year round, is venison; but the want of heavy draught in Winter, and water-carriage in Summer, will not permit them to bring many deer skins to market, not even those that are in season, and for which there has always been great encouragement given. (122-25)

Appendix 8

1. He attributed all our misfortunes to the misconduct of my guides, and the very plan we pursued, by the desire of the Governor, in not taking any women with us on this journey, was, he said, the principal thing that occasioned all our wants: “for, said he, when all the men are heavy laden, they can neither hunt nor travel to any considerable distance; and in case they meet with success in hunting, who is to carry the produce of their labour? 2. Women,” added he, “were made for labour; one of them can carry, or haul, as much as two men can do. 3. They also pitch our tents, make and mend our clothing, keep us warm at night; and, in fact, there is no such thing as travelling any considerable distance, or for any length of time, in this country, without their assistance. 4. Women,” said he again, “though they do every thing, are maintained at a trifling expence; for as they always stand cook, the very licking of their fingers in scarce times, is sufficient for their subsistence.” 5. This, however odd it may appear, is but too true a description of the situation of women in this country; it is at least so in appearance; for the women always carry the provision, and it is more than probable they help themselves when the men are not present. (101-02; my emphasis)
Appendix 9

1. In a country like this, where a partner in excessive hard labour is the chief motive for the union, and the softer endearments of a conjugal life are only considered as a secondary object, there seems to be great propriety in such a choice; but if all the men were of this way of thinking, what would become of the greater part of the women, who in general are but of low stature, and many of them of a most delicate make, though not of the exactest proportion, or most beautiful mould? 2. Take them in a body, the women are as destitute of real beauty as any nation I ever saw, though there are some few of them, when young, who are tolerable; but the care of a family, added to their constant hard labour, soon make the most beautiful among them look old and wrinkled, even before they are thirty; and several of the more ordinary ones at that age are perfect antidotes to love and gallantry. 3. This, however, does not render them less dear and valuable to their owners, which is a lucky circumstance for those women, and a certain proof that there is no such thing as any rule or standard for beauty . . . 4. Those beauties are greatly heightened, or at least rendered more valuable, when the possessor is capable of dressing all kinds of skins, converting them into the different parts of their clothing, and able to carry eight or ten stone in Summer, or haul a much greater weight in Winter. 5. These, and other similar accomplishments, are all that are sought after, or expected, of a Northern Indian woman. 6. As to their temper, it is of little consequence; for the men have a wonderful facility in making the most stubborn comply with as much alacrity as could possibly be expected from those of the mildest and most obliging turn of mind; so that the only real difference is, the one obeys through fear, and the other complies cheerfully from a willing mind; both knowing that what is commanded must be done.
7. They are, in fact, *all kept at a great distance*, and the rank they hold in the opinion of the men cannot be better expressed or explained, than by observing the *method of treating or serving them at meals*, which would appear *very humiliating, to an European woman*, though *custom makes it sit light on those whose lot it is to bear it*. 8. It is necessary to observe, that when the men kill any large beast, the women are always sent to bring it to the tent: when it is brought there, every operation it undergoes . . . is performed by the women . . . 9. *In times of scarcity it is frequently their lot to be left without a single morsel.* 10. *It is, however, natural to think* they take the liberty of helping themselves in secret; but this must be done with great prudence, as capital embezzlements of provisions in such times are looked on as affairs of real consequence, and frequently *subject them* to a very severe beating. (128-30; my emphasis)

**Appendix 10**

1. During our stay at Clowey we were joined by upward of two hundred Indians from different quarters, most of whom built canoes at this place; but as *I was under the protection of a principal man, no one offered to molest me, nor can I say that they were very clamorous for any thing I had*. 2. This was undoubtedly owing to Matonabbee's informing them of *my true situation; which was, that I had not, by any means, sufficient necessaries for myself*, much less to give away. 3. The few goods which I had with me were intended to be reserved for the Copper and Dogribbed Indians, who never visit the Company's Factories. 4. Tobacco was, however, always given away . . . 5. Gun-powder and shot also were articles commonly asked for by most of the Indians we met; and in general these were dealt round to them with a liberal hand by my guide
Matonabbee. 6. I must, however, do him the justice to acknowledge, that what he distributed was all his own, which he had purchased at the Factory. (135-36)

Appendix 11

It has ever been the custom among those people for the men to wrestle for any woman to whom they are attached; and of course, the strongest party always carries off the prize . . . [A]t any time when the wives of those strong wrestlers are heavy-laden either with furrs or provisions, they make no scruple of tearing any other man's wife from his bosom, and making her bear a part of his luggage. This custom . . . causes a great spirit of emulation among their youth, who are upon all occasions . . . trying their strength and skill in wrestling. This enables them to protect their property, and particularly their wives, from the hands of those powerful ravishers; some of whom make almost a livelihood by taking what they please from the weaker parties, without making them any return. Indeed, it is represented as an act of great generosity, if they condescend to make an unequal exchange; as, in general, abuse and insult are the only return for the loss which is sustained . . . .

I observed that very few of those people were dissatisfied with the wives which had fallen to their lot, for whenever any considerable number of them were in company, scarcely a day passed without some overtures being made for contests of this kind; and it was often very unpleasant to me, to see the object of the contest sitting in pensive silence watching her fate, while her husband and his rival were contending for the prize. I have indeed not only felt pity for those poor wretched victims, but the utmost indignation, when I have seen them won, perhaps, by a man whom they mor-
tally hated. On those occasions their grief and reluctance to follow their new lord has been so great, that the business has often ended in the greatest brutality; for, in the struggle, I have seen the poor girls stripped quite naked, and carried by main force to their new lodgings. At other times it was pleasant enough to see a fine girl led off the field from a husband she disliked, with a tear in one eye and a finger on the other: for custom, or delicacy if you please, has taught them to think it necessary to whimper a little, let the change be ever so much to their inclination. (141-43)

Appendix 12

1. On the same day that Keelshies joined us, an Indian man, who had been some time in our company, insisted on taking one of Matonabbee’s wives from him by force, unless he complied with his demands, which were, that Matonabbee should give him a certain quantity of ammunition, some pieces of iron-work, a kettle, and several other articles; every one of which, Matonabbee was obliged to deliver, or lose the woman; for the other man far excelled him in strength. 2. Matonabbee was more exasperated on this occasion, as the same man had sold him the woman no longer ago than the nineteenth of the preceding April. 3. Having expended all the goods he then possessed, however, he was determined to make another bargain for her; and as she was what may be called a valuable woman in their estimation; that is, one who was not only tolerably personable, but reckoned very skilful in manufacturing the different kinds of leather, skins, and furrs, and at the same time very clever in the performance of every other domestic duty required of the sex in this part of the world; Matonabbee was more unwilling to part with her, especially as he had so lately suffered a loss of the same kind. (145-46)
Appendix 13

a) 1. It is not surprising that a plurality of wives is customary among these people, as it is so well adapted to their situation and manner of life. 2. In my opinion no race of people under the Sun have a greater occasion for such an indulgence. 3. Their annual haunts, in quest of furrs, is so remote from any European settlement, as to render them the greatest travellers in the known world; and as they have neither horse nor water carriage, every good hunter is under the necessity of having several persons to assist in carrying his furrs to the Company’s Fort, as well as carrying back the European goods which he receives in exchange for them. 4. No persons in this country are so proper for this work as the women, because they are inured to carry and haul heavy loads from their childhood, and to do all manner of drudgery . . . 5. Custom makes this way of life sit apparently easy on the generality of the women, and . . . in general, the whole of their wants seem to be comprized in food and clothing. (157-58)

b) Most of the Indians who actually accompanied me the whole way to the Factory had some little ammunition remaining, which enabled them to travel in times of real scarcity better than those whom we left behind; and though we assisted many of them, yet several of their women died for want. It is a melancholy truth, and a disgrace to the little humanity of which those people are possessed, to think, that in times of want the poor women always come off short; and when real distress approaches, many of them are permitted to starve, when the males are amply provided for. (288)
Appendix 14

1. [S]o far were my intreaties from having the wished-for effect, that it was concluded I was actuated by cowardice; and they told me, with great marks of derision, that I was afraid of the Esquimaux. 2. As I knew my personal safety depended in a great measure on the favourable opinion they entertained of me in this respect, I was obliged to change my tone, and replied, that I did not care if they rendered the name and race of the Esquimaux extinct; adding at the same time, that though I was no enemy to the Esquimaux, and did not see the necessity of attacking them without cause, yet if I should find it necessary to do it, for the protection of any one of my company, my own safety out of the question, so far from being afraid of a poor defenceless Esquimaux whom I despised more than feared, nothing should be wanting on my part to protect all who were with me. 3. This declaration was received with great satisfaction; and I never afterwards ventured to interfere with any of their war-plans. 4. Indeed, when I came to consider seriously, I saw evidently that it was the highest folly for an individual like me, and in my situation, to attempt to turn the current of a national prejudice which had subsisted between those two nations from the earliest periods, or at least as long as they had been acquainted with the existence of each other. (149-50)

Appendix 15

By the time the Indians had made themselves thus completely frightful, it was near one o’clock in the morning of the seventeenth; when finding all the Esquimaux quiet in their tents, they rushed forth from their ambuscade, and fell on the poor unsuspecting creatures, unperceived till
close at the very eves of their tents, when they soon began the bloody massacre, while I stood neuter in the rear.

In a few seconds the horrible scene commenced; it was shocking beyond description; the poor unhappy victims were surprised in the midst of their sleep, and had neither time nor power to make any resistance; men, women, and children, in all upward of twenty, ran out of their tents stark naked, and endeavoured to make their escape . . . .

The shrieks and groans of the poor expiring wretches were truly dreadful; and my horror was much increased at seeing a young girl, seemingly about eighteen years of age, killed so near me, that when the first spear was stuck into her side she fell down at my feet, and twisted round my legs, so that it was with difficulty that I could disengage myself from her dying grasps . . . . I solicited very hard for her life; but the murderers made no reply till they had stuck both their spears through her body, and transfixed her to the ground. They then looked me sternly in the face, and began to ridicule me, by asking if I wanted an Esquimaux wife; and paid not the smallest regard to the shrieks and agony of the poor wretch, who was twining round their spears like an eel! Indeed, after receiving much abusive language from them on the occasion, I was at length obliged to desire that they would be more expeditious in dispatching their victim out of her misery . . . . My situation and the terror of my mind at beholding this butchery, cannot easily be conceived, much less described; though I summed up all the fortitude I was master of on the occasion, it was with difficulty that I could refrain from tears; and I am confident that my features must have feelingly expressed how sincerely I was affected at the barbarous scene I then witnessed; even at this hour I cannot reflect on the transactions of that horrid day without shedding tears.

(179-80)
Appendix 16

a) At sunset, on the first day, we reached an Indian encampment, of six lodges and about twenty men. As these people had been very recently employed offensively, against the English, in the French service, I agreed but reluctantly to the proposal of my guide and interpreter, which was nothing less, than that we should pass the night with them. My fears were somewhat lulled by his information, that he was personally acquainted with those who composed the camp, and by his assurances, that no danger was to be apprehended; and being greatly fatigued, I entered one of the lodges, where I presently fell asleep.

Unfortunately, Bodoine had brought, upon his back, a small keg of rum, which, while I slept, he opened, not only for himself, but for the general gratification of his friends; a circumstance, of which I was first made aware, in being awakened, by a kick on the breast, from the foot of one of my hosts, and by a yell, or Indian cry, which immediately succeeded. At the instant of opening my eyes, I saw that my assailant was struggling with one of his companions, who, in conjunction with several women, was endeavouring to restrain his ferocity. Perceiving, however, in the countenance of my enemy, the most determined mischief, I sprung upon my feet, receiving, in so doing, a wound in my hand, from a knife, which had been raised to give a more serious wound. While the rest of my guardians continued their charitable efforts for my protection, an old woman took hold of my arm, and, making signs that I should accompany her, led me out of the lodge, and then gave me to understand, that unless I fled, or could conceal myself, I should certainly be killed.

My guide was absent; and, without his direction, I was at a loss where to go. In all the surrounding lodges, there was the same howling
and violence, as in that from which I had escaped. I was without my snowshoes, and had only so much clothing as I had fortunately left upon me, when I lay down to sleep. It was now one o’clock in the morning, in the month of January, and in a climate of extreme rigour.

I was unable to address a single word, in her own language, to the old woman who had thus befriended me; but, on repeating the name of Bodoine, I soon found that she comprehended my meaning; and, having first pointed to a large tree, behind which, she made signs, that until she could find my guide, I should hide myself, she left me, on this important errand. Meanwhile, I made my way to the tree, and seated myself in the snow. From my retreat, I beheld several Indians, running from one lodge to another, as if to quell the disturbance which prevailed.

The coldness of the atmosphere congealed the blood about my wound, and prevented further bleeding; and the anxious state of my mind rendered me almost insensible to bodily suffering. At the end of half an hour, I heard myself called, by Bodoine, whom, on going to him, I found as much intoxicated, and as much a savage as the Indians themselves; but, he was nevertheless able to fetch my snow-shoes, from the lodge in which I had left them, and to point out to me a beaten path, which presently entered a deep wood, and which he told me I must follow.

After walking about three miles, I heard, at length, the foot-steps of my guide, who had now overtaken me. I thought it most prudent to abstain from all reproof; and we proceeded on our march till sun-rise, when we arrived at a solitary Indian hunting-lodge, built with branches of trees, and of which the only inhabitants were an Indian and his wife. Here, the warmth of a large fire reconciled me to a second experiment on Indian hospitality. The result was very different from that of the one which had preceded it; for, after relieving my thirst with melted snow, and my
hunger with a plentiful meal of venison, of which there was a great
quantity in the lodge, and which was liberally set before me, I resumed my
journey, full of sentiments of gratitude, such as almost obliterated the
recollection of what had befallen me, among the friends of my benefactors.
(4-6)

b) From the first hunting-party which brought me furs, I
experienced some disorderly behaviour; but happily without serious issue.
Having crowded into my house, and demanded rum, which I refused them,
they talked of indulging themselves in a general pillage, and I found myself
abandoned by all my men. Fortunately, I was able to arm myself; and on
my threatening to shoot the first who should lay his hands on anything, the
tumult began to subside, and was presently after at an end. When over, my
men appeared to be truly ashamed of their cowardice, and made promises
never to behave in a similar manner again. (191-92)

Appendix 17

a) Henry, early to mid-September 1761

I was not released from the visits and admonitions of the inhabitants
of the fort, before I received the equivocal intelligence, that the whole band
of Chipeways, from the island of Michilimackinac, was arrived, with the
intention of paying me a visit.

There was, in the fort, one Farley, an interpreter, lately in the
employ of the French commandant. He had married a Chipeway woman,
and was said to possess great influence over the nation to which his wife
belonged. Doubtful, as to the kind of visit which I was about to receive, I
sent for this interpreter, and requested, first, that he would have the
kindness to be present at the interview, and, secondly, that he would inform me of the intentions of the band. . . . He thought that there might be danger, the Indians having protested that they would not suffer an Englishman to remain in their part of the country.—This information was far from agreeable; but there was no resource, except in fortitude and patience.

At two o’clock in the afternoon, the Chipeways came to my house, about sixty in number, and headed by Mina’va’va’na, their chief. They walked in single file, each with his tomahawk in one hand, and scalping-knife in the other. Their bodies were naked, from the waist upward; except in a few examples, where blankets were thrown loosely over the shoulders. Their faces were painted with charcoal, worked up with grease; their bodies, with white clay, in patterns of various fancies. Some had feathers thrust through their noses, and their heads decorated with the same. —It is unnecessary to dwell on the sensations with which I beheld the approach of this uncouth, if not frightful assemblage.

The chief entered first; and the rest followed, with out noise. On receiving a sign from the former, the latter seated themselves on the floor. Minavavana appeared to be about fifty years of age. He was six feet in height, and had, in his countenance, an indescribable mixture of good and evil. —Looking steadfastly at me, where I sat in ceremony, with an interpreter on either hand, and several Canadians behind me, he entered at the same time into conversation with Campion, inquiring how long it was since I left Montréal, and observing, that the English, as it would seem, were brave men, and not afraid of death, since they dared to come, as I had done, fearlessly among their enemies.

The Indians now gravely smoked their pipes, while I inwardly endured the tortures of suspense. (41-3)
b) *Mackenzie 17 July 1793*

My men were anxious to stop for the night . . . but as the anxiety of my mind impelled me forwards, they continued to follow me; till I found myself at the edge of the woods; and . . . I proceeded, feeling rather than seeing my way, till I arrived at a house, and soon discovered several fires, in small huts, with people busily employed in cooking their fish. I walked into one of them without the least ceremony, threw down my burden, and, after shaking hands with some of the people, sat down upon it. They received me without the least appearance of surprize, but soon made signs for me to go up to the large house, which was erected, on upright posts, at some distance from the ground . . . by this curious kind of ladder I entered the house at one end; and . . . I was received by several people, sitting upon a very wide board, at the upper end of it. I shook hands with them, and seated myself beside a man, the dignity of whose countenance induced me to give him that preference. (410-11)

This description follows an extended account of the party’s difficult passage through a thickly wooded area which Mackenzie figures as oppressive and actively oppositional. He maintains the sense of opposition by distinguishing his decisive actions from the men’s desire to stop for the night and by thematizing “I.” His account of the aboriginal people focuses on the material details of the way the people live, to the exclusion of the people themselves. Edited here for reasons of length, the passage in its entirety demonstrates a characteristic focus on counting, and accounting for, things.
Appendix 18

1. In the year 1760, when the British arms, under General Amherst, were employed in the reduction of Canada, I accompanied the expedition, which subsequently to the surrender of Quebec, descended from Oswego, on Lake Ontario, against Fort de Levi, one of the upper posts situate on an island, which lies on the south side of the great river, Saint-Lawrence, at a short distance below the mouth of the Oswegatchie. 2. Fort de Levi surrendered on the 21st day of August, seven days after the commencement of the siege; and General Amherst continued his voyage down the stream, carrying his forces against Montréal.

3. It happened, that in this voyage, one of the few fatal accidents, which are remembered to have occurred, in that dangerous part of the river, below Lake Saint-François, called the Rapides des Cédres, befel the British army. 4. Several boats, loaded with provisions and military stores, were lost, together with upward of a hundred men. 5. I had three boats, loaded with merchandize, all of which were lost; and I saved my life, only by gaining the bottom of one of my boats, which lay among the rocky shelves, and on which I continued for some hours, and until I was kindly taken off, by one of the general’s aides-de-camp. (1-3)

Appendix 19

a) The hostility of the Indians was exclusively against the English. Between them, and my Canadian attendants, there appeared the most cordial good will. This circumstance suggested one means of escape, of which, by the advice of my friend, Campion, I resolved to attempt availing myself; and which was, that of putting on the dress, usually worn by such
of the Canadians as pursue the trade into which I had entered, and assimilating myself, as much as I was able, to their appearance and manners. To this end, I laid aside my English clothes, and covered myself only with a cloth, passed about the middle; a shirt, hanging loose; a molton, or blanket coat; and a large, red, milled worsted cap. The next thing was to smear my face and hands with dirt, and grease; and, this done, I took the place of one of my men, and, when Indians approached, used the paddle, with as much skill as I possessed. I had the satisfaction to find, that my disguise enabled me to pass several canoes, without attracting the smallest notice. (34-5)

b) A few days after . . . Menehwehna . . . came to the lodge of my friend; and when the usual ceremony of smoking was finished, he observed that Indians were now daily arriving . . . who would certainly retaliate on any Englishman they found; upon which account, his errand was to advise that I should be dressed like an Indian, an expedient whence I might hope to escape all future insult.

I could not but consent to the proposal, and the chief was so kind as to assist my friend and his family in effecting that very day the desired metamorphosis. My hair was cut off, and my head shaved, with the exception of a spot on the crown, of about twice the diameter of a crown-piece. My face was painted with three or four different colours; some parts of it red, and others black. A shirt was provided for me, painted with vermilion, mixed with grease. A large collar of wampum was put round my neck, and another suspended on my breast. Both my arms were decorated with large bands of silver above the elbow, besides several smaller ones on the wrists; and my legs were covered with mitasses, a kind of hose, made, as is the favorite fashion, of scarlet cloth. Over all, I was to
wear a scarlet blanket or mantle, and on my head a large bunch of feathers. (111-12)

Appendix 20

a) Relieved, as I now imagined myself, from all occasion of anxiety, as to the treatment which I was to experience, from the Indians, I assorted my goods, and hired Canadian interpreters and clerks, in whose care I was to send them into Lake Michigan, and the river Saint-Pière . . . . Everything was ready for their departure, when new dangers sprung up, and threatened to overwhelm me. (47-8)

b) Protected, in a great measure, by this disguise, I felt myself more at liberty than before; and the season being arrived in which my clerks, from the interior, were to be expected, and some part of my property, as I had a right to hope, recovered, I begged the favour of Wawatam, that he would enable me to pay a short visit to Michilimackinac. He did not fail to comply, and I succeeded in finding my clerks; but, either through the disturbed state of the country, as they represented to be the case, or through their misconduct, as I had reason to think, I obtained nothing; — and nothing, or almost nothing, I now began to think, would be all that I should need, during the rest of my life. To fish and to hunt, to collect a few skins, and exchange them for necessaries, was all that I seemed destined to do, and to acquire, for the future. (112-13)
Appendix 21

Several pages/months after the stand-off with the Otawas, "[a]t one o’clock, in the morning of the twenty-second day of December" (65), Henry describes i) his heroic action when a fire raced through the Fort at Sault de Sainte-Marie, where he had been staying since the summer, ii) the necessity of sending the garrison back to Michilimackinac to avert famine, and iii) the perils of travel at that time of the year. "The soldiers embarked," Henry reports in exemplary, narrative-of-crisis, fashion, "and happily reached Michilimackinac on the thirty-first day of the month. On the very next morning, the navigation was wholly closed" (65-6). Several pages later, he records leaving the Sault in a party of seven for Michilimackinac on the twentieth of February and describes the threats of famine that accompanied them (68).

Appendix 22

a) 1. [I]t so happened that I still remained, to finish my letters; promising to follow Mr. Tracey [sic], in the course of a few minutes. 2. Mr. Tracy had not gone more than twenty paces from my door, when I heard an Indian war-cry, and a noise of general confusion.

3. Going instantly to my window, I saw a crowd of Indians, within the fort, furiously cutting down and scalping every Englishman they found.

4. In particular, I witnessed the fate of Lieutenant Jemette.

5. I had, in the room in which I was, a fowling-piece, loaded with swan-shot. 6. This I immediately seized, and held it for a few minutes, waiting to hear the drum beat to arms. 7. In this dreadful interval, I saw several of my countrymen fall, and more than one struggling between the
knees of an Indian, who, holding him in this manner, scalped him, while yet living.

8. At length, disappointed in the hope of seeing resistance made to the enemy, and sensible, of course, that no effort, of my own unassisted arm, could avail against four hundred Indians, I thought only of seeking shelter. 9. Amid the slaughter which was raging, I observed many of the Canadian inhabitants of the fort, calmly looking on, neither opposing the Indians, nor suffering injury; and, from this circumstance, I conceived a hope of finding security in their houses.

10. Between the yard-door of my own house, and that of M. Langlade . . . there was only a low fence, over which I easily climbed. 11. At my entrance, I found the whole family at the windows, gazing at the scene of blood before them. 12. I addressed myself immediately to M. Langlade, begging that he would put me into some place of safety, until the heat of the affair should be over; an act of charity by which he might perhaps preserve me from the general massacre; but, while I uttered my petition, M. Langlade, who had looked for a moment at me, turned again to the window, shrugging his shoulders, and intimating, that he could do nothing for me . . . .

13. This was a moment for despair; but, the next, a Pani woman, a slave of M. Langlade’s, beckoned to me to follow her. 14. She brought me to a door, which she opened, desiring me to enter, and telling me that it led to the garret, where I must go and conceal myself. 15. I joyfully obeyed her directions; and she, having following me up to the garret-door, locked it after me, and with great presence of mind took away the key.

16. This shelter obtained, if shelter I could hope to find it, I was naturally anxious to know what might still be passing without. Through an aperture, which afforded me a view of the area of the fort, I beheld, in
shapes the foulest and most terrible, the ferocious triumphs of barbarian conquerors. 17. The dead were scalped and mangled; the dying were writhing and shrieking, under the unsatiated knife and tomahawk; and, from the bodies of some ripped open, their butchers were drinking the blood, scooped up in the hollow of joined hands, and quaffed amid shouts of rage and victory. 18. I was shaken, not only with horror, but with fear. 19. The sufferings which I witnessed, I seemed on the point of experiencing. 20. No long time elapsed, before every one being destroyed, who could be found, there was a general cry, of ‘All is finished!’ 21. At the same instant, I heard some of the Indians enter the house in which I was. 22. The garret was separated from the room below, only by a layer of single boards, at once the flooring of the one and the ceiling of the other. 23. I could therefore hear every thing that passed; and, the Indians no sooner in, than they inquired, whether or not any Englishman were in the house . . . .

24. The state of my mind will be imagined. 25. Arrived at the door, some delay was occasioned by the absence of the key, and a few moments were thus allowed me, in which to look around for a hiding-place . . . .

26. The door was unlocked, and opening, and the Indians ascending the stairs before I had completely crept into a small opening, which presented itself, at one end of the heap. 27. An instant after, four Indians entered the room, all armed with tomahawks, and all besmeared with blood, upon every part of their bodies.

28. The die appeared to be cast. 29. I could scarcely breathe; but I thought that the throbbing of my heart occasioned a noise loud enough to betray me. 30. The Indians walked in every direction about the garret, and one of them approached me so closely that at a particular moment, had
he put his hand, he must have touched me. 31. *Still, I remained undiscovered; a circumstance to which the dark colour of my clothes, and the corner in which I was must have contributed. 32. In a word, after taking several turns in the room, during want of light, in a room which had no window, and in which they told M. Langlade how many they had killed, and how many scalps they had taken, they returned down stairs, and I, with sensations not to be expressed, heard the door, which was the barrier between me and my fate, locked for the second time.

33. There was a feather-bed on the floor; and, on this, exhausted as I was, by the agitation of my mind, I threw myself down and fell asleep. 34. In this state I remained till the dusk of the evening, when I was awakened by a second opening of the door . . . .

35. As night was now advancing, I continued to lie on the bed, ruminating on my condition, but unable to discover a resource, from which I could hope for life. 36. A flight, to Detroit, had no probable chance of success . . . . 37. To stay where I was, threatened nearly the same issue. 38. As before, fatigue of mind, and not tranquility, suspended my cares, and procured me further sleep. (78-83)

b) 1. The respite which sleep afforded me, during the night, was put an end to by the return of morning. 2. *I was again on the rack of apprehension. 3. At sunrise, I heard the family stirring; and, presently after, Indian voices, informing M. Langlade that they had not found my hapless self among the dead, and that they supposed me to be somewhere concealed . . . .

4. *I now resigned myself to the fate with which I was menaced; and regarding every attempt at concealment as vain, I arose from the bed, and presented myself full in view, to the Indians who were entering the room.
5. They were all in a state of intoxication, and entirely naked, except about the middle. 6. One of them, named Wenniway, whom I had previously known, and who was upward of six feet in height, had his entire face and body covered with charcoal and grease, only that a white spot, of two inches in diameter, encircled either eye. 7. This man walking up to me, seized me, with one hand, by the collar of the coat, while in the other he held a large carving-knife, as if to plunge it into my breast; his eyes, meanwhile, were fixed stedfastly on mine. 8. At length, after some seconds, of the most anxious suspense, he dropped his arm, saying, ‘I won’t kill you!’ 9. —To this he added, that he had been frequently engaged in wars against the English, and had brought away many scalps; that, on a certain occasion, he had lost a brother, whose name was Musinigon, and that I should be called after him. (85-6)

c) Wawatam thanked the assembled chiefs, and taking me by the hand, led me to his lodge, which was at the distance of a few yards only from the prison-lodge. My entrance appeared to give joy to the whole family; food was immediately prepared for me; and I now ate the first hearty meal which I had made since my capture. I found myself one of the family; and but that I had still my fears, as to the other Indians, I felt as happy as the situation could allow.

In the course of the next morning, I was alarmed by a noise in the prison-lodge; and looking through the openings of the lodge in which I was, I saw seven dead bodies of white men dragged forth . . . .

Shortly after, two of the Indians took one of the dead bodies, which they chose as being the fattest, cut off the head, and divided the whole into five parts, one of which was put into each of five kettles, hung over as many fires kindled for this purpose, at the door of the prison-lodge. Soon
after things were so far prepared, a message came to our lodge, with an invitation to Wawatam, to assist at the feast.

After an absence of about half an hour, he returned, bringing in his dish a human hand, and a large piece of flesh. He did not appear to relish the repast, but told me, that it was then, and always had been the custom, among all the Indian nations, when returning from war, or on overcoming their enemies, to make a war-feast, from among the slain. (101-03)

Appendix 23

On going into the cave, of which the entrance was nearly ten feet wide, I found the further end to be rounded in its shape, like that of an oven, but with a further aperture, too small, however, to be explored.

On awaking, I felt myself incommoded by some object, upon which I lay; and, removing it, found it to be a bone. This I supposed to be that of a deer, or some other animal . . . but when day-light visited my chamber, I discovered, with some feelings of horror, that I was lying on nothing less than a heap of human bones and skulls, which covered all the floor!

The day passed without the return of Wawatam, and without food. As night approached, I found myself unable to meet its darkness in the charnel-house, which, nevertheless, I had viewed free from uneasiness during the day. I chose, therefore, an adjacent bush for this night’s lodging, and slept under it as before; but, in the morning, I awoke hungry and dispirited, and almost envying the dry bones, to the view of which I returned. At length, the sound of a foot reached me, and my Indian friend appeared, making many apologies for his long absence.
This point being explained, I mentioned the extraordinary sight that had presented itself, in the cave to which he had commended my slumbers. He had never heard of its existence before; and, upon examining the cave together, we saw reason to believe that it had been anciently filled with human bodies.

Wawatam related to the other Indians the adventure of the bones. All of them expressed surprise at hearing it, and declared that they had never been aware of the contents of this cave before. After visiting it, which they immediately did, almost every one offered a different opinion, as to its history. For myself, I am disposed to believe, that this cave was an ancient receptacle of the bones of prisoners, sacrificed and devoured at war-feasts. I have always observed, that the Indians pay particular attention to the bones of sacrifices, preserving them unbroken, and depositing them in some place kept exclusively for that purpose. (108-10)
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