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Though in the twentieth century the French explorer Pierre-Esprit Radisson (ca. 1640–1710) has taken his place among the important exploration writers of Canada, until 1885 he was rarely conceived of as a writer at all. As a historical figure Radisson had made his mark: there is documentation of his activities in the Jesuit Relations, the letters of Marie de l’Incarnation, in archival repositories in Quebec, the archives of the Hudson’s Bay Company, in the British Library, the Bibliothèque Nationale, the Public Record Office, the Vatican Archives, and even a possible contact account from the Native point of view. Nor is the significance of the explorations of Radisson and his brother-in-law Médard Chouart des Groseilliers in doubt. Early chroniclers like Oldmixon (1708), Ellis (1748), Robson (1752), and La Potherie (1753) were well aware that it was information provided by the two explorers which led to the foundation of the Hudson’s Bay Company and thus changed, in J. B. Brebner’s memorable words, “the course of history for half the North American continent.”

However, two narratives by Radisson of events on Hudson Bay 1682–4 (henceforth for ease of reference termed Voyages V and VI) were known to scholars at least; manuscripts of these have been in the hands of the Hudson’s Bay Company since 1685. In addition, in the British Library there is an undated scribal manuscript of Voyage V in English translation, and Sir Hans Sloane acquired a manuscript in French of Voyage VI which had once belonged to the seventeenth-century French administrator and antiquarian, Nicolas Joseph Foucault (1643–1721). None of these documents is thought to be autograph, and all seem to have been regarded simply as part of the historical record, not as texts with any narrative or literary interest. Though Sir James Hayes, secretary of the Company, told Viscount Preston that Radisson had returned from his 1682 sojourn on the Bay with “materialls for a very Romantique Novelle entertaining enough,” it is not evident that anyone thought he had written more than a mere report.

In 1885 this situation changed very suddenly. An American gentleman
scholar, Gideon Scull, working in the Bodleian Library in the early 1880s on unrelated documents in the Pepys manuscripts located there, recognized that Radisson was the author of a lengthy scribal manuscript included among them. It consists of four narratives or “Voyages” covering not the 1680s, but events of the 1650s (henceforth, Voyages I–IV). It is unclear how this amateur of the history of Englishmen in the American Revolution managed to identify a text so remote from his area of expertise, when there was almost nothing in the printed record to help him. In the first volume (1862) of the *Quarto Catalogues* of the manuscripts in the Bodleian the author had simply been described as “a French settler.” The manuscript had come to the Bodleian in 1755 from Richard Rawlinson, who had rescued a number of Pepysian papers from the waste-pile; the one in question was marked “Pepys Ms.” in an early hand.

Scull published his find in 1885 in a limited edition issued by the Prince Society in Boston, with a simple introduction and sparse notes. It produced an immediate scholarly response. Between the mid-1880s and the 1940s a number of articles and several books about Radisson and his adventures were written, almost all of them by American scholars; there exists even a four act verse drama (1914). In 1943 Grace Lee Nute published her ground-breaking biography of Radisson and Groseilliers, one of the most distinguished works by an American woman historian of her era, and in 1961 Arthur T. Adams re-edited all six voyages, using for the purpose a “modernization” by Loren Kallsen of all the known texts. This is not to say that there has been no interest in Radisson among Canadian scholars. Even as Scull’s edition was being published the Canadian archivist Douglas Brymner was editing a transcription and translation of Voyages V and VI, which appeared as a published report of the Dominion archives. But scholars in Quebec had special problems with Radisson; since the seventeenth century he had been considered a person of unreliable allegiance, switching loyalties from the French king to the English whenever it suited his purpose. Furthermore, if the Bodleian manuscript was to be trusted, he seemed to have written Voyages I–IV not in French, but in English.

The aftermath of American interest in Radisson is evident to anyone who has ever stayed in a Radisson hotel. The early twentieth-century entrepreneurs who founded what is now a chain quickly recognized the explorer’s value as a regional icon, for as Voyage IV testifies, he spent much of the winter of 1659–60 on the south shore of Lake Superior, and as Voyage III seems to suggest, he and his companion Groseilliers supposedly visited the source of the Mississippi. As a result, he is considered one of the founders of the state of Wisconsin. It is to the scholars of Wisconsin and Minnesota in the first half of this century that we owe much of what we know about Radisson – and, as well, too much of what we *think* we know. We are indebted to their otherwise admirable legacy for the picture of Radisson’s narratives – at least the first four – as
“exasperating” or “chaotic.”¹⁵ And to the dean of Radissonists, Grace Lee Nute, we owe the insistence that the Bodleian manuscript is a translation of a French original – and not a very good translation at that.¹⁶

Summarizing several decades of debate, Arthur T. Adams in 1961 wrote that scholarly controversy had “discredited, to a large degree, the work of Radisson. It ... cast a cloud upon his veracity and integrity, relegating his entire chronicle to the realm of doubt, and deprived the cause of history of a most valuable original source.”¹⁷ Adams did not agree with Nute that the text had been translated; the English of the first four narratives he termed “crude and grotesque,” but pointed out that any ordinary translator “would have turned out a better product,” as, for example, was clearly the case with the translation of Voyage V in the British Library.¹⁸ Adams nevertheless made his own contribution to the general confusion; assuming that Radisson’s narratives, however interesting, did not make chronological sense, in his own edition he rearranged two passages in order to conform to the itinerary and time scheme which in his view Radisson was following.¹⁹ Rearranging the elements of a problematic text is a primal editorial sin, never to be indulged in without the most painstaking codicological and philological inquiry. Despite these limitations Adams’ edition is the one from which historians most frequently quote today.

It is only in the past decade, as the result of an upsurge of Radisson scholarship in Canada and abroad, that these long-standing assumptions about Radisson and his text have been challenged. In 1986 the first of the four Bodleian narratives became available in a French translation by Daniel Vaillancourt; there is a complete translation by Berthe Fourchier-Axelsen of all four, along with the two French narratives (1999). Luca Codignola and a descendant of the family, Dr. Jean Radisson, have both found new documentary material on the explorer; M. William Wykoff has shown how much ecological information is revealed in the language of the texts, and Martin Fournier has drawn attention to the combined audacity and introspection of Radisson’s literary voice.²⁰ My own interest stems from the fact that I am both a literary scholar specializing in the seventeenth century, and a textual critic; I am re-editing for publication the already twice-edited narratives of Radisson.

In this essay, I want to return to the problem of Radisson’s manuscripts, which despite the recent upsurge of interest in the explorer has not been resolved, and is at the root of our uncertainty about both the trustworthiness of his narratives and Radisson’s cultural status in general. In an earlier article, “Discovering Radisson: A Renaissance Adventurer Between Two Worlds,”²¹ I looked at the ways the explorer interacted with Native peoples, and suggested some reasons why an adventurous young man might have tried his hand at writing in English. But I merely touched on bibliographical and archival problems which I can address here in a more technical way, and in the light of further information which has recently come to light. If the textual evidence
suggests that the Bodleian manuscript is not a translation, what is suggested by the kind of material evidence with which archivists are engaged? For example, when was it copied out? What can be learned from other manuscripts of Radisson’s writings which casts light not only on the production of the Bodleian manuscript, but on the explorer’s degree of literacy and the extent of his cultural resources? What, indeed, can be learned in the archives about the early scholarly work on Radisson? And when all this is taken into account, how has our view of Radisson’s *Voyages* changed?

The Bodleian manuscript is crucial for our initial understanding of the explorer, because his narratives of *Voyages V and VI*, those of the 1680s, exhibit a different Radisson, if one who is still recognizably the adventurer-entrepreneur of the 1650s and 60s. Though not devoid of his characteristic flair, the fifth, and to a degree the sixth, are relatively straightforward exculpatory accounts which attempt to explain what happened when he landed at Port Nelson in 1682 as the agent of a group operating out of New France organized by the Sieur de la Chesnaye, and what happened in 1684 when he returned as an agent of the English. In genre they are somewhat closer to the legal deposition or the petition than they are to the seventeenth-century exploration narrative. These later documents were occasioned by the tense relations between France and England during the 1680s over the right to trade on Hudson Bay, and it is no surprise that they should exist in several different scribal versions, since the documentation surrounding these very political incidents is rich, and Radisson is frequently at the centre of them. The most recent addition to our knowledge of this episode was made in 1996, when Dr. Jean Radisson discovered in the Royal Archives at Windsor a splendid hand-written copy of Radisson’s two 1680s narratives, prefaced by a previously unknown dedicatory epistle by the explorer framed as a petition to the king in defence of his reputation. I shall return to the Windsor manuscripts later, but it should be pointed out here that if the two 1680s narratives were the only texts we had which could be identified as Radisson’s, we would have a very different view of him: bold, entrepreneurial, self-justifying, yes, but not incoherent or disorganized, and not a linguistic primitive.

It is the final charge, which rests on the ambiguous status of the Bodleian manuscript, that needs to be addressed. As I argued in “Discovering Radisson,” the text of this manuscript is certainly in English: a jaunty, colloquial, frequently ungrammatical English laden with Francophone terms. Just as a sample, let us hear Radisson’s account of the aftermath of a pitched battle with hostile Iroquois, as he and Groseilliers travelled west with a group of Saulteur and Odawa in 1659. Radisson relates that his companions “filled their bellyes with the flesh of their ennemyes.” He goes on,

we bournd our comrades, being their custome to reduce such into ashes being slained in battle. It is an honnour to give them such a burial. Att the brake of day we
cooked what could accomodate us, and flung the rest away. The greatest marke of our victory was that we had 10 heads & foure prisoners, whom we embarqued in hopes to bring them into our countrey, and there to burne them att our owne pleasures for the more satisfaction of our wives. We left that place of masacre with horrid cryes.24

Of the terrible famine explorers and Natives endured during the winter of 1659-60 he writes,

Every one cryes out for hungar; the women become baren, and drie like wood. You men must eate the cord, being you have no more strength to make use of the bow. Children, you must die. ffrench, you called yourselves Gods of the earth, that you should be feared, for your interest; notwithstanding, you shall taste of the bitternesse, and too happy if you escape. Where is the time past? Where is the plentynesse that yee had in all times and countreys? Here comes a new family of these poore people dayly to us, halfe dead, for they have but the skin and boans. How shall we have strength to make a hold in the snowe to lay us downe?25

And his magnificent description of the Feast of the Dead later the same winter presents that event as if it were one of the Renaissance court festivals to which he twice makes reference in Voyage IV.

Between 1885 and 1935 no one doubted that Radisson had written in English, least of all Grace Lee Nute, engaged in the preliminary research for her biography, who in 1932 referred confidently to “Radisson’s quaint, seventeenth-century English, which is made a hundred times more difficult by its Gallicisms,” and concluded:

The influence of the French language is felt on every page. In fact, a knowledge of that language is essential to the proper understanding of what the author is saying. Some of the curious mistakes of students of the manuscript are caused by inadequate or total lack of comprehension of what a Frenchman with an imperfect knowledge of English would have said in a given instance.26

But her correspondence during the period she spent abroad on a Guggenheim scholarship in 1934–35 shows that she was to change her mind. In January 1935 Nute wrote to her sister, “I’m afraid it will shock Mr. Adams and Mr. Goodrich, who swear by the wording of Radisson’s Narrative, to find that it is only a translation. I was able to give Mr. Mood the positive proof of that fact, which he had come to believe from his own researches.”27 Nute was referring not only to her collaborator on an earlier article, Albert C. Goodrich, but to the American historian, Fulmer Mood, who was working in London at the same time.28 It is evident she had been discussing the English of Radisson’s text with her new friend. Had he suggested to her that it was a translation? Whatever the case, she concluded that he was correct when she found an entry in
the Hudson’s Bay Company account books which seemed to confirm their speculations.

The entry in question, found in the accounts of Sir James Hayes, who as secretary to Prince Rupert and later Deputy Governor of the Hudson’s Bay Company was the company’s early administrative brains, shows that on 23 June, 1669, five pounds was “disbursed for translating a Booke of Radisons.” Accordingly, in her 1943 biography Nute reversed her earlier position, and argued that this entry referred to the Bodleian manuscript, and that the date on which Radisson had written his narrative had to be ca. 1668 or very early 1669. The date at which the first four voyages were composed is not at issue, but the date of the Bodleian manuscript itself poses a separate problem. Let us return to the account book entry. To recapitulate briefly what I have argued elsewhere, the word “book” in seventeenth century usage sometimes meant a printed book in a library or offered for sale, but just as frequently it might signify a manuscript paper book, an account book (the very term used for in that document itself), or occasionally even the draft of a legal document. Only sometimes did it mean a “title,” or a “work” as it does for us today; indeed, it is probable that the term “treatise” – even more likely “travels” or “voyages” – would have been used if the writer of the account entry had meant what Nute thought he meant.

A further problem is raised by that five pounds; in a decade when seventeenth century sources suggest that subsistence income per head may have been about seven pounds per year, it seems high. Unhappily, no comprehensive study has yet been made of the costs of copying documents in the period, let alone translating them. Third, and most crucially for my purposes here, there simply is no necessary connection between the entry itself and the narratives in question, no guarantee that the entry in fact refers specifically to the Bodleian manuscript, or even to some pre-existing manuscript from which the Bodleian manuscript might have been copied. Nute, in effect, had no smoking gun; indeed, in my view her judgement may have been influenced by a suggestion by Fulmer Mood, which she was hasty in corroborating. We need to return to the most basic techniques of manuscript research to learn from the Bodleian manuscript itself what material evidence it exhibits of its origin. This Nute attempted, but not exhaustively, and as I turn to what she did not follow up we will find that it tells us a great deal.

The Bodleian manuscript consists of a vellum-bound book of seventy-three folio leaves, paginated in an early (but not seventeenth century) hand, and with a page size approximately 36 cm. x 23.5 cm. The text is written without interruption throughout, but close analysis suggests that it is chiefly in two very similar but distinguishable hands. Hand A appears up to the end of page 116; it is a clear and rather pretty late seventeenth-century script with few italic forms and infrequent use of secretary e or s (Figure One). At page 117, which marks the beginning of a new gathering, a second hand (B) closely resembling
Figure One  Hand A in Oxford: Bodleian ms. Rawlinson A. 329, page 8.

Courtesy of the Bodleian Library, University of Oxford.
but not identical with Hand A takes over (Figure Two); secretary e and s appear more frequently, and descenders are markedly more pointed than the looped descenders of Hand A. In the margin of page 116 the name “Beane” (Richard Beane, one of the company’s clerks) appears in a clumsy, rounded hand which does not appear elsewhere in the manuscript.35 The manuscript is completed in Hand B, except for the last folio (page 123, unpaginated) which contains a list of Native tribal names; this is in a third hand (C) devoid of any secretary characteristics, and in fact quite unlike the other two (Figure Three). On the same page Hand B has added some comments which are crowded in at the bottom. None of these hands can be traced in any of the early minutes and correspondence of the Hudson’s Bay Company, which I have so far inspected up to ca. 1690. Dr. Richard Luckett of Magdalene College, Cambridge, Pepys’s Librarian, has seen a photocopy of several pages and suggests that Hand A bears some resemblance to one that appears in Samuel Pepys’s papers at Magdalene, but is not that of any of his known amanuenses.36 The mise-en-page of the manuscript is consistent enough to suggest that the project was no helter-skelter compilation; many of the pages have ruled margins, for example. But it is also inconsistent enough to suggest that it was not written out by a professional; on pages without ruling the margins wobble somewhat, though not distractingly.

A collation37 of the manuscript reveals that the volume is made of five gatherings, each consisting of between six and nine bifolia; folio 44 is a cancel and folios 61 and 62 are conjugate with two stubs following eight blank leaves at the end of the manuscript. Hand B therefore, taking over at folio 61, commences as I mentioned at the beginning of a gathering. The watermark throughout is consistently the familiar crowned lily of Strasbourg paper making in the mid-seventeenth century, resembling most closely Heawood 1785, which that author dates to about 1670; I have recently seen it in a Petworth account roll of 1661.38 Beta-radiography and other specialized techniques of watermark analysis can distinguish minutely between different versions of such common watermarks, and may eventually tell us precisely what version of the Strasbourg lily we have here, but in the meanwhile something can be learned from the counter-mark which usually appears on the conjugate leaf of a bifolium; Strasbourg lilies have fairly diverse countermarks. In the paper of the Bodleian manuscript this is a cross with the letters IHS and frequently, but not always, the initials LM. The manuscript was written out before binding, rather than being entered in a pre-existing notebook, as is shown by the vertical folds down the centre of the folio pages which the gatherings display; these folds show that, as in the usual practice of the period, a gathering was folded vertically for storage between stints of copying. We can conclude with confidence that in material make-up this manuscript is uniform, having been written consistently, despite changes of scribes late in the process, as a single document on a single stock of paper. In my view, the Bodleian manuscript is a
which long down she finds a wood toward her, and a long
road that goes 3 days, & a day more other way to go right now to
the land. She at last comes across the land, a very great and clear
wood, and which the men could hardly see. The man is dead in the
land and his wife lies at his side. There is no Christian in the
land that has not told of these many virtues. He did not wish
the ship to go through the land, but with everyone of the
land left, they supposed that they would see him. The man said, his
sons to him: "I said to my wife that she should not be so
false to her land, and that everyone of the ship should not be so
careful of his land. I am in such a land in a very slow


Courtesy of the Bodleian Library, University of Oxford.
Figure Three  Hand C in Oxford: Bodleian ms. Rawlinson A. 329, [123].

Courtesy of the Bodleian Library, University of Oxford.
careful copy by a capable but non-professional scribe of a pre-existing manuscript, a copy which he almost finished but which had to be completed by another. The occurrence of Hand C is still mysterious to me; it does not appear to be an example of Radisson’s handwriting, of which more later.

Let us turn now to the material of the manuscript. At seventy-three folio leaves with a page size approximately 36 cm. x 23.5 cm. the volume is not very thick, and is tall in proportion to its width. In 1943 Nute suggested that both binding and watermark resembled those of the manuscripts of the period in the archives of the Hudson’s Bay Company.39 I have inspected the bindings of all the seventeenth century documents in the Company’s archives. These are more varied than one would think, but it is evident that the vellum binding of the Bodleian manuscript bears some resemblance to that of a specific category of Hudson’s Bay Company documents, the so-called “fair” minute books of the 1680s (HBCA, PAM A.1/1-9). Though all of these bindings are roughly alike in style and size,40 in those of 1671-84 the vellum cover is not blind-ruled (that is, with an un-inked line or decoration pressed into the material) around the fore-edges. However, in the case of A.1/8 and /9, covering the minutes of 1684-87, it is blind-ruled in a simple pattern not unlike that on the binding of the Bodleian manuscript. At the same time, the sewing of A.1/8 (of which more below) differs from that of the Bodleian manuscript; the gatherings are not sewn onto cords in the customary manner, but tied directly into the vellum spine with a vertical stitch. Nonetheless, the initial resemblance between the volumes supports Nute’s suspicion that the Bodleian manuscript in some way originated among the officers of the Hudson’s Bay Company. At the same time (which Nute did not notice), it suggests that in date the manuscript may be some years later than had originally been thought.

We can, however, isolate the date of the volume in the Bodleian more closely. I have traced the watermarks through several decades of Hudson’s Bay Company minute books, both the “foul minutes” and the fair copies. The Strasbourg lily, being so common at the time, makes sporadic appearances in various forms and with differing countermarks, but throughout all the paper of A.1/8, the minute book for 1684-85, we find a version of this watermark which to the naked eye is virtually identical with the one in the Bodleian manuscript and bears the same countermark – the cross/IHS – a combination I have not so far found in any other document among these papers. The Bodleian manuscript, I conclude, was written on paper drawn from stock used by the Hudson’s Bay Company some time in 1685 or early 1686, and possibly bound up by the same vellum-binder. This seems to me good evidence for situating the actual copying of the Bodleian manuscript somewhere within the orbit of the Hudson’s Bay Company ca. 1686. And if this is so, it is evident that even if Sir James Hayes’s account-book entry refers to a translation of Radisson’s narratives, it is certainly not a reference to this particular manuscript.
The re-dating of the Bodleian manuscript which I have proposed means that in considering the composition of Radisson's first four narratives, two possibilities exist, one that the immediate predecessor of the Bodleian manuscript could nevertheless have been a translation, the second that the explorer wrote or dictated his first four voyages in his own Francophone English. As I have already pointed out above, the linguistic features of Radisson's English narratives militate strongly against the theory that they are a translation. However, two problems remain unresolved: first, whether the early officers of the Hudson's Bay Company would have needed such a translation, and second, if they had, what would a translation made for their purposes have been like?

The existence of a translation of the later Voyage V suggests that in the midst of the French-English political conflict of the 1680s, some unknown person needed to read that particular narrative in English. However, for at least some of the early officers of the Hudson's Bay Company French does not seem to have posed a problem. As early as 1673 a letter in French from Count Frontenac was copied into the “Letters Outward” (A.6/1, f. 27) and during the 1680s, a number of ambassadorial exchanges were copied into the same volume, including material in French, on one occasion with careful English section-headings (11 November 1682; A.6/1, f. 36 ff). The extant evidence shows that the London Committee (the executive officers of the Company) always corresponded with Radisson in English, and that on 22 May 1685 they specifically required him to keep a careful and detailed journal of events at Port Nelson; unhappily we have only their responses to the reports he sent back, not the originals themselves, so we cannot tell if their request in English was fulfilled in French. But clearly the Committee did not regard Radisson as linguistically hampered, and the evidence of their papers shows that a report in French would not have presented insuperable difficulties.

A further difficulty with the theory that the first four voyages were translated is the idiosyncrasy (not to say incompetence) of the so-called “translation.” Neither in the 1660s nor the 1680s would the London Committee have had difficulty obtaining the services of a competent translator among the notaries used by international traders of the period when engaged in large mercantile transactions; indeed from 1682 onwards the Company was housed in Scriveners’ Hall in Noble Street, where its officers would have been regularly in contact with the scriveners’ close colleagues the notaries. As the modern historians of the notaries point out, “a particular advantage of using a notary was their claim to linguistic skills which would enable them to make copies in languages other than English.” Presumably such a notary could also have made a competent translation from another language into English, but it would certainly have been into the sober English of commerce, not the pungent mélange of the Bodleian manuscript. The argument that the Bodleian manuscript represents a translation is not strengthened by any of these considerations.
In suggesting a new date for the Bodleian manuscript we have arrived at the 1680s when Radisson, following his sudden change of allegiance, found himself at the centre of the conflict between England and France over the right to trade on Hudson Bay, and wrote two further *Voyages* in his own defence. The doubtful case of Nute’s account entry aside, no documented early references to the Bodleian manuscript can be found, and traces of its readership will have to be sought in a minute examination of the archival record of the English fur trade in Canada. In contrast, the political importance of the events of 1682-4 is evident in the extensive paper trail they left, including no fewer than three copies of Radisson’s explanation of his actions; two copies of *Voyage V* in French and one in English translation, and three copies of *Voyage VI* in French (one of these being the recent discovery at Windsor Castle, to which I will turn in a moment). Circulation of the narratives was rapid; in France, Claude Bernou was already making reference to them in a letter of October 1685.44

Like the Bodleian manuscript, the copies of *Voyages V* and *VI* in the Hudson’s Bay Company Archives are regarded as scribal, but in hand and paper they differ greatly from it. As Figure Four shows, the script is quite unlike the familiar cursive with secretarial or occasionally italic letter-forms of English manuscripts of the period.45 A regular late humanist cursive italic, it belongs to a quite different palaeographical tradition from the clerkly scripts of the Company’s minutes and account books.46 The manuscripts of these narratives in French are not drafts, but fair copies, possibly by two hands writing the same set script. In E.1/1 there are a few corrections in what, as evidence from the Clairambault document discussed below would suggest, is Radisson’s own hand. The bindings are not contemporary, and may be as late as the early twentieth century. Though the watermark is again the Strasbourg lily, in *Voyage V* (HBCA, PAM E.1/1) this is a thin, elegant manufacture with an MCMD countermark. (The paper in *Voyage VI* [HBCA, PAM E.1/2] is similar in texture but with very mixed watermarks.) Despite their apparently French provenance, there are two pieces of evidence to connect these manuscripts with early papers of the Hudson’s Bay Company; the first is a blank half-sheet of the same paper as in E.1/1 which at folio 49 is for some unknown reason bound into A.1/8, the “fair” minute book of 1684-5 mentioned earlier as revealing the presence throughout of the paper employed in the Bodleian manuscript. The second is that on September 16, 1685 a sub-committee ordered the secretary to deliver to Sir Edward Dering of the London Committee “the two Journals of M’ Radisons two last Expeditions to Port Nelson & he is ordered to desire S’ James Hayes to deliver up to the Committee, the Originalls of these Journals which are in French, that they may remaine in the Secretaries office.”47 This entry not only points to the two manuscripts still in the possession of the Hudson’s Bay Company (the “Originalls...in French”), but implies that there may have been others, already in English translation, which were sent to Sir Edward Dering. If so, it is probable that the translation
Figure Four  Hudson’s Bay Company Archives (Provincial Archives of Manitoba), E1/1, f. 4d.

Courtesy of the Hudson’s Bay Company Archives, Provincial Archives of Manitoba.
of Voyage V in the British Library (Add. 11626) is one of these, or a copy of it.

In the spring of 1996, Dr. Jean Radisson discovered, in the Royal Library at Windsor Castle, yet another manuscript of Voyages V and VI with a title page describing the volume as “fait a Londre, anno 1685.” Bound in a single volume, it is composed of paper with three different watermarks, in gatherings of varying sizes. The script (Figure Five) is a very formal one, with calligraphic features which definitely suggest that of an accomplished writing master or one of his pupils. The letters most closely resemble those of the example of “Romaine letter” in De Beau Chesne and Baildon’s A booke containing divers sorts of hands. There appear to be two versions of this script in the manuscript, one more polished than the other (perhaps a writing master’s and his pupil’s). Duplicated pages in E.1/1 are corrected, and the idiosyncratic spelling of the HBCA manuscripts has been regularized. It is possible that we will find the scribe of the Hudson’s Bay Company manuscripts at least, and perhaps that of Windsor as well, among the Huguenot community in London, whose book-sellers in the Strand have already been described by Katherine Swift.49

The prefatory epistle to the Windsor manuscripts provides us with the first new Radisson material in a long time. In addressing the king Radisson insists that his activities on the Bay, and his change of allegiance, have been reported very much to his disadvantage, and presents his two narratives to the king “comme mon premier homage de bon et fidele subject.” The manuscript provides us with two important bibliographical facts: the first concerns Radisson’s sense of genre; he thought of the narratives as two separate and distinct “voyages,” a point which helps to legitimize the division into separate voyages of the Bodleian manuscript. Second, the Windsor manuscript gives us a terminus ad quem for the writing of the narratives themselves: Radisson writes as if to the new king, so the manuscripts he presents must have originated early in the reign of James II, the Duke of York who was in every way the patron of the men who founded the Hudson’s Bay Company. Radisson left Paris to return to English allegiance in May 1684, and departed within days for Port Nelson; he arrived back in London from Port Nelson in October 1684; James became king on 6 February 1685 and Radisson left London for the Bay late in May. It is possible that Radisson began composing Voyage V while in still in France; the letter in which Sir James Hayes refers to his “materialls for a very Roman-tique Novelle entertaining enough,” is dated 22 May 1684. Nevertheless, not only the completion but the copying of both narratives – both those now in the HBCA and the princely manuscript at Windsor – must have taken place between October 1684 and May 1685, a fairly short space of time.

The problem of copying apart, could Radisson have composed his two narratives that quickly? How literate was he, in so far as we can tell? Only one book he owned is known, and that is a portolan atlas, now in the Newberry Library. On one occasion Radisson makes reference to other material he has
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Le voyage que j’entrepris étant au service de la France en l’année 1682, pour la traite du cailler en la rivière et port de Néfson, et les choses qui se sont passées entre les officiers de la compagnie royale de la baie de Hudson et moy, pendant le siége que j’y fus jusqu’en l’année 1683, ayant été importées fort désavantageusement pour moy, j’ay cru Sire qu’il estoit de mon devoir de donner une relation véritable de ce voyage, et d’y adjoueter celle de celuy que j’y fis l’année dernièr pour la compagnie de la baie de Hudson, afin de déabouter tous ceux que mes ennemis ont pu prevenir de mechantes impréllions de ma conduite pour la rendre suspecte à votre Majesté par des soufçons et de calomnies contre mon honneur et ma réputation.

Figure Five  The Royal Library, Windsor Castle, Ms. I. I. 6a., page [ii]. First page of dedicatory letter by Radisson to James II.

The Royal Collection© Her Majesty the Queen.
written: near the beginning of his 1682–83 narrative (Voyage V) he states that in his initial interview with the Sieur de la Chesnaye he had given him his “memoires,” but even if we knew what “memoires” precisely meant for him, we cannot be certain whether the statement refers to some version of Voyages I-IV, or to later accounts of his travels between 1669–1682. Our only sample of his handwriting – beyond a number of signatures, the sparse corrections in the HBCA manuscript, and the short passage recording his ownership of the atlas – is a letter of 1 January 1678 which Radisson wrote to Abbé Claude Bernou, reporting on Vice-Admiral d’Estrées’ expedition against the Dutch colonies in the West Indies, in which he participated (Figure Six). This letter, which occupies the recto and verso of two folios in Paris (Bibliothèque Nationale, Ms. Clairambault 1016), was first identified and described as autograph by Grace Lee Nute. Close examination of the manuscript leaves me in no doubt that she was correct, and that the signature and the body of the letter are in the same hand. First, the form of the capital E of “Esprit” is duplicated wherever there is a capital E in the text. As well, the ascender of the d is identical with the d’s of the letter, and the ductus, that characteristic directionality which a hand shows even when a sloped hand is disguised by writing upright, is the same in text and signature. Second there is the substance of the letter, and the situation in which it was written. There is no indication anywhere that Radisson did not write it himself. Indeed, at the end he requests Bernou to have a fair copy of the letter made so that it can be read to Bernou’s noble friends. This is the entirely practical suggestion of a man writing in perhaps difficult physical conditions in a distant place. Furthermore, it reflects the well-known function of such Renaissance and early modern “newsletters,” which were specifically intended for circulation among the friends of the recipient. Third, in the opening there is more than a suggestion of that familiar rhetorical device, the “artifice of affected humility”; here, as he would in his letter to James II, Radisson shows his awareness of differences of rank and what they imply in the way both of honourable service and valued connections.

Such issues draw us away from specifically technical and historical questions towards the cultural and interpretative issues raised by Radisson’s narratives. Up till now, a profound cultural suspicion has surrounded Radisson. Originally this stemmed from the French hostility caused by his nimble change of allegiance in 1683, though as Bernou’s derisive reference to “the two Iroquois” in a letter of 1684 reminds us, it may have been difficult to situate Radisson and Groseilliers in the elaborate social hierarchy maintained by the French court and administration. American scholars of the 1920s in their turn were restless because the narratives did not resemble the cooler scientific and descriptive accounts of eighteenth and nineteenth century explorers, a perspective exacerbated by Nute’s conviction that the Bodleian manuscript was a bad translation of a French original, and Adams’ and Kallsen’s attitude to Radisson’s “chaotic narrative.” The result has been such frustrated assess-
Figure Six  Paris: Bibliothèque Nationale, Clairambault 1016, ff. 376r. Autograph letter by Radisson to Claude Bernou, 1 January 1678.

ments as that of the great scholar of New France, Marcel Trudel, “le texte de Radisson est... un document très difficile à interpréter: expliquer les voyages de Chouart et de Radisson, c'est (sauf sur certains rares points) passer son temps à construire des hypothèses.”

Martin Fournier’s recent short study has presented a much more interesting portrait of Radisson, one which alerts us to his rhetorical flair, psychological complexity, and when we read him attentively, his accuracy in matters of fact. And as I have tried to show here, close study of the material bibliography of the documents lays a more solid foundation for a serious view of the explorer. As those few pages in Ms. Clairambault 1016 indicate, this is clearly not the hand of an imperfectly literate person. It is the hand of an accomplished and practised writer, steady and persistent in form throughout four long, closely written pages, the hand of a man who could not only complete Voyages V and VI at speed, but in good time for two elegant copies to be made of them. In its stance the letter is also that of a wiler courtier rather than the young enthusiast of the first four narratives. The Clairambault manuscript, I would contend, insists not only that we bring to bear on Radisson’s narratives the kind of physical analysis I have conducted here, but also that we consider them as cultural artifacts, signalling to us much that needs to be taken into consideration before we rush to assess Radisson’s significance.

This conclusion is confirmed by the new materials at Windsor, especially the dedicatory epistle to the king. It is possible to argue that Radisson had someone write the epistle for him. Yet but for Nute’s insistence that the Bodleian manuscript embodies a translation of a French original, would we have the same suspicion about the writing of another historical figure? It is unlikely. Arthur Adams did not agree with her view, and Martin Fournier shares with me the belief that the first four narratives were originally in English. Both Fournier and Arthur Adams have considered the possibility that they were dictated, and Fournier has particularly commented on their oral character. Dictation, of course, is a possibility, as medieval and Renaissance administrators and savants often dictated at length to amanuenses. In Radisson’s case not only is there no documentation to suggest that he dictated his first four narratives, there is no need for such a theory if we keep in mind three factors: Radisson’s linguistic versatility, his documented ability to write fluently in French, and the noticeable oral characteristics of many early Canadian exploration narratives which were not dictated, yet in their styles show the influence of orality. Henry Kelsey’s verse narrative of 1690 depends on a “story-telling” motif for its structure, Samuel Hearne’s successive revisions of his account of the Coppermine massacre of 1771 may have taken shape in constant verbal retellings of this traumatic incident, and with the Travels of David Thompson (1840s), we are in the hands of a story-teller renowned among his contemporaries. In contrast, one of the distinguishing features of the Sieur de La Véren-
drye’s courtly letters describing the continental interior in the 1730s is that they are decidedly lacking in oral characteristics.

Radisson’s six “voyages,” as well as the long letter to Bernou and the legal deposition, all share what I would prefer to term a “conversational” style. The history of English literature reminds us that in the period when Radisson was writing the narratives copied into the Bodleian manuscript, English prose was beginning a new evolution precisely on the lines embodied in his text. This was towards the brisk, vivid, personal, repertorial prose of Defoe and Fielding, and of contemporary journalism, which Radisson’s engaging impudence and picaresque stance call so strongly to mind. It is indeed, as Adams observed, the kind of language you learn from consorting with sailors. And it is this personal note, filtering into the language of English prose at every point in Radisson’s century, which both marks the explorer’s connection with his times and makes him one of the most readable of all those who traced the contours of the interior of North America.

It will be clear that from the evidence currently available to me, material, palaeographical, cultural, and literary, I have concluded that the Bodleian manuscript is not a translation. What then is it? My current hypothesis is that it is a copy, made circa 1686, of a pre-existing manuscript, one written out by Radisson in a vivid Francophone English in the late 1660s (though conceivably as late as 1682) but a text possibly unfinished or only partly drafted. The alternative interpretation, that the ur-manuscript itself was a translation, cannot be dismissed, but as we gain a more detailed knowledge of the conditions in which Radisson’s manuscripts were produced, it begins to recede in probability. Furthermore, if a version in French should ever be found, I would be cautious about assuming it is the prior text; the French, who did not generally know English and whose geographers were obsessed with the existence of an inland sea, would have had good reason to translate what Radisson in Voyages I-IV had written in such enthusiastic detail about the interior of North America, which at that point he was one of the very few to have visited.
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