

hoped that future editions of Volume 1, and particularly the forthcoming Volume 2, which will focus on scientific matters, will come equipped with a search tool.

For mountaineers the world over, Volume 1 of *Mount Logan* is essential viewing. General readers will find this CD to be well worth its price as a fascinating source of information on a variety of Arctic topics, and scientists will be particularly interested in acquiring it as the companion disk to the forthcoming Volume 2. The publication of the latter is eagerly awaited.

*Thomas W. Swaddle*  
Department of Chemistry  
University of Calgary  
Calgary, Alberta, Canada  
T2N 1N4

**SEARCHING FOR FRANKLIN: THE LAND ARCTIC SEARCHING EXPEDITION. JAMES ANDERSON'S AND JAMES STEWART'S EXPEDITION VIA THE BACK RIVER, 1855.** Edited by WILLIAM BARR. Hakluyt Society, Third Series, no. 1. London: Hakluyt Society, 1999. xvi + 292 pages, 9 maps, 4 illus., index, bib. Hardbound. £45.00.

During the 1990s, journals about the nineteenth-century expeditions in search of a Northwest Passage or in search of the missing Franklin expedition of 1845 continued to be published, some for the first time. The decade ended with another editorial contribution from William Barr, who had published *Frenchman in Search of Franklin: De Bray's Arctic Journal, 1852–1854* in 1992 and, with Glyndwr Williams, the two-volume *Voyages to Hudson Bay in Search of a Northwest Passage 1741–1747* in 1994 and 1995. This latest volume is an edition of journals by two Hudson's Bay Company men, Chief Factor James Anderson (1800–67) and Chief Trader James Green Stewart (1825–81), who were sent down the Back River in search of Franklin's ships and sailors. It takes Barr back to the continental mainland, territory that he had covered in editing and translating Heinrich Klutschak's account of the search expedition led by Frederick Schwatka, which appeared in 1987 as *Overland to Starvation Cove: With the Inuit in search of Franklin, 1878–1880*. Just as he has proved himself adept as a translator of languages other than English, and in both Arctic and Antarctic expeditions, so Barr has again proved himself an authority on expeditions that remained on the continent rather than in the archipelago. No one has done more to find Franklin textually than William Barr has.

As Barr notes in his preface, versions of Anderson's journal have been published twice before, 60 and 80 years ago. This volume marks the first publication of excerpts of Stewart's journal. Their canoe trip was the Hudson's Bay Company's response to an Admiralty request after Chief Factor Dr. John Rae published news of artefacts found by

Inuit whom Rae met at Pelly Bay in 1854. While inconclusive, the trip confirmed Rae's findings and, as Barr argues, "significantly narrowed the search area for the subsequent, entirely successful search expedition mounted by Captain Francis Leopold McClintock in the steam yacht *Fox* in 1857–9" (xii; repeated p. 257). This view of the 88-day return trip from Fort Resolution justifies this edition. But it is only fair to warn readers that Barr has filled out his volume by scouring archives, and by assembling a history of previous searches, correspondence with Lady Franklin, post-expedition newspaper reports, citations, and accounts, and assessments by later expeditions and others of the Anderson expedition's achievements. Barr decided not to print Stewart's journal in its entirety, opting instead to quote excerpts of it in footnotes where it amplifies or diverges from Anderson's. Other readers might find this editorial decision slightly disappointing, as I did. It is defensible in principle, especially as a certain amount of repetition already arises in the volume because various principals—Lady Franklin, Eden Colville, and Sir George Simpson, for example—repeat information in letters and reports to different correspondents. However, as discussed below, justification for this editorial decision ought to have been offered.

Barr uses a first chapter to set the stage for this effort by Anderson, Stewart, and 14 HBC men. He pays particular attention to Rae's discoveries in the previous year, and he reprints three of the letters Rae delivered upon his return to England. One of these is his letter to the Admiralty, which was printed in *The Times* on 23 October 1854, and in which Rae mentioned the Inuit view that "our wretched countrymen had been driven to the last resource—cannibalism—as a means of prolonging existence" (p. 20). These letters are not new, of course, but the context they provide is welcome. Regrettable, however, is that space was not made to reprint, or at least refer readers to, Rae's two-part reply in *Household Words* to the righteous and errant contribution by its editor—Charles Dickens—to the tide of "intense interest" in England over Rae's observation. It marks a great moment in the annals of Arctic history and, indeed, in the history of English prose, to witness this explorer relieving a novelist of his rhetorical trousers, so to speak (*Household Words* X [23 December 1854]:433–437; [30 December 1854]:457–459). (It is also a credit to Dickens that he had the fortitude to print Rae's reply in his own periodical; of course, as a consequence of printing it, he probably sat back and watched the Christmas and New Year's issues sell like ... well, the Dickens.)

One understanding that the documents assembled by Barr bring into sharp focus is just how quickly the HBC's lines of communication could function in the mid-1850s. Given that the public concern over Rae's charge was sparked in the third week of October 1854, it is truly remarkable that men were already signed up for the expedition and departing Red River on 26 December. In addition, three Iroquois "boutes" (expert bowsmen or steersmen)

made their way from Lachine: in Anderson's view, this was "an excellent idea of Sir George's, as such a thing as a good Canoeman is almost unknown in the North (p. 85). Men from Norway House and Forts Churchill, Simpson, and Carlton were put into service, and all were able to rendezvous at Fort Resolution and leave there together for the east end of Great Slave Lake on 22 June 1855.

At two points (p. 167 and p. 213), Barr discusses the principal disagreement between the two men's accounts, which occurred over the information received from an Inuk woman on the Back River. (Although the HBC tried valiantly to supply the expedition with an interpreter, in the event none was obtained, and, as Anderson lamented repeatedly, the expedition's success was necessarily constrained by that shortcoming. Thus, only the two members of the party who had travelled with Rae, Mustegan and McLellan, had any knowledge of Inuktitut, and that an imperfect one.) In published reports, Stewart claimed that the Inuk woman spoke of seeing alive a person who might have been the last Franklin survivor. Anderson not only did not report such a statement, but also refuted Stewart's claim when he saw it in print. Barr, who is inclined to believe Stewart, first suggests that the disagreement arose because "the expedition was constrained by the lack of a competent interpreter" (p. 167). Later, he cites a different reason, which mitigates (although it does not preclude) the former one: the men's disagreement did not surface until their reports became public owing to "the known strained state of relations between the two leaders" (p. 213). Barr maintains that it is "quite conceivable that at no point during the expedition did they compare notes as to their respective versions of what they understood the Inuit to have told them" (p. 213). Some readers will not regard these two interpretations as mutually exclusive, but they deserve clarification in terms of one another.

As Anderson and Stewart relied geographically, so Barr relies editorially on Back's *Narrative of the Arctic Land Expedition* (1836) for notes about the route down the Back River. However, he has not brought into consideration all the scholarship about Back's trip. Regrettable from my point of view is the absence of reference to David Pelly's book, *Expedition: An Arctic Journey through History on George Back's River* (1981). In it, among other achievements, Pelly reproduced some of Back's sketches and engravings of the route. The inclusion of some of them by Barr would have enriched the experience of reading this informative (but, by virtue of its fragmented structure, at times trying) edition. There is further warrant for such an inclusion: in his journal entry for 11 July, Anderson wrote that he and Stewart "immediately recognized Sussex Lake from Sir G. Back's admirable drawing" (p. 118), that is, the engraving of it in the *Narrative*.

Other additions that would have rendered the edition more reader-friendly include a grace note, that is, the insertion of the month where the date is given at the beginning of each daily entry, and maps that provide some overlap. For several decades, Keith Bigelow has supplied

maps for editions by University of Saskatchewan researchers, and the quality of them is unexceptionable. The problem with the maps here is not their accuracy, legibility, or detail, but, rather, the fact that they do not relate easily one to another. "Great Slave Lake and area," the map on page 110, names only one feature—Back Lake—that recurs on the succeeding map, "The 'Mountain Portage'" (p. 114). Thus, one is left guessing whether any features of the route followed between Great Slave Lake and Back Lake appear on the first map, and, if they do not, what the names of the unnamed features in the same area on that map are. Where is Campbell Lake or Barnston Lake on the map of "Great Slave Lake and area"? Knowing this location would help make sense of the otherwise cryptic third footnote on page 112. This frustration over orientation recurs. A portion of Back Lake appears on the map of Mountain Portage, but no portion of this lake appears on the next map, "Aylmer Lake and the headwaters of the Back River" (p. 117). Meanwhile, of these two maps, only the latter bears latitude and longitude markings. Without any overlap between maps, it is difficult to determine whether the portion of Back River where Malley Rapids occurs has been left unrepresented between the last named feature (Muskox Rapids) on the "Aylmer Lake" map and the first named feature (Beechey Lake) on the next map, the "General map of the expedition's route down the Great Fish (Back) River" (p. 120). In the last pair of maps (p. 127 and p. 132), a similar concern occurs regarding the stretch of river between Escape Rapids and Franklin Lake. Had some overlap been provided, or had both features been named on the "General Map" (p. 120), the problem would not have arisen. The irony in this frustration is that it echoes Anderson and Stewart's difficulty in making sense of the map in Back's *Narrative*, which they said "was useless in the large lakes" (p. 180).

Perhaps most important for reader access, however, is a reliable index, and here Barr's work proves most satisfactory. With such a fragmented assembly of documents, many writers treat the same subject, and the same author speaks frequently about some matters. For example, the water level in Back River was obviously much lower in 1855 than Back had found it in 1834, so it is gratifying to discover a separate entry in the index for just that subject (p. 291). Equally helpful are the cross-references in Barr's footnotes, which direct readers to the place elsewhere in the edition where the document or subject then under discussion appears. Moreover, the care shown in the index is apparent throughout the text: apart from two instances where Simpson's name is incorrectly given for Anderson's (p. 63, n. 2; p. 167), and the incorrect italicization of the titles of unpublished manuscripts, the edition appears to me error-free.

As a bibliographer, I confess disappointment over Barr's decision to introduce Anderson's and Stewart's journals by only the slightest discussion. This disappointment is exacerbated by the fact that one waits for this discussion until page 166, that is, at a point in the text following the presentation of Anderson's narrative. Only then do readers

learn the identity of what they have been reading up to that point. The document identified as HBCA E.37/3, which Barr, following Anderson, refers to as a full journal (p. 166, n.1), turns out to be what I would call Anderson's field notes, written daily during the expedition. In contrast, the document that Barr has referred to in footnotes as the "fair copy of Anderson's journal" (HBCA B.200/a/31), although based on those field notes, was written after the expedition: it shows signs of revision and narrative polish. Barr's use of the term journal to refer to both documents is misleading, as it blurs that important distinction. Furthermore, justification for subordinating Stewart's journal (Provincial Archives of Alberta 74.1/137) to Anderson's is rendered only implicitly: Stewart's is "generally less detailed than" Anderson's (p. 166–167). One is left to infer that the editing accords with the chain of command, Stewart being Anderson's junior. None of these three documents is listed in the bibliography. Welcome, as well, would have been a comparative discussion of, on the one hand, the emphasis that Barr exerts in his editing of Anderson's journal, and, on the other, the emphases placed on that journal by those who edited its two previous published appearances. In the terms Barr deploys, were the two previous editions of the "full journal" or of the "fair copy"?

As Barr notes, James Anderson's recommendations to Lady Franklin even before he left for the Back River specified pretty nearly the terms under which McClintock sailed in the *Fox* in 1857 and unlocked the mystery of the fate of Franklin. Anderson and Stewart's own expedition was the HBC's remarkably swift if modest response to the Admiralty's request that Rae's findings of 1854 be confirmed. It was constrained by a late thaw and bad weather, the lack of an Inuk interpreter, and the fact that the Back River, by necessitating travel in canoes and not some larger craft, precluded the transport of sufficient supplies to permit an overwintering at Chantrey Inlet or King William Island. Anderson and Stewart could have done no more than they managed to do, little though that was. Anderson was right, and Lady Franklin obviously knew it. However, their return trip from Fort Resolution to Simpson Strait in 88 days will likely stand as an unrivalled record in the annals of Arctic canoe travel.

#### REFERENCES

BACK, G. 1836. Narrative of the Arctic Land Expedition to the mouth of the Great Fish River, and along the shores of the Arctic Ocean, in the years 1833, 1834, and 1835. London: John Murray.

BARR, W., ed. and trans. 1987. *Overland to Starvation Cove: With the Inuit in search of Franklin, 1878–1880*, by Heinrich W. Klutschak (Vienna, 1881). Toronto: University of Toronto Press.

BARR, W., and WILLIAMS, G. 1994–95. *Voyages to Hudson Bay in search of a Northwest Passage, 1741–1747*. Vol. 1: The Voyage of Christopher Middleton 1741–1742 (1994); Volume 2: The Voyage of William Moor and Francis Smith 1746–1747 (1995). Second series, No. 177, 181. London: Hakluyt Society.

BRAY, E.F. de. 1992. *A Frenchman in search of Franklin: De Bray's Arctic journal, 1852–1854*. Edited by William Barr. Toronto and Buffalo: University of Toronto Press.

PELLY, D. 1981. *Expedition: An Arctic journey through history on George Back's River*. Toronto: Betelgeuse.

I.S. MacLaren  
Canadian Studies Program  
Department of Political Science  
University of Alberta  
Edmonton, Alberta, Canada  
T6G 2H4

ACROSS THE TOP OF THE WORLD: THE QUEST FOR THE NORTHWEST PASSAGE. By JAMES P. DELGADO. Vancouver and Toronto: Douglas & McIntyre, 1999. ISBN 0-55054-734-8. 228 p., maps, b&w and colour illus., notes, bib., index. Hardbound. Cdn\$45.00.

One might think that, in terms of reader interest and finding new material to present, the topic of the search for the Northwest Passage had been exhausted. Delgado's *Across the Top of the World* proves otherwise.

Chapter 1 provides the setting, with an excellent blend of the natural and cultural elements that make up the Arctic world. The author presents the various Inuit peoples encountered by the first Western explorers who recorded their voyages in search of the elusive Northwest Passage. (Unrecorded Arctic voyages by Norsemen who settled Greenland about 1000 years ago can only be inferred from concentrated finds of Norse artifacts on the east coast of Ellesmere Island and from far more scattered Norse finds in the rest of the Arctic. It is highly unlikely that Norse explorers ever penetrated very far into Lancaster Sound.)

As Delgado points out, it was Christian Europe's search for a new route to spices and other valuable goods in the Orient that led to the earliest known searches for a passage in the northern part of the New World. In chapter 2, the author describes the sixteenth-century voyages of Martin Frobisher and John Davis. Chapter 3 recounts the seventeenth-century voyages of Henry Hudson, Thomas Button, John Ingram, Robert Bylot and William Baffin, Jens Munk, Luke Foxe, and Thomas James, and the mid-eighteenth century voyages of Christopher Middleton and William Moor. In 1668 the Hudson's Bay Company constructed Rupert House and began its commercial domination of the North American fur trade. As the author points out, the Hudson's Bay Company was not interested in searching for the Northwest Passage. Ironically it was a "Bayman," Dr. John Rae, who determined in 1854 that King William Land was an island. Rae also brought back the first Franklin expedition relics, which he had purchased from Inuit who had seen both living and dead members of the expedition.

Of all the seventeenth-century voyages, only the 1616 Bylot and Baffin expedition, in the remarkable ship *Discovery*, pushed northward beyond John Davis's old route.