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The discovery of Canada by Europeans dates as early as AD 1000 with the Norse. Contact between the Old and New worlds continued throughout the medieval and early modern periods—with the Portuguese and the Basques in the fourteenth century, and the British and the Dutch in the fifteenth and sixteenth. Then came the French, first as fishermen and then as settlers, in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. In fact, according to historian Olive Patricia Dickason, by “the turn of the fifteenth century into the sixteenth, the waters of Canada’s North Atlantic coast were the scene of intense international activity.” But if Canada was the setting of an early form of internationalism at the beginning of the sixteenth century, it soon became transformed as the site of intense competition, mainly between two colonial powers: France and England.

Explorer Pierre-Esprit Radisson (1640–1710) played a crucial role in the drama then unfolding in North America, “where New England [is] already outdoing Old England, and New France outmaneuvering Old France.” In particular, Radisson and his brother-in-law, Médard Chouart, Sieur des Groseilliers, navigated their way through uncharted territories in New France. And, just as
deftly, they manoeuvred through colonial bureaucracies to help establish the Hudson’s Bay Company in 1670, a commercial enterprise that secured the British monopoly of the Great Lakes fur trade. In her biography of Radisson and des Groseilliers, Caesars of the Wilderness, Grace Lee Nute wryly praises the two men’s ability to ‘slip nimbly between the Sun King and His Britannic Majesty, between Jesuit camp and Recollect clique, between New England and Old England, between New France and Old France, and between Catholicism and Protestantism, giving merry chase to the wits of monarchs, fur-trading barons, governors, and churchmen’.

As Nute’s observation makes clear, Radisson was highly self-conscious about his identity throughout his life. Finding himself embedded in both New and Old world contexts, he became a social actor who stylized his sense of self accordingly. For example, as one of the first explorers of the Canadian frontier, he represents the prototypical figure of the adventurous voyageur or coureur de bois (runner of the woods). Almost always identified with hypermasculine virility and alienation from dominant society, coureur de bois figures such as Radisson exemplify an early embodiment of the “cultural renegade,” whose “transgression of civilized values, plus his willingness to adapt and/or be adopted into native cultures, inspired both the contempt of his fellow whites and the distrust of French and British colonial authorities.” In many ways, the coureur de bois was situated in a different sociocultural milieu from his fellow habitants— another new social type who in part composed the metropolitan class of paysan français in the formative French colonial settlement.

Considering his pivotal role in establishing the Hudson’s Bay Company, I would suggest that Radisson represents a hybrid version of these two New World social types, both of whom “had many traits in common: freedom and independence might be regarded as the leitmotif characterizing their actions and their self-image.” Moreover, in the context of the Old World, Radisson was equally successful in negotiating his position within the emergent public sphere. He was consistently adept in “cultivating over several decades the patronage networks, courtly and mercantile, English and French, which a man needed in this period to keep his head above water in public life.”

To the extent that the “Frenchman” Radisson succeeded in founding a British trading company, he was able to do so because of his ability to perform the various roles available to him in both Europe and the Americas. In addition to hybridizing his professional identity, Radisson also performed a similarly complex hybridization of his national, racial, and ethnic identities during his lifetime. Though he was born a French subject, by the time of his death he had been naturalized as a British one. For him, then, the performing of professional and national identities were mutually constitutive acts. As Michael Warner notes, what remains remarkable about Radisson is that he was “at various times in his life French, Indian, and English.”

His multiple and shifting subject positions articulate and make more intelligible for us the processes of identity constitution during the early modern period, when “national belonging was more about loyalty to a sovereign than about the birthright of a shared identity with a national people, and his hybrid sense of self may have been typical of many Europeans in the seventeenth-century Atlantic.” Paradoxically, Radisson was at once a unique individual and typically representative
of his time. Why, then, does he occupy such an undervalued position in Canadian history, and, more generally, in the history of the early modern transatlantic world? Given that the story of his life has so much to teach us about identity formations and re-formations in the seventeenth century, why has he suffered the fate of becoming a "coureur de bois manqué" in our current cultural imagination?13

Germaine Warkentin, currently the pre-eminent English-language scholar engaged in sustained research on Radisson, provides some answers to these questions. She points out that, even though his "name still produces [today] fused impressions of valour, bravado, and entrepreneurship to glamorize the mining enterprises, hotels, and venture-capital firms that display it," Radisson "always seems to be the centre of someone else's narrative—the historical anecdote, the television series, the children's book—rather than a narrator himself. This is probably because so few of us are aware that he was the first and best teller of his own story"—namely, in his Voyages.14 And even those who are aware of this fact have ostensibly displaced the centrality of both the man and his text for the purpose of narrating the larger story of Canada's past.

A cursory glance at earlier scholarship in literary history and Canadian historiography reveals two methodological tendencies: first, a devaluation of Radisson as a figure worth pursuing; and, second, a politically motivated commitment to imagine Canada originally as either a distinctly anglophone or distinctly francophone community. William John Karr, for example, notes in his history of Canada that "Radisson deserves to be remembered in Canadian history for two reasons: first, because he is a type of the restless, roving trader who did so much to unravel the mysteries of the vast interior of Canada; and second, because he is responsible, Frenchman though he was, for the establishment in Canada of a great English institution, the Hudson's Bay Company."15 Karr purposely neglects to consider the evidence that documents Radisson’s naturalization as a British subject in 1687, twenty-three years prior to his death in 1710. He instead insists on viewing Radisson as a distasteful "Frenchman" whose only claim to glory is in securing the British control of the fur trade during the late seventeenth century. Karr’s patronizing tone recirculates the anglocentric rhetoric once used by the British in referring to Radisson and des Groseilliers, as "Mr. Radishes" and "Mr. Gooseberry," even as the two men were engaged in their expeditions for the British.16

While Karr is suspicious of Radisson’s political affiliations, literary historian Victor G. Hopwood similarly finds fault with Radisson’s Voyages for being a non-historical literary document. Noting that because Radisson’s "first two voyages dealt with his adventures as a youth in the wilds of North America," Hopwood maintains that they are thus "not as important historically as the third and fourth voyages." And when commenting on the possibility that the Voyages is an English translation of a French original, he observes that were this the case, "the Hudson's Bay Company paid for a translation of almost dazzling illiteracy."16 Nor are such ethnocentric biases isolated within the anglophone scholarly tradition, since francophones are also invested in rewriting their own version of Canada’s past. Jack Warwick, for one, does not even mention Radisson’s Voyages in his study on literary themes in French Canada, even as he notes the recurrence and prevailing legacy of the courreur de bois figure in the French Canadian literary tradition.17 Warwick’s oversight suggests a larger, more disturbing phenomenon: the figure of the courreur de bois did not so much disappear from, as became transformed in, the Canadian cultural imagination, as the English and French both competed to tell their own versions of Canada’s past. According to Konrad Gross, by the nineteenth century, "[t]he reputation of the [courreur de bois] as a notorious bad man, created by official sources of New France for political reasons, was forgotten when literature, and later historiography, discovered the romantic potential of the fur trade and helped to model [fictional and historical] characters of almost mythic dimensions."18 And, according to Philippe Jaquin, the Québécois, in tracing their cultural roots to France, often efface from collective memory the ambiguities of the figure of the courreur de bois, and transform him into the figure of the pioneer so as to represent Nouvelle-France as a civilized and Catholic settlement.19

Both the courreur de bois and Radisson have suffered critical neglect. These earlier views indeed confirm Warkentin’s claim that "Radisson’s very skills as a narrator have left him mistrusted by historians and ethnographers, and [that] the linguistic ambiguity of
his text has discouraged literary critics."²⁰ This critical phenomenon, I would argue, reveals the extent to which earlier scholars failed to acknowledge more fully their own mediated positions as cultural critics and, more specifically, their own investments in identity politics.

According to Jonathan Hart, one of the challenges confronting readers of early modern texts is to “come to terms with the representations of the exchange [between Europeans and Natives] in a way that takes into account the gap between early modern understandings of contact and late twentieth-century views,” in order to strike a “balance between the historical record and the ethical interests of the present.”²¹ It is no coincidence that Karr, Hopwood, and Warwick presented their views in the late 1960s and early to mid-1970s, a period that witnessed the emergence of intense public debates about the possibility—and viability—of imagining Canada as a “single” nation made up of “two” equal but distinct cultures. In rehearsing their views, I mean to highlight the ways in which cultural memory has informed previous attempts to read—or, rather, not to read—Radisson and his Voyages. In comparison to the amount of scholarship available on his predecessors and contemporaries—Cartier, de Champlain, de Frontenac, and de La Salle are names that easily resonate in accounts of both New France and pre-Confederation Canada—it seems as if Radisson is deemed less worthy, less significant, as a figure for cultural critique. In effect, the earlier critical reception of Radisson’s Voyages exposes the truism of Ernest Renan’s claim that forgetting and historical error are “crucial factor[s] in the creation of a nation.”²² The failure on the part of these critics to acknowledge their implicit engagement with narrating the nation is perhaps evidence of the difficulties involved in—and, as such, the absolute need for—remembering the disconcerting fact that the Law of Nations (jus gentium) emerged in Europe during the Age of Discovery.²³ In other words, if Radisson’s accounts of his travels were put to political use during his lifetime in the creation of a nation, so they have been put to similar use in our lifetime in the re-creation of Canada’s nationhood.

These earlier views are only now being carefully reconsidered by Warkentin and, in the francophone tradition, by Martin Fournier.²⁴ I share Warkentin’s view that “Radisson’s literary presentation of himself is a historical source, although it has been dismissed, misinterpreted, and trivialized for several centuries.”²⁵ Following her lead, I position Radisson in this chapter at the centre of his own life story and explore his Voyages as a literary-historical document. In particular, I discuss the “First Voyage of Pierre-Ésprit Radisson,” a narrative in which the author recounts his captivity and eventual adoption by a group of Iroquois during the period between April or May 1652 and October 1653.²⁶ This captivity narrative has to date received little attention, though critics rightly recognize its importance for the study of the literatures of early Canada and the Americas.²⁷ Warkentin, for example, situates the Voyages within the context of an emergent “scribal culture” in New France; though much of her work focuses on the fourth or Lake Superior voyage, she nonetheless maintains that “[a]ll Radisson’s accounts of his voyages have to be read with his adoption [and captivity] constantly in view,” because so “few of the early explorers of Canada assimilated as fully to Native perspectives as did Radisson.”²⁸ Warner similarly finds the narrative captivating because it “describes one process of
acculturation—from French to Iroquois—but it performs another: from French to English.”

Gordon M. Sayre, in his turn, values Radisson for having been “the lone secular French captivity narrator.” Extending these critics’ valuable observations, I term Radisson’s negotiation and reconstitution of his subjectivities as “stylizations of selfhood.” In representing and performing from a rich repertoire of identities in his captivity narrative, Radisson foregrounds the dynamics of cultural mediation between Europeans and Natives, as well as his own complex interpretations of those mediations.

Critics of the early modern period have long recognized the need to explore the dynamics of cultural mediation in encounter and exchange narratives. According to Hart, for example, “[m]ediation is important because from the first contact some Europeans and Natives ignored the divisions between their cultures and found ways of crossing boundaries.”

Radisson consistently crosses cultural boundaries in his captivity narrative. In what follows, I discuss briefly the manuscript history of his Voyages, before continuing with close readings of the captivity narrative. Radisson’s strategies in disrupting the structural and temporal logic within his text, I argue, make intelligible the experience of his captivity both to himself and, in different ways, his readers. The narrative articulates Radisson’s desire to mediate his own self-understanding of his relationship to his captors on two discursive levels simultaneously. Describing his capture and eventual captivity, Radisson struggles to reconcile the alterity—that is, the relationship between identity and difference—that shapes his relationship with the Iroquois. But his narrative contains a metacommentary that exposes yet another struggle, one that attempts to reconcile the alterity between his present sense of self at the moment of writing his Voyages and the past self being remembered and described. Reading the Voyages as Radisson’s attempt to navigate through the recesses of his memory helps to explain why he “seems to have kept [the first four accounts of his travels] to himself for more than a decade.”

Mediating between self-representation and self-interpretation, Radisson ultimately demonstrates self-reflexive strategies that are pertinent for contemporary readers of his Voyages. His captivity narrative, in particular, foregrounds the possibility of straddling and accommodating two or more cultures, and provides important ways of reading—not only the past but also our current historical moment, as we continue to debate the status of Canada’s national identity as both English and French.

Radisson wrote about his explorations during the mid- to late 1660s, but the Voyages was not published until 1885. At the end of his first extended stay in England, during the winter of 1668-69, he wrote in English about the first four voyages. The first narrative describes his captivity and adoption; the second, the Onondaga voyage of 1654-55; the third, the Mississippi voyage of 1655-58; the fourth, the Lake Superior voyage of 1659-61. In 1685, Radisson recounted in French his fifth and sixth voyages—those, respectively, of 1682-83 and 1684. The Prince Society of Boston, in an edition of only 250 copies, compiled all six accounts—translating into English the fifth and sixth voyages—and published them as Voyages of Peter Esprit Radisson, being an account of his travels and experiences among the North American Indians, from 1652 to 1684, transcribed from the original manuscripts in the Bodleian Library and the British Museum in 1885. Critics share the view that Radisson wrote about his explorations at the request of the Stuart monarch, Charles II, and to persuade the king’s cousin, Prince Rupert, and English investors to finance the establishment of the Hudson’s Bay Company. Less clear and far more debatable is the issue of whether the manuscripts were originally written in English or in French. Remarkably that the manuscripts “have had almost as adventurous a career as their author,” Louise Phelps Kellogg explains that they “were written in English, the English of an unaccustomed foreigner.” According to Nute in her biography of Radisson, however, the original French manuscripts of Radisson’s account of his travels have been lost, and the current archive relies on the English translation, completed in 1669 by Nicholas Hayward, the translator for the Hudson’s Bay Company. The issue of language informs any study dealing with Radisson’s text, though it remains largely speculative whether Radisson composed his narratives in English, or whether they were later translated from French.

Although the manuscript history of Radisson’s Voyages is obscure, it implicitly suggests the crucial relationship between author and audience in the production of the narratives. Ian S. MacLaren
has recently called for a more careful examination of the evolution of the author in exploration and travel literatures. Sustained analyses of these genres must take into consideration the several stages of writing involved in the production of texts: the shift from field notes to journal, from manuscript to publication. Because of this multistage process, MacLaren insists, we must pay attention to the ways in which the author’s “awareness of [potential] readers vitally conditions the narrative, in terms of the way events are structured, plotted and phrased.”

Although Radisson’s Voyages did not necessarily undergo all of these stages, the author, at the time of the narrative’s composition, was all too aware of his audience: Charles II. The presupposition of an already established reader thus makes especially clear the “promotional intent” of his narrative. Radisson had to convince Charles II not only that the Great Lakes fur trade would be a profitable venture for the British, but that he, himself, would be the right person to head such an expedition. To succeed, Radisson had to establish in his text two things: a thorough knowledge of the geographical region, plus an intimate familiarity with the Native populations. What better way to describe his expertise than in recounting his captivity? After all, this period afforded Radisson an opportunity to increase his awareness of the Great Lakes area, and, perhaps more importantly, a firsthand opportunity to witness the customs and habits of the Native populations. Although Radisson “was not fundamentally a describer of scenery,” since his “natural subject-matter was the world of human beings,” he frequently assigns a correspondence in his captivity narrative between his geographical mapping of regions and the people occupying those regions. He deploys strategies that mark both his place and placement during his captivity and, in doing so, displays an acutely sensitive and cognizant awareness of his subject position in such a predicament. For example, arriving with his captors “[b]y sunset ... att the Isles of Richelieu,” he wryly remarks that it was “a place rather for victors than for captives most pleasant.”

As we will see, however, the boundary separating “victors” from “captives” is not always clearly demarcated in his captivity narrative.

Radisson begins his text by describing that he was persuaded by two of his companions to accompany them during a hunt. Having agreed to this pastime, he mentions dressing in “the lightest way I could possible”—especially appropriate for the occasion, he adds, because doing so allows him to be “nimble and not [to] stay behind” from the others. These precautionary measures, however, articulate more than just pragmatism on Radisson’s part. As he explains it, there are really two reasons for dressing in this fashion: not only will it allow him to be more lively or active in order to catch more prey, but it will also enable him to “escape [from any potential] danger ... of an enemy the cruellest that ever was upon the face of the Earth.” Radisson immediately identifies and names the enemy, saying:

It is to bee observed that the french had warre with a wild nation called Iroquois, who for that time weree soe strong and so to be feared that scarce any body durst stirre out either Cottage or house without being taken or killed, saving that he had nimble limbs to escape their fury.

These descriptions in the opening paragraph point to two important details: Radisson’s anticipation of an encounter with the Iroquois and, as a consequence, his subtle shifting of the structural logic contained within his text. Being “nimble” no longer simply signifies an ability to travel farther and thus cover more ground in search of prey. Instead, being “nimble” now metonymically signals the ability to escape any potentially hostile encounter with the Iroquois. According to Radisson’s logic at the end of the paragraph, apart from those who “had nimble limbs to escape [the Iroquois’] fury,” most Europeans did not dare to venture out of their shelters. At the beginning of the paragraph, Radisson positions himself as a hunter seeking prey; by the end of the paragraph, and in articulating his fear of the Iroquois, he has manoeuvred himself into the position of one of “the hunted.” He self-consciously displaces his own subject position within the text; he stylizes his own sense of self.

The strategies disrupting the text’s structural logic mirror the subtle ways in which Radisson plays with temporal logic as well. If to be “nimble” is to heed one’s presentiments, then Radisson is consistent, inasmuch as he already anticipates, right from the start, the appearance of the Iroquois—for the barbaric native “savage”
appears always in advance of the savage himself. To the extent that Radisson’s intuitive expectations point toward a future present time, and to the extent that this imagined temporality projects and makes manifest an actual encounter with the Iroquois, the beginning of his narrative presupposes the end result—specifically, that of his abduction. This is especially evident in the second paragraph of the narrative, where he says:

At an offspiring of a village of three Rivers we consult together that two should go the water side, the other in a wood hardby to warne us, for to advertise us if he accidently should light [upon] or suspect any Barbrs in ambush, we also retreat ourselves to him if we should discover any thing upon the River.

The ambiguity of Radisson’s use of the subjunctive tense (should) in the last part of this sentence assumes a precognition that will ensure his recognition of the Iroquois when an actual cross-cultural contact occurs. What remains peculiar about this strategy, however, is its deviation from Radisson’s predominant use of the past tense throughout his narrative. The sentence that follows this one, for example, reads: “Having com’d to the first river ... we met a man who kept cattell, and asked him if he had knowne any appearance of [the] Ennemy, and likewise demanded which way he would advise us to gett better fortune [with the hunt], and [in] what part [of the land] he [espied] more danger.”

Consider, too, the passage that immediately follows Radisson’s anticipation of an encounter, in which he describes the hunting party’s decision to separate and, more significantly, recounts the occurrence of a nosebleed:

Primring our pistolls, we went where our fancie first lead us, being impossible for us to avoid the destinies of the heavens; no sooner turn’d our backs, but my nose fell a-bleeding without any provocation in the least. Certainly it was a warning for me of a beginning of a yeare and a half of hazards and of myseryes that weare to befall mee.43

These sentences encapsulate much of the text’s often confusing temporal logic. For Radisson, the inexplicable and sudden nosebleed portends a predestined evil, “a warning for [him]” of things yet to come. Not unlike his earlier introduction of the anticipated appearance of the Iroquois, the nosebleed here functions as a textual trope that prophesies his imminent capture. As such, his use of the past tense in describing a spontaneous bodily affliction conjures up a greater future affliction. The presentation of events is therefore edited out, insofar as “the past tense ... indicate[s] [Radisson’s] arrival at the planned destination”—namely, that of his captivity.44 In her reading of the famine passage described by Radisson in his fourth or Lake Superior voyage, Warkentin notes that “one of Radisson’s most persistent stylistic devices [is] narrative in the present tense,” an indication of his absolute “confidence in the moment” of which he is engaged in describing. For “the point of Radisson’s method of narration] is not to tell us when or where something happened, she further explains, “but how it was experienced as it happened.”45 For the purpose of reading these initial moments in Radisson’s captivity narrative, however, I would slightly modify Warkentin’s point. Because Radisson is essentially setting up the Voyages in the captivity narrative, I would suggest that the temporal shifts evident in his language indicate his confidence in the potentiality of the future moment—for the Iroquois inevitably do appear and take Radisson as a captive among their tribe.

But, before encountering them, Radisson first discovers that his two companions have been killed; their wounded bodies and mutilated heads serve as evidence for the vicinity of the Iroquois. In graphic detail, he describes finding his companions both “quite naked” and with “their hair standing up, the one being shott through with three boltts and two bowes of an hatchett on the head, and the other runne thorouge in severall places with a sword and smitten with an hatchett. Art the same instance [of looking them over],” he immediately explains, “my nose begun’d to bleed, which made me afraid of my life.”46 It is no coincidence that the sight of his friends lying in a pool of blood should provoke yet another nosebleed for Radisson. The uncanny repetition of the two nosebleeds functions, I would argue, as the first of a series of “centering”
moments in Radisson’s captivity narrative. According to Vincent Crapanzano in his provocative study, *Hermes’ Dilemma and Hamlet’s Desire: On the Epistemology of Interpretation,* “centering” moments or “symbolic centers” “exist in all narratives,” and “there are always centers embedded within centers—within larger ‘centered’ and ‘centering’ units of discourse.”

Because my reading of Radisson’s captivity narrative derives much of its vocabulary and methodology from Crapanzano, allow me to rehearse his idea of centering at length. According to him, centres are images, events, or theoretical constructs that function “as a nucleus or point of concentration that holds together a particular verbal sequence” or description in narrative, giving “coherence, a semblance of order at least, to what would otherwise appear to be a random, meaningless sequence of expressions” or descriptions. In Radisson’s case, the second nosebleed not only fulfills his prophecy that the first was a “warning for [him] of a beginning of a yeare and a half of hazards and of myseryes,” but also promises to announce the entrance of the Iroquois. Both events make material his prediction of soon becoming a captive and, in the process, legitimates the function of his captivity narrative. For “[t]he center’s force lies in its ability to call forth the legitimation of its own dominant linguistic function,” Crapanzano argues. Moreover, to the extent that centering, figuratively speaking, “stops discursive time, at least the discursive display of meaning,” where “[t]ime past folds forward; time future folds backwards—into the center from which meaning and order spring,” I would also suggest that, at the moment of recalling and describing these details in writing, Radisson is engaged in assigning meaning to his imminent capture by the Iroquois. For Radisson, his nosebleeds represent mnemonic reference points from which to make sense of his past in the present moment of interpreting that very past. These initial descriptions in the captivity narrative—even *prior* to the entry of the Iroquois—expose the author’s anxiety to mediate successfully between the present moment of writing and the past moment being recollected in writing. Positioning his nosebleeds as centering events that invite interpretation, Radisson prepares himself to reach an understanding—or, at the very least, the presumption of understanding—of his past experience as a captive.

In preparing himself, moreover, he also prepares his readers for what has thus far appeared to be the delayed appearance of the Iroquois. Radisson’s anxiety is made especially evident in the language he uses to announce the arrival of the Iroquois. Interpreting the repeated occurrence of the nosebleed as a preternatural phenomenon, Radisson continues by describing hearing “a noise” close by and finding himself surrounded. Enter the Iroquois onto the scene of Radisson’s recollection:

Seeing mysefle [en]compassed round about by a multitude of dogges, or rather devils, that rose from the grasse, ruses and bushes, I shott my gunne, whether unawares or purposely I know not, but I shott with a pistolle confidently, but was siesed on all sides by a great number that threw me downe, taking away my arme without giving mee one blowe; for afterwards I felt no paine att all, onely a great guidinesse in my heade, from whence it comes I doe not remember. In the same time they [the Iroquois] brought me into the wood, where they shewed me the two heads [of my companions] all bloody.

Although somewhat awkward in its prose, this passage displays the rich descriptive mode that characterizes much of Radisson’s narrative. In addition to vividly capturing the author’s immediate confusion and panic during the encounter, this passage foregrounds two important structuring theamtics: memory and identity. The problematics of memory and identity both centre on recognition—on seeing the past in relation to the present, and on seeing ‘the self’ in relation to ‘the other.’ Radisson can readily recall, in retrospect, feeling “a great guidinesse in [his] heade,” but adds, in qualifying this memory, that “[from] whence it comes [he] doe[s] not remember.” To the extent that some memories escape retrospection, they leave just enough impression for Radisson to make some semblance of coherence in reconstructing the past. Radisson’s present project of reconstructing the past, moreover, is inextricably linked to the project of reconstructing his identity: that is, to stylize his subjectivities in relation to whatever memories remain available. Describing his
capture, he first recalls “seeing [him]self compassed round about by a multitude,” thereby recognizing himself as different from the Iroquois, his cultural ‘others’—or those whom he instead prefers to interpellate as “dogges, or rather devils.” But the binary of self/other remains insufficient for Radisson, not least because it fails to maintain the demarcation of the boundary separating Europeans from Natives, and vice versa—for the Iroquois’ act of capturing Radisson finally makes material the cross-cultural encounter which Radisson has consistently anticipated within the “contact zones” of his consciousness.¹⁵

The Iroquois’ gesture of showing Radisson his companions’ heads constitutes yet another centering moment that marks the dissolution of the boundary separating the two cultures. In other words, this moment shatters the illusion between European and Iroquois; more specifically for Radisson, it collapses the binary of self/other. Unlike his two unfortunate companions, Radisson vaguely remembers being “tak[en] away ... without ... one blowe” from any of his captors. In effect, then, Radisson does not represent an ‘other’ for those whom he perceives as his cultural ‘others.’ At least for the moment, the Iroquois see Radisson as somehow different from his two companions, and instead of killing him, they prefer to take him captive. But for the white captive, his recognition of difference does not occur immediately: he requires the intervention of the Iroquois; he must be made to see the difference. According to Crapanzano, in “ethnographic and other cross-cultural encounters where the conventions of centering are not necessarily shared by the parties of the encounter, the negotiation of a ‘meaningful’ center plays an important role. Each party attempts to center the relationship—the conversation—in terms of his own concerns and conventions,” and “though the interest [in centering] is shared, its personal and cultural significance may not be.”¹⁶

In recalling this particular moment, Radisson is essentially describing the cross-cultural negotiation between himself and the Natives, as the two parties attempt to make intelligible the alterity that shapes their relationship with each other. Prior to the encounter, the mutilated heads signify for Radisson the vicinity of the Iroquois, whereas now, these same signifiers function as the visual evidence of his own difference. “At the same time [the Iroquois] brought me into the wood,” the captive recalls, “they shewed me the two heads all bloody.” Forced by the Iroquois to witness the mutilated heads of his companions, Radisson finally recognizes his difference: a difference not in relation to a cultural ‘other,’ but to the self—to himself in particular, a white captive who would have been killed but for the grace of the Iroquois.

These centering moments cumulatively destabilize the self/other binary informing Radisson’s self-image of his body. In fact, as we have seen, Radisson’s captivity narrative often privileges the corporeal—whether it be a nosebleed or a mutilated head. Moreover, references to the body are often grotesque: the removal of someone’s heart and the burning of fingers are striking and ubiquitous features of Radisson’s text. One graphic passage renders especially explicit some of the torments inflicted on the captives by the Iroquois. In it, Radisson introduces his descriptions as a digression, saying, “I prolong a little from my purpose of my adventure for to say the torments that I have seen suffered att Coutu ...” before going on to narrate:

They [the Iroquois] tie the prisoners to a post by their hands ... They pluck out their [the prisoners’] nailes for the most part ... After[ward] they tye your wrist with a corde, putting two for this effect, one drawing him [the captive] one way, another of another way ... Some others cutt pieces of flesh from all parts of the body & broyle them, gett you to eat it, thrusting them into your mouth, putting it a stick of fire.¹²

By purposely alternating between the third-person they and the second-person you in his retelling, Radisson makes the scene not only more immediate and grotesque for his readers, but also productively confusing by pulling them into his narrative. Although it can be argued that such descriptions are part and parcel of any captivity narrative—what better way to relate the Indians’ barbarity than to magnify their brutalities toward their captives?—a more careful examination of Radisson’s narrative yields as many allusions
to an aesthetics of the body, especially as it pertains to hair and body adornment. Indeed, to judge by the number of accounts, the Iroquois seem to have entirely fetishized Radisson’s hair and body: for example, “they combed my head, and with a filthy grease greased my head, and dashed all over my face with redd paintings”; “the young men tooke delight in combing my head, greasing and powdering out a kinde of redd powder, then tying my haire with a redd string of leather like to a coard”; “a woman ... taking hould on my haire ... combs my head with her fingers and tyed my wrist with a bracelet”; “they cut off my hair in the front and upon the crowne of the head.” With each experience, Radisson gains a more comprehensive understanding of the ways in which the body—specifically his body—figures as a legible, cross-cultural signifier of alterity—of identity and difference—for both himself and his captors.

These numerous examples indicate that the Iroquois, regardless of gender, take pleasure in altering their captive’s appearance. Their attentions toward Radisson articulate their fondness for him and, additionally, anticipate their later adoption of him into their tribe. One particular passage stands out among the rest. In it, Radisson first describes the group’s decision to make camp upon its “arriv[al] in a good and pleasant harbour;” then notes the Iroquois’ attentions toward him, and, finally, explains his dilemma about attempting to escape from the group. As he recounts it:

The place round about [was] full of trees. Here they kindled a fire and provided what was necessary for their food. In this place they cutt off my hair in the front and upon the crowne of the head, and turning up the locks of the haire they dab’d me with some thicke grease. So done, they brought me a looking-glasse. I viewing myself all in a pickle, smir’d with redde and black, covered with such a cappe, and locks tyed up with a pece of leather and stunked horridly, I could not but fall in love with myselfe, if not that I had better instructions to shun the sin of pride. So after repasting themselves, they made them ready for the journey with takeing repose that night. This was the time I thought to have escaped, for in vaine, for I being alone feared least I should be apprehended and dealt with more violently. And moreover I was desirous to have seen their country.

This passage resonates with Radisson’s description of his capture in its careful regard for details—from the setting of the landscape to the setting of his hair. More importantly, Radisson’s recital here echoes the rhetoric of the previous passage: here, he notes “I viewing myself ...”; earlier, in describing his capture, he notes “seeing myselfe [en]compassed ....” Both occasions centre on the agency of the first-person subjective I. But this “I”—the agent—is additionally subjected to seeing itself as a subject—a self—by the intervention of an ‘other.’ Previously, the Iroquois forced Radisson to recognize himself as different from his companions; here, they again function as mediators and, by bringing him the “looking-glasse,” force him to do the same.

What remains significant, in the end, is Radisson’s response to his mirror image: “I could not but fall in love with myselfe,” he recalls in retrospect. The mirror scene represents the ultimate, embedded centering moment in Radisson’s captivity narrative. To the extent that the moments I have described each function to mediate Radisson’s conceptualization of his selfhood—his own self-awareness of his identity as a subject of captivity—the mirror scene registers not only his “awareness of a contrasting world” but, in effect, also his “recognition ... of [his] own otherness in that world.” The mirror scene constitutes a double alienation for Radisson: the reflected image makes intelligible not only the difference between European and Native but, more interestingly, also the difference between Radisson’s identity as the subject engaged in retrospection and as the object of such retrospection. Even though Radisson recognizes the need “to shun the sin of pride” at the time of recounting this episode, he also confesses to a pleasure in having indulged, however temporarily, his own vanity. And even with the distance of twenty years, he fondly remembers encountering his visage, “all in a pickle, smir’d with redde and black.” Here, then, Radisson enacts what Georges Gusdorf identifies to be the ontological problematic that both conditions and limits the genre of autobiography. On the one hand, Radisson “looks at himself being and delights in being looked at—he calls himself as witness for himself.” On the other hand,
Radisson's present invitation to bear witness to a prior self belies the transparent self-referentiality that governs all forms of life writing. For, as Gusdorf maintains, "autobiography is condemned to substitute endlessly the completely formed for that which is in the process of being formed."

Radisson's very act of composition attempts to synchronize the past with the present. In other words, he ultimately yearns for a temporality that exceeds the boundaries of text—his captivity narrative—and context, that is, the events conditioning that very narrative. What Radisson essentially remembers is a "white captive" in the process of becoming a "white Indian," a transformation of the self as it begins to embody an 'other.' But that transformation can only materialize with Radisson's recognition and taking possession of his own doubly alienated subjectivity. For, as Crepazano suggests, an "individual must take possession of his own otherness and not be aware simply of the otherness about him" in order to become a self or subject. Radisson's decision not to try to escape from his captors strongly indicates his attempt to take possession of his own otherness. "And moreover I was desirous to have seene their country," he finally admits. From here on—as his description of the mirror scene implicitly foregrounds—the pronoun refers to that differentiate the first-person Radisson from the third-person Iroquois become less and less clear.

In staying faithful to this desire "to have seene their country," Radisson decides to stay with the Iroquois and eventually gets adopted by a family within the tribe. The remainder of his captivity narrative contains fond references to his adoptive family, whose members consistently intervene in his behalf. So strong are his affections for the Iroquois that Radisson "resolve[s] to offer [him]selfe for to serve, and to take party with them" in their tribal war against the Algonquians and, in consequence, against the French. But despite this genuine desire on his part, Radisson remains self-conscious of his insider/outside status within the Iroquois tribe. He recalls asking his adoptive father about this matter:

[U]pon this I venture to ask him what I was. [He] presently answers that I was a Iroquois as himselfe. Let me revenge, said I, my kindred. I love my brother. Let me die with him. I would die with you, but you will not because you goe against the French. Let me a gaine goe with my brother, the prisoners & the heads that I shall bring, to the joy of my mother and sisters, will make me undertake at my retourne to take up the hatchett against those of Quebec, of the 3 rivers, and Monteroyall in declaring them my name, and that it's I that kills them, and by that you shall know I am your son, worthy to beare that title that you gave me when you adopted me.

In this passage, Radisson clearly articulates his desire to be identified as a legitimate member of the tribe. He demands that he be named by his adoptive father as "a Iroquois as himself." Only after this confirmation of his identity does Radisson go on to recite his filial/tribal duties to his family/tribe. He vows "to take up the hatchett against those of Quebec, of the 3 rivers, and Monteroyall," thereby shifting his political allegiances from the French to the Iroquois. Here, Radisson characteristically aligns his subject position on a geographical/ethnographical trajectory; this example also marks the shifting of Radisson's placement of himself "against"—and hence not in affiliation with—"those of Quebec, of the 3 rivers, and Monteroyall." But as Radisson quickly discovers in the course of the military expedition, he can never fully "pass" as an Indian. Not coincidentally, the Natives are the ones who once again provoke Radisson to confront his cultural drag. For example, upon the party's arrival at Seneca, a village occupied by another tribe within the Iroquois nation, Radisson describes the Natives' "admiration" to see a frenchman accompanying wild men, which [he] understood by their exclamations. Interestingly, in retrospectively recalling this moment, Radisson realigns his subject position as "a frenchman accompanying wild men." But to the extent that the Senecans maintain tribal affiliations with the Iroquois nation, and to the extent that the Iroquois are known to be at war with the French, Radisson's self-conscious positioning of himself as "a frenchman" is strategically misleading.

Significantly, Radisson continues to deploy such strategies in the remainder of his captivity narrative. Claiming to be French on one occasion, and Iroquois on another, he stylizes his subject position...
to suit the different contexts in which he finds himself embedded. Consider the following two examples, each describing Radisson’s arrival at different destinations. Describing his arrival at “the fort of Orange,” the Dutch outpost on the site of present-day Albany, New York, Radisson recalls:

I went into the fort with my brother, and have not yet ben knowne [as] a french[man]. But a french soldieur of the fort speaks to me in [the] Iroquois language, & demanded if I was not a stranger, and did veryly believe I was French, for all that I was dabbled over with painting and greased. I answered him in the same language, that no; and then he speaks in swearing, desiring me [to tell him] how I fell in the hands of those people.61

Later, having just succeeded in making his escape from the Iroquois, he remembers his arrival “in a place full of trees cutt,” where he meets a Dutchman cutting wood. “I went nearer and called to him,” Radisson explains:

[The man] incontinently leaves his work & comes to me, thinking I was Iroquoise. I said nothing to him to the contrary. I kept him in that thought ... I tould him I was savage, but that I lived awhile among the french, & that I had something valuable to communicate to the [Dutch] governor.62

To the French soldier, Radisson claims to be French rather than Iroquois; to the Dutch woodcutter, he claims to be a “savage” or Iroquois rather than French. Representing the soldier’s and the woodcutter’s respective responses to his appearance as instances of mistaken identity, Radisson underscores the extent to which cultural assumptions shape any European’s encounter with others in the New World. But these examples also foreground Radisson’s recognition and acceptance that cultural differences have shaped, and will continue to shape, his own relationships with both Natives and Europeans. To the extent that Radisson consistently succeeded in creating and performing from a repertoire of identities, he was able to do so because of his captivity experience with the Iroquois. By orchestrating Radisson’s departure from European culture and immersing him in theirs, the Iroquois have led Radisson, figuratively speaking, to reach his final destination—namely, to come to terms with his “stylizations of selfhood.”

Among his other discoveries, explorer Pierre-Esprit Radisson deserves to be remembered for discovering his identity in difference. As we continue the debate on Canada’s conceptualization of its national identity, in the present and for the future, it would serve us well to wonder, in rephrasing Radisson’s self-observation as a rhetorical question: as Canadians, could we but fall in love with ourselves?
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