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Abstract

Russell’s Point (CiAj-1) is a Little Passage/Beothuk site located on the western side of Dildo Pond roughly 2.4 km (1 ½ miles) south of Dildo Arm at the bottom of Trinity Bay. It was found using information contained in John Guy’s journal of his voyage into Trinity Bay in the fall of 1612 and is believed to be the site visited by him on October 26, 1612 and described by him in his journal. Between 1994 and 1997, twenty-six weeks were spent working at the site, 158 square metres were excavated, 23 major features were located, mapped and photographed and 1225 artifacts recovered. Excavation and subsequent analysis focused on determining how long the site had been utilized by the Beothuk and their ancestors, what role the site had played in the seasonal round of the Trinity Bay Beothuk, and what effect, if any, contact with Europeans had had on the material culture of the Trinity Bay Beothuk by the second decade of the seventeenth century.

Analysis of the data indicates that the site was utilized by the Beothuk and their ancestors for roughly 650 years from circa A.D. 1000 to circa A.D. 1650 and that it probably served as a fall and winter base camp. The limited amount of European material recovered indicates that while the Beothuk at Russell’s Point had adopted a certain amount of European material by the time the site was abandoned and had begun to modify iron, their material culture was still largely based on traditional materials and suggests that the adoption of European materials must have greatly accelerated in the second half of the seventeenth century after Russell’s Point was abandoned.
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Chapter 1

Introduction

The first official European colony in Newfoundland was established at Cupers Cove (now Cupids) in Conception Bay in August 1610 by the London and Bristol Company of Merchants Venturers. In the autumn of 1612 the colony’s first governor, John Guy, and eighteen others sailed out of Conception Bay and into Trinity Bay on a voyage of discovery the main purpose of which was to establish friendly relations with the Beothuk Indians. On 24 October the colonists sailed into a harbour at the bottom of Trinity Bay where they found the first evidence of Beothuk occupation including several ‘houses’, a number of implements used by the Beothuk and a “great path thorowe the woodes”. They christened this place ‘Savage Harbour’.

Two days later, on 26 October, they followed the path and found that it came to “a great freshe water lake... about a mile from any parte of the harborough”. Roughly half a mile farther along the lake they came to a second Beothuk camp consisting of three houses. This second camp is described in considerable detail not only in Guy’s journal of the voyage but also in the diary of Henry Crout, one of the colonists who accompanied Guy on the voyage, and in a letter written by Crout to Sir Percival Willoughby, a major investor in the Newfoundland Company and Crout’s employer, on April 10, 1613.

Given the documentary evidence, there can be little doubt that Guy’s ‘Savage Harbour’ and present day Dildo Arm are one and the same and that the “freshe water lake” is Dildo Pond, a 4 km (2.5 mile) long lake located roughly one mile south of and
emptying into Dildo Arm (Gilbert 1990:151-154). In the spring of 1988 a survey of Dildo Pond was conducted in an attempt to find the site described by Guy and Crout and, after two weeks of testing, a Little Passage/Beothuk site was located on a low lying grassy point of land on the western side of the lake about 2.4 km (1 ½ miles) from the bottom of Dildo Arm. A total of twenty-six weeks were spent digging at this site, which came to be known as Russell’s Point (CiAj -1), between 1994 and 1997 and during that time 158 square metres were excavated, 23 major features located, mapped and photographed and 1226 artifacts recovered.

The discovery of this site raised a number of important questions and the following thesis attempts to address three of the most basic of these:

1. How long was Russell’s Point utilized by the Beothuk and what does this tell us about the Beothuk occupation of Trinity Bay?

2. What role did Russell’s Point play in the seasonal round of the Trinity Bay Beothuk and what does this tell us about Little Passage/Beothuk seasonality during the late prehistoric and early historic periods?

3. What evidence is there for Beothuk-European trade or other forms of contact at Russell’s Point and to what extent, if any, had Beothuk culture in Trinity Bay been effected by contact with Europeans by the early seventeenth century?
I have attempted to combine the various lines of evidence, artifactual, architectural, faunal, environmental and ethnographic, to provide a general overview of the site and address these three questions.

Archaeological Background

As Ralph Pastore (1993:260) has pointed out the “systematic study of the Beothuks” began with James P. Howley who spent over forty years collecting information on these people and compiled it all into a single volume published in 1915. However, the vast majority of the information contained in Howley deals with the Beothuk living in the Exploits River/Red Indian Lake region in the second half of the eighteenth and the early nineteenth centuries at a time when their way of life had been greatly altered by European settlement. This bias has led to a number of erroneous assumptions about the Beothuk including the belief, still prevalent today, that Notre Dame Bay and the Exploit’s River had been the centre of Beothuk settlement on the Island and that the subsistence patterns and relations between the Beothuk and Europeans prevalent at that time and in that place had prevailed since the beginning of the historic period. Only 28 pages of Howley’s 348 page work deal with the Beothuk before John Cartwright’s journey up the Exploits River in 1768 and the origins of these people and their way of life prior to the establishment of year round European settlement remained largely a mystery. Certainly, the fact that Newfoundland had been home to a number of different aboriginal cultures over the previous 5,000 years was totally unknown.
The first person to attempt an analysis of ‘Beothuk’ material culture was geologist T.G.B. Lloyd (1875, 1876a, 1876b) who visited a number of sites on the Island in the early 1870s and actually conducted rudimentary excavations at both Sops Island and Conche Harbour. However, most of the artifacts described by Lloyd (1876b: Plates X and XI) were actually of either Maritime Archaic or Palaeo-Eskimo origin. Similarly, Howley lumped Maritime Archaic, Palaeo-Eskimo, Recent Indian and Beothuk artifacts all together under the heading of ‘Beothuk’. However, a better understanding of the cultural history of Newfoundland began to gradually emerge in the 1920s.

The Dorset Eskimo culture was first identified in the Canadian Arctic by Diamond Jenness in 1925 and survey work conducted by both Jenness (1933) and W.J. Wintemberg (1939; 1940) on the Great Northern Peninsula in 1927 and 1929 confirmed the presence of the Dorset culture on the Island. Also in the 1920s, William D. Strong unearthed artifacts near Hopedale, Labrador which he ascribed to an early Indian culture he termed the “Old Stone Culture” (Hood 1993: 164). In 1949 and 1950 Elmer Harp Jr. excavated a Dorset site at Port au Choix on the Great Northern Peninsula and his subsequent Ph.D thesis (1964), which compared the Newfoundland Dorset Culture with that found in Labrador and the Arctic, defined the Dorset Culture in Newfoundland. While working in the Strait of Belle Isle during this period, Harp also uncovered Maritime Archaic material that, following Byers (1959), he identified as “Boreal Archaic”. Fourteen years later, in 1964, MacLeod (1967) conducted excavations at the Curtis site on Twillingate Island and uncovered a large Archaic cemetery almost identical to those found in Maine early in the
twentieth century. MacLeod’s work also produced the first radiocarbon dates for this culture placing it firmly in the second millennium B.C. Between 1967 and 1969 James Tuck conducted excavations at an Archaic cemetery in Port au Choix and uncovered the remains of over 100 individuals and well preserved bone, antler and shell grave goods in addition to stone tools. Harp’s work laid the foundation for all subsequent Palaeo-Eskimo research in Newfoundland and led to the identification of a Palaeo-Eskimo presence on the Island beginning roughly 3000 years ago and lasting until the disappearance of the Middle Dorset people from the Island about 1200 years ago (Tuck n.d.: 112-114). Like Harp’s work on the Dorset Culture, Tuck’s work at Port aux Choix defined the Maritime Archaic culture in Newfoundland and laid the foundation for all subsequent work on the Archaic in the province which eventually established the presence of Archaic people on the Island from roughly 3000 BC until 1200 BC and traced their presence in Labrador back to approximately 4000 BC (Tuck n.d.: 49-53).

While our knowledge of the Palaeo-Eskimo and Maritime Archaic cultures was increasing, the material culture of the Beothuk and their ancestors was still poorly understood. This began to change in the 1960s. The earliest excavations on Beothuk sites took place at locations that were already known either from documentary evidence or earlier research. In 1964 Helen Devereux conducted excavations at Pope’s Point. Located where the Badger River empties into the Exploits, this site was first recorded in 1915 by Frank Speck who reported seeing "about a dozen wigwam pits there" (Speck 1922: 22). Devereux initially concluded that all the material recovered by her from Pope’s Point was
historic Beothuck (Devereux 1965: 21). However, this reflects the general lack of knowledge about prehistoric material culture in the province at that time since, in retrospect, it is clear that at least four components, Maritime Archaic, Dorset, Recent Indian and historic Beothuk, are present in the collection (Gilbert 1996c). The following year, Devereaux (1969) excavated one house pit and tested another at the Beaches in Bonavista Bay, a site first identified by T.G.B. Lloyd (1876a) in 1872. In 1969-1970 she conducted excavations at Indian Point on Red Indian Lake, a site visited by both Lloyd (1875:223-224) in 1871 and Speck (1922:22) in 1914 and generally believed to be one of the last camps occupied by the Beothuk. Devereux found only a small number of stone and iron tools at the former site and was reluctant to reach any conclusions (Pastore 1993:264). At the latter, she was able to distinguish between an “Upper Occupation Level” that contained mostly iron artifacts and a “Lower Occupation Level” that contained stone tools. However, she was unable to determine the age of the latter material (Devereux 1970:12-15, 28, 41). Two years later, in 1972, Raymond LeBlanc (1973) conducted excavations at another Exploits River site, Wigwam Point, a late historic site discovered by Don Locke (LeBlanc 1973:57). The faunal remains recovered from this site highlighted the impossibly difficult situation faced by the Beothuk when forced to subsist on the limited resources of the Newfoundland interior.

Between 1972 and 1975 Paul Carignan (1975,1977) conducted excavations at the Beaches and Cape Freels in Bonavista Bay. At the latter he discovered stones tools of Indian origin associated with hearths radiocarbon dated to between A.D. 345 and A.D.905
(Carignan 1977: 147) and at both sites he uncovered distinctive side and corner notched points, now known as Beaches points, that clearly post dated the earlier points and which throughout the remainder of the decade were generally believed to have been produced by prehistoric Beothuk people (Tuck 1976,1982; Carignan 1975).

Tiny bifacially or unifacially flaked points with corner notches or stems for hafting had been found in association with the Beaches points and were generally assumed to be, “a minor tool type associated with the larger projectile points” (Tuck n.d.: 161). However, while surveying the south coast of the Island in 1979 and 1980, Gerald Penney (1984) located five sites that included these points along with triangular bifaces of about the same size, flake scrapers and large flake side-scrapers clearly indicating that this was a distinct complex. During the early 1980s work at Frenchmen’s Island (Evans 1981,1982) and Stock Cove (Robbins 1982) in Trinity Bay, Boyd’s Cove and Inspector Island in Notre Dame Bay (Pastore 1982) and the Port au Port Peninsula on the Island’s west coast (Simpson 1984) confirmed the presence of this Little Passage Complex, as it came to be known, in these areas as well. Radiocarbon dates from some of these sites placed the complex in the first half of the second millennium A.D. suggesting that the Little Passage people, rather than the Beaches people, were the direct ancestors of the historic Beothuk. The fact that the Locke collection from the Notre Dame Bay/Exploits River region contained both Little Passage and historic Beothuk material from the same sites and that Little Passage material from both Stock Cove and Frenchman’s Island seemed to be found
in association with seventeenth century European material further reinforced this argument.

This connection was confirmed in 1984 when, while conducting excavations at Boyd's Cove, Ralph Pastore (1985:323) found Little Passage points and bifaces in direct association with historic Beothuk material. That same year at Boyd's Cove Pastore uncovered, "the first dated Beaches complex on the Island", when he found a Beaches component including a side notched point in association with a hearth radiocarbon dated to 960 +/- 50 BP (A.D. 940 -1040) directly below a Little Passage/Beothuk deposit. Pastore's discoveries suggested a continuity between the historic Beothuk and the Beaches complex people extending back to at least the tenth century A.D.. This connection received further support that same year with the completion of Frederick Schwarz' honour's dissertation (1984) which compared projectile points from eighteen Little Passage sites and proposed a chronology spanning roughly 1000 years from circa A.D. 800 to circa A.D. 1800.

With a rough culture-historical framework established and the number of known sites increasing, some researchers began to turn their attention to the larger processual questions of seasonality and subsistence. The limited faunal resources of the Island's interior, especially when compared with the rich diversity of its marine resources had led a number of scholars to speculate that the resources of the interior likely played only a minor role in the subsistence patterns of the various prehistoric people who had occupied Newfoundland and that the intensive fall and winter occupation of the interior recorded
for the Beothuk during the last sixty or so years before their extinction was an anomaly forced upon them by the increasing pressures of European settlement.

In a ground-breaking work published in 1985, Tuck and Pastore attempted to explain the repeated extinction of prehistoric peoples on the Island by placing it in its environmental context. The paper argued that the limited number of major prey species and the fact that most of these were available for only a short period each year meant that prehistoric people in Newfoundland were even more dependent on the precisely timed arrival of prey where and when expected than were most other logistically oriented hunter/gatherer groups. The relative shortage of other "fall back species" meant that the failure of even one of the major prey species, such as caribou or harp seal, could have had tragic consequences and possibly lead to extinction. The paper also suggested that in areas such as the west and northeast coast, where harp seals are available from roughly late February until May, aboriginal hunter/gatherers would almost of necessity have followed a seasonal round that consisted of hunting harp seals in the outer coastal zone in the late winter and early spring, exploiting a variety of resources - salmon and harbour seals being two of the main ones - in sheltered inner coastal locations in summer and intercepting the caribou herds during their fall migration.

However, in a paper published the following year, Pastore (1986) noted that Recent Indian sites appeared to be more common in inner coastal locations while large Palaeo-Eskimo sites were almost always located in the outer coastal areas that provide easy access to harp seals. While conducting analysis for his honour's dissertation Schwarz
(1992:11) noted that not only did Recent Indian sites appear to cluster in inner coastal locations but also that many were located near major corridors leading into the interior. This, combined with the fact that there was little evidence of a Little Passage presence along the coast in autumn or winter, led him to speculate that the interior may have played a more important role for the Beothuk’s prehistoric ancestors than had previously been assumed. To test this hypothesis Schwarz conducted a survey of the near coastal interior of Bonavista Bay in 1987 and discovered seventeen sites on Gambo Pond. Four of these were sampled more extensively the following year. Based on the results of his own research and information from sites elsewhere on the Island, Schwarz (1994:65-68) suggested that, despite the limits of the Newfoundland ecosystem, Palaeo-Eskimo and Recent Indian subsistence patterns did seem to vary. He argued that while both groups likely harvested harp seals in the outer coastal zone in the spring, exploited a variety of resources in the inner coastal zone in the summer and hunted caribou in the interior in the fall, Recent Indian people may have remained in the near coastal interior throughout the fall and winter while the Palaeo-Eskimo presence in the interior was probably brief and followed by a late fall departure for the outer coast to exploit harp seals during both their southward migration in late December and January and on the ice flows from late February to early May. Schwarz also suggested that the Palaeo-Eskimos’ greater emphasis on harp seals may have made them more vulnerable to extinction than Recent Indian people for whom the winter environment of the near coastal interior may have offered the “greatest possible diversity of terrestrial and maritime winter resources.”
At about the same time that Schwarz was analysing his data from Gambo Pond, Rowley-Conwy (1990:24-27) published a paper in which he suggested that the “ideal winter base camp” for Recent Indian people would probably have been located in the near coastal interior on a river or pond offering easy access to the resources of both the interior and the coast. Like Schwartz, Rowley-Conwy argued that such a location would provide access to the greatest variety of species at a time of year when no one species was available in any quantity. Rowley-Conwy’s hypothesis was greatly influenced by a visit to the Russell’s Point site in the spring of 1989, a year after it had been discovered, and various discussions about the site. Indeed, Russell’s Point seemed ideally suited to test both Schwartz and Rowley-Conwy’s ideas about Recent Indian interior settlement.

**Documentary Background**

Reliable descriptions of the Beothuk from the sixteenth century are rare and the geographic and ethnographic detail in many of the earliest accounts is so vague that little or nothing conclusive about these people can be determined. Indeed, in many cases one may rightly question whether these are actually descriptions of the Beothuk or of some other group of northeastern hunter-gatherers. Even those few accounts that can be said with some certainty to be of the Beothuk, such as that of Pierre Crignon from 1529 (Hoffman 1963:14) or Oliver Dawbeny from 1536 (Hakluyt 1964:158) are at best descriptions of a people glimpsed briefly and from a distance. The Beothuk first begin to emerge from the protohistoric mists in the writings of John Guy, Henry Crout and other
colonists involved in the establishment of the Cupers Cove plantation. From 1612 until 1620 the colonists at Cupids were engaged in a concerted effort to establish a fur trade with the Beothuk living roughly 20 miles to the west in Trinity Bay and the documentary accounts of the Beothuk contained in the writings of these people are not only some of the oldest but also some of the most detailed descriptions in existence. They are also important because they depict a people that, while not totally unaffected by contact with Europeans, were certainly far less affected than were their descendants living in Notre Dame Bay over a century and a half later. By far the best known episode in this story of Beothuk/English interaction is that of John Guy’s voyage into Trinity Bay in the autumn of 1612.

Scholars have known about Guy’s voyage for many years. An abbreviated version of Guy’s journal, along with a number of other documents related to the Cupids colony, was first published by Samuel Purchas in his *Hakluytus Posthumus; or Purchas his Pilgrims* in 1625. However, while an important document, Purchas’ version omits many significant details present in the original. For example, while both Purchas’ version and the original make it clear that ‘Savage Harbour’ was located at the bottom of Trinity Bay, only the original states that the Beothuk camp visited by Guy on 26 October 1612 was located on a “great freshwater lake” roughly “a mile” inland from Savage Harbour (Cell 1982:70-71). Purchas’ version (1906:419) says only that the camp was, “in the south bottom of Trinitie Bay”, and mentions the lake only in passing. This omission lead Seary (1971:59) to suggest that Savage Harbour might have been either Spread Eagle or Chapel
Arm located farther west. However, the presence of the lake makes it clear that Savage Harbour could only be Dildo Arm and the lake Dildo Pond. It is also clear from the original that there were actually two camps: one by the salt water and another on the lake.

While Purchas was widely read by those interested in exploring, exploiting and settling the New World at the time of its publication, it later faded into obscurity and was largely unknown to all except a small group of scholars. However, some vague knowledge of Guy’s dealings with the Beothuk lingered on. In his *History of the Island of Newfoundland* published in 1819, Lewis Anspach wrote that, “Guy behaved towards the natives with so much prudence and kindness, that he apparently gained their friendship”, and in his *Newfoundland as it was and as it is in 1877*, Lewis Torque (1878) reported that Guy had attempted to establish trade with the Beothuk (Baker and Rollmann 2001:26).

By at least 1887 J.P. Howley was aware of the information contained in Purchas. In that year he published a transcription of John Guy’s letter of 16 May, 1611 taken from *Purchas his Pilgrims* (Baker and Rollman 2001:27). While conducting research in England in the late nineteenth century, D.W. Prowse came upon the original of Guy’s journal at the Lambeth Palace Library and in 1895 he published brief summaries of both Purchas’s version and the original in his *A History of Newfoundland From the English, Colonial and Foreign Record*, (Prowse 1895:128 & 133).

Prowse was also the first to make the possibly erroneous connection between John Guy’s voyage of 1612 and a trading expedition into Trinity Bay, led by a Captain Whittington, described by David Kirke in a letter written in 1639 and first published by
Henry Kirke in 1871. Prowse (1895:64-65) presents what he says is a quote from Purchas describing Guy’s voyage but what is actually his own summary of the account given by Kirke fourteen years after Purchas was published. Whether the incident described by Kirke is actually a garbled version of Guy’s voyage or, as Kirke suggests, a later voyage sponsored by Guy is still far from clear and largely hinges on whether the Captain Whittington of Kirke’s narrative was the same person as the George Whittington who sailed with Guy. Certainly, Marshall’s assertion (1996:29, 463 n.36) that George Whittington must have captained the *Indeavour* during Guy’s voyage simply because he was referred to as “Master Whittington” does not bear scrutiny and there is no evidence in the original documents to suggest that this was the case. In describing the encounter between Guy and the Beothuk at Bull Arm, Crout says simply that, “...the governor sent but the boote to go ashoore and ther landid one man called Master Whittington: with our flag of truce...”(Quinn 1979:162).

In 1908 Purchas’ version of Guy’s journal was published in *Christmas Bells*, a seasonal publication printed in St. John’s. Baker and Rollman (2001:28) believe that the editor, who incorrectly claimed the document was a transcription of the original journal, was James P. Howley and this is probably correct. Howley published the same transcription in his *The Beothuks or Red Indians: The Aboriginal Inhabitants of Newfoundland* in 1915 (15-22) along with the erroneous claim that it was taken from a letter written by Guy to John Slaney, the secretary of the Newfoundland Company. According to Howley (1915:15), the document was, “acquired from the Curator of the
Bristol Museum some years ago. The journal itself was first published in 1957 in the catalogue of the Lambeth Palace Library's exhibition in London. However, that version was not widely distributed. The journal received much wider distribution when it was published in Volume IV of D.B. Quinn's *New American World: A Documentary History of North America to 1612* in 1979 and Gillian T. Cell's *Newfoundland Discovered: English Attempts at Colonization, 1610-1630* in 1982.

The existence of other significant documents related to the history of the Cupids plantation, Guy's voyage into Trinity Bay, and relations between the Beothuk and the settlers at Cupids, first came to public attention with the publication of Cell's *English Enterprise in Newfoundland, 1577-1660* in 1969. In the course of her research, Cell had been presented with transcriptions of the private papers of Sir Percival Willoughby made by a Professor King of the University of Hull (Cell 1969: iii). These documents, then the property of Lord Middleton and now housed at the University of Nottingham, include nineteen letters written from Newfoundland to England between 1610 and 1631 and a weather diary kept by Henry Crout at Cupids between 1 September 1612 and 13 May 1613 and served as the basis for much of Cell's analysis of the history of the Cupids plantation. Crout's weather diary, "Occurrents in Newfoundland", was published by D.B. Quinn in Volume 4 of *New American World* (1979:157-178) and Crout's letter of April 10, 1613 was published by Cell in *Newfoundland Discovered* (1982:79-89). It was an analysis of the information contained in these three documents that led to the discovery of the Russell's Point site in 1988.
Further analysis of these documents over the winter of 1989-1990 showed that the Beothuk occupation of Trinity Bay, at least in 1612, had been much more extensive than had previously been believed and resulted in the publication of the first detailed account of the voyage (Gilbert 1990). This account indicated that Guy’s party had actually seen and recorded at least seven Beothuk camps - six at the bottom of Trinity Bay and another on the Come-By-Chance River in Placentia Bay - the largest of which, with nine structures, was almost certainly located at Stock Cove. Further analysis of the remaining unpublished Willoughby Papers in the spring of 1992 revealed that they contained a surprising amount of additional ethnographic information on the Beothuk in Trinity Bay, suggested that Beothuk/European relations at the bottom of the bay in the second decade of the seventeenth century were more cordial than had previously been believed and indicated that the Beothuk occupation of the bottom of the bay had continued until at least 1620 (Gilbert 1992). Two years later, on June 4, 1994, excavations began at Russell’s Point.
Chapter 2
Setting, Climate, Resources

Setting

The Russell's Point site (CiAj-1) is located on the western side of Dildo Pond just off the main highway through the community of Blaketown and directly behind the Russell's Service Station (Figures 1 and 2; Plates 1 and 2). Here a low grassy point of land, roughly triangular in shape and 70 metres wide (north to south) at its base, extends east for 34 metres from the base of a gently sloping bank. On the water side the point rises roughly 1 metre above a fine gravel beach ideal for launching and hauling up boats. To the north it is bordered by wet ground and a small stand of fir trees, while to the south a track runs east down the bank and across the point to the water (Figure 3).

During recent times the point has been used as a place for parking school buses, a campground, a launching and hauling up place for boats, and a playground. Car wrecks were also once dumped on the site. Consultations with local residents indicate that no permanent structures were built there within living memory and that it has been clear of trees as long as anyone can remember. However, recent activity seems to have flattened the area and this may have obliterated any surface features that might once have existed.

Dildo Pond is a lake formed during the Pleistocene by the northward movement of glacial ice through a pre-glacial river valley (Yoxall 1981:171,174). The lake lies in a lowland, 30.5 m (100 feet) above sea level, at the northern end of a broad valley that forms a corridor extending south across the Avalon Peninsula for 28 km (17.4 miles) to
the headwaters of St. Mary’s Bay. Its waters empty into the bottom of Dildo Arm down a 500 m (1641 ft) long, rapidly flowing stream, Dildo Brook, arising in the northwest portion of the lake. The lake measures 4 km (2.5 miles) long from north to south by 675 m (.42 mile) wide and has an average depth of 9.96 m (32.7 ft) although near the north end it extends down to a maximum depth of 21.33 m (70 feet). Near the southern end of the lake are two small islands. (Seabrook 1962:16-19).

The drainage area for Dildo Pond is roughly 40 square kilometres (16 square miles). A river flowing north into the north end of the lake from a series of small ponds and one substantial lake, Goose Pond, originates 7.24 km (4 ½ miles) to the south. Beyond this the drainage is to the south and the waters of the Rocky and Colinet Rivers flow into St. Mary’s Bay. To the east a series of small ponds, including Strayaway Pond, Wigwam Pond and Drover’s Pond, drain into the lake along short, fast flowing streams, while to the west a number of small streams empty into the lake from the boggy ground between the hills.

The bedrock in this area consists of Precambrian sedimentaries, mostly shale, covered with glacial till. The well rounded hills surrounding the lake were, and for the most part still are, covered with forests consisting today of largely coniferous trees (fir, spruce and larch) interspersed with occasional deciduous (mostly birch and alder) trees. However, surveyor’s reports from the 1880’s indicate that at that time the hills along the western side of Dildo Pond, where the community of Blaketown now stands, were covered in, “large white and yellow birches” (Clarke, Dawe, Drover, Gilbert, Jones and
Osbourne 1997:4). Bogs are common in low lying areas between the hills. At one time the forest encircled the lake down to the beach and in many places it still does. However, along the western bank a roughly 150 metre wide strip was cleared for farmland when Blaketown was established in the 1880s. The farmland gradually gave way to meadowland and much of it is now claimed by housing. The hills rise to a maximum height of 183 m (600 ft) to the west, 137 m (450 ft) to the northeast, 60 m (200 ft) to the east and 76 m (250 ft) to the southeast. (Seabrook 1962:16-17).

Climate

The climate of the Avalon Peninsula is somewhat milder than the rest of Newfoundland and by about the first of April the daily mean temperature has usually risen above zero degrees C. (32 degrees F.). Lakes on the Avalon are usually frozen over by the third or forth week of December and ice free by the third or forth week of April. The last spring frost usually occurs around June 1 and the first fall frost about October 15. The average mean daily air temperature in the summer is 16 degrees C., although highs of 20 degrees C. or more are not uncommon during July and August while the average winter temperature is -4 degrees C. Mean annual precipitation is 1400 mm with close to half of this falling between the months of November and March. The ground is not usually snow covered until about 30 November or later and most areas are clear of snow by the middle of April although occasional wet snow squalls may occur in May or, in some cases, even early June. The actual period of snow cover can vary considerably. Banfield (1981:102-
115) states that, “the number of days with a snow-cover of at least 2.5 cm varied from 30 to 130... over the period 1941-60”, and snow cover is sometimes discontinuous. The climate in the early seventeenth century, and for roughly 300 years prior to that time, would have been approximately 2 degrees colder than it is today as a result of the ‘Little Ice Age’ which followed the Medieval Warm Period and lasted from about 1315 until 1850 (Fagan 2001).

Resources

When considering the resources that may have been exploited at Russell’s Point, or any other site, it is useful to think in terms of ‘zones of exploitation’ (sensu Binford 1982). The resources exploited and the range over which they are exploited depends largely on the nature of the site itself. Specialized hunting camps, by their very nature, are occupied for only a short period each year, usually days or weeks, and focus on the exploitation of a limited number of resources available in the immediate vicinity of the site. On the other hand, base camps are occupied over a longer period each year and may serve as the hub from which a much wider area and much broader range of species are exploited.

The Site

At the most basic level, a site must provide sufficient surface area on which to erect structures and conduct necessary activities. Russell’s Point consists of roughly 1200 square metres of level dry land and the most basic of necessities, fresh water and wood for fuel and construction, would have been readily available. As mentioned above, the beach is
ideally suited for launching and hauling up small boats. A number of faunal and botanical resources would have been accessible in the immediate vicinity of the site. Dildo Pond is well known for a variety of fish including non-anadromous arctic char (Salvelinus alpinus); non-anadromous brook trout, or 'mud trout', and anadromous brook trout, or 'sea trout' (both Salvelinus fontinalis); and ouananiche (Salmo salar ouananiche) (Scott and Crossman 1964:53, 64-75, 115). The American eel (Anguilla rostrata) is also common (Eales 1968:45) and floater clams (Pyganodon [formerly Anodonta] sp.) can be found in the waters just off the point. A number of berries would also have been available in the woods near the site. Of these by far the most common is the blueberry (Vaccinium angustifolium ait.) which still grows in great numbers on the hills around Dildo Pond. The wild strawberry (both Fragaria vesca L. and Fragaria virginiana), raspberry (Rubus idaeus L.) and pin cheery (Prunus pennsylvanica L.F.) would also have been available in some numbers (Scott 1975:45-47, 53 & 61).

The exploitation of these resources is unlikely to have led to the establishment of a substantial camp and would probably have left only the most ephemeral traces on the archaeological record. However, one resource in particular is likely to have once been available in considerable numbers twice a year in the waters around Russell’s Point. We know that until the eighteenth century the range of the Avalon caribou (Rangifer tarandus) extended north to the Bay de Verde Peninsula (Mercer et al. 1985:23) and the writings of John Guy and Henry Crout make it clear that in the early seventeenth century caribou were present as far north as Bay de Verde itself. Guy states that colonists fishing
off Bay de Verde in November 1610 saw, “great store of Deere ... and twice they came within shot of them” (Quinn 1979:149). While sailing past Baccalieu Island on 13 November 1612 Crout records seeing, on a hill above Bay de Verde, “in one companie 12 or 13 deer marching along one after another”. Crout also reports that the crew of the shallop which went aground at Bay de Verde the next day, “had sight of some 4 companies of deer 6 - 5 - 4 and 3 in each companie coming very neer unto them so long as they kept going but standing still they would come no[t] near them” (Quinn 1979:163). However, an expedition sent out from Cupid to Bay de Verde on December 14 of the same year to hunt these animals returned nineteen days later with fox, duck and ‘partridge’ (ptarmigan), but no caribou (Quinn 1979:166-167).

Burch (1972:345) has pointed out that while caribou are continuously on the move, two definite seasonal movements can be anticipated in almost all herds in a natural state: a spring or early summer movement to open ground prior to calving and a fall movement to a forested winter range. Until around 1900 the winter range of the western Avalon herd was in the broad valley that lies to the south of Dildo Pond (Bergerund 1971:16; Fig. 4), and it seems clear that the calving grounds for at least a part of this herd was to the north on the barrens of the Bay de Verde Peninsula. The hunting party that set out from Cupids probably returned empty handed because by December 14 the caribou had already left for their winter grounds.

Given that, as LeResche and Linderman (1975:59) have pointed out, caribou tend to funnel, “between or along topographical features”, during their seasonal migrations, at
least a portion of the western Avalon herd would likely have had to cross Dildo Pond at these times. The movement of caribou through this area is also confirmed by Henry Crout. On 1 September 1612 Crout and seven others left the Cupers Cove plantation and set out overland for Trinity Bay marking the way as they went. Crout described this trip in both his journal (Quinn 1979:157-158) and in a letter written to Sir Percival Willoughby on September 8, 1612 (M ix 1/20). On the third day out Crout reported coming to, “a verie faire river”, and seeing, “a pathe which made showe of much deer had passed that way” (Quinn 1982:158). Recent research has allowed us to reestablish the route followed by Crout and it seems clear that the “faire river” he mentions is actually the Grassy Gullies, a series of small ponds connected by streams that runs from northeast to southwest and empties into the bottom of Trinity Bay at New Harbour. For much of its length the Grassy Gullies follows a small valley which opens up onto the New Harbour Barrens to the northeast and terminates on the eastern side of Dildo Pond almost directly opposite Russell’s Point to the southwest (Figures 4 and 5). The railroad established in this area in 1884 followed the same route northeast from Dildo Pond and it seems clear that the caribou trail mentioned by Crout did so as well. LeResche and Linderman point out that, once established, caribou trails tend to form routes that are reused again and again. Thus, the trail seen by Crout could possibly have been many years or even centuries old by the time he encountered it in 1612.

Burgerud (1971) has stated that the Avalon caribou herd no longer appears to have a summer calving ground but this is almost certainly a recent phenomenon. Various
writers have pointed to road and railway construction and increasing human populations as factors effecting migration. However, as Heard (1997:28-31) has observed, the single most important factor influencing caribou movements, at least in northern Canada, is the presence or absence of wolves. Wolves tend to follow the herds for most of the year but during May, when pups are being born, they den near the tree line. Caribou migrate to the barren ground beyond the tree line to have their calves, at least partly, to escape the wolves which pose such a threat to the newborns. Wolves were once common on the Avalon Peninsula, but have been extinct since the about 1911 (Northcott 1974: 49). The decline and eventual extinction of the wolf would have removed the need to migrate. While instinct might dictate that the behaviour continue, the establishment of roads and rail lines, the increasing human population and the resulting increase in pressure on caribou from hunting would probably, over time, restrict and eventually bring an end to the practice. Certainly, the establishment of a railway line along a major migration route, as appears to have happened at Dildo Pond, would probably have done much to discourage it.

The Foraging Radius

If Russell's Point was a specialized hunting camp, then the main resource exploited there would almost certainly have been the seasonally available migratory caribou supplemented, perhaps, by trout, char, ouananiche and eels. On the other hand, if the site was a base camp occupied for an extended period each year a much wider area, and range
of species, were likely exploited. Beyond the immediate vicinity of a site is the zone that Binford (1982:7) refers to as the ‘foraging radius’. This is the area, usually estimated at about 10 km (six miles), that can be comfortably exploited during day trips without having to spend nights away from the camp. If we turn our attention to this broader zone, we find that both a greater abundance of the resources already mentioned and other previously unmentioned resources may have been exploited from Russell’s Point.

Ouananiche inhabit lakes and only venture into streams during spawning in October. They can be taken in lakes during most of the year but are especially plentiful at the mouths of streams and in the streams themselves during their fall spawning runs. A number of the streams that flow into Dildo Pond may have contained ouananiche in some numbers during this time.

According to Scott and Crossman (1964:63-64) the mud trout, “is so universal that it apparently occurs in all suitable waters on the island... regardless of size”, and this is certainly correct. Even today the many ponds, streams and brooks within a 10 km radius to the east, south and west of Russell’s Point are rich in these fish and no doubt would have been more so before the arrival of Europeans. The size of mature mud trout tends to covary with the size of the body of water they inhabit. Those under six inches are usually found in small brooks and those between 6-9 inches in larger brooks and small ponds, while the largest, from 10 to 14 inches, are generally found in larger ponds and lakes such as Dildo Pond. Mud trout can be taken throughout most of the year but both mud trout and sea trout are especially plentiful at the mouths of swiftly flowing streams between
mid-October and mid-November where they gather to spawn (Scott and Crossman 1964: 64 & 72) and could have been easily speared or taken with either a baited hook or bone fish gorge.

Sea trout spend most of the year in freshwater lakes and streams where, like the mud trout, they can be taken throughout most of the year. However, starting in late April, sea trout travel downstream to the sea and spend several months trimming along the shores of the bays and feeding on a variety of fish before returning to fresh water, well fed and fattened, in August. At least partially because of their access to the richer resources of the salt water, sea trout tend to be larger than mud trout. Although these are obviously exceptional, sea trout weighing as much as seven pounds have been reported from Alexander Bay and of eight and nine pounds from Deer Harbour (Scott and Crossman 1964:73). The run to the sea is greatest once the water temperature approaches 10 degrees C. (50 degrees F.) sometime in May and these fish can be taken in considerable numbers in the streams and estuaries both during the May run downstream and the August run upstream (Scott and Crossman 1964:72). New Harbour Brook, 10 km (6 miles) north of Russell’s Point, Spread Eagle Brook, 6.5 km (4 miles) to the northwest, and Dildo Brook itself are all well known for their runs of sea trout. At the latter, large numbers of anglers can still be seen gathered around the ‘Salmon Pool” at the bottom of Dildo Brook 2.4 km (1 ½ miles) from Russell’s Point during the August run.

Eels are still frequently taken in Dildo Pond and in the many streams and small ponds that flow into the lake from the south, east and west. However, eels are available in
much greater concentrations first as 5-9 cm (2-3 ½ inch) long ‘elvers’ as they migrate up
stream in May and June and later as mature (5 to 10 year old) silver eels in the rivers and
estuaries as they migrate downstream on their way to the salt water - and eventually their
spawning grounds. This downstream migration begins about the middle of August and can
continue as late as mid-November (Eales 1968:2-7; Facey & Van den Avyle 1987:1-11).
However, the vast majority of migrating eels at the bottom of Trinity Bay pass down
stream to the salt water in the last two weeks of August. The migration is greatest
following a heavy rain at which time several hundred pounds can sometimes be taken in a
single night. After one or two such nights, each usually proceeded by heavy rain, the rate
of movement gradually decreases until by early September it has slowed to a trickle (Ron
Hillier: pers.comm.)¹. Little is known about the spring elver run in this area although in
some parts of Atlantic Canada it is reported that during intense runs several hundred elvers
can be taken, “with a few grabs of the bare hand” (Eales 1968:4). However, Dildo Brook,
and the estuary at the mouth of Spread Eagle Brook 6.6 km (4 miles) to the northwest of
Russell’s Point are noted for their abundance of eels during the August migration (Eales
1969:45). At the latter it is reported that a record 7000 pounds of eel was taken in one
night in the 1950s (Ron Hillier: pers.comm.).

The limited number of indigenous land mammals on the island of Newfoundland
and its effect on the subsistence patterns of the island’s prehistoric inhabitants has been

¹ Ron Hillier has been trapping eels in the area for many years as did his father as long
ago as the 1950s.
discussed in detail elsewhere (Tuck and Pastore 1985; Schwarz 1994) and need not be repeated here. Suffice it to say that, aside from humans, prior to contact there were only fourteen terrestrial mammals on the island: the arctic hare (*Lepus arcticus bangsii*), the long-eared bat (*Myotis keenii*), the little brown bat (*Myotis lucifugus*), the black bear (*Ursus americanus hamiltoni*), the beaver (*Castor canadensis caecator*), the caribou (*Rangifer tarandus*), the ermine (*Mustela ermina*), the red fox (*Vulpes vulpes delectrix*), the canadian lynx (*Lynx canadensis subsolanus*), the common muskrat (*Ondatra zibethicus obscurus*), the otter (*Lutra canadensis degener*), the pine martin (*Martes americana atrata*), the meadow vole (*Microtus pennsylvanicus terranovae*) and the Newfoundland wolf (*Canis lupus beothucus*). Of these only four, the arctic hare, black bear, beaver and caribou fit into the general definition of prey species. However, unless the Beothuk were very different from their Algonquin cousins, the muskrat, otter and martin were almost certainly hunted for food as well as for fur and even the ermine, fox, lynx and wolf were probably consumed at least occasionally.

William Epps Cormack mentions that the “larder” of a Mi’kmaq hunter he encountered on October 12, 1822 during his trek across Newfoundland included the carcasses of caribou, beaver, otter, muskrat and martin (Howley 1915:149) and Tanner (1985:53) lists not only caribou, beaver and bear among the game animals of the Mistassini Cree but also muskrat, martin, otter and ermine. According to Henriksen (1993:2-3) wolf, fox, otter and lynx were all hunted by the Naskapi of Labrador for both
their fur and their meat and weasels (ermine) would be eaten, "in times of scarcity". All of these creatures would have been available within a 10 km radius of Russell's Point.

As mentioned above, the winter ground of the western Avalon caribou herd once lay to the south of Dildo Pond. Around 1900, the northern boundary of these winter grounds lay near the head of Dildo Pond roughly 3 km (1.86 miles) to the south and well within the foraging radius of Russell's Point (Bergerund 1971:16). Although more difficult to hunt in winter then during their spring and fall migrations, caribou certainly can be hunted at this time of year (Burch 1972: 347) and the inhabitants of Russell's Point may have made trips into this area in winter to hunt caribou.

Beaver were also once common in the area and are today experiencing something of a comeback. The nearest location where beaver could possibly have been taken lies roughly 2.8 km (1.74 miles) to the south of the site in the marshy waters at the head of Dildo Pond where even today several beaver lodges, now long abandoned, can still be seen. The nearest active lodge known to the author lies about 6.5 km (4 miles) south of Russell's Point on a small pond that forms part of a system of ponds connected by streams that flow into the head of Dildo Pond. Prior to the arrival of Europeans most of the small ponds that dot the landscape around Dildo Pond probably contained beaver and Henry Crout bears witness to the large number of these animals in the area. During his trip overland between Conception Bay and Trinity Bay in September 1612 he reported seeing, "great store of paunds on every side as we passed. And in every paund great store of beavers nestes..." (Crout to Willoughby September 8, 1612: Mi X 1/20).
Studies undertaken in the 1950s and 1960s indicate a surprisingly high beaver population on the Avalon. A survey of a 105 square mile area bounded by Holyrood, Colinet and Whitbourne, the latter just 8 km (5 miles) south of Russell’s Point, conducted in the fall of 1955 located 84 beaver lodges (0.80 per square mile) of which 53 (0.50 per square mile) were occupied (Gregg 1955). An aerial survey of the Island in 1961 led to estimates of a total beaver population for the Avalon of 4600 animals with the highest density (1.0 +/- 0.26 lodges per square mile and a mean of 4.6 beaver per square mile) occurring in the centre of the peninsula around the Salmonier River (Bergerud and Manuel 1962). Indeed, at that time, the Avalon boasted one of the highest densities of beaver on the Island and this after roughly three centuries of mostly unregulated trapping.

Black bear, although now rare on the Avalon, were once common. In a letter written from Cupids on 6 October, 1610, John Guy reported seeing, “a bear now and then, that haunted this place”, (Cell 1982:61) and a letter written from Ferryland on 18 August, 1622 by ‘N.H.’ reported that, “As for the Beares, although there bee many; they beare us no ill will, I thinke, for I have eaten my part of two or three, and taken no hurt of them” (Purchas 1906: Vol XIX, 448) Bear could probably have been taken throughout most of the year but they likely were sought after most in fall when they can be easily found feeding on the berry barrens and are at their fattest after feeding well all summer. Rodgers (1972) reports that among the Mistassini Cree, “Bear are greatly desired as food, especially because of the large amount of fat they yield. They are taken at every opportunity, but are eagerly sought during the fall when they are fattest ...”. Here in
Newfoundland, Jackson reports that among the Mi'kmaq, “Black bears were hunted as they fed on ripe berries on the barrens and rocky hillsides. ... [and that]...In fall a prime bear yielded considerable fat, enough to fill a large flour sack in some cases” (Jackson 1993:133). We also have some documentary evidence to indicate that the Beothuk in Trinity Bay were hunting bear during the fall of 1612. On 5 November 1612 Crout reported that near the bottom of Bull Arm they, “found in all some 8 or 9 salvages housses// and wher they had tanned a beares skine” (Quinn 1979: 162). On the hills roughly 2 km west of Russell’s Point lies a large (2.8 km x 1 km ) stretch of open ground known locally as “the Big Barren” where berries abound throughout the summer and fall. This area may once have been ideal for hunting bear.

The willow ptarmigan (Lagopus lagopus), still present in some numbers, would also have been found feeding on the berries of the Big Barren and other smaller berry barrens at this time of year. These birds move unto the open hills and barrens in the spring to nest and spend the summer and fall feeding on the leaves and buds of willow, birch and alder, white cotton grass, berries and various insects. In the winter they move into sheltered valleys (Peters and Burleigh 1951:150-152). They make for easy hunting in fall and winter when they can be caught in snares or easily approached and stunned with a rock or stick. The barrens would also once have been home to the arctic hare.

A number of migratory birds can also be found in the marshes and ponds within a ten mile radius of Dildo Pond. These include the eastern canada goose (Branta canadensis canadensis), which are flightless between June and August and can sometimes
be easily approached; the black duck (*Anas rubripes*); the green-winged teal (*Anas carolinensis*); and the lesser redbreasted merganser (*Mergus serrator serratus*).

Berries to be found in considerable numbers on the Big Barren and many other locations within the foraging radius of Russell’s Point include the partridgeberry (*Vaccinium vitis-idaea*), the marshberry (*Vaccinium oxycoccus*), the bakeapple, or cloudberry, (*Rubus chamaemorus*), and the blackberry, or crowberry, (*Empetrum nigrum*). Blueberries (*Vaccinium angustiflorum ait.*) are plentiful on the hills and the raspberry (*Rubus idaeus*) is common, especially in cleared or burnt over areas.

Turning our attention towards the sea, ten kilometres would bring us north as far as New Harbour and west to the head and east side of Chapel Arm and into the midst of a totally different range of resources. Scott and Crossman (1964:35) state that Atlantic salmon (*Salmo salar* linnaeus), “run in most, if not all, of the rivers of the Island that are adequate in size and environment.” The salmon run begins about the middle of June and is most intense during July and the first half of August after which it may continue at a slower pace until late September (Marshall 1996:300, fig 19.2). Today there is no salmon run up Dildo Brook and Seabrook (1961:17-19) has stated that the waterfall on the brook is impassible for anadromous fish. However, this is clearly not the case since sea trout make the annual trip up and down this brook each year and it is possible that salmon may once have made this trip as well. Even if salmon were not available in Dildo Brook they can still be taken in some numbers in both New Harbour Brook 10 km (6 miles) to the north and Spread Eagle Brook.
The beaches from the bottom of Dildo Arm west to Spread Eagle contain a plentiful supply of mussel beds. Lobsters can also be taken and a variety of fish including cod, herring, mackerel, squid and caplin are available in this area during the summer months. The presence of these species once attracted, and in a number of cases still attracts, various sea mammals to the area.

Harbour seals (*Phoca vitulina* Linnaeus) were once common in Trinity Bay and are still present in both Placentia and St. Mary’s Bay to the south and Bonavista Bay to the northwest and grey seals were also once available (Boulva and McLaren 1979:2). Harbour seals tend to congregate in large numbers on beaches during daylight hours and can be hunted throughout most of the year, although their reluctance to haul out when the weather is extremely cold and their tendency to move out to the ice edge when harbours are frozen over makes them harder to hunt during the winter months (Boulva & McLaren 1979: 4-5). Boulva and McLaren (1979:4-5) reported that on Sable Island, harbour seals tend to appear in increasing numbers as the weather warms in April and that herds of up to 150 animals are not uncommon at this time. Davis (1984:35-52) observed that harbour seals on the French island of Miquelon off Newfoundland’s south coast gather in groups of up to several hundred packed close together and spread as much as 20-25 m inland from the waters edge. On Sable Island the large herds tend to break up in May when females begin to give birth but harbour seals are still available distributed over a wider area and in smaller groups well into the fall (Boulva and McLaren 1979:5-6). Harbour seals also tend to reuse the same beaches year after year. Davis (1984:63-65) has noted
that neither hunting pressure, heavy construction or pup tagging operations have been known to cause site abandonment at Miquelon and suggests that this 'site tenacity' is a result of 'site attachment' imprinted early in life. Thus, harbour seals could provide a dependable source of food for much of the year as long as a particular group was not hunted to the point where it could no longer maintaining its numbers. The nearest beach where harbour seals may have been available lies at the bottom of Dildo Arm just 2.4 km (1.5 miles) to the north of Russell's Point. In prehistoric and early historic times, harbour seals could probably also have been taken on any number of beaches within a 10 km range of the site.

The white-beaked dolphin, or 'squidhound', (*Lagenorhynchus albirostris*) can be seen in Dildo Arm and the surrounding area from May to November travelling in groups of 10 to 20. From July until October both the Atlantic white-sided dolphin, or 'jumper', (*Lagenorhynchus acutus*) and the harbour porpoise, or 'puffing pig', (*Phocoena phocoena*) are also frequent visitors: the former travelling in groups of six to eight and the latter in groups of up to fourteen or fifteen. All are attracted by the abundance of fish especially squid which seems to be a particular favourite (Hoyt 1984:103-110, 115-119). Also attracted by the squid is the pilot whale, or 'pothead', (*Globicephala melaena*) which feeds on it almost exclusively. Trinity Bay, and especially the area around Dildo Arm, is well known for an abundance of pilot whales who travel in herds of between 10 and 250 animals and are present from July until October. During the height of the pilot whale fishery in 1956 approximately 7,000 of these whales were taken in Trinity Bay
alone, many of these at Bellevue, Chapel Arm, New Harbour and Old Shop (Sergeant 1962: 1-3). During the pilot whale fishery these animals were herded unto beaches and slaughtered. However, pilot whales are well known for their habit of beaching themselves. On 28 September 1975 300 of these whales beached themselves at Charleston, Bonavista Bay and on 16 July 1979 another 300 went ashore at Point au Gaul on the Burin Peninsula (Hoyt 1984:91).

A number of other larger whales, including minkes (*Balaenoptera acutorostrata*) and humpbacks (*Megaptera novaeangliae*), visit the Dildo Arm area each summer and while we can be fairly confident that the Beothuk lacked the technology to hunt these larger cetaceans, we should not rule out the possibility that they were at least occasionally taking dolphins, porpoises and perhaps even pilot whales. One of the earliest descriptions we have of the Beothuk states that during the summers, “They fish for seals, porpoises, and certain sea birds, called gannets [Margaux]” (Hoffinan 1963:14) (for a more detailed discussion of this document see Chapter 4). Speaking of whales, William Cormack stated that, “... the [Beothuk] Indians consider it the greatest luck to kill one”. One of the six ceremonial staves drawn by Shanawdithit, the last known Beothuk, is surmounted by a whale’s tail and the caption accompanying it reads in part, “Emblematic of the Whales tail, considered the greatest prize of the hunter” (Marshal 1996:387; Howley 1915: 230 & Sketch 10). Cormack believed that this emblem represented the Bottle Nosed Whale. However, as Marshall (1996: 563 n.98) has pointed out, Howley doubted this and suggested instead that it more likely represented the “commom dolphin”. While faunal
remains are rare on Recent Indian/Beothuk sites, there is some evidence to suggest that Recent Indian people hunted small whales. One of the thirty-five identifiable faunal elements from the Little Passage site at L’Anse a Flamme in Hermitage Bay was a dolphin or porpoise bone (Penney 1985). Given their tendency to beach themselves, it is more than likely that at least an occasional pilot whale came ashore on the beaches within 10 km of Russell’s Point and once in one of the narrow arms at the bottom of the bay these whales might have easily been driven ashore. Even an occasional pilot whale would constitute a substantial addition to the Beothuk’s food supply. Sergeant (1962: 22-23) has estimated the mean yield of fat and meat from an average pothead, 3.96 m (13 ft) in length, to be 249 kg (548 lb) and 282 kg (621 lb) respectively.

Finally, while not available in the numbers they would have been farther to the north, both Ross’s Island and the south end of Dildo Island, located at the entrance to Dildo Arm roughly 8 km (5 miles) north of Russell’s Point, are nesting sites for sea birds. Today these islands are utilized mostly by gulls. However, traces of puffin borrows indicate that this species once nested on these islands and the puffin’s habit of borrowing in tufts created where the Great Auk once nested suggests that these large flightless birds may once have nested there as well (Montevecchi and Tuck 1987:157-158).
The Logistical Radius

Beyond the foraging radius of a site is a much broader zone sometimes referred to as the logistical radius. Binford defines the logistical radius as that area that can only be exploited by specialized hunting parties who must spend at least one night, and often many nights or even weeks, away from the base camp. If we extend our range south from Russell’s Point beyond the foraging radius and into the logistical radius, we find ourselves in the heart of what Daniel Prowse described in 1895 as, “then and now the finest game preserve in the Island” (1895:179). From the headwaters of the river that flows into the head of Dildo Pond, 9 km (5 ½ miles) south of Russell’s Point, it is only 200 m overland to the appropriately named Reversing Pond at the headwaters of the Rocky River which can be navigated by canoe for the roughly 21 km (13 miles) south to St. Mary’s Bay.

In January of 1828 Philip Henry Gosse, guided by, “Old Joe Byrne, a trapper and furrier, familiar with the interior”, made the trip overland from St. Mary’s Bay to Dildo Arm in three days and this in deep snow that at times greatly slowed their progress (Rompkey 1990: 237-239). As we have seen, this is the winter grounds of the western Avalon caribou herd and an area well known for its beaver. As early as 1662 John Matthews of Ferryland reported that Indians (probably Mi’kmaq) were making trips into this area from St. Mary’s Bay to, “kill beavers and other beasts for ffurres”, (Prowse 1895:179) and by at least the 1670s, and almost certainly before that, English settlers from the Avalon’s Southern Shore were undertaking winter furring expeditions into the hinterland of St. Mary’s Bay and, as one participant put it, “Mak[ing] good voyages of itt
& turn[ing it] to good profit” (Pope 1992:84; Head 1976:19). Phillip Henry Gosse worked as a clerk for merchant John W. Martin at St. Mary’s from August 1827 to January 1828 and reported that, “We did a good business in valuable furs, beaver, otter, fox (various), musquash [i.e. muskrat], &c. - and [a] whole room was hung round with dry skins, received from the trappers, awaiting shipment” (Gosse 1990:236). Writing twelve years later in 1840 surveyor Thomas Byrne reported that both the Colinet and Rocky Rivers, “seem[ed] to be alive with otters” (Byrne 1840). Both the Rocky and Colinet Rivers are also known for their mud trout, sea trout and salmon and, of course, beyond these rivers lie the marine resources of St. Mary’s Bay.

Extending our range northwest beyond the foraging radius, we find ourselves on the Isthmus of Avalon. Both archaeological and documentary evidence attests to a substantial Recent Indian/Beothuk presence in this area and archaeology has confirmed the presence of Maritime Archaic and Dorset people here as well (Gilbert 1990; Rutherford and Gilbert 1992). Robbins (1985), who conducted excavations on the Dorset component of the Stock Cove site, suggested that the appeal of the Isthmus was its close proximity to two large biomasses - harbour seals and caribou - supplemented by a number of lesser species such as grey seals, salmon, trout, caplin, birds and birds’ eggs and this is almost certainly true. Camps located on the Isthmus would also place their residents in close proximity to the resources of both Trinity and Placentia Bays.

From Bellevue, 19 km (12 miles) northwest of Russell’s Point, to the bottom of Bull Arm at the north end of the Isthmus, the average distance overland to Placentia Bay
is only 7 km (4 ½ miles) and at Bull Arm the distance is only 4 km (2 ½ miles). We know from both Guy and Crout that the Beothuk were using a trail cut from Bull Arm to Come-By-Chance in Placentia Bay to, “cary cannose over land to Imbark them selves at the other side”, (Quinn 1979: 162; Gilbert 1990:158) and it seems highly likely that other such trails existed elsewhere on the Isthmus. According to Guy, Crout and eleven others made the 4 km trip overland to Placentia Bay and back along this trail, “In two houres & a halfe” (Quinn 1979: 154). Given this, it seems that Placentia Bay could have been reached easily from any part of the Isthmus between Bellevue and Bull Arm along an established trail within roughly three hours. Of course, these trails would not only provide access to the marine resources of Placentia Bay but to the terrestrial resources of the Isthmus itself.

While surveying the Placentia Bay side of the Isthmus in the summer of 1714, William Taverner (C.O. 194/ 6, 226-228) confirmed the presence of caribou in the area. Along the coast from Long Harbour to Come-By-Chance, he said, “. is good hunting for deer, and ffoxes at the proper seasons on the year”. If caribou were present on the barren hills of the isthmus it is likely they were there during the summer and early autumn prior to the fall migration. Thus, the isthmus would have given the Beothuk access to caribou in their summer range. According to Taverner, Come-By-Chance itself, “afford[ed] nothing except seale and grass for cattle”. The presence of seals - probably harbour seals - at Come-By-Chance may have left Taverner unimpressed but it would have been much more significant to the Beothuk and had Taverner more time to investigate he may also
have noted that the Come-By-Chance River is known for its runs of salmon and sea trout. Taverner also mentioned that the islands off the coast, “afford abundance of ... seals in the winter” . Again Taverner is almost certainly referring to harbour seal and possibly grey seal. Given that Placentia Bay is normally ice free during the winter and has one of the mildest climates on the island, harbour seals would probably have been available there year round.

Moving north from Bull Arm along the north side of Trinity Bay or south into Placentia Bay would have brought the Beothuk to a number of islands where nesting sea birds and their eggs could have been collected from mid-May until the end of June. Bull Island, located on the north side of the entrance to Bull Arm, may, as it name suggests (Seary 1971:58), have been one of these islands. Richard Whitbourne (Cell 1982:193-194, 213; Gilbert 1992:10) bears witness to the Beothuk practice of collecting birds and their eggs on the islands between Heart’s Ease 30 km (18 ½ miles) north of Bull Arm and English Harbour in the early seventeenth century. However, whether these were Beothuk from the bottom of Trinity Bay, or “from the north” as Whitbourne believed, or a combination of both, we at present have no way of knowing.

While occasional forays may have been made from Russell’s Point to that part of the Isthmus beyond Bellview, the concerted exploitation of this region, and certainly of the bird islands and other resources beyond it, would have required a shift of base camp to another site better situated to provide access to these resources. Such a move was almost certainly part of the seasonal round of the Beothuk who utilized Russell’s Point.
Chapter 3
Length of Occupation

We know from the documentary evidence that Russell’s Point was occupied on October 26, 1612. However, were the Beothuk whom Guy’s party encountered at the bottom of Trinity Bay relatively new arrivals from farther to the northwest drawn there, perhaps, by its close proximity to the migratory fishery and the chance of acquiring European goods, or had Trinity Bay long been part of the Beothuk’s territory? And how long after 1612 did the Beothuk presence in Trinity Bay continue?

As we have seen, recent documentary research has shown that the Beothuk presence in Trinity Bay in the second decade of the seventeenth century was much more substantial than had previously been believed and the documents also indicate that there was still a Beothuk presence at the bottom of Trinity Bay at least as late as 1620. Thomas Rowley was among the party that accompanied Guy on his voyage into Trinity Bay in 1612. During the winter of 1619-1620 Rowley was still living at Cupids and making plans to establish a plantation at New Perlican in Trinity Bay (Gilbert 1992:7; and Rowley to Willoughby, 8 February 1620, Mix 1/53). Once settled, he planned to support the new plantation by fishing, farming, prospecting for minerals and trading with the Beothuk (Cell 1969:76; Gilbert 1992 6-7). Between September of 1619 and February of 1620 Rowley wrote a series of letters to Sir Percival Willoughby in which he makes reference to the Beothuk at the bottom of Trinity Bay. On 13 September 1619, he wrote that, “Master hill [and] I be resolu[e]d to go to the bottome of trinity bay about 16 dayes henc[e]”, to trade
with the Indians (Rowley to Willoughby, Mi x 1/50) and in another letter he wrote that once settled in New Perlican he would be, “so neare to th[e]m among the savages [and] se[e] what good beginning we may haue w[i]th them the end of the next fishing [season]” (Rowley to Willoughby, Mi x 1/60). Also included among these documents are two lists of provisions required to establish the plantation at New Perlican both of which include goods to be used as “Truck for Savages” (Gilbert 1992:7; Mi x 1/61, Mi x 1/62).

In 1620 Richard Whitbourne published *A Discourse and Discovery of Newfoundland* and two years later he published an enlarged version of the *Discourse* and *A Discourse Containing a Loving Invitation Both Honourable and Profitable to all Such as Shall be Adventurers in the New-Found-Land* which contained some material from the earlier work but also much new material (Cell 1982:27-39). Both of these works include a number of references to the Beothuk in Trinity Bay. (For a summary of most, but not all, of these references see Howley 1915:19-22). In writing his discourses, Whitbourne was drawing on almost forty years of experience in the Newfoundland fishery and in most cases it is difficult to tell when within that forty year period the events he describes took place. However, some of the references are obviously contemporary.

In the *Loving Invitation* (1622) he states that on the islands between English Harbour and Heart’s Ease on the north side of Trinity Bay, “the natiuues of the Countrey doe often come from the North, and fetch... fowles and their egges as they haue been often seen to doe” (Cell 1982:213; Gilbert 1992:10). In one of his most oft quoted statements from the *Discourse* (1620), he says that, “many of them [i.e. the Beothuk]
secretly every yeere, come into *Trinity* Bay and Harbour, in the night time, purposely to steale Sailes, Lines, Hatchets, Hookes, Knives, and such like"(Cell 1982:118). This is clearly a reference to Beothuk coming overland from Bonavista Bay or "the Bay of Flowers" as Whitbourne calls it. However, Beothuk were also apparently still living in Trinity Bay. In a letter written by Whitbourne to Lord Falkland on 24 December 1622, he says of Trinity Bay that, "the savage natives of that country live on the North side of it..." (Cell 1982:225; Gilbert 1992:10). Whether these are the same people encountered by Guy ten years earlier or another group living on the north side of the bay, we currently have no way of knowing.

The last document of which we are aware that refers to the Beothuk in Trinity Bay is a letter written by Sir David Kirke at Ferryland in the fall of 1639 (Kirke 1871:132-137). We have already mentioned Kirke’s account of a trading expedition led by a Captain Whittington into the bottom of Trinity Bay, "a place", Kirke says, "always frequented with the natives", contained in that letter. According to Kirke, this expedition, which was a success, took place, "about twenty years since", which would place it around 1619. Apparently, by 1639 relations between the Beothuk and the English had deteriorated for he bemoans the fate of, "our poore fisherman, that use to fish in Trinity Bay and more northerly, ... [who] ... wille assure you by their own continuall and sad experience, that they have found too many bad neighbours of the natives almost every fishing season" (Howley 1915:23). Again, whether the Beothuk referred to by Kirke were still frequenting the bottom of Trinity Bay or whether their range was farther north along the north side of
the bay we have know way of knowing. However, it is possible that prior to about 1650 the bottom the bay, around the Isthmus of Avalon, served as ‘safe haven’ for the Trinity Bay Beothuk.

The southern limit of the main inshore cod stocks in Trinity Bay lay roughly 40 km (25 miles) north of the Isthmus and the main stocks in Placentia Bay lay roughly the same distance to the south (Gilbert 1990:163-164; Head 1976:24). Thus, the bottom of both Trinity Bay and Placentia Bay would have held little attraction for migratory fishermen who had little time to devote to anything other than the catching and curing of cod. This situation probably changed drastically in the second half of the century. By that time small year round English settlements had been established farther out Trinity Bay in places like Old Perlican and New Perlican (Handcock 1989:41) and in 1662 a French colony was established at Placentia (Prowse 1895:178-179). Undoubtedly colonists from both these areas would have made trips into the bottom of Trinity and Placentia Bays to cut timber, hunt and trap. We have already seen that by at least the 1670s, and almost certainly before that, English settlers from the Avalon’s Southern Shore were trapping in the interior of the Avalon to the south of Russell’ Point and as early as 1662 Indians (probably Mi’kmaq) were hunting and trapping in the area. It seems unlikely that a small Beothuk population could have withstood such intrusions for long.

Unfortunately, while there is ample material evidence to show that Russell’s Point was occupied during the historic period, none of it is of much help in determining a final occupation date for the site. However, it is worth noting that whereas the Boyd’s Cove
site in Notre Dame Bay, dated by Pastore (1992:30) to between 1650 and 1720, produced a total of 67 iron projectile points and 155 modified nails (Ralph Pastore: pers.comm.), Russell’s Point produced no iron projectile points and only one modified nail, suggesting that Beothuk iron working technology was still in its infancy at the time the site was abandoned. Indeed, the Beothuk adoption of European material culture in general seems much less advanced at Russell’s Point than at Boyd’s Cove (see Chapter 5 below).

Thus, it seems likely that Russell’s Point was abandoned by roughly the middle of the seventeenth century. But how long prior to Guy’s visit was the site being used by the Beothuk? Certainly, the number of features found at the site and their relationship to each other suggests a relatively long occupation. The following is a summary of these features.

**SITE FEATURES**

**Description**

In the upper levels, the cultural deposit over most of the site consisted of a confusing mixture of fire-cracked rock, lithic debitage, charcoal, calcined bone and artifacts (Figure 6). However, as excavations proceeded, this confusion gradually began to resolve itself into recognizable features (Figures 7 and 8). In the case of the hearths, most seem to have survived because they were dug into the underlying sterile subsoil and it was only as this sterile substrate began to emerge that the hearths and some of the other features could be delineated and identified against the backdrop of the surrounding sterile
matrix. Even then, in a number of cases, only the lower portion of an obviously truncated feature survived to be recorded. While we were able to identify seventeen hearths and a number of related features within the boundaries of the excavation, there must originally have been many more that were either obscured or totally destroyed by the repeated reuse of the site over a long period.

**Hearths**

Two basic types of hearths were uncovered at the site: elliptical hearths and linear hearths. The former were usually roughly oval in shape and constructed by excavating a shallow pit, averaging about 12 cm deep, and building a fire within it. In these pits was a rich matrix containing a combination of fire-cracked rock, charcoal, lithic debris and small fragments of calcined bone. The pits themselves could generally be distinguished from the surrounding subsoil because the matrix into which they had been dug was fused by heat into a hard baked clay, usually white, beige, grey or yellow in colour. The linear hearths were similar to the elliptical hearths in construction and content but, instead of a shallow pit, they were formed by digging a long narrow trench, also usually about 12 cm deep, and building a fire in it. Depending on one's definition, some of the hearths uncovered at Russell’s Point could be designated as either linear or elliptical. However, for the sake of this discussion, I have chosen to define a linear hearth as any hearth that is at least twice as long as it is wide. Of the seventeen hearths identified, six were linear (Hearths 1, 3, 4, 5, 8, and 10) and nine (Hearths 2, 6, 7, 9, 11, 12, 13, 15, and 16) were elliptical. Two others
(Hearths 14 and 17) were only partially exposed by the excavation and thus could not be classified by shape.

**Elliptical Hearths**

**Hearth 2** - Located in Unit 6 beneath Midden 2, Hearth 2 measured 58 cm (east to west) by 72 cm (north to south) and was 10 cm deep. In addition to the usual fire-cracked rocks, charcoal, lithic debris, and calcined bone, this pit also contained twelve tooth fragments from a juvenile caribou.

**Hearth 6** - Hearth 6, located in Unit 17, measured 36 cm (east to west) by 32 cm (north to south), extended down to a maximum depth of 10 cm and had been constructed along the western side of a 25 cm wide, flat stone.

**Hearth 7** - Hearth 7 was located just 15 cm north of and 4 cm below the level Hearth 6 and clearly predated it. Indeed, Hearth 7 was only discovered after Hearth 6 had been completely excavated and we were surprised to find this feature in what we believed to be sterile beach gravel. It measured 95 cm (east to west) by 52 cm (north to south) and was a maximum of 10 cm deep.

**Hearth 9** - Located in the southern half of Unit 23, Hearth 9 measured 58 cm (east to west) by 51 cm (north to south) and was 15 cm deep.

**Hearth 11** - Located in the southern half of Unit 29, Hearth 11 measured 47 cm (east to west) by 60 cm (north to south) and was 7 cm deep.
Hearth 12 - Located in Unit 28, Hearth 12 measured 90 cm (east to west) by 57 cm (north to south) and was 19 cm deep.

Hearth 13 - Hearth 13 was located beneath FCR Feature 1 (see below) and clearly predated it. It measured 1.10 m (east to west) by 60 cm (north to south) at its widest and extended down to a maximum depth of 9 cm.

Hearth 15 - Hearth 15 was located in the baulk between Units 26 and 24 and just 15 cm north of Hearth 10. It measured 55 cm (east to west) by 48 cm (north to south) and was contained in a shallow pit extending down to a maximum depth of 15 cm.

Hearth 16 - Located beneath Midden 1, Hearth 15 measured 72 cm (east to west) by 45 cm (north to south) and extended down to a maximum depth of 15 cm.

Linear Hearths

Hearth 1 - Hearth 1 was located in the extreme northwest of the excavation in Units 1 and 4 and extended west beyond the boundaries of the excavation. As a result its total length is unknown. However, the excavated portion extended east into the operation for 1.85 m, measured 84 cm across at its widest point and was 10 cm deep.

Hearth 3 - Hearth 3 was located mostly within Unit 8 beneath Midden 2. It measured 1.95 m (east to west) by 32 cm (north to south) and was 15 cm deep.

Hearth 4 - Hearth 4 ran from east to west across Units 9 and 38 and was partially covered by Midden 2. It measured 3.06 m (east to west) by 36 cm (north to south) and was 6 cm deep.
Hearth 5 - Hearth 5 extended from east to west across the site in Units 10, 11 and 12. It measured 4.90 m (east to west) by 40 cm (north to south) and was, on average, 10 cm deep.

Hearth 8 - Hearth 8 was located roughly 70 cm southeast of Hearth 6 in the baulk between Units 18 and 22. As a result, it went undetected for some time. It measured 1.25 m (east to west) by 35 (north to south) and was 16 cm deep.

Hearth 10 - Hearth 10 extended east to west across Units 19, 26 and 29 and measured 3.45 m (east to west) by 38 cm (north to south) although at roughly two thirds of the distance east along its length it was 62 cm wide. Indeed, it is possible that Hearth 10 was either built over an older elliptical hearth or that it had originally been an elliptical hearth that was later expanded into a linear hearth. It was 17 cm deep.

Other Hearths

Hearth 14 - A portion of Hearth 14 was located in the extreme north of Unit 24. However, the remainder of this feature extended north into an unexcavated portion of the site, so its exact dimensions are unknown. That part of the hearth excavated measured 1.03 m (east to west), extended south into Unit 24 for 36 cm and was 15 cm deep.

Hearth 17 - Like Hearth 16, Hearth 17 was located beneath Midden 1 and clearly predated it. It extended east beyond the limits of the excavation so its total length from east to west is unknown. However, the exposed portion of it measured 68 cm (east to west) by 48 cm (north to south) and extended down for a depth of 5 cm.
As mentioned above, debris, in the form of fire-cracked rocks, charcoal, small fragments of calcined bone and lithic debitage, was scattered over most of the site. However, in two areas intensive concentrations of material were uncovered that could only have been the result of intentional dumping. Midden 1, located in the extreme northeast of the excavation, consisted mostly of organic material intermixed with fire-cracked rocks while Midden 2, located roughly 4.5 m southwest of Midden 1, consisted mostly of fire-cracked rock.

**Midden 1** - In the northeast corner of the site, roughly 3 m from the edge of the beach was a depression measuring 2.25 m in diameter and extending down to a maximum depth of 35 cm below the surrounding surface. At first, we thought that this might be the remains of a house pit, albeit a rather small one. However, as the excavation proceed, it became clear that it was not. Instead, the depression appears to have been formed naturally. The ground gradually slopes down to the east and north in this area as it nears the bank above the beach and this slope formed the south and west sides of the depression, while the east, and probably the north, sides were formed by a ridge of beach gravel that had accumulated along the edge of the bank over a period of perhaps hundreds of years.

Although a natural formation, this depression proved anything but disappointing. Beneath an 8 cm overburden of sod and silt was a deposit of beach gravel, averaging 6 cm thick, and beneath this was a greasy black deposit, approximately 20 cm thick at its
thickest, containing a combination of fire-cracked rock, charcoal, stone tools, lithic debris and calcined bone. This depression was clearly used by the inhabitants of Russell’s Point as a midden. Of the 1023 faunal elements recovered from the site, 628 came from this roughly 2 m x 2 m area. In other words, 61% of the faunal remains came from 02.5% of the total area excavated. Beneath this midden deposit we found the remains of Hearth 16 and Hearth 17.

**Midden 2** - As mentioned above, fire-cracked rock was scattered over almost the entire excavation but while most of this seems to have been the result of random scatter, in the northwest corner of the excavation (Units 5, 6, 8 and 9) there was a concentration that must have been the result of intentional dumping. The exact perimeters of this concentration were hard to define because lesser concentrations of fire-cracked rock extended away from it in all directions. However, at its greatest extent, it measured approximately 4.5 metres in diameter and was roughly 15 cm thick. Apparently exhausted fire-cracked rock had been dumped in this area from hearths located elsewhere on the site.

**Fire-Cracked Rock Features 1 and 2**

East of Midden 2 and south of Midden 1 were two concentrations of fire-cracked rock that were clearly more than just hearth scatter. FCR Feature 1 measured 1.90 m (east to west) by 94 cm (north to south) and FCR Feature 2, located immediately west of it, measured 2.25 m (east to west) by 1.80 m (north to south). Both consisted of a single layer of tightly packed fire-cracked rock that at first glance had something of the
appearance of shattered cobblestones, in a two to three centimetre thick matrix of organically enriched black silt. The purpose of these features is, as yet, unknown although it has been suggested that they may have served as roasting platforms.

Post Molds

Only two post molds were identified at the site; both of these were associated with Hearth 5 and located roughly two thirds of the distance east along the length of that feature. Post Mold 1 was located 15 cm north of the hearth and Post Mold 2 was located 57 cm south of it almost directly opposite Post Mold 1.

Pits

Two shallow, gravel-filled pits were identified at the site, both associated with linear hearths. Pit 1 was located about half way along the north side of Hearth 5 and only a few centimetres north of it. It measured 38 cm in diameter and 13 cm deep, was filled with beach gravel and covered in red ochre. Pit 2 was located 80 cm south of Hearth 10, was 22 cm in diameter and only 5 cm deep although it may have originally been deeper. Another pit, Pit 3, was located just south of the southern edge of Midden 1. Unlike Pits 1 and 2, Pit 3 was filled with firecracked rocks. It measured 37 cm (east to west) by 26 cm (north to south) and was 20 cm deep.
Greasy Black Organic Deposit

Extending east from Unit 19 into the eastern half of Unit 26 was a greasy black organic deposit measuring 2.2 m long (east to west) by 1.9 m wide (north to south) and roughly 3 cm thick. This deposit resembled the rich organic matrix often found in association with coastal sites where sea mammals have been butchered and may have been a butchering area. It was located above the level of Hearth 10 and clearly post dated that feature.

Red Ochre Stains

A number of red ochre stains were uncovered at the site. Bright red and greasy, these stains were apparently produced by mixing ground red ochre with animal fat.

Site Features and Length of Occupation

Over the past twenty years a number of theories have been proposed to measure the degree of site reuse over time. One of the more useful is Gillford’s (1980) concept of ‘feature discreteness’. Gilford suggests that sites which have been used only once or twice should present only a few discrete features with little evidence of disturbance. However, as the level of reuse increases, features will become more blurred (less discrete) with elements of older features being incorporated into newer ones and newer features constructed that overlap older ones. Thus, sites that have been reused on a regular basis over a long period of time should present an extremely high level of feature indiscreteness.
and the stratification of features one above another. As we have seen, many of the features at Russell’s Point, especially in the upper levels, were extremely blurred and difficult to interpret and, in a number of cases, more recent features had been constructed above older ones. Clearly, the extreme level of feature indiscreteness and the stratification of some features suggests repeated use over an extended period.

Another measure of site use frequency is refuse accumulation. The longer a site is used, or the more often it is reused, the more debris will accumulate. Moreover, as both Binford (1978a, 1978b, 1983) and Schiffer (1976) have pointed out, the longer a site is used the greater will be the need to employ some form of waste management. Simply put, if people are using an area only once and for a short period, they are less likely to manage their waste than if they plan either a longer stay or regular reuse. In most cases this has little to do with any preconceived ideas of hygiene and a great deal to do with the practicalities of site use. The more ‘stuff’ there is lying around, the more it hinders necessary activities. Thus, the more regularly a site is used, the more likely refuse will be relocated to designated discard locations or middens (Schiffer 1976: 15). Thus, while refuse accumulation can be a useful measure of reuse, frequent reuse should also result in refuse being deposited in specific locations away from the main activity areas.

Clearly, using refuse accumulation as a measure of reuse at Russell’s Point, the site must have been reused many times over a long period. Aside from the fire-cracked rocks and other hearth debris mentioned above, a total of 111 cores and core fragments, 1183 stone artifacts and 30,223 flakes were recovered. It should also be borne in mind that only
a portion of the site has been excavated and the total accumulation is undoubtedly much greater. The two middens uncovered also attest to a degree of site maintenance similar to what one would expect at a site were frequent reuse has occurred.

Another useful measure of reuse frequency is site size. As Binford (1983:113) states, "locations occupied repeatedly are considerably larger than those used only a few times". Attempts to equate site size with population density are of little use when dealing with small hunter-gatherer groups who may reuse the same site for short periods annually over decades or even centuries. However, it seems reasonable to assume that repeated use over a long period will result in an increase in the total area utilized since various factors such as the direction of the wind, the amount of sunlight, changing patterns of vegetation and the types of activities engaged in may require different parts of a site to be used at different times.

Here again, if we apply this concept to Russell's Point, it seems clear that we are dealing with repeated use over a long period. Of the 158 square metres excavated to date, all but 12 square metres in the extreme southeast of the site (Units 35, 36 and 37) have produced a substantial amount of cultural material and test pitting elsewhere on the site indicates that cultural deposits are distributed over almost the entire point (Gilbert and Reynolds 1989; Gilbert 1995, 1996a). Clearly, such an accumulation could only have built up over a long period.

An mentioned above, an analysis of projectile points from eighteen Recent Indian sites conducted by Schwarz (1984) resulted in the establishment of a basic chronology for
the Little Passage Complex. According to Schwarz (1984:61-62), changes over time include a decrease in the occurrence of biconvex and plano convex sides, and a tendency for points, “to become smaller and exhibit less surface retouch”. The most recent are tiny, sometimes asymmetrical, flake points which, Schwarz suggests, reflects the decline of lithic technology after the introduction of iron. Probably the most obvious change over time is in the hafting element. Schwarz suggests that Recent Indian projectile points go from being side notched, to corner notched, to expanding stemmed and finally to straight or contracting stemmed. While precise dates for any of these changes are impossible to determine, Schwarz places the change from side notched to corner notched at roughly A.D. 1100 or slightly before; from corner notched to expanding stemmed at about A.D. 1200 and from expanding stemmed to straight or contracting stemmed at sometime after A.D. 1600 (Schwarz 1984:64, fig. 7).

In analysing the points recovered from Russell’s Point a side notched point was defined as any point in which the notches were located on the sides of the triangular preform from which the point was made far enough above the corners to have left them intact. As a result, the base of the stem of such a point should be somewhat wider than the base of the blade. In contrast, a corner notched point was defined as any point in which notching had removed at least a portion of the corners of the triangular preform leaving the base of the stem either the same width or slightly narrower than the base of the blade. An expanding stem point was defined as any point in which notching had removed
enough of the corners of the triangular preform to make the base of the stem noticeably narrower than the base of the blade but still wider than the neck.

All of the projectile points recovered from Russell’s Point, with the exception of three Dorset Eskimo harpoon endblades not considered here, are either Little Passage or historic Beothuk. There is no evidence of a Beaches or other Recent Indian presence at the site. One hundred and ninety of the 368 projectile points and projectile point fragments recovered from Russell’s Point can be classified by hafting element. Of these, four (2.1%) are side notched; 18 (9.5%) are corner notched; 130 (68.4%) have expanding stems; 32 (16.8%) have straight stems; and six (3.2%) have contracting stems. Thus, assuming Schwarz’s chronology to be correct, the changes in projectile point haft element from Russell’s Point suggest an occupation extending from around A.D. 1100 or slightly before to sometime after A.D. 1600. It should also be noted that only 66 (17.9%) of the 368 projectile points from the site are the flake points associated, according to Schwarz, with the introduction of iron technology. This also strongly suggests that the site was being utilized long before the historic period.

Given how thin the cultural deposit was over most of the site (10-20 cm), it was impossible to determine the formation sequence of many of the features uncovered based on stratigraphy alone. Instead, what we were often left with was a palimpsest (sensu Binford 1982: 16-17) in which features created as a result of a series of occupations over an extended period occurred on the same level and in some cases blended one with the other. However, in a number of cases, a relative chronological sequence could be
determined. Fire-Cracked Rock Features 1 and 2, Midden 2, and the 'butchering area' were all so near the surface - the Fire-Cracked Rock Features were only 4 cm below surface on average with some of the larger stones clearly visible beneath the sod - and the fire-cracked rock features were so well preserved that these were almost certainly some of the most recent features uncovered at the site. Fire-Cracked Rock Feature 2 also produced a ballast flint arrowhead clearly indicating that it dated from the historic period. Hearth 13, located beneath FCR Feature 1 and separated from it by a 3 cm thick deposit of silt, obviously predated it by some time and Hearths 1, 2, 3 and 4 were all located beneath the level of both Midden 2 and FCR Features 1 and 2 and had to be of an earlier date. Indeed, Hearths 2, 3 and the western half of Hearth 4 were located directly beneath Midden 2. Similarly Hearth 10 was located beneath the butchering area and was clearly of an earlier date. Hearths 16 and 17 were located beneath Midden 1 and obviously predated that feature. In fact, Hearth 17 was obviously in use prior to the creation of the pit in which Midden 1 accumulated, since it extended east beneath the beach gravel that formed the eastern wall of the pit. Likewise, Hearth 6 was located 4 cm above and was clearly more recent than either Hearth 7 or Hearth 8. The formation sequences becomes much clearer when we consider the radiocarbon dates recovered from the site.
Radiocarbon Dates

A total of ten radiocarbon samples, out of more than forty samples recovered, were selected for dating. All ten of the samples came from identifiable features (Hearth 1, 2, 9, 10, 14, Midden 1, and Midden 2) and allow us to place these features in chronological sequence. The dates for these samples and their provenance are given in Table 1 below. The samples are arranged chronologically from oldest to most recent by calibrated A.D. date (2 sigma, 95% probability).

Hearth 9 (A.D. 970-1040) is most likely the oldest of the surviving hearths uncovered at the site although Hearth 1 (A.D. 990-1285) could possibly be as old. Given the depth of some of these early hearths and their location right in the beach gravel, it seems likely that Russell’s Point was little more than an unconsolidated gravel spit at the beginning of the Recent Indian occupation. The ongoing occupation and the resulting accumulations of organic and other materials probably led to the eventual consolidation of the point and the establishment of vegetation. Hearth 14 (A.D. 1055-1085 or A.D. 1150-1270), which was only partially excavated, clearly postdates Hearth 9 and could be roughly contemporary with Hearth 1. Given that the earliest possible date for Midden 1 is A.D. 1290, Hearths 16 and 17 were probably in use prior to that date, while Hearth 10 (A.D. 1250-1305) was in use just prior to and/or during the early years of the formation of Midden 1. Hearths 11 and 12 first became visible and were on roughly the same level as
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sample</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Conventional Radiocarbon Age</th>
<th>Calibrated Results (2 Sigma, 95% Probability)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7. (Beta 151321)</td>
<td>Hearth 9</td>
<td>1020 +/- 40 BP</td>
<td>A.D. 970-1040</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. (Beta 128508)</td>
<td>Hearth 1</td>
<td>890 +/- 90 BP</td>
<td>A.D. 990-1285</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. (Beta 151324)</td>
<td>Hearth 14</td>
<td>840 +/- 40 BP</td>
<td>A.D. 1055-1085 and A.D. 1150-1270</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. (Beta 151322)</td>
<td>Hearth 10</td>
<td>720 +/- 40 BP</td>
<td>A.D. 1250-1305</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. (Beta 151323)</td>
<td>Midden 1</td>
<td>620 +/- 40 BP</td>
<td>A.D. 1290-1410</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. (Beta 128507)</td>
<td>Midden 1</td>
<td>600 +/- 40 BP</td>
<td>A.D. 1295-1420</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. (Beta 128509)</td>
<td>Hearth 2</td>
<td>560 +/- 40 BP</td>
<td>A.D. 1305-1430</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. (Beta 128506)</td>
<td>Midden 1</td>
<td>290 +/- 40 BP</td>
<td>A.D. 1490-1665</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. (Beta 128511)</td>
<td>Midden 2</td>
<td>120 +/- 100 BP</td>
<td>A.D. 1525-1560 and A.D. 1630-1950</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. (Beta 128510)</td>
<td>Midden 2</td>
<td>140 +/- 60 BP</td>
<td>A.D. 1650-1955</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Hearths 9 and 10 and so can be assigned with some confidence to roughly the same period, circa A.D. 970-1305. Hearth 2 (A.D. 1305-1430) clearly post dates Hearths 1, 9, 10, 11, 12, 14, 16 and 17 and is almost certainly more recent than Hearths 3 and 4 as well, since these last two only became visible after Hearth 2 had been totally excavated. Hearth 2 was also apparently in use at the same time that Midden 1 was accumulating.

Based on radiocarbon dating, the broadest possible time range for Midden 1 is...
A.D. 1290 to 1665. Samples 1 (A.D. 1490-1665) and 2 (A.D. 1295-1420) were the first two samples sent for dating from this feature and it was because of the apparent discrepancy in these dates that Sample 9 (A.D. 1290-1410) was later sent for dating. Clearly, Midden 1 had begun to accumulate by at least A.D. 1410 and the accumulation continued until at least 1490 or somewhat later. That it was still in use in the historic period is confirmed by the presence of a utilized flake of ballast flint in the midden. However, a fairly long period of accumulation is not so surprising when we consider the nature of the feature. Midden 1 was basically a natural depression into which hearth debris, and possibly other material, was thrown. This process would likely have continued until the depression was filled and, given organic materials tendency to break down and compact, this could have taken some time. In this case the process seems to have extended from the late prehistoric period - circa A.D. 1400 or before - into the early historic period - circa A.D. 1500 or later. At sometime in the latter period, Midden 2, 4.5 m southwest of Midden 1, probably began to accumulate.

It has already been mentioned above that Midden 2, Fire-Cracked Rock Features 1 and 2, and the butchering area are some of the most recent features uncovered at the site and the radiocarbon dates from Midden 2 (A.D. 1525-1560 or A.D. 1630-1950; and A.D. 1650-1955) bear this out. Clearly the accumulation of Midden 2 did not continue until 1955 and these late dates illustrate the problem encountered when using radiocarbon dating on sites that extend into the historic period. However, they do indicate that Midden 2 was still in use until at least 1650 and possibly for some time after that. Hearth 5, located
just south of Midden 2, contained, among other things, two charred European grape
seeds and thus also clearly dates from the historic period.

Radiocarbon samples from Russell’s Point clearly indicate that the site was being
utilized by the Beothuk and their prehistoric ancestors from roughly A.D. 1000 until the
middle of the seventeenth century. The extensive accumulation of debris, the variety of
features and the presence of middens at the site all combine to suggest that this was also a
fairly intensive occupation.
Clearly, Russell’s Point was being used by the Beothuk and their Recent Indian ancestors for centuries before the John Guy’s visit in October 1612 and continued to be used for sometime thereafter. But exactly how did Russell’s Point fit into the seasonal round of the Trinity Bay Beothuk? A great deal of work has been done over the past two decades to develop methods and concepts aimed at identifying different site types and placing them within an adaptive system (Binford 1976, 1977, 1978a, 1978b, 1979, 1980, 1982, 1983; Chatters 1987; Gillford 1980; O’Connell 1987; Thomas 1983). Much of this work has been inspired by Lewis Binford’s (1980) introduction of a modified version of Wagner’s gatherer-collector dichotomy which views gatherers and collectors as representing two different responses to the distribution of resources across the landscape.

We have already touched on Binford’s concepts of foraging radius and logistical radius in Chapter 2. In order to address the question of seasonality it is now necessary to examine Binford’s concept of foragers (or gatherers) versus collectors in greater detail. The basic difference between the two is one of mobility.

Gathering (or foraging) strategies are practiced in environments where sufficient resources can be found at, or very near, a particular location at a particular time to supply all the need of a group. These resources are generally exploited on an encounter basis and when exhausted the entire group moves to another equally resource rich area. In contrast, collector strategies are practised in environments, such as Newfoundland, where resources
are much more temporally and/or geographically dispersed. Under such conditions residential moves are planned so as to place the group within optimum range of this widely dispersed resource base. While some essential resources may be exploited at or near the residence, or base camp, other necessary resources can only be acquired by sending specialized groups out beyond the limited range of the base camp, or foraging radius, into what Binford refers to as the 'logistical range'. As mentioned above, the logistical radius is that area which can only be exploited by spending at least one night away from the base camp and, depending on the nature of the resource to be exploited and its location in relation to the base camp, trips of many days, or even weeks, are sometimes necessary.

Foraging generally requires more frequent residential moves from resource patch to resource patch, while collecting requires fewer residential moves but greater movement of specialized groups beyond the range of the base camp. According to Binford, foragers produce two basic types of sites: base camps and 'locations' where various resources are exploited within the camp's foraging radius. Locations are generally fairly ephemeral, leaving little trace on the archaeological record. Obviously, collectors also produce base camps and locations but their excursions beyond the foraging radius into the logistical radius generate three other site types: field camps, where specific resources are exploited; stations, where resources are monitored; and caches where supplies (i.e. 'gear' and/or food) are stored for future use.

When applying this model it is necessary to recognize that most groups cannot be divided neatly into either foragers or collectors. Rather, as Chatters (1987: 337) has
pointed out, both strategies can, "be found in various mixtures in all hunter-gatherer adaptations", and most adaptations, "defy a simple collector-like or forager-like characterization". Groups may practice a foraging strategy at certain times of the year and a collector strategy at other times or may, over time, come to place more emphasis on one or the other strategy as climatic or other conditions change. It is also important to note, as Binford (1980) reminds us, that the same place may play different roles in the strategy of a particular group either at different times of the year, as the centre of the logistical radius (i.e. the base camp) shifts in response to the changing availability of resources, or at different times during the exploitation of an area by a particular group. For example, a base camp occupied during the summer may become a field camp on the periphery of the logistical range when the base camp shifts elsewhere in the autumn; or a field camp used occasionally on the periphery of a group's territory may take on the role of a base camp when a territorial shift takes place. So, the distinctions are never quite as clear cut in practice as they might seem in theory.

Still, bearing these points in mind, the gatherer-collector model can be extremely useful in helping us make inferences about seasonality based on the static traces left behind at archaeological sites. Implicit in this model is the assumption that not all sites generated by the same hunter-gatherer group will be "internally homogeneous" (Binford 1983:142). Instead, different activities take place at different locations across what is often a very broad geographical area. These different activities require different tools, or at least different combinations of the same tools, exploit different resources, and leave different
traces in the archaeological record. As Thomas points out, the real significance of this
gatherer-collector model is that it, "stress[es] the strategies behind the observed patterns
... [and] suggests a number of archaeologically observable implications" (Thomas
1983:11). What, then, can the archaeological traces left behind at Russell's Point tell us
about its role in the seasonal round of the Trinity Bay Beothuk? Or, to paraphrase Binford
(1983:100), how do we get from the static archaeological traces to the dynamic past
behaviours that led to their formation? The following is an attempt to gain some
understanding of the role played by Russell's Point in the seasonal round of the Trinity
Bay Beothuk using this gatherer-collector model combined with what we can glean from
the historical documents.

Site Type

As we have seen, Tuck and Pastore (1985) have pointed out how sparsely
distributed, both temporally and geographically, the faunal resources of Newfoundland are
and how the failure of just one of the major prey species to appear at the usual place and
time might have disastrous effects on a hunter-gatherer population. Given the temporal
and geographical incongruity of resources in the Newfoundland environment, there can be
little doubt that the Beothuk, and the various other prehistoric groups that have occupied
the island over the past 5000 years, utilized some form of logistical strategy for at least a
good portion of the year in order to survive. Therefore, if Binford's model is correct, we
would expect to find all five site types associated with a logistical strategy within the territorial range of a Beothuk band.

In the case of Russell's Point, two of the five site types associated with a logistical adaptation can be quickly eliminated. As we have seen, locations are relatively ephemeral and leave little trace on the archaeological record and caches, while often difficult to locate, are easily recognizable when found. Clearly, Russell's Point with its numerous features and considerable artifact and refuse accumulation is more substantial than either of these. Nor does it seem likely that Russell's Point acted exclusively as a station, although it may have served this purpose at certain times. As Binford (1978a:330-333) points out, stations are information gathering centres and many of the activities conducted during their occupation are aimed at reducing boredom rather than directly related to their purpose. As such, perhaps the best criteria for identifying stations may be not archaeological but geographical. Unlike base camps, locations, or hunting camps, stations are not placed in close proximity to specific resources. Rather they are situated in areas that offer a commanding view of the surrounding terrain. Russell's Point does offer a commanding view of much of Dildo Pond and it may have been used to monitor the movement of caribou during the spring and fall migrations but clearly much more was going on at Russell's Point than this.

If we eliminated these other three possibilities, it seems clear that Russell's Point must have served mainly as either a base camp or a field camp. Again, a number of useful concepts exist to help differentiate between these two types of sites. Thomas' (1983:75)
theory of tool and feature diversity suggests that, as the centre of substance activities, base camps should contain a wide variety of features and present evidence of a wide range of activities. In contrast, at specialized hunting camps (or field camps), where activities are usually limited to the exploitation of one, or at most a few species, one would expect to find less diversity of feature and artifact types. Andrefsky (1997:204-206) has also pointed out that, in most cases, "Artifact diversity [has been] found to have an inverse relationship with residential mobility - as mobility increases, artifact diversity decreases. ... [and] ... if a narrow range of activities [was] preformed at a particular location, one would expect to find a relatively low number of artifact types." The features uncovered at the site have been described in the previous chapter. The following is a description of the lithic, bone and some of the diagnostic iron artifacts recovered from the site (a more detailed description of the metal artifacts will be given in Chapter 5 below).

**Lithic, Bone and Iron Artifacts**

**Hammerstones (N=1)**

A single water rounded beach cobble of purple-grey sandstone (10.77cm x 7.92cm x 6.70 cm) with clear evidence of battering on two surfaces and grooves created by what appears to be repeated rubbing was recovered from Unit 2.
Chert Nodules (N=1)

A single nodule of light grey chert (8.67 cm x 8.61 cm x 4.24 cm) was recovered from Unit 6. Although this nodule exhibits evidence of flake removal on three surfaces and should perhaps be classified as a core, the flake scares are worn as if the nodule had been water rolled or weathered for many years prior to being deposited at the site.

Cores and Core Fragments (N=111)

One hundred and eleven cores and core fragments were recovered. All are multidirectional cores and vary from a maximum of 8.4 cm to as little as 1.9 cm in length. Many are clearly exhausted cores with 50.4% being less than 4 cm long. One hundred and six (95.5%) are of various shades of grey chert. While this chert varies in colour from almost white to light grey to dark grey to grey green and grey blue, it is almost certainly all the same material. This is obvious from some of the larger cores in which several shades of grey are clearly visible in a single piece and by the presence of small red inclusions, or in some cases veins, in almost all of this material. The high proportion of this material, not only in cores but in all the other tool types as well, and its appearance at other sites in this part of Trinity Bay, suggests that its source is probably somewhere in the region. Of the other cores, 5 (4.5%) are of a grey rhyolite almost certainly from the Bloody Bay Cove quarry site in Bonavista Bay (Laurie McLean: pers.comm.); 4 (3.6%) are of a beige chert; 3 (2.7%) are of a patinated chert; and 1 (0.9%) is of a tan chert.
Utilized Cores (N=7)

Seven cores, all of grey chert, show evidence of having been utilized along at least one edge for either cutting or chopping.

Core Chopper (N=1)

A single core chopper of grey chert (6 cm x 5.5 cm x 2.8 cm), bifacially worked on two sides to form a chopping edge, was recovered from the upper levels of Unit 26 (Plate 3).

Other Core Tools (N=4)

Another four core tools were recovered all exhibiting evidence of unifacial retouch along one edge. Three are of grey chert and the forth is of Bloody Bay Cove rhyolite.

Biface Preforms (N=48)

The biface preforms range in size from a large water rounded example made of purple rhyolite (9.3 cm x 5.5 cm x 2.6 cm), one of the few artifacts found on the beach, to a small (2.8 cm x 1.5 cm x 0.5 cm) example of beige chert, and represent various stages of reduction (Plate 4). Thirty-five (72 %) are made of grey chert; four (8 %) are of grey rhyolite, likely from Bloody Bay Cove; another four (8.3 %) are of a beige chert; three (2%) are of a coarse grey chert; one (0.9 %) is of a tan coloured chert; and one (0.9%), as mentioned above, is of purple rhyolite which may also have originated in Bloody Bay Cove (Laurie McLean: pers.comm.).
Backed Knife (N=1)

A single distinct cutting tool was recovered from Unit 2 that, while technically not a biface, is obviously a knife. Made from local grey chert and measuring 6.7 cm long, 3.5 cm wide and 1.1 cm thick, the tool is bifacially worked along all but the left lateral margin which has retained the cortex allowing for safe handling (Plate 5).

Bifacial Knives (N=14)

Fourteen bifaces and biface fragments were recovered that are clearly bifacial knives or knife fragments. Five of these (Plate 6, top row and middle row left) are complete and four (top row) exhibit obvious notching and or blunting of the base to facilitate hafting. One (middle row, right) had only the tip missing; three others (middle row, centre) are the broken upper portions of blades; three (bottom row, left to centre) are bases; and one (bottom row, right) has a portion of the base missing. Nine are made from grey chert, one from black chert, one from brown chert, one from a coarse grey chert and one is patinated. The largest is 6.3 cm in length and the shortest 3.4 cm.

Hafted Triangular Biface (N=1)

One triangular biface recovered from the site has a clearly defined, thinned and blunted hafting element. The biface measures 4.8 cm long, 2.1 cm wide at the base and 73 mm thick and is made of grey rhyolite. The hafting element is 1.1 cm long and the blade is
3.7 cm long. Whether this biface was used as a knife or a projectile point is at present unknown (Plate 7).

**Triangular Bifaces (N=152)**

The triangular bifaces range in length from 1.7 cm to 4.8 cm. Of the 78 examples for which both length and width of base could be measured, 83% have a base measurement of between 45% and 65% of the length. Only two (2.6%) have a base measurement less than 45% of the length, while 11 (14%) have a base measurement greater than 65% of the total length. One hundred and nineteen (78.3%) are made of grey chert; eleven (7.2%) are made of grey Bloody Bay Cove rhyolite; nine (5.9%) are patinated; five (3.3%) are of white chert; four (2.6%) are of brown chert; two (1.3%) are of black chert; two (1.3%) of beige chert; two (1.3%) of tan chert; and a single example (0.6%) is of ballast flint (Plates 8, 9 and 10).

**Single Notched Triangular Bifaces (N=7)**

Seven triangular bifaces recovered from the site, six of grey chert and one of purple rhyolite, exhibit a single corner notch. These are almost certainly bifaces that were in the process of being notched to create projectile points when they were either lost, broken or discarded because of some problem in the notching process. The largest of these is 3.2 cm long and the smallest a mere 1.8 cm in length (Plate 11).
Round Based Lanceolate Bifaces (N=5)

Five small round based lanceolate bifaces, two of dark grey chert, two of light grey chert and one of tan chert, were recovered. The largest is 3.1 cm long, 1.8 cm wide and 60 mm thick and the smallest 2.3 cm long, 1.1 cm wide and 41 mm thick. Whether these bifaces were intended to be notched to make projectile points or served some other purpose is unknown (Plate 12).

Bipointed Biface (N=1)

A single bipointed biface of red chert measuring 12.3 cm long, 4 cm wide and 1.2 cm thick was recovered from Unit 3. Whether this biface served as a spear point or a knife is unknown (Plate 13).

Stemmed Bifaces (N=3)

Three small stemmed bifaces were recovered that while they may have been failed attempts at producing arrowheads could not be clearly classified as such. One of these (Plate 14, left) is made of grey chert and measures 3.4 cm in length and another (Plate 14, right) is of patinated grey chert and is 2.8 cm long. The third example (Plate 14, centre), made from dark grey chert, has its tip missing but the portion that remains measures 3.3 cm in length.
Circular Biface (N=1)

A single, roughly circular biface made of local grey chert and measuring 4.5 cm long, 4.1 cm wide and 9.8 mm thick was recovered from Unit 11.

Biface Fragments (N=116)

Another 116 biface fragments were recovered from the site that were either too fragmentary or too poorly executed to be identified by type. Some of these are probably from triangular bifaces, others may be fragments of bifacial knives, while still others appear to be fragments broken or discarded during manufacture.

Awls? (N=2)

Two long, narrow, bifacially worked tools were recovered that may have been used as awls. One measures 2 cm long and is 68 mm wide and 22 mm thick at the base, tapering to a point. The other has the tip missing but the portion that remains is 1.7 mm long and measures 68 mm wide and 26 mm thick at the base. Both are made of grey chert and both came from Unit 39.

Notched and Stemmed Bifacial Points (N=302)

In analysing the projectile points from Russell’s Point, any point in which the dorsal and ventral sides could be readily distinguished was classified as a flake point. This included points with marginal retouch on the ventral side. Points that were bifacially
worked to the extent that the dorsal and ventral sides could no longer be easily distinguished were classified as bifacial points. The distinctions in haft elements are the same as those given in Chapter 3 (pages 57-58) above.

A total of 302 bifacial points and point fragments were recovered. Of these, 76 (25.2 %) are complete, another 45 (14.9 %) have only part of the tip missing and 30 (9.9%) consist of the blade with all or part of the hafting element missing. The remaining 151 (50%) consist of various stem, mid section and tip fragments. Of the 76 complete points, the longest is 4.8 cm in length. Only three (3.9 %), including that point are over four centimetres in length, 26 (34.2 %) are between three and four centimetres in length, 39 (51.3 %) are between two and three centimetres in length and 8 (10.5%) are less than two centimetres long with the shortest being 1.5 cm. A number of the smaller points appear to have been produced by simply notching the broken tips of larger points. Of the 143 points and point fragments for which the hafting element could be classified, four (2.8 %) are side notched, seventeen (11.9 %) are corner notched, 100 (69.9 %) have expanding stems, nineteen (13.3%) have straight stems and three (2.1 %) have contracting stems. Five of the expanding stem points also exhibit a single, centrally placed basal notch.

Of the 302 points and point fragments, 243 (80.5%) are made from grey chert, eighteen (6 %) are patinated, ten (3.3%) are made from grey rhyolite, eight (2.6 %) from black chert, four (1.3 %) from purple rhyolite, four (1.3%) from grey/brown chert and three (1%) from ballast flint. There are also two each of brown, white, tan, and grey/green
chert and one each of grey chert with black banding, coarse grey chert, buff chert and Ramah chert (Plates 15, 16, 17 and 18).

**Notched and Stemmed Flake Points (N=66)**

Of the 66 flake points recovered from the site 60 (90%) are made from grey chert, four (6%) are patinated, one is made from ballast flint and one from a white chalcedony. Thirty (45.5%) are complete and these range in length from 1.4 cm to 2.8 cm with 16 (53%) of these measuring less than 2 cm. Of the 47 points that could be classified by haft element only one (2.1%) is corner notched, 30 (63.8%) have expanding stems, 13 (27.7%) have straight stems and three (6.4%) have contracting stems. Twenty-nine (43.9%) of these points exhibit bimarginal retouch along at least one lateral margin, thirteen (19.7%) exhibit unimarginal retouch along at least one lateral margin and 21 (31.8%) appear to be nothing more than conveniently shaped flakes that have been notched, presumably to facilitate hafting. It is difficult to imagine what practical purpose any but the largest of these points could have served (Plates 19 and 20).

**Scrapers (N=148)**

One hundred and forty-eight scrapers and scraper fragments, all of them end scrapers, were recovered from the site. These range in length from as little as 1.3 cm to as much as 3.9 cm. Sixty-seven of these are complete and of these 36 (53.7%) are triangular; 11 (16.4%) are trapezoidal; 10 (14.9%) are ovoid; and 5 (7.4%) are circular. A further 3
(4.5%) are made on linear flakes and 2 (3%) are made on extremely small flakes. Most are clearly the exhausted stubs of what had once been larger tools and six, including one made on a linear flake, exhibit clear evidence of reduction at the proximal end to facilitate hafting. In all 87.8% of the scrapers were manufactured from grey chert, two (1.3%) from Bloody Bay Cove rhyolite, and the remainder from a wide range of high quality cherts (Plates 21 and 22).

**Retouched Flakes (N=10)**

Ten flakes were recovered that had obviously been retouched along at least one edge. Eight (80%) of these are of grey chert and the other two (20%) are of grey rhyolite. One, a grey chert flake measuring 3.5 cm long, 3.5 cm wide and 5 mm thick, exhibits bimarginally retouch along one edge and all the others are unmarginally retouched. The largest is a grey rhyolite flake measuring 6.2 cm long, 5.4 cm wide and 2.2 cm thick; the smallest a grey chert flake 2.5 cm long, 1.4 cm wide and 4 mm thick. One grey chert flake, 6.4 cm long, 3 cm wide and 9 mm thick, is unmarginally retouched along roughly 50% of its edge while retaining the cortex along the other 50%, thus rendering it, for all intents and purposes, a backed blade.

**Utilized Flakes (N=30)**

Thirty flakes were recovered that show clear evidence of having been utilized along at least one edge. Of these, 26 (87%) are of grey chert, three (10%) are of grey
rhyolite, probably from Bloody Bay Cove, and one (3 %) is of a beige chert. The largest is a grey rhyolite flake measuring 8.1 cm long, 7.3 cm wide and 1.2 cm thick and the smallest is a flake of grey chert only 1.9 cm long, 1.5 cm wide and 3 mm thick.

**Linear Flakes (N=151)**

A total of 151 linear flakes were recovered from the site. Of these, 126 (83.4 %) are made from local grey chert, nine (6 %) are patinated, six (4 %) are made from black chert, four (2.6 %) from a tan coloured chert, three (2 %) from ballast flint, one (0.7 %) from beige chert, one from brown chert and one from grey rhyolite. Thirty-one (20.5 %) of these linear flakes show clear evidence of having been utilized along at least one lateral margin.

**Flakes and Debitage (N=30,223)**

A total of 30,223 flakes and pieces of lithic debitage were recovered from Russell’s Point. Of these 16,088 (53.2%) are less than 1 cm in length, 28,629 (94.7%) are less than 2 cm in length and 30,048 (99.3 %) are less than 3 cm in length.

**Bone Fish Gorge (N=1)**

Roughly half of a small, calcified bone fish gorge measuring 15 mm long, 4.6 mm wide and 2.2 mm thick was recovered from Unit 4 (Plate 21). Had the gorge not been calcified it would not have survived and one can only speculate about how many other
implements made of bone, and other organic materials, may have been lost in the acidic soil of the site.

**Wrought Iron Fish Hooks (N=4?)**

Fragments of three wrought iron fish hooks and another fragment of rounded wrought iron that may be part of a fish hook were recovered. These are described in greater detail in Chapter 5 below.

**Iron Knives (N=1)**

A 135 mm long knife fragment consisting of the tang and part of the blade was recovered. It is described in greater detail in Chapter 5 below.

Clearly, the diversity of features and tools indicates that Russell’s Point was the hub of a wide range of activities including hunting, fishing, butchering, hide preparation, tool reduction and tool repair and strongly suggests that the site served as a base camp. The high percentage of tools made from locally available grey chert also indicates a people firmly rooted in Trinity Bay although the presence of Bonavista Bay rhyolite points to a certain amount of contact, possibly through trade, with that region.

We have seen in the previous chapter how waste management at a site can be used as an indicator of reuse frequency. Tani (1995) has suggested that the ordering of waste at a site also may be an indicator of site function. At a site, such as a hunting camp, occupied
for only a short period each year, there is little need to invest time in waste management and most deposits are primary, either dropped or placed in the immediate vicinity of the activity area or tossed just a short distance from the area. As a result, one would expect to find, “clustered primary refuse deposits within an area surrounded by scattered refuse of larger [tossed] pieces”, at such a site (Tani 1995:245). However, as the length of occupation, and the accumulation of waste, increases, it becomes necessary to invest more time in waste management and one should begin to see the formation of secondary deposits in the form of middens. Tani (1995:246) has suggested that secondary midden deposits will begin to accumulate, “when the occupation span lengthens from ‘weeks’ to ‘months’”. Assuming this to be correct, the presence of middens at Russell’s Point also suggests that the site’s primary function was that of a base camp occupied for an extended period each year.

Both Thomas (1983) and Chatters (1987) have proposed that differences in species diversity between sites can help to differentiate base camps from field camps. Field camps, by their very nature, are focused on the acquisition of one or, at most, a few species and, as a result, the faunal remains recovered from such camps should be limited to only those species exploited there. On the other hand, a base camp lies at the centre of an extensive range of activities covering a wide geographical area and this diversity should be reflected in the taxa recovered. Chatters (1987 350-352) also suggests that the faunal remains from a field camp should present a high degree of both geographical and temporal congruity while the faunal remains from a base camp should be highly geographically and
temporally incongruous. In other words, barring other considerations, only those species available at that site and during the time of year the site was occupied should be represented at a hunting camp, while species recovered from well beyond the immediate area and at a variety of times during the year should be represented at a base camp. The element of temporal incongruity reflects not so much the longer occupation of the base camp as the likelihood that food would be preserved and stored there for later use.

One thousand and twenty-three faunal elements recovered from Russell’s Point were analysed by Kathlyn Stewart of the Canadian Museum of Nature. A number of other extremely small fragments of calcined bone, likely impossible to identify, were also recovered but not sent for analysis. Of the 1023 elements analysed, all except a number of tooth fragments, were calcined and the vast majority were less than 2 cm in length. Of this total, only 63 or 6.8% could be identified. The breakdown of these elements by species type is given in Table 2.

Clearly these 1023 elements represent only a very small fraction of the total number of prey that passed through Russell’s Point over the roughly six and one half centuries that it was being utilized by the Beothuk and their ancestors. The gatherer/collector model forces us to abandon the naive assumption that all animals killed on or near a site were necessarily consumed there. Almost certainly, many animals, or portions of them, were transported to and eventually consumed at other locations within the annual range of the Trinity Bay Beothuk. Further, of the animals consumed at the site,
only those few elements that were calcified and buried under conditions that promoted their preservation, not a common occurrence in the acid soils of the Avalon Peninsula, survived and, as we can see, far fewer survived sufficiently well to be identified. Therefore, given the small size of this sample, is it reasonable to assume that it represents the basic outline of a long term subsistence pattern, or does it merely reflect those few elements that managed somehow to survive, part of the overall prey spectrum but nothing more?

While it is necessary to practice caution when drawing conclusions based on such a small sample and it is highly likely that other species were also being exploited by the inhabitants of Russell’s Point, when we place these elements in their proper locational and temporal context, it seems clear that the rough outline of an established subsistence pattern does begin to emerge. Although few in number, these elements were not restricted to a single feature or event but rather were recovered from six different features.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Species</th>
<th>Number of Elements</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Beaver (<em>Castor canadensis</em>)</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caribou (<em>Rangifer tarandus</em>)</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seal (<em>Phocidae Indet.</em>)</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Muskrat (<em>Ondatra zibethicus</em>)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unidentified Mammal Bones</td>
<td>960</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>1023</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 3: Radiocarbon Dates and Species Types from Features at Russell’s Point

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feature</th>
<th>Conventional Radiocarbon Age</th>
<th>Calibrated Results (2 Sigma, 95% Probability)</th>
<th>Species</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hearth 9</td>
<td>1020 +/- 40 BP</td>
<td>A.D. 970-1040</td>
<td>Caribou (<em>Rangifer tarandus</em>)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hearth 1</td>
<td>890 +/- 90 BP</td>
<td>A.D. 990-1285</td>
<td>Beaver (<em>Castor canadensis</em>), Seal (<em>Phocidae Indet.</em>)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hearth 10</td>
<td>720 +/- 40 BP</td>
<td>A.D. 1250-1305</td>
<td>Beaver (<em>Castor canadensis</em>)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hearth 2</td>
<td>560 +/- 40 BP</td>
<td>A.D. 1305-1430</td>
<td>Caribou (<em>Rangifer tarandus</em>)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Midden 1</td>
<td>620 +/- 40 BP, 600 +/- 40 BP</td>
<td>A.D. 1290-1410, A.D. 1295-1420, A.D. 1490-1665</td>
<td>Beaver (<em>Castor canadensis</em>), Caribou (<em>Rangifer tarandus</em>), Seal (<em>Phocidae Indet.</em>), Muskrat (<em>Ondatra zibethicus</em>)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FCR Feature 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Caribou (<em>Rangifer tarandus</em>)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

distributed both geographically across the site and temporally over a period of roughly six hundred years. And one of these, Midden 1, contained deposits that appear to have accumulated over an extended period. Table 3 lists the features that contained identifiable taxa and the range of species and radiocarbon dates recovered from each feature. No radiocarbon date was run for FCR Feature 1. However, as is mentioned above, its relative depth beneath the surface and good state of preservation suggests that it dated to fairly late in the occupation.

Clearly, although the sample is small, it exhibits a degree of geographical incongruity more likely to be associated with a base camp than a field camp. Of the four
species identified only one, caribou, is likely to have been taken in the immediate vicinity of the site, probably during the spring or fall migration. As mentioned in Chapter 2, the nearest location where beaver could possibly have been taken lies roughly 2.8 km to the south of the site in the marshy waters at the head of Dildo Pond. However, any long term pattern of beaver exploitation would have required that the Beothuk at Russell’s Point extend their range well beyond the limits of Dildo Pond into the interior of the Avalon where beaver were once plentiful, at least by Newfoundland standards.

While the seal bone could not be identified by species, Stewart (pers.comm.) stated that they were all from a relatively small type, probably either harp or harbour seal. Given the location of the site, harbour seal seems the most likely type. Harp seals can be taken in the outer coastal zone either in late December and January when adults and older immatures trim close to the shore on their way south to their winter feeding grounds or during whelping on the ice flows from March to early May (Ronald and Healey 1981:62-64; Schwarz 1994: 66). Harps are also sometimes available in the open waters at the bottom of Trinity Bay in May and June before they begin their northward migration to their summer range in the arctic. However, while these animals are taken today by hunters using speed boats and high powered rifles, it seems unlikely that they could have been taken in any numbers in prehistoric times.

On the other hand, as we have seen, harbour seals could once have been taken at any number of locations at the bottom of Trinity Bay. Although, as with the beaver, if the taking of harbour seals were part of a long term strategy, it would likely have been
necessary for the inhabitants of Russell’s Point to extend their range farther west along the Isthmus of Avalon or north farther out the bay.

Chatters (1987:344) among others (i.e. Binford 1978b; 1981) has also suggested that, barring non human forces, “the degree of [bone] fragmentation may ... be an indicator of where a site or activity area belongs on a trajectory from procurement to consumption.” He points out that the least amount of bone fragmentation occurs as a result of butchering, more fragmentation occurs when bones are broken to extract marrow, and the greatest amount of fragmentation occurs when bones, mostly shafts and joints, are crushed and boiled to extract fat and collagen. Thus, it would seem logical that smaller bone fragments would be found at base camps, where resources are processed and consumed, rather than at hunting camps where a minimum of processing would probably occur. Chatters also suggests that fragments of the size associated with marrow, fat and collagen extraction would probably be an indication of food storage since it is unlikely that such energy consuming procedures would be used under conditions where a plentiful supply of fresh meat was available (however see Loring 1997:199-200) and that the degree of fragmentation may increase the longer a site is occupied. As we have seen, at Russell’s Point the vast majority of the bones recovered consist of fragments less than two centimetres long. If this fragmentation is the result of human activity, and Chatters’ hypothesis is correct, then this also suggests that Russell’s Point was a base camp where the inhabitants subsisted, at least partially, on stored food.
There is one final piece of evidence that points to Russell’s Point being a base camp. Pastore (1996) has suggested that the smaller, often crudely made projectile points recovered from most Little Passage and historic Beothuk sites on the island are, in fact, children’s points and that their presence could be a valuable aid in determining site function since it would seem logical that children are more likely to be present at base camps, and perhaps locations, than at any of the other site types (caches, stations and field camps) found within the seasonal round of a logistically oriented hunter-gatherer group. In presenting this hypothesis, Pastore draws on the work of Bob Dawe (1997:303) who has pointed out that almost every collection of arrowheads contains, “a component ... of relatively poorly made, often very small, and not readily classifiable specimens”. Drawing on his work at Head-Smashed-In Buffalo Jump, Dawe notes that these small, often poorly made points are relatively rare on late prehistoric plains bison kill sites but much more common at adjacent processing sites and suggests that this discrepancy reflects the greater number of children likely present at the latter. Both Dawe and Pastore dismiss the suggestion made by some researchers that these smaller points were used to hunt birds and smaller game and point out that in almost every known ethnographic instance, including that of the historic Beothuk (Pastore 1996:1; Howley 1915:212), birds and smaller game were hunted using blunt arrows. Drawing on ethnographic accounts, Dawe (1997:306) concluded that it is, “unlikely that expedient, poorly made, often asymmetrical projectile points should be a normal component of a tool kit designed for the serious business of hunting game by adults”, since most bowmen would insist on a consistent quality of
manufacture, "to ensure accuracy in marksmanship". In addition, it is hard to understand how points under a certain size could have been properly hafted.

Dawe (1997: 308-309), following Christenson (1986: 119), has proposed that successful hafting requires a projectile point neck width equal to or slightly larger than the width of the distal end of the shaft and suggests an approximate width of 8 mm as the dividing line between children's points and adult points since a shaft much thinner than 8 mm would be of little practical use in hunting. If we apply this theory to the 234 projectile points recovered from Russell's Point that can be measured for neck width, we find that only 36, or 15% of the total have neck measurements of 8 mm or greater. Assuming that this percentage holds constant for the entire collection, then only 55 of the 368 arrowheads recovered from Russell's Point would qualify as adult points.

While one might question whether we should accept 8 mm as a hard and fast boundary between adult and children's points - perhaps, for example, the shafts tapered somewhat towards the distal end - it is hard to imagine that neck width could be much less than this without compromising the hafting efficiency of the point. Table 4 presents the neck widths for the 234 arrowheads from Russell's Point for which this measurement could be taken arranged both by number and percentage greater than between 2 mm and 13 mm. Even if we assume a neck width of 7 mm to be a more realistic division, still only 28.6% would qualify as adult points and if we choose to draw the line at 6 mm fully 49.6% would still be classified as children's points.
Table 4: The Neck Widths Of Projectile Points From Russell’s Point

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Neck Width</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>% of Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2 mm &gt;</td>
<td>234</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 mm &gt;</td>
<td>231</td>
<td>98.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 mm &gt;</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>89.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 mm &gt;</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>70.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 mm &gt;</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>50.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 mm &gt;</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>28.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 mm &gt;</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>15.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 mm &gt;</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>9.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 mm &gt;</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 mm &gt;</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 mm &gt;</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 mm &gt;</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 mm &gt;</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If these smaller points are indeed children’s, this would do much to explain their high frequency at both Russell’s Point and other Little Passage and Beothuk sites.

Schwarz (1992:61) has pointed out that, “projectile points are the most extensively-finished tool type”, found in the Recent Indian tool kit and that as a result, “we would expect their replacement cost, and therefore, their level of curation to be higher than for any other type.” In other words, one would expect to find relatively few adult projectile points on sites since they would have been maintained as long as possible and, if possible,
reworked into some other type of tool, perhaps even a child’s point, once they were broken. On the other hand, less well made, expedient children’s points would be less highly curated and more prone to loss. If Pastore and Dawe are correct, then Russell’s Point was clearly not utilized by specialized hunting parties consisting exclusively of adult males. Instead, it was home to families over much of the six and one half centuries that it was occupied.

**Seasonality**

From the above it seems clear that Russell’s Point was a base camp used seasonally by the Trinity Bay Beothuk but exactly how did the site fit into the Beothuk’s annual cycle of resource exploitation? Once again, the documents provide us with some important clues. We know from Crout’s and Guy’s descriptions that the site was occupied on 26 October, 1612 and it seems clear that at that time the Beothuk were engaged in hunting caribou. Guy tells us that, “This time of the yeare they live by hunting, for we fownd twelve stages hoofes [presumably twelve hooves from three caribou] that weare latelie killed” (Cell 1982:71). Guy also reported that two of the three houses at the camp were covered in “deere skinnes”, although these may not have been from recently killed animals. In addition, the Beothuk that Guy’s party met and shared a meal with eleven days later at Bull Arm, and whom Crout says were the same people that they had seen at Dildo
Pond², had with them, "deeres fleshe dried in the smoake, or wind", which, Guy says, "savoured very well" (Cell 1982: 74). As we have seen, faunal and radiocarbon evidence from Russell's Point substantiates Guy and Crout's observations and indicates that caribou were being consumed at the site as much as 600 years before Guy and Crout's visit.

As mentioned above (Chapter 2), until about 1900 the winter grounds of the Avalon caribou herd lay only 3 km (1.86 miles) south of Russell's Point (Bergerund 1971:16, Fig.4) and the inhabitants of the site may well have made forays into this area to hunt caribou during the winter. However, caribou could have been taken in far greater numbers and with much less effort while crossing bodies of water during their fall and spring migrations. Russell's Point would have been ideally situated for this purpose and the caribou bones recovered from the site suggest that this was indeed the case.

Drawing on his work among the Nunamiut Eskimo, Binford (1978b:145) has proposed that animal body parts are selected for transport according to their economic value and that we can gain some idea of how far removed a location is geographically and/or temporally from a kill site by considering the economic value of the taxa recovered. Body parts of low economic value, such as heads and feet, would probably be removed and discarded at or near the site of the kill, while most of the more economically valuable body parts would be transported elsewhere for consumption or storage. Only seventeen

---

² Crout says that "so Farr as we could perceave it wear the very Same people which wear in the lak which the governor lefte in ther brassen kettel bread and pointes and amber beades for we Found the same boott saille which covered ther house where we had parlle with them...". (Cell 1982:86).
faunal elements from caribou were recovered from Russell’s Point and twelve of these are the teeth of a juvenile and almost certainly from a single animal. Table 5 lists these elements and their provenance. While few in number, these elements do suggest a pattern. All, with the possible exception of the sesamoid, are from body parts that would be considered of low economic value and would probably be some of the first to be removed during the butchering process. Thus, it seems likely that these animals were killed either at or very near the site rather than transported to the site from elsewhere.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 5: Identifiable Caribou Elements from Russell’s Point</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Location</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hearth 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hearth 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hearth 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Midden 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Midden 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FCR Feature 1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The large number of arrowheads recovered at Russell’s Point also suggests that animals were being hunted at or very near the site. As we have seen above, 368 arrowheads have been recovered from the site and this with only roughly 50% of the site excavated. Schwarz (1992:61), among others, has suggested that, “high frequencies of projectile points ... reflect a high emphasis on the acquisition of prey, with the deposition of large numbers of projectile points occurring either during the preparation of hunting
tools at the base camps prior to the kill, or during the extraction, loss, and failed repair of hunting tools immediately after the kill". Even if, as seems probable, a high proportion of the projectile points recovered from Russell’s Point are children’s points, the site has still produced roughly 50% of all the Recent Indian/Beothuk points excavated to date on the entire Island of Newfoundland (John Erwin: pers. comm.). This almost certainly reflects a heavy emphasis on hunting and the animal most likely to have been hunted at or near Russell’s Point is caribou.

Chatters (1987:352) has suggested that one should expect to find evidence of storage facilities at logistical base camps and while no direct archaeological evidence of such features was found at Russell’s Point there is documentary evidence to suggest that a storehouse once stood near the site. Aside from the three structures located at the point, Guy mentions seeing, “a new Savadge house almost finished, which was made in a square forme with a small roofe...” (Cell 1982:71). This ‘house’ appears to have been located roughly 800 metres (½ mile) north of the camp near where the trail left the lake and ran down to Dildo Arm. Aside from a building encountered by John Cartwright on his journey up the Exploits River in 1768 (LeBlanc 1973:9; Howley 1915:30), there is no evidence that the Beothuk lived in square structures. However, we know from ethnographic evidence that, at least in the early nineteenth century, they did build square structures for storing caribou meat (Howley 1915: 69, 85, 248-249), and one tends to wonder if the structure encountered by Cartwright was not actually either a storehouse or a smokehouse. One such storehouse was drawn by Shanawdithit and, according to the
caption accompanying this drawing, it measured 10 feet (3 m) across and 4 ½ feet (1.37 m) high from base to wall plate and contained, "dried venison, in birch bark boxes or packages to keep during the winter" (Howley 1915: Sketch VIII). In 1810 William Cull encountered a similar, although apparently much larger, storehouse about sixty miles up the Exploits River and provided a detailed description of its contents (Howley 15:69). If the square structure seen by Guy was, in fact, a storehouse, this suggests that the Beothuk were planning a fairly long stay, perhaps all winter. Such a structure would of necessity have been placed at some distance from the camp to prevent attracting predators. Its location, roughly half way between the base camp and the bottom of Dildo Arm, would also have made it equally accessible from either the base camp or the salt water.

The location of the site on the side of a lake and along a caribou migration route, the time of year, the presence of caribou body parts and what was probably a storehouse all suggest that the people Guy and Crout saw at Russell's Point were gearing up for the fall caribou hunt the purpose of which would have been to accumulate as much caribou meat as possible for the coming winter. If the hunt was a success and a sufficient stockpile of meat was accumulated, the Beothuk would probably have spent the winter near their winter stores. Burch (1972:354) uses the term "insurance’ kill" to refer to the initial killing of a large number of animals during the fall migration. The stored meat would free the band from any immediate threat of hunger. Women, children, the elderly and infirm could then remain safely at the base camp while hunters would be free to pursue other game, such as beaver, at a more leisurely pace.
Indeed, Guy states in his journal entry for November 8, 1612 that of all the camps seen during the voyage along the roughly 45 kilometres (28 miles) of coastline between Dildo Arm and Bull Arm only those at “Savage bay”, or Dildo Arm, were occupied at that time (Quinn 1979: 156) and the impression one gets is of a people withdrawing from their summer range into the near coastal interior at the beginning of the fall caribou migration. Certainly, the colonists at Cupids believed that the Beothuk would remain in the Dildo Arm area over the winter. Crout tells us that on 8 January 1613, ten colonists with provisions, “for 15 or 20 days”, set out overland from Cupids, “... to find out the solvages in Solvage Bay [Dildo Arm]: for to see ther manner of life in the winter...”. Unfortunately, the party was forced to turn back when the weather turned mild and they could not proceed in the soft, deep snow (Quinn 1979: 168). While it is possible that they may have been incorrect in their assumption, analysis of the documents related to the Cupers Cove plantation has shown that the colonists, and especially Henry Crout, were much more familiar with the habits of the Trinity Bay Beothuk than was once believed (Gilbert 1990; 1992).

The faunal evidence also supports a fall and winter occupation for the site. By far the most diverse faunal sample was recovered from Midden 1. A total of 39 elements from this feature could be identified by species and many of these could be assigned to one of four age groups: juvenile, immature, subadult or adult. Table 6 lists the elements from Midden 1 that could be identified by species and, where possible, age group.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Species</th>
<th>Element</th>
<th>Approximate Age</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Beaver</td>
<td>Humerus Fragment</td>
<td>Juvenile</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Beaver</td>
<td>Femur Fragment</td>
<td>Juvenile</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Beaver</td>
<td>Vertebra Fragment</td>
<td>Juvenile</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Beaver</td>
<td>Radius Fragment</td>
<td>Juvenile/Immature</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Beaver</td>
<td>Rib Fragment</td>
<td>Juvenile/Immature</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Beaver</td>
<td>Radius Fragment</td>
<td>Juvenile/Immature</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Beaver</td>
<td>Metapodial Fragment</td>
<td>Juvenile/Immature</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Beaver</td>
<td>Phalanx Fragment</td>
<td>Juvenile/Immature</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Beaver</td>
<td>Metapodial Fragment</td>
<td>Juvenile/Immature</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Beaver</td>
<td>Humerus Fragment</td>
<td>Immature</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Beaver</td>
<td>Humerus Fragment</td>
<td>Immature</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Beaver</td>
<td>Metapodial Fragment</td>
<td>Immature</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Beaver</td>
<td>Vertebra Centrum</td>
<td>Immature</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Beaver</td>
<td>Metacarpal Complete</td>
<td>Immature</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Beaver</td>
<td>Phalanx Fragment</td>
<td>Subadult</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Beaver</td>
<td>Caudal Vert Fragment</td>
<td>Subadult</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Beaver</td>
<td>Femur Fragment</td>
<td>Subadult</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Beaver</td>
<td>Phalanx Fragment</td>
<td>Adult</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Beaver</td>
<td>Phalanx Fragment</td>
<td>Adult</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Beaver</td>
<td>Phalanx Fragment</td>
<td>Adult</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Beaver</td>
<td>Ischium Fragment</td>
<td>Adult</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Beaver</td>
<td>Metapodial Fragment</td>
<td>Adult</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Beaver</td>
<td>Phalanx 1 Complete</td>
<td>Adult</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Faunal Element</td>
<td>Fragment Type</td>
<td>Age</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Beaver Phalanx 2</td>
<td>Complete Adult</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Beaver Phalanx 3</td>
<td>Complete Adult</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Beaver Vertebra</td>
<td>Fragment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Beaver Ilium</td>
<td>Fragment</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Beaver Phalanx</td>
<td>Fragment</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>? Beaver Scapula</td>
<td>Fragments</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>? Beaver Tooth</td>
<td>Fragment</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>? Beaver Vertebra</td>
<td>Fragment</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>? Beaver Vertebra</td>
<td>Fragment</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>Seal Vertebra</td>
<td>Fragment</td>
<td>Juvenile</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>Seal Vertebra</td>
<td>Fragment</td>
<td>Juvenile</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>Seal Metapodial</td>
<td>Fragment</td>
<td>Juvenile</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>Caribou Metapodial</td>
<td>Fragment</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>Caribou Phalanx</td>
<td>Fragment</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>Muskrat Metatarsal</td>
<td>Fragment</td>
<td>Possibly Immature</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

One of the most striking things about this sample is the high proportion of beaver bone which accounts for 82% of the total. While this obviously suggests a strong emphasis on the acquisition of beaver, the high proportion of beaver bone relative to caribou may be somewhat deceptive. Caribou killed in the water may have been hauled ashore and butchered at any number of locations on the shores of the lake aside from the base camp. If, as seems likely, the meat was then taken to a storehouse located at some distance from the camp, little evidence of butchering would be present at the camp. Nor does it seem
likely that caribou meat would have been stored with the bone attached. According to William CulL, the storehouse he visited on the Exploits River contained caribou meat, "stowed in boxes made of birch and spruce rinds", that had been, "entirely divested of bone", prior to storage (Howley 1915:69). The practice of crushing caribou long bones and joints to extract fat and collagen would also mean that much of the caribou bone would not have survived in any recognizable condition. And, as we have seen, only calcined bone has survived at the site. On the other hand, beaver, and other smaller animals, are more likely to have been cooked whole and, as a result, to have produce many more calcined bones (Tanner 1985:166-168).

Of the bones from Midden 1, the juvenile and immature beaver bones are the most useful for determining seasonality. Although the categories are fairly broad and there may occasionally be some overlap, generally speaking, juvenile beaver range in age from roughly zero to six months and immatures from roughly six to twelve months or slightly older. Of the beaver bones recovered from Midden 1, three were classified as juvenile, six as juvenile/immature and five as immature. A metapodial fragment from an immature beaver was also recovered from Hearth 1 (Table 7). Since beaver are usually born sometime between the last week in May and the first week in June (Northcott 1974:83), juvenile beaver could have been taken at any time between roughly 1 June and 1 December. However, one of the juvenile elements was from an individual aged between three and six months (Kathlyn Steward: pers.comm.) indicating that it was probably taken
sometime between roughly 1 September and 1 December and this is likely true of the others as well.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Species</th>
<th>Element</th>
<th>Approximate Age</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Beaver</td>
<td>Metapodial Fragment</td>
<td>Immature</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Beaver</td>
<td>Phalanx 3 Complete</td>
<td>Adult</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Seal</td>
<td>Phalanx Fragment</td>
<td>Subadult</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Seal</td>
<td>Phalanx Fragment</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Obviously beaver served as a source of both fur and flesh. In the case of the former, beaver would almost certainly have been hunted in the late fall or winter, when their coats are in prime condition, rather than at other times of the year, while in the case of the latter, it seems unlikely that too young an animal would have been hunted for food except under the most extreme conditions. Certainly, the large number of scrapers recovered from the site suggests a heavy emphasis on hide processing. We also know that the Beothuk whom Guy encountered at Russell’s Point in the fall of 1612 were hunting beaver. Guy reports finding, “A little peecie of fleshe ... which was found to be a beaver cod”, at the site (Cell 1982: 70). Similarly, immature beaver could have been taken at any time from about 1 December to 1 June or perhaps even later but they would probably not have been hunted for fur much after the end of March. Whether they were hunted for food later than this depends on exactly how early in the year the focus of subsistence shifted from the interior to the coast.
As mentioned above, harp seals are available in Newfoundland waters several times between late December and May. However, they are by far the most numerous and most easily taken on the pack ice off the west and northeast coasts of the island between late February and early April and, as Tuck and Pastore (1985:72) have noted, hood and bearded seals can also be taken on the ice at this time. Most scholars have assumed that aboriginal groups who could would have taken advantage of this rich resource and both Palaeo-Eskimo and Recent Indian sites found in outer coast locations close to the spring pack ice are generally viewed as having been used for this purpose (Tuck 1976:26; Tuck and Pastore 1995:74; Pastore 1986:126-127).

If the Beothuk occupying Russell’s Point exploited this resource, it would mean either a relocation of the base camp to farther out the bay around the end of February or, at the very least, forays farther out the bay by specialized hunting parties for extended periods. However, whether these people pursued a spring harp seal hunt or not is at this point a matter of conjecture. While harp seals can be taken on the ice farther out Trinity Bay, they are generally less plentiful in this area than they are farther to the northwest in Bonavista and Notre Dame Bays. In addition, Tuck and Pastore (1985:74-76) have emphasised how variations in the amount of pack ice and factors such as wind direction can effect access to the harp seal herd and these factors would probably have been even more pronounced in Trinity Bay. As a result, harp seals may have been a much less reliable resource and may have played much less of a role in the seasonal round of the Beothuk who wintered at Russell’s Point than of their cousins to the north and west. A much more
dependable prey species for the Beothuk at the bottom of Trinity Bay was probably the harbour seal.

Rather than pursue what was probably a fairly chancy harp seal hunt farther out the bay, perhaps, as the weather warmed in late March to early April, and harbour seals began hauling out in increasing numbers on the beaches at the bottom of Trinity Bay, the Beothuk who had wintered at Russell's Point began making forays out Dildo Arm in search of these seals. These forays may initially have taken the form of short trips, only a day or two in duration, to reconnoitre the bottom of the bay and return to the base camp with any game that may have been taken. Perhaps this explains the presence of both seal and immature beaver bone in Hearth 1 (Table 7). Harbour seals could probably have been taken in fairly large numbers in April when the herds were large but as the herds dispersed into smaller groups in May with the unset of pupping, it may have been necessary for the Beothuk to disperse as well.

There can be little doubt that the spring and summer months were spent exploiting the resources of the coast and one coastal resource exploited by the Trinity Bay Beothuk is well documented. We know that during the late spring and early summer at least a portion of the population was engaged in collecting birds and birds’ eggs on the islands off the coast. In July of 1613 Henry Crout and four other colonists returned to Dildo Arm aboard a shallop, “only to see”, Crout writes, “[if they] wear still [inhabiting] in the freshe watter lake w[hi]ch we did see the last year”. Crout found the camp unoccupied and stated, “...thos[e] w[hi]ch we see last wintter wear gone all abroad acoastinge ... for Eeggs
and birds agaynst the wyntter w[h]ich in one l[and] [to] the northward the[y] may fill ... them into ther bootes from the shoore". He adds that "thes[e] eggs and birds the[y] dry for ther wintter..." (Crout to Willoughby, August 1613, Mi x 1/24; Gilbert 1992: 4-6). We have already mentioned (Chapter 3) Richard Whitbourne’s reference to the Beothuk collecting, "fowles and their egges", on the islands between English Harbour and Heart’s Ease on the north side of Trinity Bay, “as they have been often seen to doe” (Cell 1982:213; Gilbert 1992:10). Whitbourne also describes an encounter somewhere in the vicinity of Heart’s Ease in which a group of Beothuk were found boiling birds and birds’ eggs in pots made from the, “rinds of trees” (Cell 1982:193-194).

While we may question the validity of projecting a practice observed in the early seventeenth century back into prehistoric times, it seems unlikely that such a rich resource would have been ignored by the Beothuk’s prehistoric ancestors. Indeed, given that migratory fishermen had by this time been frequenting the Newfoundland coast during the summer months for well over one hundred years, one might expect that such a practice would be more likely to decrease than increase in the historic period. There is also a much earlier account of the Beothuk’s summer subsistence pattern which mentions the practice. The Discorso D’vn Gran Capitano di mare Francese del louco di Dieppa was first published in Ramusio’s Navigationi et Viaggi in 1556 and is generally believed to have been written by the Norman sea captain Pierre Crignon in 1539. It relates the story of a voyage which took place in 1529 and describes a group of people living on the coast from, “Capo di Ras - as far as the entrance to the Golfo de Castelli [the Strait of Belle Isle]".
Some have suggested that this is a description of native people living on the Labrador side of the Strait of Belle Isle but this stems from confusion over the term 'Golfo de Castelli' or Bay of Castles. Charles Martijn (1990:47-49) feels that the term could apply to, "either the eastern entrance of the Strait, or Chateau Bay itself". However, Jacques Cartier's account of his 1534 voyage makes it quite clear that the Bay of Castles, or "La Baye des Chateaux", is the Strait of Belle Isle. According to Cartier, the entrance to the Bay of Castles is Point Degrat on Quirpon Island off the northern tip of the Great Northern Peninsula. Schooner Island located roughly 25 kilometres to the west in Pistolet Bay is on the south side of this bay while Chateau Harbour, or "Le Hable des Chateaulx", is located, "on the north shore of the said bay" (Bigger 1924:9-15).

The description reads in part:

The inhabitants live in small huts and houses which are covered with tree bark, which they build to live in during the fishing season, which begins in the spring and lasts all summer ... They fish for seals, porpoises, and certain sea birds, called gannets [Margaux], which they take on the islands [to dry]. They make oil out of the fat of these fish. When the fishing season ends with the approach of winter, they return with their catch in boats made of the bark of certain trees called birch [Buil], and go to warmer countries, but we know not where" (Hoffinan 1963:14).

Ingeborg Marshall (1996:295) has suggested that the reference to them going, "to warmer countries", may actually refer to the Beothuk withdrawing into the interior in the fall and this is probably correct.

Pastore (1986:131) has drawn a distinction between the inner coastal zone and the outer coastal zone. The former he defines as, "the bottoms of bays and the inside sheltered
areas of complex coastlines”, and the latter as, “islands and exposed headlands and coastlines”. The main resource available in the outer coastal zone is the harp seal which, as we have seen, during a short period in late winter and early spring is available in amazing numbers. Nesting birds and their eggs can also be taken in great numbers in the outer coastal zone beginning around the end of the harp seal hunt. However, birds and birds’ eggs can also be taken on islands in sheltered inner coastal areas and, as Schwarz (1994:56) has pointed out, resources are by far the most plentiful during summer in the inner coastal zone.

Crout actually arrived in Dildo Arm at the end of the egging season. Birds generally begin to nest and lay eggs on offshore islands around the middle of May and the young are usually hatched by roughly the first of July (Montevecchi and Tuck 1987:145-183)). While Russell’s Point was unoccupied when Crout arrived, Dildo Arm was not. Crout visited and left presents at a Beothuk house on one of the islands, almost certainly Dildo Island (Gilbert 1996b), at the entrance to the arm and in or near the house found “sondry ro[a]ste meatts vpo[n] ther wooden speets”. As the colonists sailed past the island the next day they found the camp deserted but some of the spitted meat was left behind in exchange, according to Crout, for the presents left by the colonists the previous day. As they sailed out the arm, the colonists saw a signal fire lit by the Beothuk somewhere in the arm and upon approaching the fire, they found that the Beothuk had, “hanged out such small store of skines as the[y] had vpon poolles on a beache as it wear in a markett place”.
We will probably never know exactly what the 'sundry meats' were that the Beothuk were roasting on Dildo Island on 3 July 1613. One likely possibility is harbour seal and another might be birds which could probably have been taken on either the south end of Dildo Island or on Ross's Island immediately to the north. Crout's use of the term 'sundry' suggests that there was probably more than one kind and, given the much more inclusive nature of the term 'meat' in the seventeenth century, we need not necessarily exclude various types of fish from the list of possibilities.

Certainly, the other major resource that probably would have been taken during the summer months is salmon which are available in considerable numbers during their spawning runs up the Island's rivers from early June until late August (Marshall 1996:300; Tuck and Pastore 1985:75). While we have no direct evidence that the Trinity Bay Beothuk were taking salmon, we know from later sources (Marshall 1996:62-67) that salmon played an important role in the diet of the Beothuk in Bonavista and Notre Dame Bays and, according to Shanawdithit (Marshall 1996:297), salmon was sometimes dried for later consumption. As we have seen, salmon would likely have been available in most of the larger streams at the bottom of Trinity Bay.

Other species available at the bottom of Trinity Bay in the late spring and summer have already been listed in Chapter Two and need not be repeated here. While no one of these resources is sufficient to form a base of subsistence on its own, taken together, they suggest that the summer months would probably have been a time of relatively plenty. There is certainly ample archaeological and documentary evidence of a Recent
Indian/Beothuk presence in the inner coastal region at the bottom of Trinity Bay. Figure 9 shows the location of the various camps mentioned in contemporary documents between September 1612 and July 1613 and over the last 20 years the presence of a number of these sites has been confirmed archaeologically (Gilbert 1990, 1996b; Rutherford and Gilbert 1992). It is also clear that the Beothuk were travelling across the Isthmus of Avalon into Placentia Bay and documentary and archaeological evidence confirms their presence in that bay as well (Howley 1915:292-294; Linnamae 1971; Quinn 1979:65).

While an analysis of these sites, the possible resources exploited at each, and their relationship one to another is beyond the scope of this thesis, it is worth noting that they suggest a dispersal over a broad area in pursuit of a variety of resources. I would suggest that most of these camps were occupied in the late spring and summer when coastal resources were most varied and plentiful. Of these camps, if any one served as a summer base camp, Stock Cove, centrally located on the Isthmus, appears at present to be the most likely candidate. As we have seen, it was almost certainly at Stock Cove that Guy’s party reported seeing nine houses on November 3, 1612 and Robbins (1985:51-52) has suggested that the site, “May prove to be one of the larger Recent Indian occupations on the Island”.

The presence of a Beothuk camp somewhere around Heart’s Content in early September, 1612 is especially interesting. We have already noted Crout’s reference to the Beothuk hunting caribou around Bay de Verde. If this is correct then it must have taken place sometime between the spring and fall migrations before the herd left this area for its
wintering ground to the south. Burch (1972:343) and Jackson (1997:158-159), among others, have noted that caribou skins are in the best condition for clothing manufacture in August and that the formation of back fat at this time also makes the animals especially attractive to hunters. Clearly the Beothuk relied on caribou for much of their clothing and it would only make sense that they would hunt them, if possible, when the hides were in the best condition. Perhaps the site reported by Crout was a base camp located at least partly to launch hunting expeditions into the interior of the Bay de Verde Peninsula to hunt caribou for furs. The camp, mentioned in a letter of 8 September, 1612, was not seen by Crout but described to him by someone, probably a migratory fisherman, who had, “of Late”, been in the area. So, it was probably occupied during August. As mentioned in Chapter 2, caribou also could have been accessed from any of the camps located on the Isthmus during the summer months.

There is some evidence to show that, while marine resources were the focus of Beothuk subsistence during the spring and summer, Russell’s Point was at least occasionally visited during this time of year. Hearth 2 produced elements from two caribou, an adult and a juvenile (Table 8). The juvenile elements consist of twelve teeth, probably all from the same individual. According to Kathryn Stewart (pers.comm.) these teeth are from a very young animal perhaps even an unborn calf and the broadest possible

---

3 For example, Guy says that the Beothuk he met in Bull Arm each wore, “A shorte gowne or cassocke made of stag skinnes, the furre innermost that came downe to the middle of their leg, with sleves to the middle of their arme...” (Cell 1982:75).
age range for this animal is from one month before birth to three months after birth. Given that caribou calves are born in late May or early June (Northcott 1974:83), this animal may have been taken at any time between roughly late April (if it was an unborn calf) and early September. Obviously, one is tempted to suggest that these two animals were a cow and her calf, and that may well be the case, but we will probably never know for sure.

While it is possible that stray caribou may have been present around Dildo Pond during the summer, it is much more likely that caribou would have been taken in the area in the late spring when the herd, including many pregnant females, would have been moving north towards the calving grounds. In any case, it seems that Russell’s Point must have served, at least occasionally, as a spring and/or summer hunting camp on the periphery of the Beothuk’s summer range.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Species</th>
<th>Element</th>
<th>Approximate Age</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Caribou</td>
<td>11 Teeth Fragments</td>
<td>Juvenile (-1 to 3 months)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Caribou</td>
<td>Astragalus</td>
<td>Adult</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The presence of juvenile seal bones in Midden 1 may also be indicative of a summer presence at the site. As we have seen, these bones are probably from harbour seals which are usually born in the latter half of May or the first half of June (Davis 1984:20). Like beaver, a juvenile harbour seal ranges in age from about zero to six months. So, one might expect juvenile harbour seals to have been taken anytime between
about 15 May and 15 December. However, Boulva and McLaren (1979:14) have observed that harbour seal pups are especially easy prey to hunters since they can be more easily approached than adults and even when killed in the water tend to float because of their thick blubber. If the juvenile seals present at Russell’s Point were taken during this vulnerable period, then they were likely taken during the summer. However, it is also possible that they were taken later in the year and represent animals acquired in the fall prior to moving inland to prepare for the fall caribou hunt.

From the above it seems clear that Russell’s Point was used by the Trinity Bay Beothuk as a fall and winter base camp. The Beothuk probably moved to the site from the coast prior to the fall caribou migration to prepare for the hunt and, if the hunt was successful, spent the winter there subsisting on stored caribou meat supplemented by other game taken from the surrounding countryside. With the coming of spring and the increasing availability of coastal resources, these people almost certainly shifted their attention, and their camp, to the Isthmus of Avalon. However, Russell’s Point appears to have been used, at least occasionally, as a temporary hunting camp during the spring and/or summer months.
Chapter 5
The Effects of Contact

Obviously, John Guy's encounter with the Beothuk in 1612 was not an instance of first contact. The documents from the Cupers Cove colony indicate that the Beothuk in Trinity Bay had access to European material. At Dildo Pond Guy mentions seeing, among other things, "a copper kettle kepte very brighte ... [and] a fishing reele". According to Guy, one of the three houses at the camp was covered in an old sail, "which they had gotten from some Christian", and Guy suggests that some of their "oares' were made from beech wood oars of Basque origin (Cell 1982:71; Gilbert 1990:154-155)). At the camp located on the Come-By-Chance River in Placentia Bay, Crout reports seeing, "a basket full of Fishermens hookes, a little brassen kettell ... [and] a ca[u]llking [iron]" (Quinn 1979:162; Gilbert 1990:158). A canoe found on the beach at the bottom of Bull Arm contained, "a fishing lynne ... [and]... a Fisher mans caepe" (Quinn 1979:162) and Guy mentions seeing what he calls a "holiberte", or halberd, at one of the camps in Savage Harbour (Cell 1982:70), although whether this was the medieval weapon generally associated with this term or simply a native spear is uncertain. In describing the same camp, Crout says only that he saw, "long staffes or pikes" (Quinn 1979:160). In what may seem an odd reversal, Guy also states that in addition to the chain of periwinkle shells, arrow without a head, and feather presented to George Whittington during the encounter in Bull Arm, one of the Beothuk gave him "a spilting knife" (Quinn 1079:155).
It is also clear from the documents that the Trinity Bay Beothuk were familiar with the nuances of trade. During both Guy's voyage in 1612 and Crout's voyage in 1613, the Beothuk lit signal fires to initiate trade and displayed their furs on poles, "as it wear in a markett place" (Crout to Willoughby, 1613, Mix 1/24). During Guy's meeting, a single Beothuk approached first carrying a white wolf skin on a pole, "which", Crout says, "was ther flage of truce" (Quinn 1979:162). This was followed by the ritual exchange of gifts, dancing, singing and a feast.

As a number of scholars have pointed out (Axtell 1992; Bradley 1987; Trigger 1985), ritualized exchange was an essential part of aboriginal social interaction and extensive trade networks in more exotic materials existed long before the contact period. Trigger (1985:185-186), following Rotstein (1970,1972), states that long before contact ritualized trade served to maintain friendly relations between native groups. That the Beothuk's Little Passage ancestors were involved to some degree in this system of exchange is obvious from the presence of Ramah chert on sites as far south as Bonavista (Schwarz 1992b:64-72) and Trinity Bays including Russell's Point (Page 76, above). Thus, the exchange of gifts, singing, dancing and feasting described by Guy and Crout were probably all aspects of a ritualized trade known to the Beothuk and their ancestors long before the arrival of Europeans. However, other aspects of these encounters, such as the signal fire, the white flag and the display of furs on poles, almost certainly have their origin in the post contact period and are clearly part of a trading system familiar to both natives and Europeans in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries.
That native Americans living along the eastern seaboard had access to at least some European materials from a very early period is clear. The earliest and probably most oft quoted example of this is a description of natives carried to Portugal from somewhere on the northeast coast of North America aboard one of Gaspar Corte-Real’s ships in 1501. One of these people was said to have possessed, “a piece of a broken gilt sword”, and another to be wearing in his ears, “two silver rings”. According to the Venetian ambassador at Lisbon who observed these people, both the sword and the silver rings appeared to have been manufactured in Italy (Hoffinan 1961:27-28). As Axtell (1992:85), among others (Salisbury 1984:53), has pointed out, the Abenaki encountered by Verrazzano on the coast of Maine 23 years later were not only familiar with Europeans and their trade goods but exhibited a level of caution and distain for Verrazzano’s men that suggests earlier, less than positive encounters.

By the time of Verrazzano’s voyage, European fishermen had been pursuing a cod fishery off the shores of Newfoundland for at least a quarter of a century. By 1509 about 100 vessels from the French provinces of Brittany and Normandy were sailing to Newfoundland annually and by 1519 they had been joined by a number of Portuguese vessels. Spain was somewhat slower to become involved but by about 1550 cod and whales, the latter in the Strait of Belle Isle, were drawing approximately 200 of her ships across the Atlantic each year. English involvement in the cod fishery was limited to a few vessels during the first half of the sixteenth century but by the 1570s the English fishery had begun a rapid expansion and by 1595 approximately 100 English vessels, mostly from
Country, were sailing to Newfoundland harbours annually. Increasing competition for cod caused by this influx of English fishermen, the majority of whom focused their efforts on the Avalon Peninsula, led to an expansion of the fishery south along the coast of Nova Scotia and into Maine (Matthews 1973:69-70, Cell 1969:5-53, Trigger 1985:135).

While cod and whales were the main focus of European attention in the northeast during most of the sixteenth century encounters with native Americans inevitably led to some trade. Trigger (1985:135-136) suggests that the volume of trade in the Maritimes probably increased steadily during the century and that whaling and fishing activity in the Strait of Belle Isle during this period resulted in the movement of a considerable amount of European material west into the North American interior. Turgeon (1986:523-549) has pointed out that by the late sixteenth century French fishing ships often carried a small boat to search for furs during the fishing season and that contracts sometimes state that French fishing crews were also engaged in trading with native people. Throughout most of the century this trade would have been in a variety of "small furs", such as the ermine, martin, fox, otter and lynx used to trim the cloths of the middle and upper classes, and hides of larger animals, such as caribou, moose and deer, to be used as leather. However, the growing popularity of the beaver hat led to an increasing demand for beaver pelts in the last two decades of the century (Axtell 1988:162-165).

Some of the trading practices observed by Guy and Crout among the Beothuk were already evident among the Mi'kmaq and St. Lawrence Iroquoians during Cartier's first voyage in 1534. The Mi'kmaq whom Cartier met in Chaleur Bay on July 6, "set up a
first voyage in 1534. The Mi'kmaq whom Cartier met in Chaleur Bay on July 6, “set up a
great clamour and made frequent signs to us to come on shore, holding up to us some furs
on sticks” (Bigger 1924:49). Two days later, while sailing along the north shore of the
bay, they encountered Mi'kmaq on what was apparently Tracadigash Point, “who were
making many fires that smoked”. Once they had the Frenchmen’s attention, the Mi’kmaq
approached in one of their canoes and left, “strips of cooked seal, which they placed on
bits of wood and then withdrew making signs to us that they were making a present of
them”. Cartier’s men took the meat and left, “hatchets, knives, beads and other wares”, in
exchange (Bigger 1924: 55). A month later, on August 5, Cartier encountered a group of
St. Lawrence Iroquoians at Natashkwan Point on the north side of the Gulf of St.
Lawrence who were lighting what appear to have been signal fires. When Cartier’s vessel
did not approach, “because the wind blew towards the shore”, twelve Indians in two
canoes approached their vessel and, “came as freely on board ... as if they had been
Frenchmen” (Bigger 1924: 76-77). Certainly the practice of lighting a signal fire to initiate
trade was well established by the mid-seventeenth century. Writing in 1672 Nicholas
Denys (1908) reported that in Acadia

The Indians are in the habit of betaking themselves to the
vicinity of places whither they know the fishermen will
come to stand with their ships. As soon as they catch site of
these, they make a great smoke in order to inform the
people that they are there. The ship thereupon approaches
the land, and the Indians take a few skins and sit down in
their canoes in order to row nearer.
The significance of the white flag was also known to native Americans from an early date. During their first voyage to the Canadian arctic in 1576, David Frobisher's men used "a white cloth" to entice Inuit to approach and trade with his party and the following year Inuit tried to lure Frobisher ashore by waving a white skin (Quinn 1979:207-212). In 1582 David Ingram, "of Barking in the Countie of Essex Sayler", who claimed to have walked from the Gulf of Mexico to within "sixty leagues" of Cape Breton over a twelve month period beginning in October 1568, was questioned concerning his knowledge of the Americas and its people (Quinn 1967:64). While much of what he reported was clearly the work of an overactive imagination, his description of the trading practices of the natives of the region bears a striking resemblance to the behaviour reported by Guy and Crout. "If you will have any of the people come aborde your ship," he said, "hang out some white cloth upon a staffe, for that is a signe of amitie. [and] If you will bargaine for ware with them, leave the thing that you will sell, upon the ground, and goe from it a pretie way off: then wil they come and take it, and set downe such wares as they will give for it in the place: And if you thinke it not sufficient, then leave their wares with signes that you like it not, and they will bringe more, untill either they or you be satisfied, or will give no more. Otherwise you may hang your wares on a long poles end, and so putt more or lesse on it, untill you have agreed on the bargaine (Quinn 1967:286).

Thus, it seems clear that the Beothuk encountered by Guy and Crout were following trading practices common over much of the northeast during the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries.
The Beothuk also seem to have been aware of the European preference for beaver. According to Crout and Guy (Quinn 1979:156, 163), the Beothuk whom Guy’s party met in Bull Arm on November 6, 1612 displayed fourteen skins on poles: one was a “sable” (probably martin), one was a fox, another was the skin of a”strange Fowell”, and most of the rest were beaver. It has also been suggested (Gilbert 1990:164) that the Trinity Bay Beothuk’s taste for aquavit indicates previous contact with Europeans. One of the things Guy’s men gave the Beothuk during the meeting in Bull Arm was aquavit which Crout says, “they liked well” (Quinn 1979:162). In contrast, a group of Abenaki met by Waymouth on the George River in Maine in 1605 tasted aquavit when it was offered, “but would by no means drink” (Axtell 1992:92).

In addition to the items of European origin which the Beothuk already possessed, the Cupers Cove colonists left a variety of trade goods with them during their encounters in 1612 and 1613. According to Guy and Crout, ship’s biscuit, amber beads, points and bracelets were left at Dildo Pond on 26 October, 1612 (Quinn 1979:153,161). In addition to the raisons, bread, butter, beer and aquavit shared with the Beothuk during the feast at Bull Arm on November 6, 1612, the colonists gave them two knives, a piece of brass, a dozen points, their white flag of truce, a shirt, gloves, a linen cap, two hand towels, and two table napkins. Two days later, on November 8, the colonists left a hatchet, a knife, a pair of scissors and four threaded needles in exchange for furs left displayed upon poles (Quinn 1979:155-156). In July 1613 Crout left biscuit, cheese, a linen cap and a napkin on an island at the entrance to Dildo Arm and the next day he left knives, aquavit, linen, “and
other things which we esteeme twise to the valew of them”, in exchange for furs displayed on poles somewhere in Dildo Arm (Crout to Willoughby, 1613, M ix 1/24).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Wrought Iron Nails and Nail Fragments</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Altered Nails</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wrought Iron Fish Hook Fragments</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iron Wire Fragment (Possibly Fish Hook)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knives</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keys</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Copper Hooks</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Copper Tack Fragments</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iron Nodule</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Copper Fragments</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burnt Copper Fragments</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coarse Earthenware Fragments</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charred Grape Seeds</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>42</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Given all this, it may seem surprising that so few objects of European origin were recovered from Russell’s Point. In all, only 42 such items, including the two charred grape seeds, were found (Table 9). These include twenty-one wrought iron nails and nail fragments (Plate 24) of which seven are complete, six consist of the head and part of the shaft, five are shafts without heads, two are the tips of shafts, and one is a head without a
shaft. The fragmentary nature of the majority of these nails does not appear to have been the result of intentional modification. However, a single 29 mm long altered nail fragment was recovered consisting of the head and a small portion of the shaft flattened and flared at the distal end (Plate 25). This nail is similar to examples found at Boyd’s Cove in Notre Dame Bay. Pastore (1992:30-31) has suggested that such fragments were a byproduct produced when the shafts of wrought iron nails were hammered flat to make projectile points but that they may also have been utilized for scraping hides. Perhaps the unaltered nails were being used as awls or punches.

Three fish hook fragments and a fragment of rounded wrought iron wire that may be part of the shaft of a fish hook were recovered. Two of the fragments, one 41 mm long and 2 mm thick and the other 44 mm long and 2.2 mm thick, consist only of a fragment of the hook. The third, which measures 112 mm long and 2.2 mm thick, includes the hook, barb and part of the shaft (Plate 26). The other possible hook fragment is 25 mm long and 2.2 mm thick.

A knife fragment measuring 135 mm cm long and consisting of a flat tang, 80 mm long and 3 mm thick, and part of the blade was recovered (Plate 27). The tang is 18 mm wide at its proximal end but tapers to only 15 mm near the blade. Three circular depressions, 2 mm wide and located at 13 mm (1/2 inch) intervals along the length of the tang, probably mark the location of corroded holes once used to attach what was probably either a wooden or bone handle long since decayed in the acid soil of Russell’s Point. The portion of the blade that has survived measures 55 mm long, 24 mm wide and is 2 mm
thick at the back of the blade. Such an item would have been a vast improvement over the
stone cutting tools used by the ancestors of the Beothuk in prehistoric times and was no
doubt highly valued.

Part of a small iron key, measuring only 21 mm long and consisting of the bow and
part of the shank without the step, was also recovered (Plate 28). The shank is 4.8 mm in
diameter and the bow is 14 mm across perpendicular to the shank. A V-shaped projection
extending from the end of the shank into the bow gives it the heart shaped appearance
typical of keys manufactured during the seventeenth century (Noël Hume 1969: 245-246).
The presence of the key is interesting. Such a small item probably did not serve any
utilitarian purpose. Instead, its purpose may have been decorative. The Recollet lay
brother Gabriel Sagard, who lived among the Huron early in the seventeenth century,
observed that they were in the habit of hanging keys around the necks of their children as
ornaments and perhaps this key served a similar purpose (Trigger 1976: 360).

Two copper alloy hooks were also recovered (Plate 29). Both are made from
round copper alloy bars, one 3.2 mm and the other 3.1 mm in diameter. The former
measures 100.5 mm in length and is bent at both ends to form U-shaped, slightly inflaring
hooks flattened into a roughly rectangular cross section at the tips. The latter, which
appears to have one end missing, is 78.4 mm in length and has a single, slightly inflaring
hook with a flattened tip. The purpose of these hooks is at present unknown.

The head of a small copper tack, 8 mm in diameter, was recovered from among the
fire cracked rocks of Midden 2. Five small, thin, slightly curved fragments of copper, the
largest only 9 mm long and the smallest 5.6 mm long, were also recovered. All were from the same area and are almost certainly part of the same object. Two small pieces of burnt copper, the largest only 21 mm long, were also found. Little can be said about these copper fragments. However, we have already noted that copper kettles were reported at both Dildo Pond and the Come-By-Chance River during the 1612 voyage. We also know that copper was much sought after by native people during the early historic period and that items such as copper kettles were often cut up and the copper recycled as tools and ornaments (Trigger 1985:216-217). Therefore, it should not be surprising to find small pieces of copper on a Beothuk site from this period.

A single coarse red earthenware base fragment, measuring only 32.9 mm long, 27 mm wide and 15.3 mm high, was recovered from the site. The fabric contains small white and purple inclusions and the side of the vessel exhibits a stamped, fluted design. While the material has yet to be identified, it appears to be of Iberian origin.

Unlike the lithic material which was scattered over the entire site, items of European origin were largely restricted to two areas, suggesting that these were the two areas most heavily utilized in the historic period. Eight of the iron artifacts, including six of the wrought iron nails, a fish hook fragment, and the key, as well as one of the copper hooks, the five small fragments of copper and one piece of burnt copper were all found in or around Hearth 5. A ballast flint arrowhead was also found roughly one metre south of Hearth 5 and, as we have seen, this hearth also produced the two charred European grape seeds (Plate 30). Sixteen other items, including ten wrought iron nails and nail fragments,
two fish hook fragments, the iron knife, the altered nail, the other copper hook and the single piece of coarse red earthenware were found in the extreme southeast of the excavation in Units 23, 26, 27, 28 and 29.

The limited amount of European material recovered from Russell’s Point may not present a totally accurate picture of the extent to which such items had been incorporated into the material culture of the Trinity Bay Beothuk in the early historic period. As we have seen, the site was utilized by the Beothuk and their prehistoric ancestors for roughly 650 years, from about A.D. 1000 to A.D. 1650, and only the last 150 years, or about 23%, of the occupation, falls within the historic period. Fitzgerald, Turgeon, Whitehead and Bradley (1993: 44) have also pointed out that before the increased demand for beaver pelts in the last quarter of the sixteenth century, trade was a relatively insignificant sideline to the more important business of fishing and whaling. As a result, far fewer Euroepan goods would have been available during this early period and one would naturally expect prehistoric, lithic items to far outnumber items of European manufacture. Also, only those materials, such as iron and copper, that preserve fairly well in the acid soils of the Avalon, are likely to have survived. Axtell (1988:171-173;1992:136-138) has pointed out that cloth goods made up an important part of native-European trade from the sixteenth century on and that by the seventeenth century cloth goods were the single most important item in the Indian trade. This emphasis on cloth is reflected in the items such as shirts, gloves, caps, towels, and napkins given to the Beothuk by the Cupers Cove colonists and such items do not preserve well archaeologically. Items of European origin
are also more likely to have been curated and/or recycled especially during this early period when they were still relatively rare. Finally, unlike more settled agricultural peoples, the Beothuk’s seasonal round took them over a fairly wide area in the course of a year and items could have been lost or discarded at any number of locations along the way.

Still, while the Trinity Bay Beothuk’s use of European material may have been somewhat greater than is suggested by the archaeological remains at Russell’s Point, it seems clear that such items played a relatively minor role in the material culture of these people up until the time the site was abandoned. Certain European items were beginning to enter the native tool kit. Sharper and more durable iron knives were beginning to replace traditional stone knives and iron fish hooks were replacing bone fish gorges. According to the documents, copper kettles were sometimes used in place of birch bark pots and canvas sails were at least occasionally used instead of hides or birch bark to cover dwellings. The presence of a single altered nail also indicates that at sometime before the site was finally abandoned the Beothuk had begun to work iron. However, it seems clear that traditional stone tools were still an important part of the material culture of the Beothuk occupying Russell’s Point during the early historic period.

This contrasts dramatically with sites such as Boyd’s Cove and Inspector Island in Notre Dame Bay. The former has been dated by Pastore to between roughly 1650 and 1720 although a carbon date of A.D. 1810 +/- 70 recovered from a hearth located on the wall of an abandoned Beothuk house pit suggests that the site may have been visited at
least occasionally until the mid-eighteenth century or later (Pastore 1992:33). The 205 square metre area excavated at Boyd’s Cove produced over 1700 iron artifacts of which 1,179 were wrought nails and nail fragments (Pastore: pers.comm.; McLean 1990:170).

According to Pastore (1987:11-12), the four Beothuk houses excavated at the site contained an average of 161 nails and nail fragments each. A single house feature excavated on Inspector Island, roughly 14 km west of Boyd’s Cove and probably dating to the early eighteenth century, produced 30 iron artifacts including four modified nails. In contrast, as we have seen, only 28 iron artifacts, 21 of them wrought iron nails or nail fragments, were recovered from the 158 square metres excavated at Russell’s Point.

Clearly, by the time the Russell’s Point site was abandoned, the Beothuk, at least in Trinity Bay, were still at a very early stage in the process which by the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries would lead to the almost total dependence on iron tools witnessed by LeBlanc (1973) at Wigwam Point on the Exploits River and Devereux (1970) at Indian Point on Red Indian Lake.

Whether the few objects of European origin found at Russell’s Point were acquired through trade, recovered from seasonally abandoned European fishing premises, or stolen directly from migratory fishermen is impossible to say with any degree of certainty. According to Crout, the Beothuk were trading with the French and David Kirke, writing in 1639, states that both the French and the Basques, “in times past ... have traded with the natives of the country for furs and deere skins ... every fishing season, and it was sometimes intermitted as quarrells arose betwixt them” (Gilbert 1992:8, Howley
As we have seen, the Beothuk were clearly familiar with the nuances of trade and the presence of copper kettles, mentioned by both Guy and Crout, suggests that some trade may have been going on with either the Basques or the French. Axtell (1992:82) states that, "copper kettles were a standard item in the French, not the English, trade kit in the late sixteenth and early seventeenth century", while Fitzgerald, Turgeon, Whitehead and Bradley (1993: 47) state that the Basques were by far the primary traders in copper kettles at least in the last two decades of the sixteenth century.

The Basque presence in Trinity and Conception Bays during the late sixteenth and early seventeenth centuries is well documented. In 1597 Captain Charles Leigh made reference to a Spanish vessel, probably Basque, being at "Parlican", almost certainly Old Perlican, in Trinity Bay (Quinn 1979:74). Henry Crout reported that on the evening of 22 April, 1613, "master Whittington", arrived at Cupers Cove, "from Harbour de Grace with the Biskiners in their shallopp", (Quinn 1979: 176) and as late as 1638 David Kirke's brother Lewis was taxing Basque and Dutch vessels in Trinity Bay (Cell 1969:117).

It is also clear that by 1620 at least some Beothuk were not averse to helping themselves to European goods when the opportunity arose. We have already noted in Chapter 3 Richard Whitbourne's account, published in that year, of Beothuk from Bonavista Bay coming, "secretly every yeer... into Trinity Bay and Harbour", to steal goods from the migratory fishermen (Cell 1982:118). However, whether the Beothuk living in the bottom of Trinity Bay were engaged in similar activities is unknown. In his *Loving Invitation*, published in 1622, Whitbourne describes a raid by a group of Beothuk
on, "a Ship of Tapson, in the Country of Deuon; which ship, riding there at Anchor neere by mee, at the Harbour called Hearts-ease, on the North side of Trinity Bay ... [was] robbed in the night, by the Sauages, of their apparell, and diuers other prouisions..." (Cell 1982:193). Exactly when this raid took place is uncertain but given that the account was first published in 1622 and not included in the Discourse which was published in 1620, it is possible that it occurred sometime between these two dates.

Certainly, the 21 wrought iron nails recovered from Russell's Point could easily have been acquired from an abandoned fishing camp although nails were sometimes traded for furs. John Janes recorded that on 12 July, 1587 John Davis' party exchanged, "beads, nailes, pinnes, needles and cards", with Inuit for, "skinnes and darts". He also noted that the Inuit would, "for a knife, a naile or a bracelet ... sell their boats, coats, or anything they had" (Quinn 1979:249-250). Fish hooks, too, might have been either traded or pilfered. However, other items, such as the key and the knife, would seem more likely to have been acquired through trade. As mentioned above, the planters at Cupids gave knives to the Beothuk at the bottom of Trinity Bay in both 1612 and 1613 and as late as September 1619 Thomas Rowley, who was then living at Cupids and who had accompanied Guy on the 1612 voyage, stated that he had knives which he intended to trade with the Beothuk, "in the bottome of trinity bay" (Gilbert 1992:7).

The two grape seeds are especially interesting. Obviously grapes could not have been transported to Newfoundland in the sixteenth or early seventeenth century. However, raisins sometimes were and some of these obviously found their way into the
hands of the Beothuk at Russell’s Point. While it is conceivable that raisins might have been acquired by some other means, it seems much more likely that they were obtained through friendly contact. As mentioned above, among the things that John Guy mentions giving the Beothuk when he met them in Trinity Bay in 1612 were, “reasons of the sun” (Quinn 1979:155). It is also worth noting that among the items found by James Tuck in the sixteenth century Beothuk hearths at Ferryland are charred grape seeds (James Tuck: pers. comm.).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Species</th>
<th>Element</th>
<th>Approximate Age</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Beaver</td>
<td>Ulna Fragment</td>
<td>Immature?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Beaver</td>
<td>Metapodial Fragment</td>
<td>Adult</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Beaver</td>
<td>Phalanx Fragment</td>
<td>Adult</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Beaver</td>
<td>Ulna Fragment</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Beaver</td>
<td>?Tibia Fragment</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Probably Beaver</td>
<td>Rib Fragment</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Probably Beaver</td>
<td>Carpal/Tarsal Fragment</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The presence of a large number of beaver bones in Midden 1 might be taken as indicating that the Beothuk were focusing more attention on the acquisition of beaver for trade. However, it seems clear that beaver played an important role in the subsistence of the Beothuk’s prehistoric ancestors. Both Hearth 1 and Hearth 10, the former dating to between A.D. 990 and 1285 and the latter to between A.D. 1250 and 1305, produced
beaver bones. Indeed, all the identifiable bones from the latter hearth were from beaver (Table 10). Work by Reader (1994:15-17) at a Recent Indian site at Deer Lake Beach, dating to between A.D. 690 and 890, has also produced beaver bone. It is also clear that the Beothuk used beaver for clothing. Guy states that the Beothuk he met at Bull Arm each wore, “a beaver skinne about their necke” (Cell 1982:75).

On a final note, one feature at Russell’s Point is conspicuous by its absence. As we have seen, the site was utilized by the Beothuk and their prehistoric ancestors from about A.D. 1000 until roughly A.D. 1650 and it seems clear from the analysis above that the site served as a fall and winter base camp. Yet, while a total of seventeen hearths and related features have been identified at the site, not a single house pit was found. As early as 1922 Speck (1922:31) noted that the Beothuk differed from other Algonkian inhabitants of the northeast in that they were the only people to use pit houses. Speck’s knowledge of Beothuk house construction was derived from sites he had visited on the Exploits River and Red Indian Lake all of which date to the late historic period. Pastore (pers. comm.) has suggested that Beothuk house pits were an historic development facilitated perhaps by access to European tools and the evidence from Russell’s Point strongly supports this hypothesis. Even a cursory look at the house pit types recorded from the Beaches (Devereux 1969, McLean 1991), Boyd’s Cove and Inspector Island (Pastore 1982, 1985, 1987), and the Exploits River/Red Indian Lake region (Devereux 1970, LeBlanc 1973, Schwarz 1992c) suggests an evolution from shallow circular pits to much more substantial multi-sided structures over time. If this is the case, then Russell’s
Point may represent the earliest stage in this evolution, simple ground level wigwams similar to those used by the Beothuk's Algonkian speaking cousins elsewhere in the northeast.
Conclusions

Twenty years ago little was known about the Beothuk presence in Trinity Bay. Those who had read Howley (1915) were familiar with Guy’s voyage into the bay and his encounter with the Beothuk but the abbreviated version of Guy’s journal copied from Purchas (1906) by Howley left out many important details and caused considerable confusion. The prevailing view of the Beothuk presence in Trinity Bay at the time is probably best summed up by Frederick W. Rowe who in his Extinction: The Beothuk of Newfoundland (1986:16-17) wrote that

Had [the pirate Peter] Easton not made his periodic raids on Conception Bay that summer [of 1612], Guy would probably have gotten away two months earlier, and instead of confining his search to Trinity Bay, which the Boetucks [sic] did not frequent extensively in any event, he would most likely have gone on to Bonavista Bay, and even to Notre Dame Bay, where he would undoubtedly have met many more Beothuks then he did ...

Excavations at Russell’s Point have greatly enhanced our understanding of the Little Passage/Beothuk occupation of Trinity Bay. Evidence recovered from the site proves that the Beothuks’ Little Passage ancestors were well established in the bottom of Trinity Bay by about A.D. 1000 and that this occupation continued until roughly the middle of the seventeenth century. That these people were firmly rooted in the area is underlined by their extensive use of local grey chert with 95 % of all cores and core fragments and between 78 % and 88 % of all the major tool groups made from this material. The much less extensive but consistant use of Bonavista Bay rhyolite indicates ongoing contact, probably through trade, with that region.
The data from Russell's Point also provides concrete support for Schwarz and Rowley-Conwy's hypothesis that the ideal fall and winter base camp for the early historic Beothuk and their Recent Indian ancestors would have been on near coastal bodies of water providing easy access to the resources of both the coast and the interior. Clearly this was the case at least at the bottom of Trinity Bay and there can be little doubt that Russell's Point was one such camp. The Beothuk who utilized Russell's Point probably arrived at the site in the autumn prior to the start of the fall caribou migration, killed as many animals as they could during the migration and, if the hunt was successful, stored the meat nearby for use during the winter. With sufficient stores in place hunters would have been free to pursue other game at a more leisurely pace. The location of the site, at the north end of a broad valley extending south to St. Mary's Bay, allowed for easy access to the resources of the interior of the Avalon including caribou and beaver. With the arrival of spring and the increasing availability of coastal resources these people would probably have shifted the focus of their activities, and their base camp, to the coast and the numerous Recent Indian/Beothuk sites located along the Isthmus of Avalon were probably occupied during the spring and summer months.

Whether this pattern continued uninterrupted for over six centuries cannot be said with any degree of certainty. However, it seems unlikely that it did. Dramatic fluctuations in caribou populations are well documented and while caribou have been known to follow the same migratory routes for long periods, any number of factors, some of them as yet poorly understood, can lead to abrupt changes in migration patterns (Burch
1972:351-359). When such changes took place, as they almost certainly did, the inhabitants of Russell's Point would have been forced to adopt another strategy. Perhaps they moved farther east to a body of water that lay along the altered migration route; perhaps they moved south into the interior of the Avalon to better access the herd in its winter grounds; or perhaps they focused their attention on other prey species such as a beaver and bear. This last possibility may explain the presence of beaver bone to the exclusion of all other types in Hearth 10. Most likely various combinations of all these strategies were utilized when the need arose. Still, the resources that could be exploited from Russell's Point must have been dependable enough to permit repeated reuse over a very long period. Clearly, if the site was abandoned periodically, it was also repeatedly reoccupied.

That the Beothuk living in the bottom of Trinity Bay had access to a certain amount of European material by at least the second decade of the seventeenth century is obvious from the documentary data. The documentary evidence also clearly illustrates that these people were familiar with the nuances of trade and suggests that they were trading at least occasionally with the French and Basques. However, while certain European goods were being incorporated into the Beothuk tool kit, it seems clear that the material culture of these people was still largely based on traditional implements of stone, bone and wood and, while there almost certainly were variations in the rate at which various Beothuk groups on the island adopted the use of iron and other European materials, the evidence from Russell's Point suggests that the process of adopting
European materials documented at places such as Boyd's Cove and Wigwam Point must have greatly accelerated in the second half of the seventeenth century after Russell's Point was abandoned. Certainly, despite the efforts of people such as Guy, Crout and Rowley, there is little evidence to indicate that any type of sustained trade was ever established.
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Figure 7 shows the layout of Russell's Point (CiAj-1) with Level 2 features marked. The map uses symbols to denote unit numbers, stones, and hearths. The map includes a compass rose indicating north, east, south, and west directions. The grid lines on the map help in locating specific features within the site. The map is annotated with various symbols and numbers that correspond to the points of interest on the site.