Introduction

St. Croix Island in Washington Country, Maine, is a historical site of international significance. It contains the remains of the 1604-05 predecessor for permanent French settlement in North America. It was also the subject of the earliest problem-oriented fieldwork in American historical archeology, conducted in 1796 to confirm the settlement’s location. In recognition of the site’s significance to both the United States and to Canada, it was designated an International Historic Site in 1984, the only one in the National Park system.

This paper reviews the past fifty years of National Park Service (NPS) archaeology conducted at St. Croix Island. After four centuries, the site itself is remarkably intact and contains architectural, artifactual, and human remains from the 1604-1605 settlement established by Pierre Dugua. Despite the good intentions of park managers, the quality of past archaeological work was mixed and its results not adequately conveyed to the public. The first task that we face involves recovering old data or data thought to be lost and deriving new meaning from it. The second step involves applying new technologies such as geophysical survey and GIS, in conjunction with traditional field archaeology, to provide new insight into the individuals and groups who founded New France.

Background

In 1603, Henri IV of France granted a monopoly to Pierre Dugua, Sieur de Mons, for exclusive trading rights and responsibility for colonization of l’Acadie. At that time this territory roughly corresponded with the area between modern-day Philadelphia and Cape Breton. Dugua, a Protestant, assembled a mixed group of 120 Catholics and Protestants
including the cartographer and explorer Samuel Champlain, Swiss soldiers, carpenters, surgeons, a blacksmith, and sailors. After reaching the coast of Nova Scotia in 1604, they explored the Bay of Fundy and Passamaquoddy Bay. Midway up one river they discovered an island with excellent defensive features and good anchorage. It also offered an advantage for trading with Native Americans who congregated there during spring fish runs. The Island of St. Croix was named after the river of the same name, forming the shape of a cross with its nearby tributaries (Lescarbot 1911, Biggar 1922).

Champlain’s narrative from Les Voyages published with engravings in 1613 is our most important documentation of the settlement (Biggar 1922). Defense was facilitated by the island’s naturally steep granite cliffs, supplemented by palisade segments and cannon platforms. His plans depict four blocks of 19 buildings surrounding an open square containing a single tree. One block of buildings at a higher elevation, and containing Dugua’s house, was palisaded. Champlain’s narrative and illustrations support the idea that the buildings were of half-timber construction, clapboarded over, and resting on low stone foundations or rock outcrops. Some may represent the earliest examples of European row houses in North America. Doors and windows may have been transported from France or assembled on ship. To the south was built a chapel for Native American converts and a cemetery. The settlement was not limited to the island, but had spread to the mainland on either side of the river where fresh water was available.

A group of 79 individuals who stayed to winter over met with a natural disaster. Snow began to fall in October and soon the river was filled with ice flows impeding access to the mainland. Either 35 (according to Champlain) or 36 expedition members (according to Marc Lescarbot) died. A relief ship arrived in June, 1605 and the group then disassembled and moved their buildings, with the exception of the storehouse, to Port Royal in Nova Scotia.

The island was visited periodically until 1613 when Captain Samuel Argall of Jamestown, Virginia, burned the remaining building and took its supply of salt in an attempt to drive the French from the Bay of Fundy. The island then slipped into a period
of historical obscurity. What began as a potential center for settlement in New France quickly acquired a peripheral status. The island was known as Metanegwis to the Passamaquoddies and Maliseets, and successively as Bone, Dochet, Neutral, Big, De Monts, Doceas and Dochet island to Americans and Canadians in the 18th and 19th centuries (Ganong 1945:22).

The Rediscovery of Dugua’s Settlement

The Treaty of Paris set the northeast boundary of the United States at the river named by Dugua the St. Croix River despite confusion about its actual whereabouts. The river was, by definition, the same as the one visited by the Dugua expedition and the location of the island he settled. A commission was established in 1794 to verify the location of St. Croix Island and in 1797 Commissioner Robert Pagan paid a visit to a local island by then known as Doceas Island. Here, he found piles of rocks that corresponded with structures shown in Champlain’s plan. He exposed walls composed of stone set in clay mortar and found charcoal, bricks, and a stoneware pitcher. Later, accompanied by the Surveyor-General of Isle St. John, part of the island was cleared of trees and debris and the foundation of a building measuring 20 by 66 feet was exposed. Four distinct piles of brick and stone were tentatively identified as collapsed chimneys. This convinced the commission that they had located St. Croix Island so they could identify the river and set the international boundary.

In this earliest exercise in North American historical archaeology we see the development and execution of a research design involving documentary research, fieldwork, recovery of artifacts, and the production of a site map (although the ‘piles’ were omitted). Interest in the site ended with the resolution of the boundary dispute. The island served as the location of a private residence in the 19th century, and later the northern part was sold to the U.S. government where a lighthouse was built in 1856 (Cotter 1969; Ganong 1945).

In 1949 Congress authorized that St. Croix be designated a National Monument and NPS Regional Archaeologist J. C. Harrington outlined a research strategy for the island. In
1950 he hired Wendell S. Hadlock, a University of Pennsylvania anthropology graduate who was working at the Islesford Museum in Maine. Hadlock was to locate buildings and features including walls, fortifications, and burials and to “secure other information pertinent to the historic background of St. Croix Island.” Harrington had an intense interest in the site but was constrained by bureaucratic responsibilities in the Philadelphia headquarters of NPS Region One, now the Northeast Region.

Following an agreement with Harrington, Hadlock worked mainly on the north side of the island where he excavated a series of two-foot wide trenches. He succeeded in demonstrating the presence of early 17th-century French habitation and for a cemetery on the south end, evidence consistent with Champlain’s historical documentation. He believed that he located foundations for the Dugua storehouse but had difficulty delineating the structure’s exact plan. He correctly identified the presence of early 17th-century French ceramics and other artifacts. One of his trenches to the south of the island intersected two burials.

Hadlock sent a detailed narrative of his activities with his travel and work voucher that must have inspired the confidence of the Acadia Park superintendent. However, his report and maps fell short of Harrington's expectations. While Harrington had emphasized careful excavation and documentation of site stratigraphy in his own work at Fort Necessity in Pennsylvania, Hadlock failed to document the profiles of the 1,050 linear feet of trench he excavated at St. Croix Island. Even at twelve pages in length, his report is an exercise in tedium as these sample sentences suggest: “The fifth E-W trench to be excavated is that trench marked first E-W trench on the plan. Excavation was started at the junction of the first N-S trench and the first E-W trench and extended in a westerly direction.” (Hadlock 1950:3). Fortunately, Hadlock’s cartographic skills were reasonably sound, and he took ample numbers of Kodachrome slides and black and white photographs.

Harrington completed the archaeological fieldwork by proxy, requesting that the Acadia National Park superintendent send Hadlock’s fieldnotes and artifacts so that Harrington
himself could write the report. Harrington’s own contribution was to superimpose conjectural locations of the Dugua settlement over Hadlock’s site plan to determine a ‘best fit.’ Hadlock published his results in the journal *Old Time New England* and later became director of the Farnsworth, Maine, Museum (Hadlock 1951).

Hadlock’s recommendations for open excavations on St. Croix Island had to wait 20 years for their implementation, during which time the NPS acquired the rest of the island and some key mainland tracts. In 1968, the site was designated a National Historic Monument by Congress. The next NPS Regional Archaeologist, Dr. John L. Cotter, arranged for Professor Jacob Gruber of Temple University to conduct a brief survey of the island in 1968 and for eleven weeks of excavations in 1969. Through the University of Pennsylvania’s MASCA, a magnetometer survey of the island was conducted although the magnetism of the underlying bedrock and possible ant disturbance may have masked cultural features. Gruber conducted extensive stripping of 25 x 25 foot units in the north of the island that revealed more of the foundations discovered by Hadlock, possible evidence for a storehouse with a trapezoidal plan (Gruber 1970). The low walls consisted of stones set into a clay matrix, capped by leveling stones. A doorway opening could be discerned. Champlain’s *Les Voyages* describes the use of clay in their buildings which is consistent with half-timbered frame construction. Gruber detected several concentrations of clay at the north end of the site. The St. Croix Island buildings probably rested on low stone footings or directly on bedrock. The volume and type of artifacts left no doubt of their early 17th-century French origin, including Lower Normandy and Beauvaisis stoneware, yellow brick, copper and ferrous metal items, a musket ball, and blue and white glass beads. The ceramics reflected the initial period of French colonization when the ports of St. Malo, Honfleur, Rouen and Dieppe were heavily involved in colonial commerce before being eclipsed in importance by the ports of La Rochelle and Bordeaux.

Independent of direct oversight by Cotter, Gruber excavated an enormous volume of soil without systematic recovery of its contents. In the south half of the island, he excavated and exposed 23 burials in the belief that “some information could be gained both about the burial practices and about the demographic character of the population” (Gruber n.d.:
6). He received an informal ruling that a 200 year “period of permanent and undisturbed interment was sufficient to settle the soul legally and spiritually” (Gruber n.d.: 10). After documenting the physical traits of the skeletal population in situ, he removed mandibles for later analysis in Philadelphia. The skeletons varied in their level of preservation, but Gruber was able to derive a basic age structure for them and to ascertain the likely presence of scurvy. This was further supported by research conducted by Thomas Crist of Utica College for his doctoral dissertation nearly 20 years later although the two disagree about the presence of sub-adults among the skeletal population (Crist 1995, 1998, 2004).

Cotter’s correspondence from 1971 shows that Gruber’s report was moving toward publication. However, Cotter was apparently troubled by differences between Hadlock’s and Gruber’s interpretations and by the absence of detailed site plans and the report was never published. Cotter himself began to conduct research on miscellaneous St. Croix topics, for example, enlisting the aid of French ceramic historians to pinpoint the sources of the French ceramics and pursuing chemical analysis. This work culminated in an article by Cotter published in a French archaeology journal in 1978 (Cotter 1978). Despite Gruber’s recommendations for additional survey work, no archaeology was conducted on St. Croix Island for another thirty years although Gretchen Faulkner and Eric Johnson have prepared insightful reviews of the island’s archaeological history (Faulkner 1982; Johnson 1996).

Those familiar with the contributions of J.C. Harrington and John L. Cotter to the field of historical archaeology may be disturbed by the history of archaeology at St. Croix Island. Both NPS Regional Archaeologists recognized the site’s international significance but tolerated fieldwork that failed to meet their own professional standards. Questions raised by this history focus on the role of contracted archaeological services in the National Park Service. Could a better contracting system have prevented the loss of data and the subsequent lost opportunity to generate public interest in the site? Was there a need for a park archaeologist to oversee the work? Were there other potential service providers in the Northeast United States at the times these projects occurred? Do some sites merit
direct agency involvement, rather than contracted archaeological services, when research involves the destruction of non-renewable resources of potential global significance?

Recent Work

The 400th anniversary of European settlement on St. Croix Island in June 2004 provides an opportunity to address outstanding archaeological collections and fieldwork needs. Recent activities include reuniting the St. Croix Island archaeological remains at the NPS collections facility at Bar Harbor, managed by Acadia National Park Curator Brooke Childrey. Baseline geophysical surveys of the island and nearby areas of the mainland have been conducted (Enviroscan 2002). Bones removed to Temple University in Philadelphia by Gruber have been CAT scanned and returned to their proper graves by a joint Canadian-American team of forensic anthropologists, facilitated by Park Cultural Resources Manager Lee Terzis (Sorg and others 2004; Crist 2004; Pendery 2004). Public exhibits are being constructed both at the NPS viewing area near the island and at the Down East Heritage Center in Calais, Maine under the supervision of Acadia National Park’s Chief of Interpretation Deb Wade. Old site reports and related information will be re-printed as a sourcebook, and important new archaeological data will be published this year.

The rest of this paper will review new data and interpretations derived from the re-excavation of the island cemetery in 2003 to re-inter human remains removed in 1969 (Crist 2004). This information confirms the cemetery as being the final resting place of Dugua’s settlers and provides new information on the cause of death.

Class, Diet, and Death

Champlain’s detailed account leaves little doubt that scurvy contributed to the demise of at least 35 out of the 79 of Dugua’s men who wintered over. The onset of scurvy results from a deficiency of ascorbic acid, more commonly known as vitamin C, present in fresh citrus fruits and some meats and vegetables. Recent osteological analysis of 25
individuals from the St. Croix cemetery by Dr. Thomas Crist, Dr. Marcella Sorg and Dr. Robert Larocque provides further support for this hypothesis (Crist 1998, 2004; Sorg and others 2004). Further, it may be argued that the mortality rate of commoners on St. Croix Island was disproportionately high. Class-based dietary preferences may have put commoners at greater risk of death from malnutrition until adjustments to New World food sources were made. Early New France sites including St. Croix Island, Port Royal, and Quebec document the transition from a European dietary pattern to a colonial one characterized by metissage, the blending of French and Native American elements (Moussette 2003). Three independent sources of information support this, including eyewitness accounts, legal records, and archeological evidence.

Champlain’s Account

The winter of 1604-1605 was especially harsh and travel from St. Croix Island to the mainland was impeded by ice flows that appeared by mid-December. Quoting Champlain, “During the winter, many of our company were attacked by a certain malady called the mal de la terre; otherwise scurvy, as I have since heard from learned men. There were produced, in the mouths of those who had it, great pieces of superfluous and drivelling flesh…which got the upper hand to such an extent that scarcely anything but liquid could be taken. Their teeth became very loose, and could be pulled out with the fingers…Afterwards, a violent pain seized their arms and legs, which remained swollen and very hard, all spotted as if with flea bites; and they could not walk on account of the contraction of the muscles. So that out of seventy-nine, who composed our party, thirty-five died, and more than twenty were on the point of death. The majority of those who remained well also complained of slight pains and short breath. We were unable to find any remedy for these maladies. A post mortem examination of several was made to investigate the cause of their disease” (Biggar 1922:303-305). Even the surgeons themselves suffered from the disease. Father Biard remarked in later years, “of all sieur de Monts’s people who wintered first at Sainte Croix, only eleven remained well. These were a jolly company of hunters, who preferred rabbit hunting to the air of the fireside; skating on the ponds, to turning over lazily in bed; making snowballs to bring down the game, to sitting around the fire talking about Paris and its good cooks.” (Ganong
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1945:53). In March, Native Americans provided them with some fresh meat, and with the onset of spring, their symptoms disappeared.

Social Background of Settlers

The Dugua expedition included 175 men representing three wealth and occupational groups. The first consisted of gentlemen of noble birth including Pierre Dugua, Jean de Biencourt de Poutrincourt and his son Charles. The de Poutrincourts and some “gentlemen of fashion” were interested in the expedition both for adventure as well as for the opportunity to settle down in New France (Lescarbot 1911: 227, 251). Further down the social ladder may be found gentlemen of more modest means including the Sieur de Fougeray and his cousin the Sieur de Bourgjoly, otherwise known as Robert Noel. These two almost certainly originated from the area of Vitrey and Fougeres in Brittany. They joined the service of Dugua as men-at-arms and both embarked with Captain Morel in April 1604. They labored on and occupied the building lettered “T” in Champlain’s plan of the St. Croix settlement. Noel died in his bed of scurvy on the last day of March 1605, and was buried in the island cemetery. Other gentlemen about whom we know little include the Sieur Boulay, the Sieur de Beaumont, the Sieur D’Orville, the Sieur de Genestou, and the Sieur de Sourin.

The second group consisted of professionals and skilled tradesmen who were contracted by Dugua for their services. None of these contracts have survived although we have several for Dugua’s later voyages (Le Blant and Baudry 1967). This group included the surgeons, curates, metallurgist (who may have also served as blacksmith) sea captains, housewrights, and soldiers. Champdore was both a master builder and captain.

The third group included at least 100 commoners including sailors and carpenters most likely recruited at Le Havre-de-Grace and Honfleur. We may presume that many of these men already had seasonal experience in the North Atlantic fisheries. Others may have been recently released from prison. None of the sailors, soldiers, or carpenters are specifically named by Champlain and Lescarbot. It is likely that a subset of this group
populates the St. Croix Island cemetery where two of the skeletons sported silver earrings but otherwise showed no markers of occupation or status.

Class and Diet in Post-Medieval France

Diet in medieval and post-medieval France has received extensive attention from food and social historians alike. Reaching back to questions posed by Marc Bloch, historians of the Annales school including Le Roy Ladurie and Braudel initially focused historical agrarian research on the cyclical structures of the longue duree influencing cereal production (Braudel 1979). Emphasis was placed on the “le bas peuple des campagnes en etat perpetuelle sousalimentation” and on agricultural crises (Barlowsius 1992:92). This was followed by a period of nutritional studies mostly limited to statistically measurable data and biological dimensions of food and drink looking at caloric content and nutrition in a systematic and comparative way. It largely ignored the reality that how food was prepared affected the vitamins and minerals, and that deficiencies in these areas were often more important than caloric intake. Next, Levi-Straus and Roland Barthes explored the psychosociological dimensions of food. The starting and end points of this research was not the food itself, but the culture of eating and drinking (Barthes 1979). Finally, the food historian Flandrin has articulated the differences between food as nutrition and taste (“il faut distinguer la part du gout et la part de la necessite”). The focus on taste allows us to recognize the naïve assumptions about the importance of nutrition, and to focus again on culture. This is the approach followed in this study, combined with a recognition of the primacy of the archaeological record.

The documentary and archaeological record of the Dugua voyages is ideal material for study, given the elements of traditional interest in food studies (class distinctions, dietary crisis, and quantifiable data). It is also ideal for applying what we have learned about European diet on the eve of the modern period. Bloch’s distinction between the commoner’s diet and courtly or high cuisine may help explain the failure of St. Croix Island and the near failure of Port Royal. Braudel contends that abundance and quality of meat were distinctive features of the tables of the rich and middle classes until the 1550s.
The aristocratic tradition extended across state borders and emphasized diversity and delicacy in meals (CWHF II: 1211). Exotic birds were often featured as well as more common game such as venison and boar. By the mid-17th century, as cooking became more nationalized and formal, high cuisine focused more on meats that were either raised or hunted specifically for the table. Spices were used more sparingly. While nutrition emerged as a topic of great interest during the 17th-century, it was not based on science, but rather reinforced food sensitivities that served to communicate and reinforce status differences (Barthes 1979:168, 171). There were unanticipated nutritional benefits of high cuisine that, despite its permutations, maintained an emphasis on freshness and diversity.

By mid-16th-century, the cuisine of commoners included less fresh meat although smoked and salted meat increased. There was a stronger emphasis on preserved foodstuffs near the Atlantic and Mediterranean ports (Braudel 1979: 197). The North Atlantic fisheries provided salt cod throughout Europe. By 1600, preserved meat and bread formed the core of rural cuisine, with its monotony only being relieved by seasonally-available fresh vegetables and fruits.

Archaeology and Diet in New France

Dr. Marcel Moussette of CELAT, Universite Laval, has recently proposed a unidirectional trend towards metissage, or the blending of French and Native American traditions in trade and decorative arts in New France beginning with the settlement of Quebec in 1608 (Moussette 2003). It is possible to apply this model to gastronomy and extend it back in time to the period of the 1604 and 1606 voyages by combining some highly specific documentation with less complete archaeological data. This captures the period of sustained contact with Native Americans, but before metissage has fully developed. The use of this model helps to explain, rather than to simply describe, the difficulties experienced by the St. Croix Island and Port Royal settlements.
The earliest phase, that of seasonal fishing and trading voyages, did not greatly impact the diet of Europeans. Ships were provisioned as usual, including salted meats, butter, cheese, bread, wine and cider that would last for the duration of the voyage. This could be supplemented with fresh fish and sea mammals. This diet was both described and disparaged by Marc Lescarbot (1911:265) as one that “brings many ills upon the human frame.” Masters and helmsmen were also provided with a live sheep and poultry, but not the crew and passengers. He also noted that “those who bring delicacies, whether flesh or fruit, and who use good bread, good wine, and good soups, easily avoid these diseases.” This implies the existence of a tripartite dietary system on board ship observing and preserving class distinctions.

The 1604 and 1605 voyages were apparently supplied in much the same way as the routine seasonal trips with two exceptions. First, the quantity of supplies was greater to provide for the winter. Lescarbot notes that this contributed to the success of the 1606 trip in particular (Lescarbot 1911: 320). The archaeological manifestation for this at St. Croix Island was a large supply of Lower Normandy stoneware storage containers for butter and salted meat found scattered across the settlement site (Gruber 1970). Second, a means of sustained production was imported, including grain and vegetable seeds as well as millstones. The goal was to approximate the balance of the common diet until a permanent site for the settlement could be identified and livestock imported and raised, as was later the case in Port Royal.

In food, as in architecture, dress, and comportment, the gentry distinguished their status by drawing distinctions in taste in two respects. First, they imported accoutrements and items of special food as noted by Lescarbot. Present in the island archaeological collection are a few fragments of Beauvaisis stoneware containers that may have contained preserves (Tremer 1970). This would have been a welcome complement to the bread that was made on the island, but it is doubtful that there was enough to provide for all 79 men.
Another area of divergence from the common cuisine was through participating in the hunt and consuming fresh game. It is likely that by 1604, preference for domestic species had not yet taken hold among this group. There are no regrets for beef or mutton voiced by Champlain or Lescarbot. Instead, we have precise descriptions of the game birds and other mammals available. At Port Royal, of Dugua’s servants managed to keep his table supplied with “many types of ducks or wild geese, both white and gray, very often two or three dozen larks, and other sorts of birds.” Lescarbot notes of the workmen at Port Royal “some of them caught game on more than one occasion, but not being practiced thereat, they spoiled their hunting “ (Lescarbot 1911:320). James Deetz has called attention to similar incompetence in the hunt among the non-gentry settlers of early Plymouth, Massachusetts to explain the absence of wild turkey bones at area sites.

Sustained contact with Native Americans at St. Croix Island helped the gentry to identify a gastronomic common ground. Improbably, there was an underlying compatibility between aristocratic and Native American cuisines in the shared values of freshness and diversity. Fresh meat was served by Native Americans to the survivors on St. Croix Island in March, 1605. Lescarbot’s observations at Port Royal are revealing: “for our rations we have peas, beans, rice, prunes, raisins, dried cod, and salt meat, besides oil and butter. But whenever the savages encamped near us had made a catch of any quantity of sturgeon, salmon, or smaller fish, or of any beaver, moose, caribou, or other animals…they brought us the half thereof, and frequently put up the remainder to public sale” (Lescarbot 1911:320). Those who consumed the meat and innards of locally-available mammals such as seals, for example, would have survived the winter in fine health. Native Americans assumed a role as meat procurers in addition to their role in the fur trade.

Faunal assemblages from later New France sites document the rapid spread of game in Canadian cuisine. The earliest direct evidence for food itself in early New France begins with Phases I and II (1609-1632) at the site of Champlain’s Habitation in Quebec, investigated by Marcel Moussette and Anne Rick (Niellon and Mousse 1995:201-204). Both phases reflect considerable diversity in meat including mammals, birds, fish and
shellfish. For the following two decades and in the earliest Acadian deposits from Pentagoet in Castine, Maine, the Faulkners also detected a variety of meat sources well into the 17th-century (Faulkner and Faulkner 1987:221-228). Several types of wild and domestic mammals were exploited including bear, aquatic fowl and fish. Salt cod would not be detected because of filleting and salt pork and beef may also be represented by some of the domestic species remains.

Conclusions

St. Croix Island contains the best-preserved early French settlement site in North America, one that retains a remarkable archaeological focus on the Dugua settlement of 1604 and 1605. It was the earliest North American site subject to historical archaeological study and re-analysis of existing collections still allows us to address important research topics. A problem common to numerous early colonial European settlements was nutritional hardship. The historical and archaeological record from St. Croix Island allows us to study nutritional stress at both the individual and group levels. As we make progress in identifying individuals buried in the island cemetery we will also arrive at a better understanding of the unintended consequences of class-based dietary preference on survival in the New World. Architecture, mortuary behavior, and relations with Native Americans are other topics that can be addressed by re-analysis of old data. On this basis, an archaeological research design should be developed and implemented by government archaeologists lest the earliest chapters in the story of European settlement in the New World be lost or forgotten again.
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