

The Liberation of Wendake*

Bruce G. Trigger

This paper traces the history of archaeology relating to the Wendat (Huron) people and evaluates its accomplishments. The study of the Wendats is grounded in nineteenth-century efforts by the Jesuits to re-establish themselves in Canada and, more generally, in Euro-Canadian nationalism of the confederation era. Early archaeologists shared the general view that Indians were primitive and unprogressive. Since 1945, Ontario archaeologists have become leaders in the study of the prehistoric archaeology of eastern North America. Extensive archaeological research has revealed the dynamic, changing nature of Wendat society and culture in prehistoric and early historical times. At the same time, archaeologists and modern Wendats have established mutually beneficial relations. Over the years Ontario archaeologists have played a socially important role in dispelling colonial views about the Wendats, and indigenous people generally, in Canadian society and have made progress in overcoming their own estrangement from modern indigenous peoples. These developments have contributed to a sense of achievement and relevance among Ontario archaeologists.

This paper considers three Wendakes and how they relate to one another. The first is the Wendake of the seventeenth century, which once was and is no more. The second is the Wendake of nineteenth-century Euro-Canadian historical mythography, which to some extent is with us still. The third is the Wendake created by archaeologists. I will consider the history of Wendat archaeology and the transformations that it has brought about in the consciousness of archaeologists and Canadian citizens over the past 50 years. Much of what I say applies equally to Iroquoian archaeology in southwestern Ontario and the St. Lawrence Valley and to Ontario archaeology generally.

It is all too easily forgotten that, thanks to Champlain, Sagard, and Jesuit missionaries, the Wendats are the best documented aboriginal society that lived north of Mexico prior to the second half of the seventeenth century. In recent years anthropologists, historians, and literary specialists have come to understand better how this documentation was shaped and biased by the conventions of European exploration and missionary narratives of its time (Blackburn 2000; Jaenen 1976). This understanding has enhanced rather than diminished our comprehension of the historical

and ethnographic significance of these records. Linguistic studies of Jesuit dictionaries and grammars of the Huron language, especially by John Steckley (1992), have provided additional insights into Wendat culture and how it was perceived and misperceived by European visitors. The European documentation of the seventeenth-century Wendats is a precious historical resource that archaeologists and ethnohistorians are still slowly learning to use well.

The Wendake of a Colonial Culture

The Euro-Canadian mythographization of Wendake was initiated by the return of the Jesuit Order to Canada in 1842. Jesuit missionaries from France began to study early Jesuit history in Canada in an effort to re-establish their priority among Roman Catholic religious orders. In 1844, Pierre Chazelle penned the first description of the visible remains of the mission of Sainte-Marie-among-the-Hurons and, beginning in the mid-1850s, Félix Martin and other Jesuit scholars personally examined this and other sites associated with the seventeenth-century Wendat mission (Jones 1908). The work of these Jesuits

***Editors' Note:** This paper is a revised version of the keynote presentation at the Ontario Archaeological Society's 27th Annual Symposium, entitled "The Archaeology of Huronia and the Great Lakes", held in Midland in October 2000. We are grateful to Dr. Trigger for making his summary of the history of Huron archaeology available for publication.

revived interest in the Huron mission and initiated a movement that resulted in the erection of the Martyrs' Shrine near Midland, in 1926, and the canonization of the seventeenth-century Jesuit martyrs in 1930.

Interest in the history of the Wendat mission also resulted in Kenneth Kidd's (1949, 1994) excavations at Sainte-Marie between 1941 and 1943. His report on these excavations is now recognized as one of the early classics of North American historical archaeology, although at first little attention was paid to it outside of Canada. Wilfrid Jury's further excavations at Sainte-Marie from 1947 to 1951 provided the basis for his reconstruction of the site (Jury and Jury 1954), but unfortunately neither they nor Jury's other work approached Kidd's high standards. The primary goal of this religiously-inspired research was to document the Jesuit establishments in Wendake and the material culture of the indigenous people whom the Jesuits had sought to convert. The highest calibre archaeological work at a historical Wendat site was Kidd's (1953) excavation of the Ossossané ossuary, which he identified as the site of a Feast of the Dead that the Jesuits had attended and described in 1635.

In addition to its involvement in Christian religious projects, Wendake became caught up in the political myths relating to Canadian nation building that were formulated at the time of confederation. In their efforts to promote Canadian unity, English-Canadian mythographers stressed, contrary to historical evidence (Charbonneau and Robert 1987), the Norman origins of most French Canadians. The implication of this claim, in terms of the racist beliefs of the time, was the seemingly generous assertion that both English and French Canadians belonged to the same Nordic racial stock and hence were equally capable of being partners in a new nation (Berger 1970). The unspoken and much less generous subtext was that French Canadians, like the Norman conquerors of England, should cease speaking French and adopt a language more akin to that of their Nordic ancestors.

Because of his extensive travels in Ontario, English-Canadian historians embraced Champlain as a quintessential Canadian hero, acceptable to

both English and French Canadians. The two largest public monuments to this explorer and colonizer were erected in Quebec City and Orillia. In the accounts of his visit to Wendake, the Wendats were assigned a supporting role in one of the most important narratives relating to Canadian historiography produced during the Victorian era. They became part of the static aboriginal backdrop that witnessed Champlain laying the foundations of what was to become modern Canada. In Daniel Wilson's (1884) words, the Wendats were a "typical race of American Aborigines", representing a stage of cultural development that Europeans had passed through long ago. The Boston historian Francis Parkman's gripping book *The Jesuits in North America in the Seventeenth Century* (1867), published in the year of Canada's confederation, was the main source of information concerning the Wendats to which most Canadians had access. It disseminated beliefs that had become deeply rooted in American popular culture—but not yet in Canada—that all Indians were racially inferior savages, slow to learn, predisposed to violence, and incapable of evolving a civilized way of life.

The best archaeological work emerging out of this era was Andrew Hunter's survey of 637 sites, mainly Iroquoian and mostly in Simcoe County, together with estimates of their size and a record of whether they produced many, few, or no European artifacts. Hunter's is one of the earliest site surveys carried out anywhere in the world that was designed to produce information about where people had lived in the past rather than simply aiming to locate sites that were suitable for excavation (Kidd 1952:71-72). Its importance went unappreciated at the time. Hunter's reports received limited circulation and probably were of little, if any, interest to American archaeologists.

While Euro-Canadians embraced patronizing and colonial attitudes towards indigenous peoples, Canadian archaeologists found themselves at the lower end of an equally colonial relationship with their British and American colleagues. Daniel Wilson had to visit the United States to find books to read, while David Boyle later served as a regional correspondent of the Smithsonian Institution (Killan 1983).

After the First World War, interest in early

Canadian history and archaeology waned as historians shifted to the study of post-confederation events. William Wintemberg, one of only a handful of professional archaeologists in Canada, excavated Iroquoian sites in Ontario and reported on them using the formula that his mentor, Harlan Smith (1910), had used in Kentucky decades earlier. By 1930, Wintemberg recognized that sites belonging to what we would call the Early, Middle, and Late Iroquoian periods represented a historical sequence. Yet he interpreted Early Iroquoian culture as a result of Iroquoian invaders absorbing elements of an indigenous Algonquian culture rather than as evidence of cultural creativity (Trigger 1978).

While archaeology forged ahead in the United States during the economic depression of the 1930s, as a beneficiary of the American federal government's efforts to provide jobs for unemployed labourers (Fagette 1996; Lyon 1996), the Canadian government cut back on its meagre support. By 1945, basic cultural chronologies had been worked out across the United States and American archaeologists were moving forward to develop functional and processual approaches to archaeology. In Canada, government-funded archaeological research barely survived.

After the Second World War, Norman Emerson began to teach at the University of Toronto and to excavate various Iroquoian sites in the Toronto area as well as at Cahiagué. Trained at the University of Chicago, he was deeply committed to the Fay-Cooper Cole school of culture-historical archaeology (Noble 1998). He was also influenced by Richard MacNeish's (1952) demonstration that Iroquoian pottery had evolved from Middle Woodland prototypes as a series of local co-traditions around the lower Great Lakes. Emerson was first and foremost a teacher who used archaeological fieldwork, as he had learned it in Illinois in the early 1940s, to train his students.

While I was an undergraduate at the University of Toronto, Ontario Iroquoian archaeology was dominated by a rancorous debate over whether the Wendats had migrated north from the Toronto area, as Emerson (1961) and MacNeish (1952) claimed, or they had originated in the north and spread south, as Frank Ridley (1952a, 1952b), a talented and prolific

amateur archaeologist, maintained. It was clear even to an undergraduate that Ontario archaeology, and Canadian archaeology generally, was shamefully underdeveloped, both theoretically and in terms of its data base. This view was shared in high places. When I left Toronto in 1959 to begin graduate studies at Yale University, Thomas McIlwraith, the Head of the University of Toronto Anthropology Department, informed me that I would discover there that Canadian archaeology and anthropology were a decade or more behind what was happening in the United States. He advised me to start off by keeping my mouth shut and my ears open, so I would not irreparably embarrass either myself or Toronto's Department of Anthropology.

In fact I soon discovered that my undergraduate education at the University of Toronto was not nearly as inadequate as McIlwraith imagined. Thanks to William Mayer-Oakes, who taught briefly at Toronto, students there had been introduced to the most recent trends in ecological and settlement-pattern archaeology in the United States. Mayer-Oakes is an inadequately recognized pioneer in the development of Ontario archaeology.

In the early 1960s, I attempted to introduce an ecological perspective into Iroquoian archaeology (Trigger 1963). Yet, when I published "The Historic Location of the Hurons," questioning whether there might not be an ecological explanation for the concentration of the Wendat people in northern Simcoe County in the early seventeenth century (Trigger 1962), initial reaction in Ontario was focused entirely on my paper's relation to the Emerson-Ridley debate. Ridley (1963) publicly denounced me as a self-serving partisan of Emerson, while Emerson remained silent, but seemed displeased that what he regarded as an independent voice was intruding into this debate.

The Wendake of Archaeologists

Ontario archaeology was radically transformed and invigorated by the publication of James Wright's *The Ontario Iroquois Tradition* (1966). Conceived in terms of the culture-historical framework, as it had developed after World War II

(Rouse 1972; Willey and Phillips 1958), this work utilized all the Late Woodland archaeological research that had been done in southern Ontario to refine and update Wintemberg's and MacNeish's interpretations of Iroquoian development. Cultural units were defined and associated with the Early, Middle, and Late stages of Iroquoian development. Ontario Iroquoian cultures were now seen as evolving from an Ontario Middle Woodland cultural base. About the same time, William Noble (1968, 1969) took the first steps towards trying to understand the social changes that had accompanied the development of Iroquoian culture in Ontario with his study of the evolution of settlement patterns, subsistence strategies, burial practices, and pipes. He assumed that the latter had special religious significance.

In these works archaeologists succeeded in using the available evidence to reject the idea that aboriginal cultures had been essentially static prior to European contact. Ontario Iroquoian culture was, on the contrary, demonstrated to have undergone extensive development in the millennium prior to the arrival of the first Europeans. It was also made clear that these were systemic changes rather than the additive result of cultural contact, as Wintemberg had believed. Dean Snow's (1994, 1995a) recent hypothesis that Iroquoian-speakers spread north through the Lower Great Lakes region around 1100 years ago or, as he now believes, 300 years earlier (Snow 1996), has no substantial archaeological support (Crawford and Smith 1996). Yet, even if it were true, most of the changes that distinguish the Early, Middle, and Late stages of Ontario Iroquoian development must continue to be understood as the product of in situ development. There is no possibility of returning to the sort of migratory view of Iroquoian origins that archaeologists held when they still believed that native peoples shifted about, but native cultures did not change. Thus, in the 1960s, without fanfare, the racist myth that the cultures of Ontario had been static prior to European contact definitively melted away as a consequence of the work of archaeologists. Archaeologists had begun to free themselves, and all Canadians, from the corrosive heritage of colonial mythography.

This growing awareness of systemic change shifted the primary focus of Iroquoian archaeology away from a culture-historical approach towards an implicitly functionalist and later a processual one. Conrad Heidenreich's (1971) trail-blazing *Huronian: A History and Geography of the Huron Indians, 1600-1659* was the first monograph to study the historic Wendats from an informed environmental and ecological perspective. The Penetang Project, directed by William Hurley and Conrad Heidenreich (1969, 1971) initiated the archaeological study of Wendake from an ecological viewpoint. Topics that were investigated included the impact of iron axes on house construction and of growing population density on faunal and hunting patterns.

It also became evident that the frequent relocation of Iroquoian settlements, combined with infrequent re-use of the same site, provided an easy-to-read, temporally fine-grained record of site occupations that offered opportunities such as are encountered only very rarely in the archaeological record for studying short-term ecological, demographic, and social change. Recently, by demonstrating through his study of the Calvert site in southwestern Ontario that it was possible to unravel the overlapping records of early Late Woodland site occupations, Peter Timmins (1997) has shown that, contrary to previous assumptions, these sites were characterized by as much formal order at any one time as were later ones, although this order was masked by longer occupations and/or more varied uses.

In 1971, James Wright (1974) took another major step forward with his systematic total excavation of the Middle Iroquoian Nodwell site, near Port Elgin. This excavation documented an unanticipated amount of intrasite diversity, which raised questions about Iroquoian social organization. William Finlayson's (1985) almost total excavation of the prehistoric Wendat Draper site revealed the repeated expansions over a short period of what became a large and complex community, as well as much about the locations, spacing, orientation, and internal features of longhouses, the location and extent of middens, and how certain types of artifacts were reused and later disposed of at the site (von

Gernet 1985). The work at the Draper site stimulated the total, or near total, excavation of Iroquoian village sites elsewhere in Ontario, including the Ball site in historical Wendake. These excavations encouraged general studies of changes in Ontario Iroquoian longhouses and village plans (Dodd 1984; Warrick 1984). Specialized hunting sites, fishing sites, and agricultural field camps began to be identified, making possible the archaeological study of economic activities that took Iroquoians away from their main settlements (Williamson 1983). The rapid accumulation of archaeological data also facilitated new insights into the development of European trade and the impact that European goods had on Wendat culture. Marti Latta (1976), in her study of Wendat acculturation, was one of the first archaeologists anywhere to address gender issues, in this case as they related to the procurement of European goods.

The most important effect of settlement pattern studies was to shift the attention of archaeologists away from the study of archaeological cultures to the study of communities. Iroquoian history came to be viewed increasingly as the history of villages periodically relocating from an existing site to a new one. This orientation accorded with William Fenton's (1978:306-307) long-standing observation that among the Iroquois, the community—rather than the tribe or confederacy—was the primary focus of identity and association. The principal goal of many archaeologists was now to trace Iroquoian communities through time by identifying the various village sites they had in turn occupied. That required achieving ever greater chronological precision and identifying more precise material indications of community identity. Tracing community sequences was made more difficult by the frequency with which many communities came together and split apart; both processes being attested in the historical as well as the archaeological record (Ramsden 1988).

A vast amount of research remains to be done before Wendat and Petun history can be comprehensively understood in terms of community relocations. Nevertheless, significant segments of some village relocation sequences have been identified (Finlayson 1998; Ramsden 1977,

1979). The idea that the *in situ* theory of Iroquoian cultural development eliminated the study of migration is patently untrue. What it did was to replace speculative theories involving massive ethnic movements with the study of village movements. It appears that, because of their location on the northern extremity of Iroquoian settlement, Ontario Iroquoians had more freedom of movement than did the New York State Iroquois, who were confined within much narrower tribal territories (Tuck 1971). Micro-migrations do not explain cultural change, but accompanied it and therefore, constitute part of the reality in relation to which the Iroquoian material culture that is preserved in the archaeological record must be understood.

Gary Warrick's (1990) innovative study of Wendat population trends indicates the origins of the populations that eventually colonized the north (Sutton 1996, 1999). The Malthusian—rather than the Boserupian—nature of the dramatic population increase that he has documented in early Iroquoian times contradicts the predictions of many archaeologists, including myself, who viewed the pattern of population growth in pre-contact Ontario as gradual. His population curve also refuted Henry Dobyns' (1983) suggestion that very high Iroquoian populations were cut dramatically by European epidemic diseases in the early sixteenth century. By addressing major theoretical and substantive issues that are of hemispheric or general significance, Warrick's work marked the coming of age of Iroquoian, and specifically of Wendat, archaeology.

Imitation is the sincerest form of flattery. The achievements of Ontario archaeologists have stimulated emulation, most notably in Dean Snow's (1995b) Mohawk Valley Project. Snow's application of settlement archaeology methods to studying the history of Mohawk village movements, community patterns, and population trends is a major contribution to Iroquoian archaeology. He has duplicated Warrick's finding that massive population declines resulting from European diseases did not antedate the 1630s, the decade from which the earliest written records of such diseases among the Iroquoian peoples also date.

The success of the Mohawk Valley Project is a warning to Ontario archaeologists not to rest on their laurels. Yet that project also confirmed what Ontario archaeologists had quietly known for some time. The era of colonial dependency on American archaeology had ended in the 1970s. In the 1950s, the upcoming generation of Canadian archaeologists was embarrassed by the backward state of their discipline, even in southern Ontario, which was the best studied region of the country. It was cold comfort that the pathetic situation of archaeology resulted from the unwillingness of successive Canadian governments to support archaeologists—or any form of pure scientific research—at a level that even remotely approximated that of the United States. The achievements of the last forty years, made possible by a more liberal funding policy, have allowed Ontario archaeologists to become intellectually self-supporting, in the sense that their own findings and methodological innovations balance what they learn from others. A major stimulus for the transformation of Ontario archaeology came from the investigation of Wendat archaeology in the 1950s and 1960s and much of the stimulus for that work was derived from a continuing public fascination with the role that the Wendats had played in early Euro-Canadian history. For those who, like myself, were embarrassed by the undeveloped condition of Canadian archaeology in the 1950s, the overcoming of this backwardness has been a source of great satisfaction over the years.

The continued advancement of Ontario archaeology requires openness to new methods. Peter Ramsden (1996) has suggested that the rich textual sources relating to early seventeenth-century Wendake are a burden that has retarded rather than advanced the archaeological investigation of Wendat history. I appreciate what Ramsden is saying. All too often textual sources have been used to short-circuit detailed studies of archaeological data, with the result that archaeological investigations have fallen short of their potential and what we know about the Wendats is less than it might have been. Yet archaeology has never been an autonomous discipline. The universal generalizations on which processual

archaeology's inferences are based are by definition derived from the comparative study of systemic, and hence ethnographic, contexts (Binford 1977 [ed.]; Binford 1978, 1981). A growing understanding of the nature of symbolism indicates that the investigation of culturally-specific meaning in archaeology must involve the use of written or oral sources that are historically closely related to the archaeological data being investigated. The relative availability of such sources is why postprocessual approaches to archaeological data have been so successful and productive in historical archaeology (Andr n 1998; Deetz 1996; Johnson 1996; Leone and Potter 1988), while they trail off into wild speculation in situations for which relevant historical information is not available (Gosden 1994; Thomas 1996; Tilley 1994). Processual archaeology's taboo against the use of historical data provides yet another example of zealots trying to impose on the whole of archaeology methodologies that are appropriate in some situations but not in others. For archaeologists studying the Wendats, the challenge is to learn how to interpret linguistic, historical, ethnographic, and archaeological data thoroughly and completely on their own terms before synthesizing the results to see what synergistic benefits emerge.

What is required to do this is a methodology for attributing historically-particular meanings to archaeological data that is equivalent in rigour to Binford's middle-range theory, which was devised for inferring cross-culturally regular behaviour from archaeological data. Such a methodology has been emerging for the past two decades (Trigger 1995). The first task is to establish the comparability of the archaeological and textual sources of data. This is not a problem when both relate to the same time period, locality, and ethnic group. More difficulties are encountered as the archaeological and textual sources grow more distant from one another in terms of any or all of these three criteria. The direct historical approach traditionally has sought to establish relevance by demonstrating (usually archaeologically) the existence of clear and continuous historical links between the societies for which textual and archaeological data

are being combined. Alexander von Gernet and Peter Timmins (1987) have shown that it may be appropriate to combine the two even in some situations where such links cannot be demonstrated. These include situations where burial cults wax and wane in popularity, and hence evidence of these cults appears and disappears in the archaeological record, while the ideas underlying them remain constant. Sometimes cultural continuities persist for millennia (Hamell 1987). Problems are invariably posed, however, by the arbitrary nature of symbols. Sometimes meanings shift while symbols remain unchanged; on the other hand, new symbols are invented to express old meanings (Goodenough 1953-68; Panofsky 1939, 1960). Trying to cope with these problems requires archaeologists to formulate test implications, in the form of archaeological configurations that culturally-specific beliefs might be expected to produce, and then checking to see whether or not these predictions are confirmed. Only contextual approaches of this sort can rescue symbolic and cognitive archaeology from degenerating into uncontrolled speculation and purely intuitive approaches.

A recent example of a symbolic study in Iroquoian archaeology is Joyce Wright's (1999) examination of the possible significance of numbers of horizontal lines on Iroquoian ceramics. Through a systematic survey of Champlain, Sagard, and the Jesuit Relations, she sought to establish the symbolic meaning that different numbers had in early seventeenth-century Wendat culture. She then contextualized these findings by comparing the number of horizontal lines on Middle Ontario Iroquoian ceramic vessels and pipes; hypothesizing that, because the pipes had a close connection with shamanistic rituals, they would be most likely to exhibit numbers associated with such rituals. While more might have been done to justify continuity between the textual and archaeological data being compared in this study, Wright's combination of textual studies and a contextual analysis of archaeological evidence conforms to sound archaeological procedures and her study thus points the way to how more detailed and comprehensive symbolic studies might be carried out

in the future. If Ontario archaeology is to keep abreast of new developments in the discipline, it is vital that innovative studies of this sort should be encouraged.

Given the extraordinary richness of the textual and archaeological data bases for Wendake in the early seventeenth century, as well as the fine-grained chronology of Wendat socio-cultural development both prior to and following European contact, this region offers material of unsurpassed richness for the development of historical, symbolic, and cognitive approaches to archaeology. This is an opportunity that Ontario archaeologists must not miss. An enhanced ability to study how Wendat beliefs are reflected in the archaeological record would complement the successes already achieved in ecological research and the study of the evolution of Wendat sociopolitical organization. In the past, the study of Wendat archaeology has flourished as a result of the timely adoption and development of new methodologies; now is not the time to stop.

Over the years, archaeologists have created their own vision of Wendake. At the beginning, this vision was very similar to that of Euro-Canadian nationalist mythographers. The Wendats were represented as examples of arrested cultural development and as people who were technologically, politically, morally, and racially inferior to Europeans. Over time the views of archaeologists changed, as they discovered that the archaeological record did not accord with such crudely evolutionary and racist assumptions. Yet archaeologists long paid little, if any, attention to living Wendats.

Archaeologists and Wendats

I first became conscious of the potential of Euro-Canadian scholarship to be of value to aboriginal peoples when I gave a lecture in a continuing education course at what is now Concordia University that was attended by many indigenous people living in the Montreal area. I discussed the important role played by the Mohawks of Kahnawake in the economy of Montreal during the *ancien régime* as a result of their conduct of a clandestine trade between

Montreal and Albany. After my talk, a Mohawk lady said how interesting she had found my remarks. "It is good to know", she said, "that we were once good at commerce because that is how Kahnawake will have to survive in the future". Archaeological pronouncements about aboriginal peoples have at various times been very damaging to them, as Robert Silverberg (1968) first demonstrated in *Mound Builders of Ancient America*, his detailed analysis of the social and political roles played by the Mound Builder myth in the United States in the nineteenth century. That does not mean, however, that archaeological findings cannot be of positive value to native people.

The first recorded participation of indigenous people in an archaeological excavation in Southern Ontario occurred in 1972. It involved children from the Alderville Indian band assisting in Walter Kenyon's (1973) excavation of a campsite on East Sugar Island, in Rice Lake, which contained Iroquoian as well as earlier and more recent remains. The estrangement between archaeologists and Wendats came a little closer to an end when William Finlayson invited about a dozen Wendat students from Quebec to participate in the 1978 excavation of the Sprang site, as part of the New Toronto International Airport Archaeological Survey. Their physical contact with the cultural remains of their ancestors played an important role in reinforcing a renewed interest among the Wendats of Quebec in their history, culture, and historic homeland. The Wendats, a dynamic people who offer living proof that the survival of cultural identity does not depend on language, now regularly visit Simcoe County to traverse the land from which their ancestors came, view the artifacts their ancestors made and used, visit archaeological sites, rebury their dead, and renew political alliances. The same is also true of the Wyandots of Oklahoma since Charles Garrad made contact with them. The Wendat historian and philosopher Georges Sioui (1999) has made extensive use of archaeological data in his recent book *Huron-Wendat: The Heritage of the Circle*. While the interpretations that Sioui offers of Wendat history differ significantly from those of Euro-Canadian archaeologists and ethnohistorians, his interpreta-

tions command respect as those of an established Canadian academic. Talented Wendat writers and performing artists also draw fresh inspiration from their traditional culture. Thus, in expressing their own identity, modern Wendats draw upon the work of Euro-Canadian archaeologists. In René Sioui's recent National Film Board documentary *Kanata*, which studies Wendat history and identity, the archaeology of Wendake plays a prominent role. One scene records the visit of a group of Wendats to the Ball site and their reactions to what they saw there. In the course of the film, the views of Euro-Canadian scholars as well as those of Wendat elders, scholars, politicians, and ordinary people are presented. This film demonstrates the informed and positive use that Wendat intellectuals make of what Euro-Canadian archaeologists have accomplished. The Wendake of archaeologists has come to be of value to the Wendat people and Wendat scholars, such as Georges Sioui, are engaging Euro-Canadian archaeologists and ethnohistorians on the basis of professional equality. I hope that in the near future one or more Wendat professional archaeologists will be exploring their homeland alongside Euro-Canadian colleagues. Even before that happens, however, Wendat interests and concerns should have begun to influence Wendat archaeology by encouraging archaeologists to investigate questions that are of special interest to modern Wendats. Flexibility and innovation are required if archaeology is to accommodate this new and important clientele.

Conclusion

Ontario archaeologists have never been an ideologically-driven lot, nor have they been strongly inclined to spell out and debate their theoretical presuppositions. Their work, like that of most other archaeologists, has been motivated mainly by a healthy curiosity to know more about the past. The point of departure for the study of pre-colonial Ontario was Wendake—as the memories of that dynamic society were preserved, enshrouded in cultural misunderstandings, in the detailed and varied records of early seventeenth-century

European visitors. Archaeologists have added to these textual records important archaeological data concerning Wendat and Jesuit life along the shores of Georgian Bay during the seventeenth century. They have also traced the development of aboriginal society in Ontario back to the Paleoindian period. Along the way, archaeologists have shed a number of their own and their culture's intellectual burdens. By the middle of the twentieth century, their findings were helping them to break free of the evolutionary and racist stereotypes that for over a century had portrayed Indian cultures as static and had been used to justify the seizure of Indian lands and the continuing exclusion of native people from Euro-Canadian society. By creating a new and more dynamic view of Indian history prior to the colonial period, archaeology has played a significant role in eliminating pernicious Euro-Canadian stereotypes of native people that have impeded the search by indigenous peoples for justice and an integral and creative place within the Canadian social mosaic.

Since the 1950s, Ontario archaeologists have secured a higher level of recognition and funding and overcome a debilitating backwardness by comparison with American archaeology. In the course of that spiritual liberation, Ontario archaeology has become dynamic and creative and has begun in many respects to set the pace for archaeology elsewhere. We must take care, both for the sake of archaeology and for ourselves as archaeologists, that in the new global economy Ontario archaeology is not permitted to slip back into a state of colonial dependency and inadequacy. That requires that we lobby hard to ensure adequate public and private support for archaeological research. It also requires us to avoid complacency and to keep our minds open in order to ensure that we maintain our position on the cutting edge of what is happening in archaeology.

It is in our favour that historical archaeology is becoming for the first time central to the development of archaeological theory. We must strive harder to make the most of Ontario's dual legacy of rich archaeological and textual data relating to aboriginal history. Our third colonial legacy was archaeology's long estrangement from the aboriginal people

whose ancestors produced the historical record that archaeologists study. Much has been accomplished in establishing good relations with the Wendat people, but more can be done. It is in the interest of archaeology and natural justice that we not fail to make use of the exceptional opportunities that are presented to us to eliminate the last remnants of the distinctions between colonizers and colonized in our own discipline.

Acknowledgements. I thank Gary Warrick and the Ontario Archaeological Society for inviting me to be the keynote speaker at the society's 27th Annual Symposium on "The Archaeology of Huronia and the Great Lakes" in October 2000. I also thank Charles Garrad, Paul Sweetman, and James Wright for sharing with me at the conference and later by correspondence their memories of Ontario archaeology in the 1950s, 1960s, and 1970s.

References Cited

- Andr n, A.
1998 *Between Artifacts and Texts: Historical Archaeology in Global Perspective*. Plenum, New York.
- Berger, C.
1970 *The Sense of Power: Studies in the Ideas of Canadian Imperialism, 1867-1914*. University of Toronto Press, Toronto.
- Binford, L.R.
1978 *Nunamiut Ethnoarchaeology*. Academic Press, New York.
1981 *Bones: Ancient Men and Modern Myths*. Academic Press, New York.
- Binford, L.R. (editor)
1977 *For Theory Building in Archaeology*. Academic Press, New York.
- Blackburn, C.
2000 *Harvest of Souls: The Jesuit Missions and Colonialism in North America, 1632-1650*. McGill-Queen's University Press, Montreal.
- Charbonneau, H., and N. Robert
1987 The French Origins of the Canadian Population, 1608-1759. In *Historical Atlas of Canada, Volume 1: From the Beginning to 1800*, edited by R. C. Harris, Plate 45. University of Toronto Press, Toronto.
- Crawford, G.W., and D.G. Smith
1996 *Migration in Prehistory: Princess Point and*

- the Northern Iroquoian Case. *American Antiquity* 61:782-790.
- Deetz, J.J.F.
1996 *In Small Things Forgotten: An Archaeology of Early American Life*. Revised ed. Anchor Books, New York.
- Dobyns, H.F.
1983 *Their Number Become Thinned: Native American Population Dynamics in Eastern North America*. University of Tennessee Press, Knoxville.
- Dodd, C.F.
1984 *Ontario Iroquois Tradition Longhouses*. Archaeological Survey of Canada, Mercury Series Paper 124:181-437. National Museum of Man, Ottawa.
- Emerson, J.N.
1961 Problems of Huron Origins. *Anthropologica* 3:181-201.
- Fagette, P.
1996 *Digging for Dollars: American Archaeology and the New Deal*. University of New Mexico Press, Albuquerque.
- Fenton, W.N.
1978 Northern Iroquoian Culture Patterns. In *Northeast* edited by B.G. Trigger, pp. 296-321. Handbook of North American Indians, vol. 15, W.C. Sturtevant, general editor. Smithsonian Institution, Washington, D.C.
- Finlayson, W.D.
1985 *The 1975 and 1978 Rescue Excavations at the Draper Site: Introduction and Settlement Patterns*. Archaeological Survey of Canada, Mercury Series Paper 130. National Museum of Man, Ottawa.
1998 *Iroquoian Peoples of the Land of Rocks and Water, A.D. 1000-1650: A Study in Settlement Archaeology*. 4 vols. Special Publication 1. London Museum of Archaeology, University of Western Ontario, London.
- Goodenough, E.R.
1953-1968 *Jewish Symbols in the Greco-Roman Period*. 13 vols. Pantheon Books, New York.
- Gosden, C.
1994 *Social Being and Time*. Blackwell, Oxford.
- Hamell, G.R.
1987 Strawberries, Floating Islands, and Rabbit Captains: Mythical Realities and European Contact in the Northeast during the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries. *Journal of Canadian Studies* 21(4):72-94.
- Heidenreich, C.E.
1971 *Huronian: A History and Geography of the Huron Indians, 1600-1659*. McClelland and Stewart, Toronto.
- Hurley, W.M., and C.E. Heidenreich (editors)
1969 *Palaeoecology and Ontario Prehistory*. Research Report 1. Department of Anthropology, University of Toronto, Toronto.
1971 *Palaeoecology and Ontario Prehistory II*. Research Report 2. Department of Anthropology, University of Toronto, Toronto.
- Jaenen, C.
1976 *Friend and Foe: Aspects of French-Amerindian Cultural Contact in the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries*. McClelland and Stewart, Toronto.
- Johnson, M.
1996 *An Archaeology of Capitalism*. Blackwell, Oxford.
- Jones, A.E.
1908 "Sedake Ehen" or Old Huronia. Fifth Report of the Bureau of Archives for the Province of Ontario, Toronto.
- Jury, W., and E.M. Jury
1954 *Sainte-Marie Among the Hurons*. Oxford University Press, Toronto.
- Kenyon, W.A.
1973 Relatives They Did Not Know. *Royal Ontario Museum Archaeological Newsletter*, New Series, 94:1-4.
- Kidd, K.E.
1949 *The Excavation of Ste. Marie I*. University of Toronto Press, Toronto.
1952 Sixty Years of Ontario Archeology. In *Archeology of Eastern United States*, edited by J.B. Griffin, pp. 71-82. University of Chicago Press, Chicago.
1953 The Excavation and Historical Interpretation of a Huron Ossuary. *American Antiquity* 18:359-379.
1994 The Phoenix of the North. In *Pioneers in Historical Archaeology: Breaking New Ground*, edited by S. South, pp. 49-65. Plenum Press, New York.
- Killan, G.
1983 *David Boyle: From Artisan to Archaeologist*. University of Toronto Press, Toronto.
- Latta, M. A.
1976 *The Iroquoian Cultures of Huronia: A Study of Acculturation Through Archaeology*. Unpublished PhD dissertation, Department of Anthropology, University of Toronto, Toronto.
- Leone, M.P., and P.B. Potter, Jr. (editors)
1988 *The Recovery of Meaning: Historical Archaeology*

- in the Eastern United States.* Smithsonian Institution Press, Washington, D.C.
- Lyon, E.A.
1996 *A New Deal for Southeastern Archaeology.* University of Alabama Press, Tuscaloosa.
- MacNeish, R.S.
1952 *Iroquois Pottery Types: A Technique for the Study of Iroquois Prehistory.* National Museum of Canada Bulletin 124. Department of Resources and Development, Ottawa.
- Noble, W.C.
1968 *Iroquois Archaeology and the Development of Iroquois Social Organization (1000-1650 A.D.).* Unpublished PhD dissertation, Department of Archaeology, University of Calgary, Calgary.
1969 Some Social Implications of the Iroquois "In Situ" Theory. *Ontario Archaeology* 13:16-28.
1998 J. Norman Emerson: Contributions to Canadian Archaeology. In *Bringing Back the Past: Historical Perspectives on Canadian Archaeology*, edited by P.J. Smith and D. Mitchell, pp. 39-51. Archaeological Survey of Canada, Mercury Series Paper 158. Canadian Museum of Civilization, Hull.
- Panofsky, E.
1939 *Studies in Iconology: Humanistic Themes in the Art of the Renaissance.* Oxford University Press, Oxford.
1960 *Renaissance and Resuscitations in Western Art.* Almqvist and Wiksell, Stockholm.
- Parkman, F.
1867 *The Jesuits in North America in the Seventeenth Century.* Little, Brown, Boston.
- Ramsden, P.G.
1977 *A Refinement of Some Aspects of Huron Ceramic Analysis.* Archaeological Survey of Canada, Mercury Series Paper 63. National Museum of Man, Ottawa.
1979 Late Iroquoian Occupations of South-Central Ontario. *Current Anthropology* 20:597-598.
1988 Palisade Extension, Village Expansion and Immigration in the Trent Valley Huron Villages. *Canadian Journal of Archaeology* 12:177-183.
1996 The Current State of Huron Archaeology. *Northeast Anthropology* 51:101-112.
- Ridley, F.
1952a The Fallis Site, Ontario. *American Antiquity* 18:7-14.
1952b The Huron and Lalonde Occupations of Ontario. *American Antiquity* 17:197-210.
- 1963 The Ontario Iroquoian Controversy. *Ontario History* 55:49-59.
- Rouse, I.B.
1972 *Introduction to Prehistory: A Systematic Approach.* McGraw-Hill, New York.
- Silverberg, R.
1968 *Mound Builders of Ancient America: The Archaeology of a Myth.* New York Graphic Society, Greenwich, CT.
- Sioui, G.E.
1999 *Huron-Wendat: The Heritage of the Circle.* UBC Press, Vancouver.
- Smith, H.I.
1910 *The Prehistoric Ethnology of a Kentucky Site.* Anthropological Papers 6(2). American Museum of Natural History, New York.
- Snow, D.R.
1994 *The Iroquois.* Blackwell, Oxford.
1995a Migration in Prehistory: The Northern Iroquoian Case. *American Antiquity* 60:59-79.
1995b *Mohawk Valley Archaeology: The Sites.* University at Albany, SUNY, Institute for Archaeological Studies, Albany.
1996 More on Migration in Prehistory: Accommodating New Evidence in the Northern Iroquoian Case. *American Antiquity* 61:791-796.
- Steckley, J.
1992 The Warrior and the Lineage: Jesuit Use of Iroquoian Images to Communicate Christianity. *Ethnohistory* 39:478-509.
- Sutton, R.E.
1996 *The Middle Iroquoian Colonization of Huronia.* Unpublished PhD dissertation, Department of Anthropology, McMaster University, Hamilton.
1999 The Barrie Site: A Pioneering Iroquoian Village Located in Simcoe County, Ontario. *Ontario Archaeology* 67:40-86.
- Thomas, J.
1996 *Time, Culture and Identity: An Interpretive Archaeology.* Routledge, London.
- Tilley, C.
1994 *The Phenomenology of Landscape.* Berg, London.
- Timmins, P.A.
1997 *The Calvert Site: An Interpretive Framework for the Early Iroquoian Village.* Archaeological Survey of Canada, Mercury Series Paper 156. Canadian Museum of Civilization, Hull.
- Trigger, B.G.
1962 The Historic Location of the Hurons. *Ontario History* 54:137-148.

- 1963 Settlement as an Aspect of Iroquoian Adaptation at the Time of Contact. *American Anthropologist* 65:86-101.
- 1978 William J. Wintemberg: Iroquoian Archaeologist. In *Essays in Northeastern Anthropology in Memory of Marian E. White*, edited by W.E. Engelbrecht and D.K. Grayson, pp. 5-21. Occasional Publications in Northeastern Anthropology 5, Rindge, NH.
- 1995 Expanding Middle-Range Theory. *Antiquity* 69:449-458.
- Tuck, J.A.
1971 *Onondaga Iroquois Prehistory: A Study in Settlement Archaeology*. Syracuse University Press, Syracuse.
- von Gernet, A.D.
1985 *Analysis of Intrasite Artifact Spatial Distributions: The Draper Site Smoking Pipes*. Research Report 16. Museum of Indian Archaeology, London.
- von Gernet, A.D., and P. A. Timmins
1987 Pipes and Parakeets: Constructing Meaning in an Early Iroquoian Context. In *Archaeology as Long-Term History*, edited by I. Hodder, pp. 31-42. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.
- Warrick, G.A.
1984 *Reconstructing Ontario Iroquoian Village Organization*. Archaeological Survey of Canada, Mercury Series Paper 124:1-180. National Museum of Man, Ottawa.
- 1990 *A Population History of the Huron-Petun, A.D. 900-1650*. Unpublished PhD dissertation, Department of Anthropology, McGill University, Montreal.
- Wiley, G.R., and P. Phillips
1958 *Method and Theory in American Archaeology*. University of Chicago Press, Chicago.
- Williamson, R.F.
1983 *The Robin Hood Site: A Study of Functional Variability in Late Iroquoian Settlement Patterns*. Monographs in Ontario Archaeology, 1, Ontario Archaeological Society, North York, Ontario.
- Wilson, D.
1884 The Huron-Iroquois of Canada: A Typical Race of American Aborigines. *Transactions of the Royal Society of Canada*, 1st series, 2, ii:55-106.
- Wright, J.V.
1966 *The Ontario Iroquois Tradition*. Bulletin 210. National Museum of Canada, Ottawa.
- 1974 *The Nodwell Site*. Archaeological Survey of Canada, Mercury Series Paper 22. National Museum of Man, Ottawa.
- Wright, J.M.
1999 *Numbers: A Message from the Past*. Bulletin 16. London Museum of Archaeology, University of Western Ontario, London.

Bruce G. Trigger
Department of Anthropology, McGill University
Stephen Leacock Building, 855 Sherbrooke Street West,
Montreal, Quebec, Canada H3A 2T7
bruce.trigger@mcgill.ca