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Patterns from the Past: Exploring Gender and Ethnicity through Historical Archaeology among Fur Trade Families in the Willamette Valley of Oregon

Introduction

The late 1820's found retired French Canadian trappers settling the northern portion of today's Willamette Valley, known as French Prairie. As early as 1829, Etienne Lucier, a retired fur trapper, and his Native wife Josephete Nouite had established themselves in this area. Slowly other retired trappers and their families made their way here, and by the early 1840's close to 100 French Canadian families occupied French Prairie, establishing one of the first settlements in the Willamette Valley. These early settlers and their families had been virtually forgotten in Oregon history until the French Canadian Archaeological Project, started in 1982. This project which focused on historical research and archaeological information strived to change this, locating fifty two, of the ninety two documented sites along the prairie (Brauner 1989). Questions remained, however, regarding the origins and histories of these families. This research attempts to contribute to this body of knowledge by examining cultural heritage and the roles and relationships of family life on French Prairie.

French Canadian, Metis and American trappers and Voyagers throughout the fur trade era formed relationships with women of various Native groups. These alliances were a necessity for the traders not only for the sake of companionship, but for the resources that these women procured and produced. A variety of historical information put forth by scholars such as Sylvia Van Kirk (1972, 1976, 1990), Jennifer Brown (1976, 1980) and Juliet Pollard (1990), have discussed the importance and necessity of the Native and Metis wives of the fur trade trappers and officials.
throughout the late Eighteenth and Nineteenth centuries. As these scholars have explained, native women were taken "after the custom of the country" to create stable alliances with various tribes and to secure a safe and continuous passage through a foreign land. These women performed tasks such as making clothes and shoes, gathering food, hunting small game, and assisting in interpretation, all of which contributed to the families survival. Van Kirk explained that, "in Fur Trade society it was the Indian woman’s traditional skills which made her a valuable economic partner" (Van Kirk 1980:73). Once they settled on French Prairie, these women brought with them the very skills and relationships that were so valued on expeditions. Though slowly, they adopted elements of European material culture. It is hoped that through the material culture recovered from French Prairie, we might not simply identify these women and men, but distinguish and explain their social relationships and roles with their families, communities, and cultural heritage.

I hypothesize that ethnicity may have influenced consumer choice among these families. Through an examination of archaeological material, specifically ceramics recovered from sites along French Prairie and by focusing on the tribal or Native affiliations of the women, as well as the cultural background of the husbands, we are able to address gender and ethnicity issues within the archaeological record and observe a correlation between consumer choice and ethnicity. By specifically looking at the women within these families it is possible that they chose cultural material as a way to maintain cultural identity. By establishing this, we may see influences which
their background had on their purchases, as seen through variations in ceramic assemblages.

Initially, this thesis focused exclusively on the possibility that ceramic pattern and color reflected the French Canadian ethnicity of the male subjects on French Prairie, an idea which was originally proposed by Dr. David Brauner of Oregon State University, and supported by Judy Chapman in her 1993 publication French Prairie Ceramics: the Harriet D. Munnick Archaeological Collection Circa 1820-1840 A Catalogue and Northwest Comparative Guide. Chapman (1993) suggested that "ceramic dishes were obtained by the men of the house" (1993:101) which specifically addressed their consumer choice behavior and the possibility that this was influenced by ethnicity. However, it was the opinion of this researcher that because ceramics are recognized as part of the domestic culture, traditionally the woman's domain, and the fact that no solid documentation supports Chapman's theory specifying men alone were purchasing ceramics, that these ceramics might reflect the ethnicity of the Native American and Metis women on French Prairie. This hypothesis is supported by Gender, Ethnicity, and Consumer Choice theoretical frameworks regarding the analysis of archaeological material.

Research by archaeologists who have conducted ethnicity and consumer choice research in historical archaeology, have included scholars such as Suzanne Spencer Wood (1987), Lynne Clark (1987), and Marsha and Roger Kelly (1980). More recently Diana Dizerega Wall's 1999 Society for Historical Archaeology article acknowledges the further potential of examining ethnicity through historical archaeology. Her
research specifically focused on gender, class and ethnicity in 19th century New York through an analysis of ceramics. Yet removed, her study is extremely relevant to this project. She explained that, “If the variable of the wealth and ethnicity of the households that the dishes came from could be controlled, and if it were known that each plate pattern came from the household of a different ethnic group, it could be inferred that the women...used plate patterns to help mark the ethnic identity of their families” (Wall 1999:144). Thus, supporting the very idea that women attempted to maintain cultural affiliations with their past.

Gender theory as applied to archaeology is a cornerstone of this project. Research within the Willamette Valley has primarily focused on men within these families; that they were the ones doing the purchasing and making the consumer choices. Studying gender allows us to examine various social relationships in cultures that would otherwise be missed. In 1997 Sarah Nelson noted that “archaeology has an obligation to uncover and discuss all the variations of gender relationships in the past, in the interest of both presenting more accurate views of the past and combating essentialist views of men and women” (Nelson 1997:23). While this research is concerned with the fur trade families as a whole, the main focus of the study is on the women within these families. Archaeological material obtained within the past twenty years, has been used to ask new questions about the cultural and historical identity of the fur trade families on French Prairie.

It should be noted that other factors may have played a role in consumer choice, such as, education and religion. The children of the fur trade families became a
unique group combining knowledge from both their mothers and fathers. These Metis women not only maintained a knowledge of their mothers native skills, but some of these women as daughters, may have obtained more of a formal education, or had been exposed to European-American materials and behavior, therefore exhibiting Euro-American preferences in material and style. This would influence their purchasing behavior and therefore we might observe differences in ceramic choice between Native mothers and their Metis daughters, or simply between Metis and Native mothers on the Prairie.

The idea of Native peoples maintaining ethnic identity during a changing cultural climate is supported by recent research conducted by Catherine Carlson (2000) on a fur trade site in British Columbia. Also research done by Heinz Pyszczyk (1989) and Elisabet Louise Bedard (1990) stressed the influence of ethnicity on consumer choice focusing on “ethnic consumption patterns” (Pyszczyk 1989:224) and “social identity” occurring in the “stylistic attributes of artifacts” (Bedard 1990:3). The very idea of maintaining cultural identity, specifically Native culture and identity during the fur trade, is important considering that archaeological research has primarily focused on acculturation issues and the adoption of European goods and behaviors by Native peoples.

The very foundation of this research is based in historical archaeology which uses a methodology incorporating written material, oral information, and material remains, to support, prove or disprove, a theory or assumed fact. This research uses all three facets, incorporating historical literature, traders journals, eyewitness accounts,
as well as the sites and ceramics themselves, to identify and examine several families whose lives helped shape early Oregon.

METHODOLOGY

The first portion of this project focused on conducting genealogical research, which would identify the families as a whole on French Prairie, not just identifying the mother and father, but also identifying the children as well as various cultural affiliations. This information was gathered from a variety of sources which included, information collected by the Catholic Churches in the Willamette Valley and compiled by Harriet Munnick (1979), research conducted as part of the French Canadian Archaeological Project in 1989, a manuscript written by George Brown (n.d.) containing genealogical information about the Canadian origins of the families on French Prairie, and communication with the cultural resource division of the Confederated Grand Ronde Indian Tribe. A review of Hudson’s Bay Company documents from the company store at Fort Vancouver including clerks records and accounts has also been completed to determine whether the men or the women of these families, might have been the primary purchasers of ceramics. This resource was also useful in identifying the availability of ceramics to these fur trade families.

A sample of families were chosen based on the above genealogical information as well as the availability and access to material culture assemblages associated with their occupancy on French Prairie. These families included Pierre Bellique and Genevieve St. Martian, Joseph Despard and Lisette Chinook, Andre Longtain and
Nancy Okanogan, Etienne Lucier and Josephette Nouette, and Robert Newell and his Nez Perce wife Kitty. All ceramic material analyzed by this researcher was obtained through survey and excavation conducted by the French Canadian Archaeological Project since 1982, directed by Dr. David Brauner at Oregon State University and archaeological survey and excavations in search of the Robert Newell Farm during 1999 and 2000 (Cromwell, Stone, and Brauner 2000). Comparative information was gathered from various reports from regionally related sites, as well as information compiled by Judith Sanders Chapman (1993) analysis of the Harriet D. Munnick Archaeological Collection.

An analysis of the ceramic collections associated with the sample families encompassed the third portion of this project. The diverse decorative elements of ceramics, specifically pattern motifs and color, had the potential to act as obvious indicators of ethnic affiliations. All data associated with ceramic characteristics was placed into an Excel file. The information was processed using frequency charts, and examined for the presence and/or absence of certain ceramics, specifically looking at variations in color and pattern. These data were compared to information collected from the Munnick Collection. Looking at these specific characteristics within the ceramic assemblages, it was hoped that correlations could be made between the patterns or colors of the ceramics and the cultural or ethnic affiliations of the women.

If differences among ceramic assemblages indicated Native affiliations, it was hoped that a working hypothesis with which to test future sites on the French Prairie, could be developed. For instance, this hypothesis might suggest that since one Nez
Perce woman at one household purchased a Conova pattern as well as her neighbor who was also from the same cultural group, then the possibility existed that any future homesteads with Nez Perce women, may have similar ceramics, suggesting that these women attempted to maintain some semblance of their Native heritage even through the purchasing of European goods. This would indicate that these women and families were not simply a product of acculturation and passive acceptance of change, but that they attempted to maintain their cultural identity. The potential exists to test other classes of material culture and use a similar hypothesis at other Native American and /or Metis sites throughout the Pacific Northwest.

The following research questions guided this thesis:

1) Are we able to identify ethnic markers in the archaeological record which reflect the native background of these women?

2) Are ceramics the best tools with which to examine ethnicity, or would other material culture (European in origin) serve just as well?

3) Can we see that ethnicity affected consumer choice behavior among Native and Metis women on the Prairie?

Historical documentation has been brought together with ethnographic information to better understand the cultural identity of the Native groups in the subject region as well as those which are associated with the women of French Prairie. A wealth of information was also collected from journals and fur trade histories to understand the dynamics and culture of the Fur Trade.
Examining the roles and relationships of Native American and Metis women is one of the most significant contributions of this project. While the present day Native American groups are attempting to regain their history, historical archaeology has the unique opportunity to aid in this quest for knowledge. The “Contact Period”, in which native cultures became intertwined with European cultures, was a pivotal point. The loss of cultural identity was apparent even then. But what if some individuals or groups held onto their cultural identity, even through the simplest objects? While acculturation studies primarily examine the adoption of European objects into Non-European groups/ cultures, this thesis looks to go beyond the simple acquisition of material. The ceramics, with their various decoration and color might have simply been a silent representation of ethnicity, not just for these women, but for their families as well.
Natural and Cultural Background

Understanding the early environment as well as the Native American history of the Middle and Lower Columbia River Drainage System and the Northwest Coast, establishes the context for Fur Trade era development in the Pacific Northwest. The original Native American peoples within these areas held an intimate relationship with the environment, and their presence helped shape the Fur Trade and settlement of the Pacific Northwest. Much of the following information has been taken from traveler’s journals, research reports and other books on Fur Trade and Native American history. The importance of this ethnohistorical information cannot be stressed enough, while focusing specifically on the late Eighteenth and early Nineteenth century, these journals and observations allow us to look into the past, even for a brief period. It should be remembered that each observation was recorded by someone, not of the Native culture, but whose culture was shaped by Euro-American perspectives.

LOWER COLUMBIA / WILLAMETTE VALLEY

The Willamette Valley is located in the western half of Oregon, nestled between the coastal mountains on the west and the Cascade range on the east. The Willamette Valley has been described as 125 miles long and 80 miles wide, surrounded by the Cascade range, the Calapooya Mountains, the coast range and the Columbia river, and cut by the Willamette River (Sanders, Weber, & Brauner 1983:6).
French Prairie which will be the researchers focal point, is a subdivision of the Upper Willamette Valley. Dr. David Brauner has conducted extensive archaeological as well as historical research on French Prairie, and clearly defined the prairie in 1989. The prairie is 18 miles long (N-S) by 15 miles wide (E-W) and varies in elevation from 70 ft above sea level at the Willamette Rivers edge to 200 ft above sea level. The Little Pudding River and the Pudding River denote the eastern boundary of French Prairie. The Willamette River forms the North and West boundary. The northern shoreline of Lake Labish is the traditional southern boundary although the Lake has been drained and is being farmed” (Brauner 1989:6).

This expanse of land proved to be a particularly inviting place to human inhabitants as we will see when we discuss the early Native Americans in this area (Fig. 1).

The Willamette Valley is characterized by a lush environment with moderate temperatures. Balster and Parsons (1968) indicated that the Valley, “...is in the rain shadow of the Coast Range” (1968:1), and that summers are “dry and cool” (1968:1). The vegetation presently in the Valley, “...has an open Oak Savannah, with groves of Garry Oak (Quercus garryana) standing among broad grasslands” (Ames and Maschner 1999:46). Additionally, Douglas Fir (Pseudotsuga menziesii), Oregon Ash (Fraxinus oregona), Black Cottonwood (Populus trichocarpa), Big Leaf Maple (Acer macrophyllum), Grand Fir (Abies grandis), Willows (Salix.spp.) and a several varieties of Alders (Alnus) are found throughout the area (Balster and Parsons 1968), as are a variety of shrubs of grasses.

Historian John Hussey, indicted that the past environment was much the same as today, with the exception of frequent burnings by the local Natives.
Dense forests lined the streams and covered most of the hills and elevated lands. In the lowlands, the dominant trees were Douglas fir, Oregon maple, vine maple, yew, ash, white oak, alder, willow, and balm. Occasionally found in the valley floor but generally growing on the hills or mountain slopes were, fir, pine, spruce, hemlock, alder, larch, and madrone (Hussey 1967:2).

This description of the Valley by Hussey is consistent with the 1850 general land surveys which were reviewed and edited by Habeck in his 1961 publication. Habeck also included such vegetation as, “...Oregon Grape (Berberis aquifolium), Salmonberry...
(Rubus spectabilis), Elderberry (Sambucus glauca), Rose (Rosa sp.), Hardhack (Spiraea Douglasi), Renebark (Physocanpus capitatus), and Cascara (Rhamnus pushiana)” (Habeck 1961:75). In addition to these plants, bulbs, which were a staple of the Native peoples, were also found throughout the Valley. Specifically, Wapto (Sagittaria latifolia), and Camas (Camassia quamash and C. leichtinii), which were the most commonly mentioned in texts such as Ames and Machner (1999), Zenk (1990), and Hussey (1967).

William Henry’s sojourn during 1813 in the Willamette Valley, was captured in letters to his cousin, Alexander. He described the area in great detail,

There are also cedars here, and many other kinds of wood with which I am acquainted. In summer, I am told, there are fine large Blackberries [probably Rubus ursinus], delicious black raspberries and several other sorts of berries, all of which come to perfection in their season. In the woods the ground is thickly covered with ferns [Pteris aquilina] and other weeds, through which deer have paths in every direction (Couses 1965:816).

Henry’s account is useful to our understanding of available resources for the early Native Americans as well as the non-Native inhabitants of the Willamette Valley.

Abundant fauna thrived in this lush environment, sustaining the Native American groups who resided in the valley. River and stream systems throughout the Lower Columbia region and the Valley, included several types of Salmon, including Chinook (Oncorhyncha tshawytscha), Coho (O. Kisutch), and Sockeye (O. Nerka), as well as Steelhead (Salmo gairnert). Mammals included, but were not limited to Deer (Odocoileus, sp.), Bear (Ursus americanus), River Otter (Lutra candensis), Wolf (Canis Lupus), Cougar (Felis concolor), and Beaver (Castor canadensis) (Suttles
A variety of waterfowl such as geese and ducks occupied the area, some of which included Canada Geese (Branta canadensis), Wood duck (Aix sponsa), Pintail (A. Acuta), and Teal (A. Cyanoptera). Heron (Ardea herodias) and Grouse (Dendragapus, sp.) were also present as were many other types of birds (Suttles 1990:28).

Of all the animals which inhabited the Willamette Valley and the Lower Columbia region during the time of contact, none was more sought after than the beaver. This animal became the source of the fur trade economy and was driven almost to the point of extinction. Hussey recorded that, “By 1825 the Beaver in the Willamette Valley, except on the extreme headwaters of the river, had been quite thoroughly exterminated by years of trapping and trading, both on the part of organized company expeditions and the freemen” (Hussey 1967:34). Otter and Elk were also in abundance and eventually became a focus of the fur brigades as well.

The Geology and soil morphology of the Willamette Valley is described in detail in various sources (Brauner 1989; Hussey 1967; Suttles (ed.) 1990; Balster and Parsons 1968; Ames and Maschner 1999). Again Dr. David Brauner’s descriptions of the soil development on French Prairie is very concise.

Ingram Series soils are coincident with the modern floodplain of the Willamette River and Champoeg Creek. Ingram soils are well drained silty clay loam which, prior to the construction of flood control dams on the Upper Willamette River, were subject to seasonal flooding. Winkle series soils are slightly higher in elevation than Ingram soils but are also associated with the active floodplain of the Willamette River. Winkle soils are gravel-rich silt loams overlying gravelly substrata which were subject to intermittent flooding. Senecal and Calapooya Series soils are dominant over the remainder of French Prairie. Senecal soils are
moderately well drained silt loams and Calapooyia soils are poorly 
drained silt loams with a higher clay content (Brauner 1989; Balster and 
Parsons 1968).

Characteristically this land was perfectly situated for agricultural purposes. As we will 
see in a later chapter, this land was farmed from the early Nineteenth century to the 
present day, creating a unique archaeological opportunity for learning about past 
peoples in this region.

It is not surprising that this lush environment with its wide variety of plants and 
animals, was home to many bands of native peoples. Richard Pettigrew (1990) 
indicated that there was obvious cultural distinction between the peoples of the Lower 
Columbia Valley and the Willamette Valley (1990:518). He indicted that the Chinook 
peoples dominated the Lower Columbia region, while the Kalapuya made their home 
in the Willamette Valley (1990:518) (Figure 2). Among the Lower Columbia groups 
were the Kwalhioqua and Clatckanie as well as Lower and Upper Chinook (Krauss 
1990; Silverstien 1990). The Kalapuyans consisted of many separate bands (Zenk 
1990). For the purposes of this paper we will be concentrating on the Chinook peoples 
as well as the Kalapuya from the Lower Columbia and Willamette Valley.

COLUMBIA PLATEAU

The Columbia Plateau was frequented by fur traders and it's environmental 
profile and cultural distributions played a factor in the shaping of this research.
Deward E. Walker Jr. noted, “The Plateau culture area is located in a complex Physiographic unit, bounded on the west by the Cascade Range, on the South by the Blue Mountains and the Salmon River, in the east by the Rocky Mountains, and on the north the low extension of the Rocky Mountains and the northern reaches of the Columbia River” (Walker 1998:3). The Plateau itself has a diverse landscape depending on location primarily due to tectonics, flooding and glacial episodes. Severe glaciation altered the vegetation several times as well as the climate over time. Chatters’ (1998) explained that the climate is, “...a mix of continental and maritime influences” (Chatters 1998:29). The Vegetation includes Basins of Steppe grasses including Wheatgrass (Sagebrush) *Artemisia tridentata*, as well as Woodland areas
and dense forests. Fauna include but are not limited to Black Bear (*Ursus americanus*), Mountain Lion (*Felis concolor*), Otter (*Lutra canadensis*), Gray wolf (*Canis lupus*), and White tailed rabbit (*L. Townsendii*) (Chatters 1998). Birds included a variety of waterfowl and upland birds, such as the Sage Grouse (*Centrocercus urophasianus*) and many fish including Chinook Salmon (*Oncorhynchus tschawytscha*) and Sturgeon (*Acipenser transmontanus*) (Chatters 1998).

Among the Native peoples, there were over fifteen distinct languages spoken in the Plateau with their own dialect variations, the large language groups being Athapaskan, Salishan and Sahaptian (Kinkade et al. 1998:51). The Plateau cultures
include Lillooet, Thompson, Shuswap, Nicola, Kootenai, Northern Okanagon, Lakes and Colcille, Middle Columbia River Salishans, Spokane, Kalispel, Flathead and Pend d'Oreille, Coeur d'Alene, Yakima, Palouse, Wasco, Wishram, Cascades, Western Columbia River Sahaptians, Cayuse, Umatilla, Walla Walla, Nez Perce, Molala, Klamath and Modoc (Figure 3).

Settlement patterns were characterized by semi-permanent villages in the winter and temporary seasonal camps the rest of the year, which followed seasonal subsistence rounds (Chatters & Pokotylo 1998:73). Native groups were tremendously impacted by the arrival of the horse, between 2000 BC and AD 1720, which changed their way of life and expanded their opportunities for trade and made them highly mobile (Chatters & Pokotylo 1998:76). Walker and Sprague (1998) indicated that some of the Plateau tribes had integrated the horse “by the 1700's” (1998:139).

COASTS OF SOUTHERN BRITISH COLUMBIA / VANCOUVER ISLAND

The Northwest Coastal environment is a product of an ocean landscape with numerous islands and mountains. It is mentioned here because one individual, Josephette Nouite, is thought to have come from this region, specifically, Vancouver Island and the areas surrounding both sides of the Queen Charlotte Straight. This is a marine climate region with cool summers and “wet and mild” winters” (Suttles 1990:17). Rain is frequent and heavy. The floral and fauna of the island and surrounding Kwakiutl territories, is based on the marine environment. Vegetation on
the island itself is primarily Sitka Spruce (*Picea sitchensis*), Western Hemlock (*Tsuga heterophylla*), and Mountain Hemlock (*Tsuga mertensiana*). But also included Yellow Cedar (*Chamaecyparis nootkatensis*), Grand Fir (*Abies grandis*), Pacific Willow (*Salix lasiandra*), Bitter Cherry (*Prunus emarginata*), and Vine Maple (*Acer circinatum*) (Suttles 1990:21). A variety of plants could be found in the region including several varieties of ferns, lilies, and other plants with edible rhizomes or roots (Suttles 1990:23). Also included are berries of several varieties, greens and marine algae or seaweed. In addition to the abundant floral in the region, various fauna including five species of Salmon, Steelhead (*Salmo gairdneri*), Eulachon (*Thaleichthys pacificus*), Halibut (*Hippoglossus stenolepis*), and many other varieties of fish occupy the area. Mammals included Seals such as the Harbor Seal (*Phoca vitulina*), also sea lions, dolphins, porpoises, whales, otters, deer, bear, beaver, and a wide variety of waterfowl. The obvious marine environment also produced various shell fish. This lush environment allowed for centuries of human occupation, sustaining populations and allowing cultures to thrive.

Cultural groups within this region, according to the *Handbook of North American Indians*, included Northern Coast Salish, Central Coast Salish, Kwakiutl, and Nootkan peoples (Figure 4). These groups were part of the Wakashan and Salishan Language families, subsisted as hunting and gathering cultures, and primarily focused on maritime resources.
ETHNOGRAPHIC CONTEXT

The following section summarizes the cultural characteristics of the various Native peoples which will be covered within this research project. These groups include the Kalapuya of the Willamette Valley, The Chinook of the Lower Columbia River, The Nez Perce and Okanogan of the Plateau, and the Kwakiutl of the Northwest Coast. Each description is meant to familiarize the reader with the culture of the wives of the French Canadian families being reviewed. It is hoped that we might see some culturally significant choices or associations with the archaeological collection based on these characteristics. Most of the information in this section is taken from ethnohistorical sources as well as the *Handbook of the North American Indian*.
Smithsonian Institution series and other useful texts. Therefore this section will deal primarily with these native groups as of the late Eighteenth Century and through the historic period.

The Kalapuya

This particular grouping of Native Americans, is actually comprised of several distinct bands, who spoke Kalapuyan languages (Zenk 1990:547). Harold Mackey (1974) described in detail the various bands and villages that made up this culturally distinctive group. Table 1 lists the appropriate bands name with their location in the

Table 1. The Kalapuya Bands and Geographical Range
(Adapted from Mackey, 1974)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BAND</th>
<th>GEOGRAPHICAL RANGE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ahantchuvuk</td>
<td>Pudding River</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Atfalati (sub-divided)</td>
<td>Around Forest Grove</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calapooya (Sub-divided)</td>
<td>Willamette River, McKenzie River</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chelamela</td>
<td>Long Tom Creek</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chepenafa</td>
<td>Mary's River</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luckiamute (Sub-divided)</td>
<td>Luckiamute River</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santiam</td>
<td>Santiam River</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yamel</td>
<td>Yamhill River</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yoncalla</td>
<td>Elk and Calapooya Creeks; Umpqua River</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Willamette Valley as described by Mackey (1974), while Figure 5 shows the
distribution of various bands in the Willamette Valley. Several of the major bands
were sub-divided into smaller groups.

The Kalapuyans have been described as maintaining seasonal rounds for
gathering food (Zenk 1976). They indulged in berries, seeds, insects, bulbs or roots
and game, with camas being one of their main food sources (Zenk 1976 and 1990).
Alexander Henry while traveling in the early 1800's noted that, “These people preserve
their camas much better than any others; they mash it up in cakes of about 10lbs
weight, 3 inches thick, in which state it keeps fresh and moist” (Henry 1847:815).
They were known to have maintained their food sources by burning the vegetation for
habitat and resources (Zenk 1976 & 1990). Jerry Towle’s 1979 article on “Settlement
and Subsistence” indicated that, “The role of deliberate burning in both long-term and
seasonal subsistence activities gives yet more credence to the idea that the Kalapuya
were oriented to the terrestrial rather than riverine resources” (Towle 1979:20).

The Kalapuya had developed many cultural traditions such as head
defformation and tattooing. They maintained a socially stratified society and are said to
have practiced slavery (Ruby and Brown 1993:214; Zenk 1990). Clothing was made
from various skins and bark for both sexes (Zenk 1990). Zenk suggested that,
“Kalapuyans occupied permanent villages during the winter months, but during the
drier part of the year lived in transitory camps” (Zenk 1990: 548). These patterns were
interrupted by the emergence of the white man who brought with them, disease. Hussey
(1967) explained that, “What appeared to be the most reliable estimate, places the
population of the entire Kalapuyan stock at 3000 in 1780. Shortly after this time, in 1781-82, a white man's plague, most certainly smallpox, swept through the Northwest" (Hussey 1967:9). We also find other periods throughout the 1800's where

Figure 5. Kalapuya Band Distribution
(Adapted from Cromwell, Stone and Brauner 2000; originally taken from Jacobs 1945)
conditions like smallpox and malaria roared through the Willamette Valley decimating the Native populations (Zenk 1990; Hussey 1967; Zucker et al. 1983). Non-Native settlers had been established in the Valley as of the 1820's, but by the 1840's Euro-Americans arrived in earnest forcing the Natives off the land and onto the Reservations which still exist today. Zenk indicated that around 1851 the United States government attempted to establish treaties with the Kalapuyan peoples for their land (1990:551). "Most tribes and bands of the inland valleys and south coast were isolated on the Grand Ronde and Siletz Reservations by late 1856" (Zucker et al. 1983:113).

The Chinook

Explorers, travelers and trappers frequently encountered the Chinook along the Columbia River, providing us with various ethnohistorical accounts. The travels of Alexander Ross and Lewis and Clark help to paint a picture of the Chinookan peoples as they once were and as they were perceived by the outside world.

As we have already indicated, the Chinook Indians occupied the area of the Lower Columbia river all the way to the Pacific Ocean and to the east as far as The Dalles (Silverstein 1990:533). The Handbook of the North American Indian separates the Chinook into upper and lower groups based on geographical and linguistic information. The Chinook languages are a part of the Penutian Phylum separated into two branches of upper and lower Chinook. Lower Chinook is separated into three other languages including Cathlamet, Multnomath, and Kiksht (Thompson and
Kinkade 1990:35). “Lower Chinookan was spoken by the Clatsop on the south shore of the mouth of the Columbia River and Chinook proper on the north shore and northward. Cathlamet was spoken, evidently in a single dialect, along both banks of the Columbia ...Kiksht consisted of a series of intergrading dialects...” (Thompson and Kinkade 1990:41). It should be noted that Chinook Jargon, which was spoken by Fur Traders, was not the same as the Chinook language. Chinook Jargon was actually an intermarriage of French and Chinook which was used as the common language of trade (Silverstein 1990:533).

Most cultural information about the Chinook people reflects the early Nineteenth and late Eighteenth century traditions. The Chinook peoples subsisted on fish and game as well as berries and other vegetation (Silverstein 1990:536). As we’ve described the rivers in this region were teaming with many different kinds of fish which was the staple for the Chinookan people. Waptoe and Camas were also generously consumed.

Social structure was stratified. “At the basis of Chinookan social organization were large, permanent, independent villages strongly linked together by trade and marriage alliance” (Zucker et al. 1983:8). This organization did consist of slavery as was practiced by many tribes in the area, and which would carry over even into the Euro-American/French Canadian and Native marriages of the Nineteenth century. Alexander Ross recorded in 1810-1813 that, “Slaves do all the laborious work; and a Chinook matron is constantly attended by two, three or more slaves, who are on all occasions obsequious to her will” (Ross 1904:107). Ruby and Brown (1993) wrote
that the Chinooks traded in slaves heavily and that they were also used in the negotiations of the bride price (1993:40).

Housing structures generally consisted of plank houses in the winter, and “temporary summer villages” (Silverstein 1990:538), with mat structures (Silverstein 1990:538). Characteristically the Chinook have been known for their carving and basket making abilities (Silverstein 1990).

It is important to note that by the time individuals such as Alexander Ross and Lewis and Clark arrived to rendezvous with the Chinook, they found that these native peoples had already obtained numerous Non-Native goods. Northwest coast native groups had made contact with Russian Fur traders as early as the Mid 1700's (Ruby and Brown 1981) and that trade between Native groups would have redistributed non-Native goods. By 1774 the Spanish explorer Juan Perez, had ventured up the Northwest coast with other Spanish explorers close behind. Natives primarily traded furs and food stuffs which the Europeans had welcomed, for ornamental objects and a variety of other unusual and hard to get items. In James Ronda's 1984 book on Lewis and Clark, he noted that, “Those goods ranged from high quality two and three point blankets and course cloth to sheet copper and brassware. Also in demand were knives, fishhooks, pots, kettles, and firearms. ...Of course, there was always a market for blue beads, known in the Chinook trade jargon as tyee-kamosuk or ‘chief beads’. In return, the maritime traders obtained dressed and undressed elk skins, sea otter and beaver pelts, and...dried salmon” (1984:201). Thus, by the time Jacob Astor’s group founded Fort Astoria on the Northwest Coast (1811), the Natives were already accustomed to
trade with the non-natives. Ronda (1984) added that, "...what continued to occupy
Lewis and Clark's attention was the sizable number of European objects held by river
people. In fact, European influence now went beyond material goods and could be
heard in the language" (Ronda 1984:177).

While traveling during 1810-1813, Alexander Ross recorded a great many
details of the Chinook culture, specifically the style of dress. Concerning the dress of
the males he said, "Their dress invariably consists of loose garment, made of the skin
of the wood-rat, neatly sewed together and painted, which they wrap around the body
like a blanket" (Ross 1904:104). But it was his descriptions of the women and their
style of dress which took on greater detail. "In addition to the rat garment used by the
men, the women wear a kind of fringed petticoat suspended from the waist down to
the knees, made of the inner rind of the cedar bark and twisted into threads, which
hang loose..." (Ross 1904:106). He goes on to say that, "The females are excessively
fond of singing and adorning their persons with the fantastic trinkets..." (Ross
1904:107). Juliet Pollard (1990), has written extensively on the Chinook women of
the Fur Trade, and provides us with important details of habits and customs of a past
way of life. For instance, she indicated that during pregnancy women were not to wear,
"...beads, bracelets, or other forms of rope..." (Pollard 1990:68). Gabriel Franchere's
Journal from Astoria (1810-1814) also made note of the Native women. He expressed
that, "Their ornaments consist of brass bracelets, which they wear indiscriminately on
wrist or ankle; glass beads, preferably blue ones; and white shells called haiqua in the
native language, which are a kind of coin of the Indian realm..." (Franchere 1967:
(111). Silverstein (1990) also noted that head deformation was practiced as another facet of personal enhancement.

By the time the fur trade was well under way, roles and practices among native cultures began to change. Ronda (1984) explained that in particular the role of women shifted. He wrote that, “With the coming of the white traders in the mid-1790's Chinook women began to play an increasingly important role in an expanding native economy. Trusted by whites who perhaps feared males, Chinook women soon became the principle intermediaries between fur merchants and their own kin” (Ronda 1984:208). This becomes even more defined later on when we see fur trade men marry into the tribes.

Considering the marriage cycle of the Chinook, Silverstein explains that these groups engaged in marriage, and that a bride price was involved. Usually the women or girl being traded for goods (Silverstein 1990:543). This practice would in essence carry over into the Custom of the Country practice, established by the Fur Traders.

The Chinookan peoples became a central part of the fur trade landscape, yet they too suffered due to disease and the abundance of non-Native settlers claiming their lands. Eventually, they were forced onto reservations, such as the Grande Rhond and the Siletz (Zucker 1983), just as their Kalapuyan neighbors had been.
The Kwakiutl peoples have been included in this section since one French Canadian, Etienne Lucier, took for his first marriage Josephette Nouette, who was reported to have been a Kwakiutl woman. Understanding and looking into the past of her culture is therefore, essential to this archaeological study.

As Helen Codere wrote, “The center of Kwakiutl territory is Queen Charlotte Strait on the central coast of British Columbia. They formally lived along the outer coast from Smith Sound to Cape Cook, on the shores of Queen Charlotte Strait and the inlets leading into it, eastward along Johnstone Strait” (Codere 1990:359). The Kwakiutl peoples are actually broken up into many tribal groupings within the above mentioned area, which have essentially changed throughout the course of history.

Codere explained, “The Kwakiutl once consisted of around 30 autonomous groups usually identified as ‘tribes’; the name applied to the Kwakiutl people as a whole is generalized from that of one tribe......Each tribe had its territory, winter village, and several sites occupied seasonally” (Codere 1990:359). Additionally, Codere explained that, “Each Kwakiutl tribe was made up of from one to seven numayms, usually three or more. The numaym was a social division that traced its crest back to a supernatural ancestor” (Codere 1990:366). Josephette Nouette’s last name may give some indication as to the possible location of her people. The northern most tip of Vancouver Island, appears to be associated with the tribal group or band named,
Nahwitti or Nuwitti. It is possible that her family association is from this area. This is supported by research done by Harriet Munnick, on the Lucier family (Munnick 1995, 1956).

The Kwakiutl have a rich and diverse cultural history. Franz Boas and Codere (1990), provided a clear and concise account of this early culture. Codere explained that the Kwakiutl peoples relied heavily on marine resources, as well as gathering of vegetation. They were and still are expert wood carvers and artisans, with the characteristic Totem pole, elaborate masks and Bent wood boxes, as well as distinctive painting techniques (Holm 1990). The Kwakiutl lived in plank structures, usually as multi family accommodations (Codere 1990:364-365).

Clothing and covering, consisted of blankets and bark clothing as well as hats, with women wearing “necklaces, bracelets, and anklets...” (Codere 1990:366). An 1889 report, while later than the period in question, stated that, “The women of the Kwakiutl tribes wearing tight anklets, which prevent free circulation between feet and legs. These anklets leave lasting impressions” (Sprague 1974:47).

Social organization was based on a complex system of crests, that delineated family membership. This carried over into marriage practices and other social events such as the Potlatch ceremony. Material goods were exchanged as a part of the marriage practices, these sometimes included blankets (Sprague 1974:57). A part of the Kwakiutl social structure also included slavery, with individuals being acquired through trade and the like.
We know that not only the British, but the Russians and Spanish traveled the Pacific waterways for trade and that this transmitted into the changing cultures which we are discussing. Codere, in her article, adapted some population estimates for the Kwakiutl from 1835 through 1954, which show the drastic decrease in population due to illness and death, with an estimated population in 1854 at 1,891, down several thousand from the early Nineteenth century (Codere 1990:367).

The Okanogan

The Okanogan, residing along the Columbia Plateau, spoke the Okanogan language, part of the Salishan phylum (Kennedy & Bonchord 1998). They were at the time of the early Fur Trade, a hunter/gatherer people, separated into smaller bands (Ray 1939:7), and relying on “fishing, hunting and gathering” (Kennedy & Bouchard 1998:241). They wintered primarily in semi-subterranean pithouses as well as mat lodges (Kennedy & Bonchord 1998:242), and occupied temporary seasonal camps throughout the rest of the year. “Other structures included a separate lodge where children were born, women stayed during menstruation, unmarried girls were secluded, and elderly women stayed to chaperon young people” (Kennedy & Bonchord 1998:243). Their social structure included slaves who were obtained through trading and raiding, but as Ruby and Brown (1993) explained, were treated well, especially the women, who were “accepted as societal members” (Ruby and Brown 1993:245).
Alexander Ross’s journal from his travels among the Okanogan, inform us of certain habits or customs that he had observed. On the subject of appearances he noted that, “The Young persons of both sexes always paint their faces with red and black bars, extremely well designed” (Ross 1904:280). He also observed the detailed dress of the women.

That of the young females consists of a robe or garment of deer skin, down to their ankles, well dressed, and soft as chamois, with long wide sleeves, fringed and ornaments with beads, and the more valuable higuas with a belt around the waist, adorned with the teeth of animals, beads, and trinkets, and is far from being unbecoming. Leggings, or Indians stockings, trimmed with all the showy ornaments of Indian fancy; shoes, and a loose robe of deerskin, thrown carelessly around the body, constitutes the whole of their dress at all seasons of the year (1904:281).

Kennedy and Bonchord also indicated that, “Clothing included moccasins, leggings, belt, breechcloth or apron, shirt or vest, and cap or headband for the men, and moccasins, short leggings, long dress, belt and cap or headband for women” (1998:245). These types of clothing or general preferences for certain clothes, colors or styles, would eventually change with the Euro-American contact, yet some items may have been retained.

Among their many daily tasks, women were known to have been excellent basket makers. Ross noted that, “Nor are the women less busy- curing fish, drying meat, dressing leather, collecting roots and fire-wood; with their domestic and family affairs, their whole time is occupied; and, indeed, they may be said to serve in the double capacity of the wife and the slave” (Ross 1904: 281). It should be noted that
the white women of Alexander Ross's day, those of some wealth and property, did not engage in many tasks. A well kept woman had others performing a myriad of tasks for her, so it is likely that this observation by Ross is somewhat reflective of his own background.

The Nez Perce

The Nez Perce occupied an area that encompassed North central Idaho, Southeast Washington, and Northeast Oregon. Their language is of the Penutian Phylum (Walker 1998). These hunter/gatherers practiced seasonal rounds and were mainly distributed in bands throughout their land. Verne Ray (1939) indicated that, "The Nez Perce, ... is actually an ethnic grouping including several politically independent tribes, which in turn are made up of many villages enjoying considerable political power" (Ray 1939:12). These independent groups became even more mobile with the introduction of the horse and for this reason, the Nez Perce are known as a horse culture. As Alvin Josephy indicated in his 1965 book, the Nez Perce actually specialized in horse breeding (Josephy 1965). They were able to trade with more groups and thus increased their exposure to other cultures. Josephy added that, "The long practice of gathering at the Dalles and other intertribal meeting places tended inevitably to intermix some of the cultural traits of the different peoples" (Josephy 1965:22). The Dalles played a crucial role in exchange with many tribes from the Columbia Plateau beyond coming to trade. The Nez Perce are known to have traded in
slaves, and it is very likely that the Dalles may have played a role in this. Ronda said of Lewis and Clark among the Native Americans that, “Distant Sahaptians, especially the Nez Perce who had access to the plains, brought skin clothing, horses, and buffalo meat. Less interested in fish than their Columbia cousins, the Sahaptians of the Plateau were drawn to the Dalles in search of European goods, especially metal and beads” (Ronda 1984:170).

Among this hunter gatherer group, semi-subterranean houses were the norm with seasonal occupation. Also prevalent were longhouses or communal structures, and “bison skin-covered structures” (Walker 1998:427). Walker noted that, “Nez Perce villages were usually composed of several extended families and led by a headman” (Walker 1998:425). Also noted among the structures are separate sites for women in times of menstruation (Ray 1939; Walker 1998). Josephy indicted that by the 1860's many of the Nez Perce peoples had come together in one large area (1965:445). His description gives us a glimpse into the vanishing seasonal rounds kept by many native groups.

In the spring of each year the Indians came up from their scattered camps in the warm canyons, gathered Kouse in te Chesnimnus area and other high meadowed regions in the northern part of the district, and then moved south to the Wallowa Valley, with its sparkling lake and river, where they laid in a store of salmon and spent the summer in the hills and on the prairie beneath the Wallowa Mountains. In the fall they returned to the Chesnimnus and northern wooded areas to hunt deer and bear and, as cold set in, descended again to the shelter of the deep canyons. (Josephy 1965:445).

Among the Nez Perce as well as the Okanagan, the style of dress and ornamentation is frequently noted. Walker indicated that, “Women wore long, belted,
buckskin dresses, basketry caps, and knee-length moccasins” (Walker 1998:429). Ornamentation was key, and Nez Perce women were noted for their intricate bead work, as they are today. One significant recollection of an encounter between migrating Euro-Americans during the Nineteenth century and several Nez Perce women was recorded by S.H. Clark (1905). He noted that, “...in the Umatilla Valley, their camps were visited one day by a gay cavalcade of Nez Perce women, who rode their beautiful ponies with perfect abandon. They rode ‘straddle’...They had buckskin dress, fringed at all the seams and beautifully ornamented with bead work...Their dresses, leggings and moccasins were worn with the utmost grace...” (Clarke 1905:250-251). What the early Fur Traders must have seen was something quite similar to this description. It is already well noted that prior to even Lewis and Clarke, most native peoples had acquired various material made by non-Natives (Ronda 1984; Josephy 1965).

The fate of the Nez Perce and the Okanogan, were the same as the Kalapuya and the Chinook. These groups were placed on reservations and deprived of their native lands. The Nez Perce, however, fought for their lands after the United States government ignored terms of an initial treaty. In the 1870's the Nez Perce War broke out, in a desperate attempt to retain their land, these people fought back. For further information Alvin Josephy’s 1965 book, gives an excellent description of the coming of the Nez Perce War and what ensued.

One aspect that should be discussed further is the use of slavery within Native cultures in the Pacific Northwest. As has been noted in the previous summaries, most
of the Pacific Northwest Native cultures participated in slavery to some extent. Ruby and Brown (1993), explained that slaves were obtained through trading and raiding, yet this was dependent on the tribes and the region (1993:25). There is no solid information as to when slavery first began among the Native populations, but they indicate that by the time the Europeans arrived, it was well under way (Ruby and Brown 1993:70-71). While the practice varied depending on region, it is noted that slaves were traded for goods among tribes, and eventually they were traded among the Russian, Spanish and European explorers. Slaves were also obtained through raiding parties and wars. Aside from how they were acquired, slaves were used for different tasks depending on the tribes that they lived with. Ruby and Brown note that among the Chinook, slaves helped with various tasks, were used a commodity during Potlatch Ceremonies, and were used as sources of amusement and even prostitution once the Europeans arrived (Ruby and Brown 1993:39-74). Treatment of the slaves again varied among the tribes, some being mistreated and then some actually being incorporated into the tribal culture as with the Okanagan. Ruby and Brown do note that once the Europeans arrived, slavery seemed to decline among the Pacific Northwest Natives (19993:120), but that during the contact period, “roughly a quarter of the native populations” were slaves (1993:33).

The rich cultural heritage of the Pacific Northwest influenced the development of the Fur Trade and the eventual settlement of Europeans into the region. While customs and cultural behaviors had been established for centuries, once the Europeans
began intermingling with the native peoples, an obvious change began to occur, specifically seen in their acquisition of Europen goods, and simple interactions with the new comers. To say that the Natives were the only groups to be affected by Contact in inaccurate. Culture change occurred on another level with non-Natives as well, specifically those who became part of the Fur Trade.
Historical Background

A vivid and detailed history surrounds the Fur Trade in the Pacific Northwest. Numerous books and articles have been written on the subject contributing to a romanticized view of the era, though, in reality it was a rough and turbulent period. To understand this rich history is to truly understand Euro-American contact with Native cultures and the changing environment of the Northwest. Within the Pacific Northwest, the first explorations were initiated by sea as well as the far reaching interiors of Northern Canada. Earliest references indicate that the Russians as well as the Spanish explored lands along the Pacific Northwest coastline, but by the late 1700's England had established strong links to this region (Woodhouse-Beyer 1999; Cole and Darling 1990; Ruby and Brown 1976). With the discovery of the Columbia River by traders, a fast and efficient way of trading with the interior was realized. This would forever change the Fur Trade in North America. For the purposes of this thesis, we are mainly concerned with the British and American Fur Trade establishments, and their connection with the Native peoples of North America as well as their use of land.

The companies which had the greatest effect on the land and people were the Pacific Fur Company, the North West Company and the Hudson’s Bay Company. These fur trade organizations exploited the land and resources throughout Pacific Northwest. Their objectives, motives and character, altered the environment as well as the Native cultures which flourished in North America during the late Eighteenth and early Nineteenth centuries.
The Pacific Fur Company, a short lived American operation, was established around 1809. It was the American foothold in a true ‘world scramble’ for furs and untapped resources. This venture was started by John Jacob Astor who set up a post at Astoria, the furthest Northwest point in Oregon. The exact date is unknown, but sometime around 1811 Astor’s ship the *Tonquin* docked on the shores of Astoria (Ruby and Brown 1976). Trading commenced immediately with the Native population, specifically the Chinook, with the Company erecting Fort Astoria, to house its men and goods. The Pacific Fur Company, attempting to tap inland resources, established another post, Wallace House, in the area now known as Salem, Oregon. Brauner (1989), indicated that, “Wallace House was used as a base camp for hunting expeditions out of Fort Astoria through September 1813 when it was last abandoned” (1989:11). This was one of the first Euro-American settlements in the Willamette Valley. One man, Alexander Henry, was an employee of the Pacific Fur Company and kept a detailed journal describing sites and activities along the Columbia and in the Willamette Valley. His journal has provided detailed information for fur trade researchers. Sometime between 1813 and 1814 the Pacific Fur Company was purchased by the North West Company (Mackie 1997; Ross 1976). This could have been due to many factors, one simply being that the British presence on the Pacific Coast was in itself too great, but the War of 1812 might have also played a role. With the Northwest Company takeover, Fort Astoria became known as Fort George, and
continued to be a hub of trade in the region. References for the Pacific Fur Company can be found in Mackie 1997; Henry’s Astoria; Journals 1813-1814; and Hussey 1967.

The Northwest Company, in its hay-day, was a strong and stable Fur Trade operation which dominated the Northwest. Operating out of Canada, it was established in 1779 (Campbell 1957), although, Newman (1987) suggested that the dates for the Northwest Company are 1783-1820. Rich (1967) suggested that the company, “...was a form of a multiple partnership which would have been described in those days as a ‘common-law company’” (1967: 173). The Northwest Company, as with most fur trade ventures, was primarily concerned with furs and enlisted numerous trappers and traders. David Thompson’s Overland Party, established an inland trade route along the Columbia River for the Northwest Company, eventually ending up in Astoria. With the take over of the Pacific Fur Company, the Northwest Company renamed Fort Astoria to Fort George. The company had posts lined all along the Columbia River at “Spokane House, Flathead House, Fort Kootenay, Fort George, Fort Okanagan, and Fort Nez Perce” (Mackie 1997:18). Figure 6 shows the placement of some of the Fur Posts in Washington and Oregon. The employee base of the Northwest Company relied primarily on French Canadian and native men, with most individuals eventually working for the Hudson’s Bay Company after the two companies merged in 1821. Extensive research has been done on the Northwest Company and can be referenced in books by Newman 1985 and 1987; Mackie 1997; Campbell 1957; and Hussey 1967.
After the establishment and abandonment of Wallace House, another post was built in 1814 called Willamette Post under the direction of the Northwest Company. Brauner stated that, “This post functioned for many years as a trading post and base camp for hunting expeditions supplying meat and furs to Fort George” (1989:11). This was one of the first Euro-American structures in the Willamette Valley, in the area known as French Prairie. Hussey described the post saying that, “...the establishment consisted of one dwelling house for Northwest employees and two huts for freemen and for the ‘issing’ Indians employed as hunters. Since there was no trade house, the traffic with the natives was carried out of doors” (1967:28). This post, now forgotten except for a historic sign on the side of the road, was key in the acquisition of goods for the fur trade.

Eventually competition was fierce between the Northwest Company and the Hudson’s Bay Company, and in 1821 the two companies merged, allowing the Hudson’s Bay Company to dominate the region.

In the year 1670, King Charles the Second awarded a charter to Prince Rupert of England. The objective of the charter and the enduring operation was to establish and locate potential resources for the Crown (Newman 1985; Galbraith 1957; NPS Handbook Fort Vancouver, Washington). Thus, the Hudson’s Bay Company was charted. Early expeditions established posts within the area that came to be known as Rupert’s Land, encompassing most of the Great Lakes region and Canada. Posts were established throughout the Hudson’s Bay territories with their employees and personnel coming primarily from Europe, but Native populations were also employed.
Resources would be shipped from England, through the Sandwich Islands, to the Northwest and back again, establishing one of the most comprehensive trading ventures in the World.

In 1824, Fort Vancouver was established on the banks of the Columbia River. Lester Ross, one of the leading researchers on Fort Vancouver and its archaeological collections indicated that, “Fort Vancouver was initially established in 1824 as the administrative headquarters and primary depot for the Western Department” (Ross 1976: 3). Eventually, Fort Vancouver became the chief supplier for all of the other Hudson’s Bay Company posts within this region of the Northwest. Supplies at Fort Vancouver sustained the employees at the fort, those on expeditions, as well as employees at other posts and outlining settlements within the Pacific Northwest. John McLoughlin, the Chief Factor for Fort Vancouver, operated his fur post like a well oiled machine. Mackie (1997) indicated that, “Fort Vancouver was the emporium-the center -of the company’s extensive fur trading operations everywhere west of the Rockies” (1997:96).

Fort Vancouver boasted a sale shop and trade store, good relations with the surrounding natives and active employees. The culturally diverse group of employees lived in what was known as Kanaka Village, a small encampment of homes just outside the fort walls. Trapping brigades were sent out regularly, with a chief trader and numerous trappers with their respective families. Mackie explains that, “The company (HBC) annually sent out from Fort Vancouver two well equipped hunting and trapping parties, usually numbering between 50 and 100 men and women (French
Canadian, Native, and Metis) and led by a single seasoned officer…” (1997:102).

With the post under constant watch, McLoughlin was also sympathetic to the retired trappers and voyageres who found themselves searching for settlements once their terms of employment were complete. Thus, with his help, French Prairie, in the Willamette Valley, became an active community.

In addition to Fort Vancouver, another Fort was erected to maintain the Fur Trade, this post was Fort Nisqually. Stilson (1991) suggested that, “Fort Nisqually, in both its 1833 and 1843 manifestations, became Puget Sound’s main supply depot for Native Americans and early Euro-Americans” (1991:24). The employee situation around the Fort mimicked that of Fort Vancouver, with traders and laborers taking Native women as companions. The Fort was eventually converted to agricultural purposes. Many other posts were in the hands of the Hudson’s Bay Company, most acquired when the North West Company merged with the Hudson’s Bay Company.

Further information on the Hudson’s Bay Company and their many activities can be found in such sources as Ross, 1976; Galbraith 1957; Newman, 1985 and 1987; Mackie, 1997; Schooling 1920; as well as trader’s journals and cultural resource reports housed at the Oregon and Washington State Historic Preservation Offices.

FUR TRADE EMPLOYEES

The employee base within the Pacific Northwest Fur Trade was comprised of Scottish, Irish, Orknymen, Hawaiians, or Kanakas, French, French-Canadian, and
Natives, occupying positions as trappers, traders, boatmen, officers and clerical staff. This diverse group of workers created a unique multi-cultural atmosphere within the Fur Trade. Habits and customs began to intermingle and the history that these people created was in itself shaped by each person’s own cultural identity. Mackie suggested that, “Native labor was restricted primarily to the fur trade and to a lesser degree to the provision trade” (Mackie 1997:30), but their role was essential for gathering resources. Regardless of which company was bought out by whom, the lead company would maintain the employees of the last. When the Northwest Company merged with the Hudson’s Bay Company, most of the men stayed on in their original capacities. Men would sign up with a company under a contract and perform duties in various capacities.

The importance and overwhelming impact of the Fur Trade, specifically trapping is discussed in detail by Newman (1985). He explained that, “Beaver became such a valued commodity that it was literally turned into money. For a century and a half, the standard of currency was not cash but beaver skins” (Newman 1985:47). Pelts and skins were in demand in Europe, and America seemed the Land’O Plenty. Fur brigades would venture into the wilderness with upwards of 50 men, returning to the Forts only after they successfully trapped what they could. In the Journals of John Work and Peter Skene Ogden, we learn of the other individuals who also traveled with the brigades, which included women and children.

The voyager, who held the dangerous position of traveling the waterways, was usually a French Canadian. Washington Irving’s journal about Astoria described the
voyagers and gives us a rare image of these adventurous men. "They are dextrous boatmen, vigorous and adroit with the oar and the paddle, and will row from morning until night without a murmur. The steersman often sings an old traditional French song..." (Irving 1964:?). Ballantyne, who traveled among the fur traders during the early part of the Nineteenth century said that, "The men used to row for a space of time, denominated a pipe, so called from the circumstance of their taking a smoke at the end of it. Each spell lasted for nearly two hours, during which time they rowed without intermission. This smoke usually occupied five or ten minutes, after which they pulled again for two hours more and so on" (Ballantyne 1908:82-83).

Families with a mix of French Canadian and Native cultures would come to settle French Prairie. While the chapter *French Prairie and Families* discusses in depth the settling of the Willamette Valley, Hussey (1967) suggested that certain French Canadian trappers and their families were settling this area in the Willamette Valley as early as 1826. The Willamette Valley was an excellent spot for farming with extensive natural resources, it was ideal for agricultural development. Freeman fur trapper Etienne Lucier had approached McLoughlin in 1828 about the possibility of settling the Willamette Valley, however, formal approval for settling the Willamette Valley was not given by John McLoughlin until either 1829 or 1830 (Hussey 1967:49:50). McLoughlin advanced valuable agricultural necessities to Lucier and others keeping them on the payroll as HBC employees, "but no service would be exacted of them" (Hussey 1967:51). Thus, settlement on the Willamette Valley began, with the help of the Hudson's Bay Company.
Through the French Canadian Archaeological Project established in the 1980's, a research focus to assess and identify these families has since been underway (Brauner 1989). French Canadian culture, deeply focused on the Catholic religion, was established in the Canadian provinces. French Canadian men signed up in force for the fur trade, mainly as Voyagers, who maned the canoes for transport. The French Canadian often mentioned with his Tuque of scarlet, the typical cap worn during the fur trade, and his scarlet sash worn around the waist. This unique culture, which blended with the Native cultures of their wives, essentially dominated early Oregon history. As Brauner noted these families were left out of the history books. He explained that, “Early Northwest historians were unable or unwilling to discard the nationalistic and racist cloak that blanketed much of the Nineteenth and early Twentieth century society. Prejudice against French-Canadians and their Indian/Metis wives and children have run deep and long” (Brauner 1989:15). Because they have been excluded from most written histories, we will turn to the archaeological record to provide us with insight and information.

The men of the fur trade sought companionship among the Native women of the region. This union supported and aided in maintaining the Fur Trade among the peoples of differing cultures. Jennifer Brown, who has done considerable research on the social and historical implications of the Fur Trade explained that, “The Hudson’s Bay Company...demanded both celibacy and chastity from it’s Bay employees, seeking to impose monastic as well as military order upon their lives there” (Brown 1976:55). Yet as Peter Newman (1985) indicated, “The men of the HBC may have been loyal but
they were not monastic; and no head office directive was more widely or happily ignored" (Newman 1985:202). Essentially, imposing chastity upon these men was doomed to failure and eventually, the Hudson’s Bay Company, as well as the Northwest Company condoned relationships with Native women, seeing the true value in maintaining strong ties with the various Native groups.

NATIVE WOMEN AND THE FUR TRADERS

Each company had specific policies for dealing with the Native populations and how their employees should act with women. The Northwest Company early on understood the benefits of taking Native wives. As Van Kirk explained in her book, *Many Tender Ties*, they found that, “...an Indian mate could be an effective agent in adding to the trader’s knowledge of Indian life” (Van Kirk 1990:13).

Eventually, even the Hudson’s Bay Company reversed their position on Native women and put faith in the potential alliances. Essentially, these women became a valuable economic asset (Peterson 1981:43). Men “in-country”, began taking native wives by what was called the *custom of the country or a la façon du pays*. Alfred Miller’s 1850 painting, *The Trapper’s Bride* (Figure 7), illustrates this very unique relationship which came to represent fur trade relationships. Some of the tribes which participated in this custom included Cree, Okanagan, Chippewa, Chinook, Nez Perce, and locally the Kalapuya. Yet this practice was not restricted to the Pacific Northwest and actually followed the fur trade throughout North America. There was a bride price
which was paid to the woman’s family (Van Kirk 1990:36) and the traders usually bargained with guns and supplies. There were no formal marriage vows and separation was as simple as the marriage itself. If one person disliked another then the marriage was considered off.

Early on, the Hudson’s Bay Company London Committee barred white women from entering Rupert’s Land, mainly because an attempt in the late 17th Century proved to be a failure (Van Kirk 1990:173-174). In the 1680s, two white women were allowed into Albany and then onto Fort Charles, but having fared unfavorably while the Fort was under attack, they were considered a “nuisance” (Van Kirk 1990:173-174), thus forcing the Hudson’s Bay Company to make their decision. After this, white women were unseen, at least within the Pacific Northwest, until the early 19th Century. In 1806 a young Orkney girl named Isabel Gunn entered the region under disguise as a man and that same year Marie-Anne Gaboury managed to follow her husband on brigade (Van Kirk 1990:175-177). Later, in 1814, Jane Barnes, who had arrived on the Issac Todd as companion to Governor Donald McTavish, had a brief foray at Fort Astoria (Porter 1930:125).

Eventually taking a woman by the custom of the country became common practice (Van Kirk 1990: 39). Although, some company men abandoned their native wives to go back to England when the end of their work term came. Van Kirk suggested that these native women would eventually go back to their tribes which would accept them (Van Kirk 1990:49), but Jacqueline Peterson (1981) indicted that, “Once an Indian woman had been married to an employee of the trade, she was
unlikely to return permanently to her natal family, even if abandoned” (Peterson 1981:91). Despite these conflicting opinions, it is most likely that these women would have been expected to marry traders again.

These native women became essential to the fur trade. They had an intimate knowledge of the land and the people, as well as the surrounding cultures. They could speak the languages and knew the customs. For these reasons, native women became tremendous economic assets to the fur traders (Brown 1980:66). These women performed tasks that were essential to the survival of the traders and trappers, as well as in the maintenance of the posts. They made socks and snowshoes, fished, gathered plants, caught small game and accompanied their male companions on the fur brigades. Not many, but a few of the surviving fur trade journals make reference to the Native women and children which made up the camps of the fur brigades. Peter Skene Ogden’s 1825 journal, indicated that of 131 persons on the trip, women and children were present (Ogden 1825). In his 1824 journal, Alexander Ross remarked that on March 25, 1824, “All the women went off to collect berries” (Ross 1824).

Probably the most consistent and thorough writer and recorder of fur trade behavior was John Work. On his 1830-31 expedition, Work indicated that out of 115 people, there were “29 women, 22 boys, 23 girls” (Haines 1971:4) and that on Saturday May 7, 1831 women were “busy drying” buffalo meat (Haines 1971:106). Even from the infrequent mention of these women, we can still understand the obvious need for women during expeditions.
Figure 7. The Trapper’s Bride by Alfred Miller 1850
*Courtesy of the Joslyn Art Museum, Omaha, Nebraska
Obtaining a wife was no small endeavor. As Van Kirk explained, “A first and essential step for the trader who wished to take an Indian wife was to obtain the consent of the parents. He would then be required to pay a bride price which was determined by the girls relations, for the Indians were adamant that the traders should follow their customs” (Van Kirk 1990:36). Bride prices and customs varied among Native groups, but once the marriage was solidified, an alliance was formed between the trader and the Natives. The importance of these women in the daily life of the Fur Trade, cannot be stressed enough. However, these relationships were fragile. There is some indication that if a woman became pregnant this only complicated the relationship. Ross Cox’s Journal from his travels along the Columbia River, noted the harsh reality of such circumstances. He expressed that, “Very few men wish to have offspring by their Indian wives; a sterile woman is therefore invaluable. They are however scarce, and happy is the man who succeeds in obtaining one” (Stewart 1957:359-364). Stories can be found among the traders early journals concerning these relationships and the indiscretions involved in attempting to release a woman of this situation once the employee was ready for departure from the region. Many times when these men would leave at the end of their contracts, they would try to place their wives “under the protection of another officer,...or engage” (Van Kirk 1990:50), sometimes called “Turning-off” (Van Kirk 1990:50) or they would simply abandon their partners.

Few references are made regarding the wives of the retired French Canadian fur traders of the Willamette Valley. The historian Eva Dye, in her 1902 book on John
McLoughlin, attempted to describe how the women and children looked and acted. “There mothers, in calico dresses and leggings and moccasins, with red kerchiefs crossed around their breasts....These women, whose mothers had packed teepees and dug camas all their lives, women who had passed their infancy strapped on a baby-board, now scrubbed their little cabins and managed the garden and dairy...” (Dye 1902:37). Dye’s description of the daily life of these women, gives a picture of the merging of two cultures. Yet it also describes the necessity of these women and the contributions of their work to their families.

There were many men who formed lasting bonds with their Native partners. These families are the ones who endured. “Loyalty to their Indian families was a primary cause of many engages remaining in the west...” (Van Kirk 1990:48). Eventually, clergymen in an area would take the liberty of Christianizing these relationships, so that they were legitimate in the eyes of the church and officially seen as husband and wife. This gives testament to the strong religious sentiments of the French Canadian husbands.

While trapper’s met Native women through certain tribes, these women might not have actually been born into these tribes or bands. As discussed in Chapter 2, the practice of slavery played a specific role in the societal make up of Northwest Native cultures. Women were specific targets of raiding and trading. While some women were incorporated and accepted into the tribe, as with the Okanogan, many women were simply seen as a commodity and used in trade. It stands to reason that when the trappers came through the area, they might have traded a slave for material goods,
leaving the trappers with a woman acquired from a known tribe, but whose original cultural affiliation was lost to history. While this might not have happened frequently, it should be taken into consideration when examining the cultural make up of fur trade families.

THE METIS

Those relationships lucky enough to endure the fur trade lifestyle, produced children known as the Metis or ‘mixed bloods’. The sons of this union would have been educated, yet they certainly may have felt the discriminating attitudes of the Euro-American culture. They would have taken jobs in whatever situation was open to them, and attempted to follow the new emerging Euro-American lifestyle of the Nineteenth Century. The daughters of the Custom of the Country, were surrounded by different circumstances. These children would occupy an important part in the changing cultural climate of the region. For the purposes of this thesis, we will be concentrating on the daughters of a la facon du pays. These women would posses skills and knowledge of both their father and mother and would eventually marry, passing on their knowledge to their own children.

Many historians have written about the women of the fur trade, Pollard (1990); Peterson (1981); Brown (1976); and Van Kirk (1990). All have expressed the importance of women during this turbulent time in history and all have agreed that the Metis daughters of a la facon du pays, played a significant role in the shaping of Fur
Trade families. Metis daughters had the knowledge of their Native mothers and the Euro-American/Canadian influence of their fathers. Their mothers passed on numerous traditional skills and possibly languages to their daughters, and the fathers provided an education as well as the moral upbringing or religious sentiment. For these reasons, Metis women were preferred; they became the “vogue” (Van Kirk 1990). Brown explained that, “many traders daughters could offer the same country skills and economic contributions as Indian women” (1976:168). Van Kirk discusses that not only were the Metis daughters looked upon in a valuable light by economic standards, but they also had physical appeal. She explains that, “white men generally evinced a decided personal preference for a mixed-blood wife whose lighter skin and sharper features more closely approximated his concept of beauty” (1976:57).

Many of these Metis children began to receive a Euro-American education, as well as instruction in the Catholic religion, and were further pushed to take on more European qualities. Both sons and daughters received an education. Some fathers even managed to send their children to England or to Canada for an education. Although, this was more common among the wealthy Chief Factors and Chief Traders within the fur trade. On French Prairie the situation was, as we will see, different. Pollard (1990) indicated that, “...what is suggested here is that the education of servant’s children was designed to make them good Christians and useful laborers, whereas the education of Gentlemen’s children was to reproduce another generation of gentlemen and gentlewomen” (Pollard 1990:282). Schools were set up at fur trade posts and forts, even at Fort Vancouver. On French Prairie the education of children was a priority and
had begun in 1834, with a class being taught out of the home of Joseph Gervais (Munnick 1959:53). As Pollard explained, "...they paid special attention to the education of the retired servants' wives and daughters, who were encouraged, among other things, to dress in French Canadian fashion and be submissive to their husbands and fathers" (1990:338). French Canadian or "Canadian" fashion has been noted as a more European style of dress, including "shirt, short gown, petticoat and leggings" (Van Kirk 1990:37). Pollard further indicted that, "Teaching needlework and cloth making to the girls had to wait, however, until 1844 when the Sisters of Notre Dame de Namur from Belgium arrived and established St. Marie de Willamette Academy" (1990:339). It was this type of education that would shape the young Metis women on the Prairie. Pollard suggests that this education would be brought home by the children. "The nuns believed that the girls would teach these skills to their mothers" (Pollard 1990:340), in turn perpetuating the Euro-American lifestyle. Sister McNamee (1959) wrote that the Sisters of Notre Dame were mainly concerned with the education of women and children. The nuns taught them, not only everyday skills, but prayers in both Chinook and French (McNamee 1959).

Religion played a dominant role in the lives of these early fur trade families, specifically among the French Canadians who were Catholic. We see along French Prairie, repeatedly, the importance of religion to these early settlers. As Pollard (1990) stated, "...there was no single educational experience for servant's children. The only goal shared by all the educational institutions was the conversion of their students to Christianity and all that implied" (1990:349). Educating their children about
Catholicism and religion not only linked French Canadian fathers to their children, but played a key role in the development of new cultural characteristics among these children in the future. “In practice, being a Christian was synonymous with being civilized and for many of these schoolchildren, this meant rejecting much of their mothers culture in favor of their father’s” (Pollard 1990:349).

This shift toward the incorporation of Euro-American culture becomes clear in their style of dress and eventually their possessions. Metis women retained certain native styles that they probably adopted from their mothers such as the native shawl and moccasins. However, the push to “Europeanize” their daughters was increasing. Van Kirk (1990) explained that company men began to order special items from Europe specifically for their daughters and Metis wives. These items included jewelry, silk, imported cloth and undergarments. But with these increasing European skills it is possible to see that these women were losing some autonomy that their mothers had. By having more of a knowledge of European skills and manners, these Metis daughters might have been losing valuable skills that might help them survive without a man. Van Kirk explained that by, “cultivating the civilized graces of the British lady, the young mixed-blood woman was also in danger of assuming the relative uselessness and excessive dependency of her white sister, which contrasted sharply with the autonomy and self-reliance of the Indian woman” (1990:153).

The emergence of white women into the area during the 1830's probably influenced others perceptions about these “in-country” marriages. Women from the East Coast of the United States came in abundance, after 1834, as part of the
Methodist Mission. By the 1840's white women started to arrive in the West as missionaries and on Wagon Trains. Many of the traders who had taken native and Metis wives began to abandon their “in-country” partners for those women of European decent. But there were those traders and freemen who kept their “in country” wives and families.

These white women brought with them a new kind of prejudice and racism. The position of the Metis women as well as their Native mothers, was being threatened by these new arrivals. Pollard suggested that European and/or American women saw the Metis as competition (Pollard 1990); This made matters very difficult. I speculate that this competition fueled Metis women to take on even more of a European persona, which might have become evident in their style of dress or behavior, and probably their purchases.

It is obvious that the mixing of cultures and ideas was a significant part of the fur trade era. With men of mixed ancestry, marrying Native women and producing children from this union, a peculiar situation was born. Pollard (1990) explained that, “The children carried their fur trade traditions into their new social environments and, although they modified these customs to some extent, they continued to adhere to them and organize their lives along customary patterns (1990:466). More importantly this period is like a time capsule. It is the crossroads of cultures, where the ability to maintain ones identity slowly gets blurred and overshadowed by another. For these reasons, the fur trade period is extremely useful for examining ethnicity and cultural identity within the framework of anthropology. Important still is our ability to use this
information and the accumulating material culture, to examine the significance of ethnicity, cultural identity and gender dynamics within the Willamette Valley.
French Prairie and Families

The rolling hills, prairies and Oak grooves of the Willamette Valley proved to be lush hunting grounds for the early trappers. Some of the first permanent settlers on the prairie were retired fur traders, otherwise known as freemen. John Hussey wrote that, “The Company (HBC) was bound by its licence to return its employees to Canada or Europe at the ends of their engagements and was forbidden to leave them in the Indian Country” (Hussey 1967:45). But when John McLoughlin was approached by freemen of the Hudson’s Bay Company, with the idea of settling along the Willamette, he took a different perspective. Hussey says of McLoughlin that, “He realized that forcing discharged employees to return east of the mountains, often worked great hardships on their families” (Hussey 1967:51). Eva Dye wrote in 1902 about John McLoughlin and his experience with the families of French Prairie. She explained that, “To transport them to Canada would be not only a great expense, but a cruel exile. To separate the men from their families—that was not to be thought of” (Dye 1902:36). Yet Brauner (1989) emphasized that, “John McLoughlin and Governor George Simpson realized that the only hope of stemming an American push into the Pacific Northwest, and an eventual claim to the territory, was to establish a much larger British presence in the form of established settlements” (1989:25-26). So when the opportunity to settle permanently along the Willamette arose, it was taken.

Exactly who was the first person to settle French Prairie is widely disputed. Some say Etienne Lucier was the first, some suggest Joseph Gervais and some Jean
Baptiste Desporte McKay (Munnick 1956; Hussey 1967; Lyman 1900). However, it is estimated that by 1827 Lucier was already in residence with his family on French Prairie, these figures come from historians such as Hussey (1967) and Eva Dye (1902) who wrote extensively on the early French Canadian settlement. Brauner (1989) estimated that, “The occupation sites selected by the first permanent French Canadian settlers from 1829-1831 may well have been their place of residence for several years prior to receiving formal permission from the Hudson’s Bay Company to settle in the Valley” (1989:25). Who ever was the first to settle was definitely not alone, so it is safe to assume that possibly all of these men settled around the same time, with their families. Figure 8 shows the area known as French Prairie, in relationship to various towns of the period as well as its’ proximity to Fort Vancouver.

John Jackson (1995) in his book *Children of the Fur Trade*, explained that, “Their persistence convinced McLoughlin that freemen could become responsible citizens and he circumvented the regulation by keeping them on the servants list without pay. The first settlers were advanced seed, flour, and four cows and were permitted to purchase necessary farm implements at 50% of cost” (1995:132). These families established independent farms along what would be known as French Prairie. Jackson further explained that by “1833, eight or nine farms could be counted on the Willamette Valley” (1995:137) and that by the next year that had almost doubled. By 1837 about 19 families, estimating, (100 people) were recorded on the prairie (Jackson 1995:137). Brauner estimated that, “...of the 97 French Canadian heads-of-households known to be on French Prairie between 1829 and 1843, we know the land
claim boundaries of 46 of these individuals and the approximate location ... of 30 of these households” (Brauner 1989:26). The town of Champoeg was one product of French Canadian settlement. F.X. Matthiew, who was employed as a trader, and had stayed with Etienne Lucier recalled, that, “The name Champoeg was ... a corruption of the French term Champement Sable - the camp of the sands” (Lyman 1900:88). Louise Labonte, who was also a resident on French Prairie noted that it was a congregation place of the local Native Americans (Lyman 1900:175).

Champoeg would become an important location on French Prairie during the 1840's. Lou Ann Spedula (1988), wrote that, “During the 1830's Champoeg began to take on the appearance of a farming neighborhood” (1988:11). Strategically, Champoeg was placed along the Willamette River, so that transportation of goods might be easier (Hussey 1967:57) and was composed mostly of the Jean Baptiste Desporte McKay settlement. In 1835, a grist mill was established. Again, Hussey (1967), wrote that, “By 1835 the amount of wheat raised by the French Prairie settlers was reaching substantial proportions” (1967:108) which seemed to grow yearly. Sometime in the early 1840's a warehouse was built by the Hudson's Bay Company and the town of Champoeg began to take shape. It wasn’t until the early 1840's that attempts were made to create a provisional government for the town (Hussey 1967). This was a difficult task when we think of how to incorporate fairly, the needs of Americans and French Canadians alike. Hussey noted that many French Canadians were opposed to organized government, but that on May 2, 1843, this didn’t matter, because “... at least six French Canadians risked the illwill of their fellow
Figure 8. Shows the area of French Prairie in relationship to places such as Fort Vancouver and Oregon City around 1834. (Adapted from Hussey 1967)

countrymen...to join the movement for mutual protection of lives, property and land claims” (Hussey 1967:156). The town itself did quite well through the 1850's, but the flood of 1861 changed things. After that catastrophe, the town never recovered, and now remains a park and monument to the birth place of Oregon.
Creating a permanent settlement was no small task. These men choose grounds nearby previously erected posts which followed along the Willamette, River, but not so close that they might suffer from flooding. Brauner indicated that a flat levee or terrace was chosen for these exact reasons (Brauner 1989:29; Kinoshita n.d). In describing the type of structures built by the French Canadian’s, Brauner wrote that, “... occupation of a year or more at one location required the erection of a single log cabin, probably employing the Piece sur Piece building technique typically associated with French Canadian construction. Less elaborate log buildings suitable for short term occupation, storage, or some other function may also have been associated with these isolated cabin sites” (1989:25). Figure 9, shows the lot arrangement for all five families associated with this sample, as part of the Donation Land Claim Acts of the early 1850's, which redistributed acreage for new and previous settlers in the valley (Head 1971:9). Hussey (1962) described the general accommodations of the French Canadian settlers during the early 1830's. He explained that, “...most of the settlers, both Canadian and Americans, lived during this early period in small unpainted log houses of various styles and shapes. For most prairie farmers, fireplaces were made of sticks plastered with clay. There were few stoves. Cooking generally was done over the coals or in kettles swung on cranes in the fireplaces” (Hussey 1962:153). Another characteristic of these early settlers on the prairie, were the long lots, which were
Figure 9. Section of the 1852-53 Donation Land Claims note the Lucier, Bellique, Despard, Longtain and Newell Claims.

brought with the French Canadian settlers (Burley 1992; Brauner 1989). This was a systematic plan for farming to retain the most of one's resources (Cromwell 2000; Brauner 1989).

Many of these families kept slaves. These individuals were the possession of the native women/wives and most likely were part of her dowery. Sparse references speak to the issue of slavery on the Prairie. In her 1971 dissertation, Susan Kardas explained that, "Women who married traders and laborers continued to own slaves..." (Kardas 1971:167). William Slacum, who ventured through the Willamette Valley and
along the Columbia River between 1836 and 1837 wrote about Fort Vancouver noting that, "The laborers and mechanics live outside the Fort in good log cabins...and as nearly every man has a wife, or lives with an Indian or half breed woman, as each family has from two to five slaves" (Slacum 1912:187). The same was true for those on the Prairie. Catholic church records frequently mention a slave of a settler being baptized or dying in their home. In actuality, these slaves, were given as gifts or part of doweries. Kenneth Ames and Herbert Maschner (1999) as well as Ruby and Brown (1993) discuss the history of Native American slavery in their book on Northwest Prehistory, and explain that it was a factor in the social stratification of certain Native groups.

Most of our recorded history from French Prairie was taken down by priests and nuns who recorded day to day occurrences within the settlement. Religion, as we’ve previously discussed, was extremely important among the French Canadians. Many unions were blessed by the Priest in residence at Fort Vancouver. And eventually, the French Canadians petitioned for Priests to come to the Willamette Valley and establish a congregation. Father Blanchet was one of these early Priests to reside on the Prairie. In 1834, "...the Catholic settlers in the Willamette Valley petitioned the nearest Canadian Bishop, Joseph Norbert Provencher of Red River, for a priest who would come to live among them and bring to them the joys and consolations of religion, of which they had been for so long a time deprived" (Lyons 1940:1). Blanchet wrote that, "Many of the servants and settlers had forgotten their prayers and the religious principles they had received in their youth. The women they
had taken for their wives were pagans, or baptized without sufficient knowledge” (Blanchet 1878: 71). Emphasizing their love and need of religion, Blanchet noted that, “...so great was their desire to have their wives and children instructed and to loose nothing of the instruction given, that they brought them from home to live in tents around the church. The men would do no less; those living nearest came every day to hear mass and passed the whole day at the church...” (Blanchet 1878:80).

Harriet Munnick wrote that, “When Father Blanchet and Demers reached the Prairie in January 1839, a month was required to instruct the Indian women, marry them to their Canadian consorts, and baptize and legitimize their children in the eyes of the church” (Munnick 1995: 204). These brief portraits of the early settlers and their families allow us to see that they were indeed immersed within their own culture, as well as religion, and that they expected their wives and children to do the same.

The efforts of the priests were further supported by the arrival of the Sisters of Notre Dame De Namur and Father DeSmet in 1844. They established a convent at what was known as St. Josephe’s school, and a boarding school where they concentrated on the instruction of women and children. Families such as the Lucier’s and Bellique’s would place their children under the care of the nuns, sometimes paying in grain and other goods (McNamee 1959). In addition to their religious education young girls were taught domestic skills (McNamee 1959: 163).

With the arrival of the Methodist Missionaries, attitudes began to change. These missionaries from the East began to arrive in Oregon around the early 1830's and in 1834 a Methodist Mission was established on French Prairie with
reinforcements arriving from the East Coast. The Methodists had already established themselves on the Willamette, prior to the arrival of a Catholic congregation. Their mission was particularly aimed at the Native Americans that were in the area, mainly the Kalapuya. New Methodist recruits would arrive in mass during 1840 as a part of the “Great Reinforcement” (Hussey 1967:115) and brought with them Euro-American attitudes about the Metis and Natives. With this, the arrival of the Great Migration (1843) settlers also found their way to the Willamette Valley. Essentially, prejudice worked its way into the area and threatened, not only the Native Americans, but the French Canadian families that resided there as well. Harriet Munnick, who has written extensively on Etienne Lucier, wrote concerning the French Canadian’s that, “They kept the French Canadian language and customs, being self-sufficient and clannish, but when the great covered wagon migrations of the Americans began to infringe upon their seclusion, they were forced to change their ways, or leave” (Munnick 1995:196). John McLoughlin recorded in March of 1845 the changing attitudes of people in this region. “It is reported that some of the immigrants last come have said that every man who has an Indian wife ought to be driven out of the country, and that half-breeds should not be allowed to hold lands” (Jackson 1995:222). A great deal of this might have been due to the fact that the French Canadians held the best lands for agricultural purposes. These new immigrants wanted the best land, what better way to drive out the unwanted, then to create prejudice against a people (Jackson 1995:225). This
issue of land and hostility eventually drove many French-Canadian settlers out of French Prairie and was further compounded by the establishment of Indian Reservations in the 1850's.

A brief genealogy was compiled for the purposes of this thesis so that we might understand the family histories as well as the cultural attributions of the different individuals on French Prairie. This list includes only first and second generations on French Prairie. All of the information was gathered from the Catholic Church records, as well as a small independent family genealogy and files found at Oregon State University. This genealogy appears in Appendix B. Only five families have been chosen as the primary subjects of this thesis. Material remains associated with these families constitute the representative archaeological sample for this project, which were initially collected as a part of the French Canadian Archaeological Project. These families include: Pierre Bellique and Genevieve St. Martain, Joseph Despard and Lisette Chinook, Andre Longtain and Nancy Okanogan, Etienne Lucier and Josephete Nouette, and Robert and Kitty Newell. It should be noted that conflicting dates are found throughout the historical record and simply reflect the inconsistency in research material.

PIERRE BELLIQUE AND GENEVIEVE ST. MARTIN

Pierre Bellique (1793-1849) and Genevieve St. Martin (1814-1904) established themselves in the Willamette Valley sometime around 1830 (Hussey 1962:85).
However, Pierre continued to work for the Hudson's Bay Company through the mid 1830's, holding the position of "steersman" or "middleman" among the voyagers. Pierre was a French Canadian from L'Assumption, Canada, began working for the North West Company around 1818 (Brauner 1989) and was a Hudson's Bay Company employee as of 1821. Once he settled in the Willamette Valley, his land claim encompassed that of Willamette Post. Hussey (1967), explained that, "By 1837 he had 50 acres enclosed, 45 of them under cultivation. His wheat crop amounted to 700 bushels and he owned 9 horses, 28 hogs and 2 good houses" (1967:62). The Pierre Bellique Family Tree 1797-1980, written by Lorraine Benski, as well as the Provisional Land Claim records, indicates that the Bellique's, as of 1846, actually had a total of 640 acres. However, by 1862, the Bellique claim totaled approximately 216 acres, in Township 3S, Range 2W, section 33 and Township 4S Range 2W, Section 4 (Brauner 1989).

Bellique was among some of the earliest settlers in the area, which included Etienne Lucier, and Joseph Gervais. It is noted that these three individuals were influential in bringing about the arrival of Father Blanchet. Lyons (1940) explained that, "on January 3, 1839, Lucier and Bellique came with two large canoes to escort the missionary from Fort Vancouver" (1940:22). Bellique continued to work sporadically for the Hudson's Bay Company through 1836, after which he took up farming. In 1849 he journeyed with his son and with hundreds of other fortune seekers to California in search of gold. Unfortunately, "...he died on the return voyage and was buried at sea off the mouth of the Columbia River..." (Brauner 1989:51).
Unlike some of the other women researched on French Prairie information does exist on Genevieve St. Martin, who was Metis. Harvey McKay’s book on St. Paul, indicated that “Genevieve St. Martin, was the daughter of Joseph St. Martin, an early fur trapper, and a woman of the Chinook Nation” (1980:94). The Bellique Family history indicates that she was actually born in Oregon Territory and that her father was an active fur trapper for the North West Company. She is known to have had one sister. With the death of Pierre, Genevieve married Casimir Gardepie (Brauner 1989) and moved to Eastern Oregon. While married to Pierre Bellique, Genevieve had seven children, Pierre, Sophie, Esther, Joseph, Cyprien, Genevieve, and Jean Baptiste. The 1850 Oregon Territory census indicates, Sophia, Pierre, Jane, Esther, and John all on roll after Pierre’s death. Genevieve was 90 years old when she died in Eastern Oregon. McKay (1980) said of the Bellique’s that they, “...were important leaders in the establishment of social, religious and economic life in early Oregon. Their children attended St. Joseph’s College and the Sisters of Notre Dame School in St. Paul. The family loved social affairs and dancing” (1980:96). To find specific dates and information on these individuals please reference Appendix B.

ETIENNE LUCIER AND JOSEPHETTE NOUETTE

The memory of the Lucier family has been long standing on French Prairie. Etienne Lucier, who was potentially the first farmer on the Prairie, aided in establishing the later organized provisional government and helped bring Father
Blanchet to the Prairie. He was married twice to Native women, Josephette Nouette and Marguerite Chinook having a total of nine children.

Etienne Lucier was a French Canadian, born in Boucherville, Quebec, Canada. His exact birth date is unknown, however, several sources suggest that he was born in 1793 (Hussey 1962; Munnick 1956), a French Prairie genealogy written by George Brown (n.d.) indicated that Lucier was born June 9, 1786, while the 1850 Oregon Territory census cited that Etienne Lucier was 60 years old, making his date of birth 1790. Despite these discrepancies, we do know that Lucier joined the Hunt Overland Party in 1810, was recruited into the Northwest Company in 1813 and was recorded by Alexander Henry as being at Fort George in April 1814 (Couses 1965: 868). It was around this time that he met his first wife Josephette Nouette.

Josephette’s origins leave room for speculation. Catholic Church Records indicate that she died in January of 1840 at the age of 40 and was buried in the St. Paul Cemetery. Munnick (1956) suggested that Josephette Nouette was from Northern Vancouver Island. “The Nouites spelled variously Nouities, Newette, and Nawati, are of the Kwakuitl tribe of northern Vancouver Island. A village of that name was found in early times at Cape Conmerell” (Munnick 1956:8). She goes on to suggest that Etienne met Josephette in Spokane; Josephette was probably 14 years old (Munnick 1956:8). This time line does fit with descriptions by Alexander Henry who indicated that Etienne Lucier was on a canoe bound for Fort William on May 1, 1814, delivering goods to Spokan House, carrying material such as food stuff, copper kettles and beads (Couses 1965: 904). The couple had six children together, Felicite, Adrienne,
Louise, Michel, Joseph, and Pelagie, before Josephette’s death in 1840. In August of 1840 Etienne married Marguerite Chinook, of the Chinook nation, and went on to have three more children, Pierre, David, and Etienne; Little is known of Marguerite.

French Canadian settlers, established themselves on the Prairie, while continuing to work for the Hudson’s Bay Company. Hussey (1967) indicated that by 1826, Lucier was already established on the Prairie, but that he was not farming the land until sometime around 1830 (1967:69-75). As history suggests, it was Lucier who approached Chief Factor John McLoughlin about the possibility of farming the Willamette Valley with help from Fort Vancouver.

McLoughlin agreed to help Lucier by lending him cattle, the increase to be the property of the company; by advancing him seed wheat; and by selling him farm implements and other needed articles at the advance of only 50 per cent on prime coast.....In order to comply with the Company’s license, all retired or discharged servants permitted to farm would be kept on the books as employees, but no service would be exacted of them (Hussey 1967:51).

As of 1846, the Lucier’s property encompassed 640 acres bordering the Willamette River, located in T3S R2W, Secs. 29, 32, 33 as well as T4S R2W, Sec 4. It is also noted that Skookum Lake was part of the Lucier property, and that this land afforded quite a bit of trapping (Munnick 1956:25). While farming became a way of life, Lucier participated in the Hudson’s Bay Company Southern Expeditions in 1828/29 as well as 1830. It is uncertain as to whether Josephette accompanied him on these expeditions, although it was common at the time for the families of trappers, to travel as part of the expeditions, as made evident by the journals of Peter Skene
Ogden, Alexander Ross and John Work. These women, as mentioned in chapter three, played a significant role in the processing of game at the camps.

Lucier was a frequent trader at the Fort Vancouver Sales Shop as well as the Indian Store. Sundry Accounts from Fort Vancouver list the items that Lucier purchased and traded for, including, “large and small hunting knives, scalping knives, flat files, pistol flints, ball, shot, beaver traps including accessories, iron wire, metal coat buttons, and large quantities of Jewish tobacco (HBC Fort Vancouver Sundry Accounts 1828-1830). Much of this was in exchange for various furs trapped by Lucier himself, including elk, otter, and beaver skins.

Outside observations provide us with small details of the Lucier family and their daily activities. Historian Eva Dye, in writing McLoughlin and Old Oregon, explained how John McLoughlin stopped at the Lucier house and tasted of Josephette’s culinary skills. She wrote, “...of nothing were the Canadian’s more proud than of their wives’ skills in bread-making” (Dye 1902:116). These women of the fur trade were capable of many tasks, and when they settled the Prairie they brought with them skills and customs of their native traditions. Dye (1902) makes reference to slaves at the Lucier home (1902:117), more than likely coming with Josephette. We see this again at the Despard home as noted in the Catholic Church Records.

While knowing little of Marguerite Chinook, we do have one short reference to her while at Lucier’s home. Munnick (1956) cites an encounter between a traveler, “a roving preacher, Pearne” (1956:29) and Marguerite Chinook. Although it was a brief encounter, Pearne described the home as being “a whitewashed house surrounded by
a peach orchard" (Munnick 1956:29), after which Marguerite explained that this was Lucier’s house and set the preacher on his way to Doc Newell’s.

F. X. Matthiew, who came to the Prairie in the Fall of 1842, briefly stayed with the Lucier’s and remember’s Lucier as being “short and stocky, and of a dark complexion” (Lyman 1900:89). Lyman further noted that, “All the settlers of the Prairie he (Matthiew), found to be hospitable in the extreme; they were willing to share with the stranger anything they had” (1900:90).

Lucier was key in the formation of local government. It was during the Wolf Meetings of 1842 and 1843, which had dealt with the issue of predatory animals and the protection of the Oregon settlement, that the idea of a provisional government was discussed. Hussey (1967) noted that many people of the Prairie were divided on the subject of localized government, specifically the French Canadians. But Gervais and Lucier became part of the committee to discus this issue (Hussey 1967:146). In May 1843 the Champoeg settlers voted on forming a government. Hussey (1967) noted that, “In view of the apparent irreconcilability of the several eyewitness accounts, it seems necessary to conclude merely that a majority of the settlers present voted in favor of the objects of the meeting...” (Hussey 1967:154). However, F.X. Matthiew reported that it was he and Lucier that cast the deciding votes (Lyman 1900:94). What we can gather from this information is that Lucier was involved with the early decisions and votes pertaining to French Prairie and Champoeg, and later participated in other acts of government (Brauner 1989:171).
JOSEPH DESPARD AND LISETTE CHINOOK

Joseph Despard (1788-1875) and Lisette Chinook (1804-1851) are known to have settled on French Prairie around 1830, having six children, Marguerite, Mary Ann, Rose, Joseph Jr., Marie, and Victoire. Joseph Jr. was born in 1827, indicating that Lisette and Joseph met prior to that year. They were formally married on January 21, 1839, and on that same day, Lisette was baptized. Church records further suggest that Despard was a French Canadian from St. Hyacinthe, Montreal.

Prior to settling permanently on French Prairie, Despard was in the service of the North West Company 1816-21, and then worked for the Hudson's Bay Company from 1821-37 as a "Middleman" on the rivers as well as a trapper. He took part in the Snake River Expeditions with Peter Skene Ogden in 1825-26, 1826-27, 1828-29 as well as with John Work in 1830-31. Journals from these expeditions provide glimpses into the life of Joseph Despard and other traders as well as their families. One of the earliest references to Despard notes a murder. It is recorded that in 1825, while on the Snake Expedition, Despard killed a slave, but that the matter was dropped (Munnick 1979; Elliot 1909). Yet, it is John Work's 1830 Snake River Expedition Journal that sheds light on the daily happenings of the trapper.

This 1830 expedition totaled 115 individuals, including women and children. It is possible that on this occasion, Despard was accompanied by Lisette and Joseph Jr. who would have been three years old at the time. On Thursday, September 21, 1830 he wrote, "Three men, Laforte, Despard, and Longtain who slept out the last two
nights arrived in the evening with 14 beaver which they took in Read's River...” (Haines 1971:18-19). Another reference is made to Despard on January 19, 1831, when his horse was stolen (Haines 1971:67). Similar incidents happened frequently to the traders on the Snake River Expeditions.

Account books from Fort Vancouver show that Despard was a frequent trader. He had acquired debt at the Sales Shop as well as the Indian Store. One list from the Summer of 1832 shows several items obtained by Despard, which included, “3 loaves of bread, butter, a blanket, soap, Rum, and a half dozen hunters clay pipes” (HBC Fort Vancouver Book of Debt 1832).

As of 1848, Depard’s claim encompassed 500 acres, on the Willamette River. The French Canadian Archaeological Project placed his claim in T3S R2W, Sec. 34 as well as T4S R2W, Sec. 3, 10 (Brauner 1989:84). While the 1850 census records list Despard and family members, Catholic Church Records reveal more about the other individuals present on the Despard farm. References are made throughout 1843-45 to Indian children and adults living on the Despard farm, several being baptized at the Despard home, as well as Joseph Despard himself being the Godfather. Two references are made to “huts on the field of Despard” in October and November of 1843 (Munnick 1979:81,86). These “huts” were most likely slave homes on the Despard farm, but could have possibly been family members of Lisette also living on the land. These references to Natives at the Despard home could suggest a more developed relationship between Despard and the native peoples on the Prairie.
ANDRE LONGTAIIN AND NANCY OKANOGAN

Andre Longtain (1793-1879) spent his time in service to the Hudson’s Bay Company as a Middleman and a trapper, until he settled permanently on French Prairie. George Brown (n.d.) recorded that ‘Andre Lonetain’ was a French Canadian from St. Constant Parish, Canada, the son of J.M. Longtin and Suzanne Robert. Andre met Nancy Okanogan (1809-1876) around 1820 according to Hussey (1967:79), and had seven children including, Joseph, Genevieve, Henritte, Catherine, Luce, Angelique, and Thomas.

Longtain was an employee of the North West Company from 1817-19 and then worked for the Hudson’s Bay Company from 1819-33, taking part in many expeditions including the Snake River Expeditions and a 1832 California trip with John Work. On the 1830 Snake River Expedition, John Work recorded Longtain as trapping with Joseph Despard on several occasions. While on the 1832 California Expedition it is recorded that, “His wife and three children accompanied him on the trip southward with John Work, and all his brood suffered severely from illness” (Hussey 1967:79). It was after this journey that Longtain settled on the French Prairie.

On John Work’s 1832 expedition to California, Longtain traveled again with his wife and the other trappers as employees of the Hudson’s Bay Company. Unfortunately this journey was plagued with illness as Work wrote on the 28th of August 1832, “Several of the man and some boys taken ill. Some with the fever and some with a cold which is very prevalent about the place and seems to be infectious”
Longtain himself was ill for most of this trip, but his wife Nancy faired the worst. Work wrote that she was severely ill on two occasions, specifically on October 1, 1833, when he wrote that, "...she was not expected to live over a few hours, bleeding at the nose and the mouth that could scarcely be stopped" (Maloney 1945:79). Thankfully, Nancy survived the trip and made it back to French Prairie.

Longtain’s claim on the Prairie fluctuated through the years, as did all of the early settlers property. Brauner (1989) placed Longtain’s claim in T4S R2W, Sec. 2, 3, 10, and 11, with approximately 551 acres. However, Provisional Land Claims records indicate 640 acres in 1846, and 1847. Hussey (1967) noted that part of Longtain’s claim belonged to George W. Ebbert at one point. He wrote, “One of the most firmly held Champoeg traditions avows that Andre Longtain settled on the present park lands in 1841 after buying up George W. Ebbert’s squatter’s rights for 100 bushels of wheat. But it is known that Longtain was living in the Champoeg vicinity long before 1841" (Hussey 1967:79). What is certain is that Longtain did well for himself and his family. “In 1837 Longtain had 45 acres enclosed, 24 of them being cultivated...[with] three horses, 33 hogs, and two ‘good’ houses or farm building” (Hussey 1967:80). He also made a point to have his children educated. Munnick (1959) wrote, “Education of the Metis became more general with the founding of the Catholic School at St. Paul, particularly of the girls. There they learned housekeeping and sewing as well as academic subjects, many becoming expert housewives. The Wagner, Lucier, and Vandale daughters were trained there, as well as the Longtain
sisters, well known in later years for their dashing style and high spirits” (Munnick 1959:55).

Longtain became a strong supporter of a town, and worked with Robert Newell in the creation of Champoeg. Hussey noted that, “...the two neighboring landholders at Champoeg had joined forces in promoting a town situated partly on the Newell holdings and partly on the Longtain property” (Hussey 1967:198). However, like many who lived so close to the River, the flood of 1861 devastated his home, and forced him to relocate.

ROBERT NEWELL AND KITTY

Robert Newell played a significant role in the birth of Champoeg as well as the development of the early Oregon government and Indian relations in the Pacific Northwest. He has been written about extensively by historians and scholars (Hussey 1967; Delamarter 1951; Dobbs 1932; Clarke 1905; and Cromwell, Stone, and Brauner 2000).

Newell was born in Ohio in 1807 and became a fur trader at a young age. Hussey (1967) noted that in 1829, in St. Louise, Newell “...signed with William Sublette for a stint as a trapper in the Rocky Mountains” (1967:193). Newell had spent time in the Rocky Mountains among the Nez Perce, before meeting his Nez Perce wife Kitty. It is noted of Kitty that Newel took her, “... unto himself in mountain fashion on Ham’s Fork of Green River about 1834” (Hussey 1967:193).
However, Dobbs (1932), wrote that Newell married Kitty in 1833 (1932:152). Kitty’s father was the “buffalo-hunting chief, Kowsoter” (Josephy 1965:192), whose two other daughters married Joseph Meek and Caleb Wilkins. By 1840 at Fort Hall, it was decided that Newell, Meek, and Wilkins would move to the Willamette Valley. Josephy explained that, “...on September 27, [1840] they all left the post with their Indian wives and children, driving the three wagons, as well as a small herd of cattle that the missionaries had also left behind” (Josephy 1965:208).

Newell initially settled on the Tualatin Plains in 1840 with Meek and Wilkins, then in 1842 moved to Oregon City, finally going on to Champoeg in 1843 (Dobbs 1932:151). Speculation surrounds the way in which Newell obtained his land claim on French Prairie, it being suggested that Newell and Walter Pomeroy actually traded claims (Hussey 1967:107). Despite such speculation, Hussey wrote that the claim “...was approximately one mile square. It lay on the south bank of the Willamette River and directly east of the land claimed by Andre Longtain” (Hussey 1967:195). It was partially wooded, with a stretch of prairie, which is where Newell built his house (Hussey 1967:196). It should be noted that this claim was occupied by several other parties prior to Newell’s possession.

John Ball, who settled what is thought to be the same area in March 1833, was an American trader who took up with Nathaniel Wyeth, and came to the prairie to settle via Fort Vancouver. Hussey (1967) wrote that McLoughlin, “...lent Ball 25 bushels of wheat for seed, corn, potatoes, the necessary farming ‘utensils’ and as many horses as he cared to catch and break” (Hussey 1967:65). He built a log cabin type
structure, with fence and barn, but left this claim on the River in September of 1833, having grown tired of the prairie life (Hussey 1967:66). It wasn’t until 1839 that the property was acquired by Thomas McKay, and used as his second farm. McKay, was also a trader, having worked for the North West Company as well as the Hudson’s Bay Company, and maintained a farm on the Columbia River. Yet, with McLoughlin’s help, he established a grist mill and a second farm on French Prairie, although “hired hands, agents, or tenants” probably maintained the property (Hussey 1967:95-97). In 1843, the area experienced a flood, “...it appears that he disposed of both of his Champoeg properties soon after the flood...” (Cromwell, Stone, and Brauner 2000:23).

Not long after McKay, Walter Pomeroy, an American immigrant, took up the claim of approximately 640 acres in 1843 (Hussey 1967:107). It was in that same year that Pomeroy purchased or traded claims with Newell.

Newell had five children with Kitty, until she died in December 1845. Hussey (1967) wrote that, “The grave is said to be situated on the east side of Champoeg Creek about 1000 feet south of the Willamette River...” (1967:200). It wasn’t long before Newell remarried a young American girl, Rebecca Newman, and had eleven more children (Delamarter 1951:208; Cromwell, Stone, and Brauner 2000:15). Sadly this is all that we really know about these two women, although we can speculate that they led comfortable lives married to an entrepreneur such as Robert Newell.

Robert Newell was an industrious man and sometime between 1844 and 1845 he and Andre Longtain, established the town of Champoeg on their land claims.
Champoeg became a thriving little town for a brief period of time, until the 1861 flood, after which it never really recovered.

Among his many achievements, Newell sat on the Provisional Government Legislature 1844-48, and “...in 1845, and in 1847, served as Speaker of the Assembly” (Hussey 1967:201), he also served as an intermediary in tribal affairs, and in 1849, “...was appointed as one of three Indian sub-agents for Oregon Territory” (Hussey 1967:201). Newell also became involved in the shipping business having two cargo ships, the Mogul and the Ben Franklin, and in 1849 he ventured to California with other fortune seekers in search of gold. (Hussey 1967:203; Cromwell, Stone, and Brauner 2000:15).

Around 1850 Newell had established a general store and warehouse in Champoeg, and between 1852 and 1854 he built a new home at a higher elevation, out of flood range (Hussey 1967:206). But by 1857 Newell had sold his farm to Donald Manson, a retired trader with the Hudson’s Bay Company, who had married Etienne Lucier’s daughter Felicite in 1828. After this, Newell took his family back to live among the Nez Perce peoples, where he functioned as an intermediary between the Nez Perce and the American government. Dobbs wrote that, “In 1868, he visited Washington D.C., in company with some Indian Chiefs to assist in procuring amendments to the Indian Treaties...” (Dobbs 1932:154). He died of a heart attack in 1869 (Hussey 1967:237; Cromwell, Stone, and Brauner 2000:20).
Gender, Ethnicity and Consumer Choice Theory provide the theoretical framework which supports this research project. All three theories as related to archaeology play an active role in understanding the type of research proposed and the outcome of the findings. This section will define each theory and look at how the concepts will be used to contribute to our understanding of the original research questions. Gender, Ethnicity, and Consumer Choice Theories reflect the social and cultural dynamics of archaeology and how we can use archaeological material to say something about culture. The goal here is to understand the way cultural material reflects the individuals or families of French Prairie, providing some insight into their cultural or social behaviors.

Gender theory in archaeology seeks to reveal something about the cultural interactions between gendered individuals and allows us to examine various social relationships in cultures that would otherwise be missed. It accepts that gender is a learned behavior which encompasses the roles and relationships individuals have with one another. It does not simply look at the presence and absence of material culture at a site. Gero and Conkey (1991), who pioneered early archaeological studies concerning gender theory, explained gender as, “a constitutive element of human social relations, based on culturally perceived and culturally inscribed differences and similarities between and among males and females” (Gero and Conkey 1991:8). Their early work, as well as the work of other scholars such as Cheryl Claassen (1991), Janet
Spector (1993:1998), Kelly Gilpin (1998), Sarah Nelson (1998), Donald Hardesty (1994) and many others, came about due to the lack of information concerning women and children in the archaeological record, as well as the simple social interactions of early groups. This post-processual theory dictates that archaeologists need to look to cultural material to say something about culture which involves social relationships and group interaction. McGuire and Paynter (1991) in their article “The Archaeology of Inequality: Material Culture, Domination, and Resistance”, suggested that traditions and habits change over time and generations and that we should be able to examine social roles through material evidence. Supporting this type of research, David Hardesty (1994) explained that, “Certainly the activities reflected in archaeological remains of households can provide key information about how gender influenced labor and social relations” (1994:136-137). Specifically, David Burley (1989), focused on the use of transfer printed ceramics among a semi-sedentary buffalo hunting group of Metis in Nineteenth Century Canada. He explained that the ceramics had a specific symbolic meaning to the individuals within these groups and a very significant social meaning for the women. He explored the possibilities of identifying social roles and relationships among a culturally transitional group. In the case of the men and women on French Prairie, identifying them through the archaeological record, is one vehicle for understanding their social roles and relationships. Specifically looking at the wives within these families contributes to the little information that we have on these Native women.
However, there are problems with doing gender studies in archaeology. Not only is some historical and ethnographic material biased, but there are the biases of the potential researcher. A great deal of historic information simply did not mention women. Women, were present but not discussed, or they were mentioned briefly or in a derogatory way, suggesting that we must be careful and read this type of information not just for what is written, but for what is not written. Our own biases are just as important to consider when examining gender in the archaeological record. As archaeologists we need to be careful not to project our own cultural understandings on the past in our own interpretations; Certain cultures might not have had such concepts of gender. However, gender theory has provided the opportunity to address and study women in the past, which wasn’t always the case.

Research and studies in archaeology using Ethnicity theory also support this research. It is necessary here to first define ethnicity or ethnic identity as well as the concept of acculturation. Webster’s Dictionary defines “ethnic” as “pertaining to or characteristic of a people, especially a group, sharing a common and distinctive culture, religion, and language, etc...”, and ethnicity as simply, “ethnic traits”. They define Acculturation as “the process of adopting the cultural traits or social patterns of another group, especially a dominant one...”. While this research does discuss the adoption of certain European goods by Native women and French Canadian men, it is primarily focused on individuals maintaining their original culture even through the adoption of certain mainstream goods. Most acculturation studies focus on how certain groups slowly assimilated into the dominant culture, adopting their behaviors as well
as material culture. Maintaining one's cultural affiliation or ethnicity while still adopting European goods, goes beyond the concept of acculturation, exploring the concept of "cultural maintenance" introduced by Catherine Carlson (2000).

Archaeological research focusing on ethnicity or attempting to identify ethnic markers in the archaeological record is well established. Orser and Fagan (1995) described ethnic markers as being, "...individual artifacts or grouped of artifacts that can undeniably indicate the presence of certain ethnic groups at archaeological sites" (1995:210). Within this research project, European ceramics are the identified artifact, but in this case we are trying to see if the acquisition of such material might reflect a non-European group.

Ethnicity research in archaeology seeks to identify and contribute to our understanding about certain cultures in the past. This research is concerned with identifying Native women by their original Native culture and contributes to our understanding about shifting cultures during the fur trade era. Similar studies by other scholars such as Elisabet Louise Bedard (1990), David Burley (1989, 1992), Susan Kardas (1971), Lynda Gullason (1990) and Catherine Carlson (2000) all discussed ethnicity and acculturation during the Fur Trade, through the archaeological record. While scholars such as Theresa Singleton and Mark Bogard (2000), Laurie Wilkie (2000), Diana Loren (2000), Stephan Shennan (1989), Brooke Arkush (2000), Philip Hobler (1986), Heinz Pyszczyk (1989), Samuel Wilson (1993) and Daniel Rogers (1993) all pursued other archaeological studies concerning ethnicity and acculturation, supporting the importance of such research.
Bedard (1990) specifically looked at various material culture from Fort D’epinette in Canada, which was another active Nineteenth Century fort. She explained that, “These studies see cultural differences as being maintained and expressed along ethnic lines and boundaries. Thus the archeological expression of social identity occurs in the stylistic attributes of artifacts and artifact spatial distributions” (Bedard 1990:3). Gullason’s (1990) research concerning Fort George-Buckingham House in Canada attempted to use gender as well as ethnicity in archaeology to reveal more about the Native groups that were also occupying the Fort. And Catherine Carlson’s research concerning “native identity and cultural maintenance” (2000:277) at a Fur Post in British Columbia also stresses the importance of looking to the archaeological record to say more about culture than simply identifying material. Importantly, Susan Kardas (1971) looked at archaeological material from several households in Kanaka Village at Fort Vancouver, exploring the possibilities of cultural choice and ethnic markers.

However, scholars such Singleton (2000), argued that there are inherent problems in doing ethnicity studies in archaeology. She explained, specifically in reference to African American archaeology, that too often, “The object comes to define the group rather than the group defining the significance of the artifact” (Singleton 2000:9). Yet she does explain that certain items become “intercultural artifacts” and can say a great deal about “identity formation” and “cultural interaction” (Singleton 2000:9).
Consumer Choice theory is the last theoretical framework which supports this research. According to Susan Spencer-Wood (1987), it utilizes economics, archaeology, anthropology, and consumer behavior theory (1987:10). Specifically, she explained that, “Consumer behavior theory is concerned with the complex interaction of economic, cultural, social, and psychological factors involved in the process of consumer decisions to acquire one particular item rather than another” (1987:10). This framework is used to say something about individuals or cultures based on their acquisition of material goods.

Within this study, motivations to purchase English/American or European ceramics might have been based on other factors besides availability, possibly influenced by ethnic ties or simply necessity. A wonderful example of research which utilized ethnicity and consumer choice theory in a Fur Trade context, was conducted by Heinz Pyszczyk (1989). He was looking specifically for “ethnic distinctions in consumption behavior” based on archaeological material from workers barracks at four forts in Canada (Pyszczyk 1989:224). His own research indicated that there was some level of culturally related behavior concerning resources and goods.

These theories were chosen based on what they could contribute to our understanding of the various cultures studied in this research project. Gender, Ethnicity, and Consumer Choice Theory are unique in what they suggest about culture, yet support this type of research, creating a firm theoretical foundation.

The methodology utilized for this research project was essentially guided by historical archaeology. As Charles Orser explained, “...historical archaeology is a multi
disciplinary field that shares a special relationship with the formal disciplines of anthropology and history, focuses its attention on the post-prehistoric past, and seeks to understand the global nature of modern life” (1995:14). Essentially, historical archaeology focuses on and makes use of material culture, written and oral information, setting it apart from prehistoric archaeology, which does not use a foundation of primary source information. Historical archaeology focuses on incorporating written, documentary evidence to support or deny archaeological findings, and allows researchers to substantiate the research questions at hand. The artifacts recovered in historical archaeology can tell us a great deal about culture. As Deetz explained, “...the combined use of archaeological and documentary materials should permit us to say something about the past that could not have been said using only one set of data” (1996:32). Essentially, recovered material culture sets the foundation for any discussion about the culture in question. In keeping with the methodology dictated by historical archaeology, this research brought together genealogical information, first hand accounts of the fur trade experience in the form of journals, account/debt and material availability information from Fort Vancouver, as well as the ceramics recovered from French Prairie. The methodology for this research consisted of three parts. The genealogical and historical research, the identification of the sample families and associated ceramic assemblages, and the ceramics analysis and conclusion.

The preliminary historical background research for this project brought together a diverse group of information from varied sources. Fur traders journals from
the early part of the Nineteenth Century provided distinctive historical information pertaining to the fur trade and the Native peoples of the Pacific Northwest.

Genealogies collected from the Catholic Churches in the Willamette Valley during the early Nineteenth century, as well as a family genealogy compiled by a member of the Bellique family and a local scholar's genealogical study of the early French Prairie settlers, contributed to the background histories of the early families. Specifically, this work is supported by the French Canadian Archaeological Research Project from 1989, which conducted extensive research concerning the early French Canadian families in the Willamette Valley.

Five families, as previously mentioned, were identified and researched for this project. Ceramic assemblages from the Luceir site (35MA69), Despard site (35MA71), Longtain site (35MA23), and Bellique site (35MA68), were gathered under the French Canadian Archaeological Project (1989), conducted by Dr. David Brauner and are currently stored at Oregon State University. The ceramic assemblage from the Newell site (ORMA-41), was gathered during fieldwork conducted in the Summers of 1999 and 2000, under the direction of Dr. David Brauner, Delight Stone and Robert Cromwell, and is housed at Oregon State University. These sites were specifically chosen based on several factors, one being that researchers were able to positively identify the homestead sites on French Prairie with the original families. The sites were then systematically surveyed and tested producing reliable, accurate data. Comparative information was gathered from research conducted by Judith Sanders Chapman (1993) and published in *French Prairie Ceramics: the Harriet D. Munnick*
Archaeological Collection Circa 1820-1840 A Catalogue and Northwest Comparative Guide. This guide contains information about ceramic assemblages from French Prairie, originally collected by Harriet D. Munnick. Reports concerning the ceramic assemblages from Fort Vancouver’s employee’s quarters were researched, but to have included this information in its entirety, would have been beyond the scope of this thesis. However, these reports were examined and used as supportive information for this project, specifically Kardas (1971). While similar research conducted by scholars such as Bedard (1990), Gullason (1990), Lightfoot (1995), and Burley (1989, 2000) gave justification to this type of research.

Ceramics were chosen as the sample material type for this project because of their wide variety and availability. Ceramics were the most widely represented artifacts on French Prairie, consistently found at every site, and because of their visual appeal, provided this research with a possible vehicle for studying ethnicity and consumer choice. Also important was the recorded availability of ceramics through places like Fort Vancouver, whose accounts and inventories help support the research.

The ceramic assemblages were examined and placed into an Excel spreadsheet where the data could be manipulated properly. The ceramics were entered initially by site, then by specific characteristics, including Type/Variety, Paste, Vessel Form, Color, Decoration, Pattern, and Date (See Tables 2,3,&4). A field for Munsell Color indicators was also included to describe the colors of the ceramics accurately and consistently.
Analysis consisted of comparing data from all five sites and focused specifically on the presence and absence of ceramics using frequency charts. These figures were also compared to figures presented by Chapman (1993). While included for consistency, Paste and Vessel Form tests were not run due to their relevant lack of contribution to the research questions at hand. The likelihood that someone purchased ceramics based on the paste of the ceramic is slim considering the focus of research has been on the visual quality of the ceramics. A vessel form test was not included due to the small size of the ceramic fragments, this being attributed to the plowzone nature of the sites.

A total of 795 ceramic fragments were entered into the Excel database. Not included were Plain White Earthenware fragments considering it would have been nearly impossible to differentiate between plain white fragments of a Transfer Printed plate and plain white fragments of a Hand Painted plate. Also excluded from the

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TYPE/VARIETY</th>
<th>PASTE</th>
<th>VESSEL FORM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Transfer Printed Utilitarian</td>
<td>White Earthenware</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hand Decorated Chinese Porcelain</td>
<td>Yellowware</td>
<td>Hollowware</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chinese Porcelain</td>
<td>Grey Porcelain</td>
<td>Flatware</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Redware</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Porcelain</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Stoneware</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Earthenware</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 3. Ceramic Color and Decoration from Sample Assemblages

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COLOR</th>
<th>DECORATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>Sepia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pink</td>
<td>Yellow/Brown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blue</td>
<td>Flow Blue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blue&amp;Grey</td>
<td>Purple</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brown</td>
<td>Dark Blue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grey</td>
<td>Multicolored</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Green</td>
<td>Red</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cottage ware</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Salt Glazed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Spatterware</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Stamped</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hand Painted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Spongeware</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Shell Edged</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Transfer Print</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mocha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yellowware</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Redware</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

database were burned ceramic fragments which would have been difficult to distinguish patterns and color.

As mentioned, four of the sites discussed were previously recorded as part of the French Canadian Archaeological Project, which attempted to assess and delineate the original farms on French Prairie with its earliest French Canadian inhabitants. This project was begun after archaeological excavations at the Willamette Mission (1983), left questions as to the other inhabitants on French Prairie during the early Nineteenth Century. Very little information was available on this French Canadian population. However, excavations concerning the Champoeg townsite were underway beginning in 1971, specifically focusing on the townsite, and revealing a diverse amount of cultural material.

The French Canadian Archaeological Project was designed as a, "...multi phased research project focusing on archaeological and archival data designed to
elucidate French Canadian settlement patterns, economic systems, sociopolitical systems, technological systems and the role they may have played in acculturating indigenous native populations and early settlers entering the Willamette Valley” (Brauner 1989:3). During 1985 and 1986, the project conducted extensive archival research as well as fieldwork including survey and excavations. The ceramic

Table 4. Ceramic Patterns from Sample Assemblages

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TRANSFER PRINTED</th>
<th>OTHER</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Abbey</td>
<td>Lily</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adelaide’s Bower</td>
<td>Lobelia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aesop’s Fables</td>
<td>Louis Quatorze</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alhambra</td>
<td>Marino</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Antique Vase</td>
<td>Macaw/Pagoda</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B700</td>
<td>Pattern 95-JC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B772</td>
<td>Persian Vase</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blue Rose</td>
<td>Portland Vase</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>British Flowers</td>
<td>Rhone Scenery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Broseley</td>
<td>Seasons</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Camilla</td>
<td>Star</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canova</td>
<td>Static</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canton No. 107</td>
<td>Swiss or Canton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chinese Export Boat</td>
<td>Union</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chinese Flowers</td>
<td>Venestus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Columbia</td>
<td>Venetian Scenery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Convolvus</td>
<td>Violet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crystal Palace</td>
<td>Watteau</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doria</td>
<td>Willow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excelsior</td>
<td>Willow Variant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Field Sports</td>
<td>Warwick</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>French (Radiating) Sprigs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harriet’s Llama</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harriet’s Rose</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harriet’s Scaley Back</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hudson</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
assemblages from the Lucier, Bellique, Longtian, and Despard sites were gathered during this field season. It should be noted that Harriet Munnick and others collected extensively on sites such as the Lucier, Bellique and Despard properties.

The search for the Robert Newell farm did not begin until 1999, however, as explained by Brauner, Cromwell and Stone (2000), the site was first observed in 1996 as a field scatter. The site itself is located within an area of Champoeg State Park that was under cultivation, yet sits on a higher terrace than the rest of the surrounding area. Remote sensing of the site area in 1998 and the use of a proton magnetometer in 1999 (Brauner, Cromwell and Stone 2000:25-26), pointed researchers to potential areas for excavation. A 1999 surface finds map (Figure 10), shows the general area of artifact concentration, which aided in the discovery of the farmstead itself. Artifact recovery was substantial considering the disturbed nature of the site, leading researchers to believe that they have in fact found the Newell Farmstead.

Importantly, the agricultural use of the French Prairie cultural area has definitely displaced artifacts and potentially disturbed any sub-surface features. Specifically, years of plowing have not only mixed deposits but potentially damaged cultural material, which has direct relevance to this research project. Out of all five sample sites, not a single complete vessel was recovered. While this could be attributed to the initial discard of the object, the fact that the sites were all located within potential agricultural areas suggests that they were subject to breakage. Despite these apparent problems, researchers of plowzone archaeology suggest that these types of sites are still valuable to the archaeologist.
In a report for the National Park Service, Talmage and Chesler (1977), suggested that sites which have been disturbed have been traditionally overlooked. Clayton Lebow’s 1982 Master’s Thesis from Oregon State University examined a large 257 acre land tract in Jackson County, Oregon which was surface collected and mapped, then plowed and collected and mapped again. He found that, “An archaeological site disturbed by plowing will still yield information” (Lebow 1982:106). Other plowzone related projects were conducted by Warren and Miskel (1981), in Putman Bottom in Missouri, Nance and Bell (1981) as part of the Cumberland Archaeological Project, Jermann (1981) on the Lower Columbia River in Washington, and Roper (1976) in Illinois. Other sites include the Hopper Site in Missouri (Chomko 1974), Onesquethaw Creek in New York (Fisher 1974), the Cayonu Site in Turkey (Redman and Watson 1970), Beckwith’s Fort Missouri (Healan 1972), and the Newtown Neck Site in Maryland (Robertson 1976), all suggesting that despite disturbance, areas that have been previously plowed can still contribute to our cultural understanding of a site.
Figure 10. Field Map of the Newell Homestead Site (ORMA-41) indicating Surface Finds and Test Unit Layout, August 1999. Adapted from Cromwell, Stone, and Brauner, 2000.
The material suppliers in the Pacific Northwest during the early Nineteenth Century, maintained and offered a variety of goods, including European, Chinese, and American products. The Astor Company and the Northwest Company kept Fort Astoria well stocked with European and American trade goods. Chapman (1993), noted that at the Fort, items existed such as, “...clothing, food times, blacksmith supplies, Tobacco and cigars, English muskets, pistols, balls and shot, building equipment, toiletry items, cloth, buttons, and sewing items, stationary equipment, drum and fifes, hats and shoes, garden seeds, spirits, blankets, and kitchen equipment” (1993:14). She also noted that a few ceramics were available, including Mocha ware (1993:14). Trade continued out of Fort Astoria, or Fort George, and out of the Northwest Company’s Willamette Post facility. After the Hudson’s Bay Company took over the Northwest Company, trading and purchasing was taken over by Fort Vancouver in 1824. A complete and descriptive discussion about the consumer goods and availability of items in the Pacific Northwest during the early Nineteenth century can be found in Chapman (1993).

AVAILABILITY

After 1824, Fort Vancouver was the primary supplier for the other fur trade posts in the region, and was a center for Native trade as well. Material would have
been shipped from Europe or China, through the Sandwich Islands, and then on to the
Pacific Northwest, and back again. All types of consumer goods were for sale or trade
through the shops at Fort Vancouver, in exchange for furs and other goods brought in
by the Natives and trading expeditions. With fur expeditions maintaining over 26 able
bodied trappers, including a number of women to process the hides, it was not
unheard of to take well over 100 animals in one month. Employees would come in
and trade furs for goods supplied at the Sales Shop or Indian Trade Store at Fort
Vancouver. The employees would trade for Tobacco, knives, ceramic, cloth, buttons,
trapping equipment and or anything else they might need (Hudson’s Bay Company
Account Books, 1828-1835, including Sundry Accounts, and Books of Debt). Lester
Ross (1976) indicated that, “Trade stores were established as fur exchange centers for
Natives who brought their furs to the fort. Trade goods (as opposed to Euroamerican
sale goods) were stocked in the stores, and during fur exchange, natives could select
the goods desired” (1976:31). This was a little different compared to the Sale Shop
which, “...stocked imported and locally produced manufacturers and provisions, and
up until 1860 it was one of the few all-purpose general stores in the region” (Ross
1976:32). Employees such as Lucier, Despard and Longtain, maintained debt at both
the Sale Shop and the Indian Trade Store according to Hudson’s Bay Company
records (Hudson’s Bay Company, Account Book, Book of Debts, 1831,1833). Hussey
(1972) explained that the Willamette farmers on French Prairie traded with wheat and
other crops (1972:192). He further explained that, “Transaction at the Sale Shop were
conducted almost entirely upon a credit and debt arrangement” (Hussey 1972:191).

According to Steele (1979),

...the sale shop functioned mainly for the convenience of the firm's own gentlemen and servants. The officers and clerks of the company frequently ordered clothing, books, special foodstuffs, and similar luxuries directly from England, but for the men in the lower ranks, the sale shop was the only available source for the shirts and trousers, tobacco, pipes, eating utensils, and other items they and their families needed to supplement the rations dispersed by the Hudson’s Bay Company (Steele 1979:215).

Ceramics available at Fort Vancouver came in a variety of styles and forms. Lester Ross wrote that, “Beginning in the early 1820's the HBC began procuring ceramic wares on a regular basis” (Ross 1976:235). The following list, recorded by Chapman (1993) indicates the available vessels at Fort Vancouver.

Table 5. Available Vessels at Fort Vancouver
(Adapted from Chapman 1993:15-16, originally taken from Ross 1979: 198-200)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Slop bowls, Egg cups, sauce bowls, Milk jugs, Vegetable bowls, Condiment dishes, Children’s mugs, Decorated mugs, Water jugs, Platters, platter strainers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Earthenware: butter bowls, sugar bowls, coffee cups, tea cups &amp; saucers, jugs, tea pots, pots &amp; covers, plates, soup tureens,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fancy Luster: mugs, jugs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toiletry related ceramics: Chamber pots, Wash basins, Water jugs</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ceramics came from a variety of suppliers. Ross (1976) noted that ceramic suppliers to Fort Vancouver began with Robert Elliot, then focused on wares brought in by Spode pottery (Ross 1976:235). In addition to their own potteries, these suppliers also
included wares by other potters (Ross 1976:237). Chapman contends that all items that the French Canadian’s could want besides ceramics, were available at Fort Vancouver, it had most everything that they needed (Chapman 1993:17). She explained that, 

Before transferred table wares reached peak popularity in the 1840's, a French Canadian table setting probably consisted of a colorful mix of blue shell-edge plates and flat dishes, earthy toned mocha and yellow ware mugs and bowls, and floral hand painted cups and saucers in color combinations of blue, brown, pink, green, yellow, and black. An occasional transfer ware or utilitarian cream ware vessel may be seen on the table or in the pantry, or, blue, purple and pink spattered tea wares in the cupboard (Chapman 1993:99).

However, she explained that, “Most American’s up until 1820 used pewter or tin plates, utensils and serving dishes (Chapman 1993:95).

The Methodist Missionaries who occupied the nearby Willamette Mission were close neighbors with the French Canadians on French Prairie and eventually developed a strong trading relationship with them. Chapman explained that initially, Fort Vancouver was the main supply source for the missionaries as well, (1993:19), but that eventually they imported their own goods. She suggested that, “It is doubtful the missionaries brought west ceramic wares before 1837” (Chapman 1993:20). However, after this, Missionaries had their own supplies shipped from the East, and made available at their mission store. Chapman noted that this did in fact include ceramics (1993:20). In speaking about the Hudson’s Bay Company and the Methodist Mission, Newell wrote that, “The farmers get all their supplies from the two places” (Spedula 1988:15, originally taken from Delamarter 1951:39).
Aside from the Methodist Mission store, Ewing Young had established a sawmill and store in the area. In 1839 and 1840, Young traded with Lucier specifically for ceramics, specifically cups and saucers, plates, wash basins, and one earthenware jug (Chapman 1993:21, Originally taken from Young 1920:270,237). Apparently there was a general lack of ceramic wares during the early 1840's (Hussey 1967:118; Chapman 1993:31), but this is based on comments from Americans in the Valley. The Americans coming from the East were more accustomed to elaborate table settings, as opposed to the French Canadian and Native families, who were making due with what was available in the area.

The 1840's brought with it many new American settlers into Oregon Territory, who had traveled on the Oregon Trail and were settling throughout the Valley. This influx of new arrivals impacted the young economy and promoted a mercantile boom. Chapman (1993) explained that, “The 1842-1843 season witnessed a shift from Fort Vancouver to Oregon City as the focal point of mercantile activity in the Oregon country” (1993:24). Specifically the Methodist Mission maintained a store in Oregon City as well as 2 stores run by American’s. A store started in 1843 by F.W. Pettygrove and Philip Foster in Oregon City and one in Champoeg in 1844, as well as a Hudson’s Bay Company trade shop attached to the Warehouse in Champoeg in 1843 (Chapman 1993:24) added to the expansion of consumerism in the Willamette Valley. We know that the Oregon City store did offer a selection of ceramics available through various shops. Pettygrove (1878) noted that the local farmers would trade produce for goods. The Champoeg store, maintained by the Hudson’s Bay Company, as explained by
Hussey (1967), was a “modest Trade Shop” and “was a convenience for the settlers who deposited their wheat there. A certain amount of trading for furs was also conducted there, both with whites and Indians” (1967:111). Brauner (2002), explained that the Champoeg Trade Shop offered ceramics, probably similar in nature to the Hudson’s Bay Company Sales Shop at Fort Vancouver. And that Pettygrove’s Champoeg Store, also had ceramics available. Importantly, after 1847, Chapman (1993) noted that, “...the merchants were catering to an indispensable new customer - the American woman homesteader” (1993:35). Thus, they maintain more luxury items as well as domestic items offering greater consumer choice opportunities.

CERAMIC DESCRIPTIONS AND ANALYSIS

As noted in Tables 2, 3, and 4, the ceramics available on French Prairie and in the Willamette Valley, came in a wide variety of styles. The ceramic assemblages that were collected from the five French Prairie homestead sites attest to this, suggesting that these families chose ceramics based on style and not just function. A total of 795 fragments were entered into the database, 73 fragments from the Lucier site, 148 fragments from the Bellique site, 198 fragments from the Despard site, 51 fragments from the Longtain site, and 325 fragments from the Newell site. Plain white earthenware and ironstone fragments were not entered, due to the inability to describe the initial patterns. The small size of the fragments made determining the patterns a challenge, but as explained in the previous chapter, that is due to the disturbed nature
of the site. While 795 fragments were analyzed, the minimum number of possible vessels represented in the assemblage is 140. Figure 11, shows the minimum vessel count in terms of percentages for each of the five sites. Transfer printed ceramics were the most widely represented ceramics, while Chinese Porcelain was under
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**Figure 11. Percentages based on the Minimum Vessel Count**

represented, coinciding with the availability of such ceramics through Fort Vancouver. The following section is broken up by ceramics type, with descriptions of the various ceramics and the representation among the five assemblages from French Prairie.
Transfer Printed

Transfer Printed ceramics are the most widely represented ceramic within all five assemblages. A total of 95 transfer printed vessels have been identified within the five assemblages within a variety of colors. We know that transfer printed wares were available through HBC as well as the Methodist mission and other independent stores and trade shops, making them readily available to the French Prairie residents.

Table 6. Ceramic Decoration represented at each site. (Representation among the Munnick Collection noted with “m”).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DECORATION</th>
<th>Lucier</th>
<th>Bellique</th>
<th>Despard</th>
<th>Longtain</th>
<th>Newell</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Floral Painted</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chinese Decor.</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>m</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transfer Printed</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salt Glazed Stone.</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shell Edged</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spongeware</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Redware</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yellowware</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mocha</td>
<td>m</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stamped</td>
<td>m</td>
<td>m</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spatterware</td>
<td>m</td>
<td>m</td>
<td>m</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The process of transfer printing has been written about extensively by scholars (Chapman 1993; Larsen 1939; Lehner 1980; Gaston 1983; Samford 1997; Sussman 1977 & 1979; P. Williams 1978-1998; S. Williams 1949). Beginning in the mid to late 1700's, transfer printing according to Samford (1997), "allowed standardization of decoration, permitting complex designs to be created quickly and in large quantities" (1997:2-3). There were two types of transfer printed wares, over and under glazed. Little (1969) explained that the overglazed method only lasted briefly, and was discontinued because without the glaze, the ceramic body and image was "less durable" (Little 1969:14-15). Thus, there was move to the more stable underglazed process. Among the five assemblages only the under glazed transfer printed ware is represented. This delicate process began with a copper plate that had been engraved, covered with an oil/color mixture, and then wiped down, "...leaving the colors only in the engraved areas..." (Samford 1997:3). Tissue paper was placed on top and then the entire piece was run through a press. The paper with the print was then cut to fit, and placed on a piece of ceramic. "The ceramic item was then fired at a low temperature to burn off the linseed oil and set the color agent" (Samford 1997:3), then the piece was glazed. Transfer Printed ceramics were popular throughout the early Nineteenth Century, but started to decline after this period. Images for the ceramics were based on a wide range of topics. Many manufacturers, maintained their own artists who ventured out and drew the images which would later be placed on the ceramic vessels. Early on, manufacturers used old prints previously published in books, however, this ended in 1842 with the passage of the Copyright Act (Samford 1997:10).
Transfer Printed patterns focused on central motifs or images that reflected certain scenes, views, or past times. For the purposes of this study, they provide a wonderful opportunity to focus on consumer choice preference, because they were so decorative. Samford (1997), noted in detail many of the central themes represented on the ceramics and distinguished between ten motifs: Chinese, British Views, American Views, Exotic Views, Classical, Romantic, Pastoral, Gothic Revival, Floral, and Japanese Aesthetic.

The Chinese motif appears to be one of the most popular themes. This motif, included the Willow pattern dating to 1780, as well as Broseley, which were identified at three of the five French Prairie sites. Samford indicated that, “The peak ranges of production of marked Chinese Designs fall between 1797 and 1814” (Samford 1997:8), making them some of the earliest patterns. British and American Views date to 1815-1840 and depict various British and American scenes. Exotic Views were “either based on published engraving of actual places” or “romantic interpretations of exotic places” (Samford 1997:12). Classical images were popular in the mid Nineteenth Century. Canova, which was found at the Bellique and Despard site, and noted by Chapman at the Lucier site in the Munnick collection, is a Classical Motif. The Romantic motif focused mainly on landscapes and nature scenes, while the Pastoral Motif was associated with “rural based scenes” (Samford 1997:14). Gothic Revival dates to 1820-1870’s and depicted “churches and other building ruins, structures with architectural details such as arches, turrets, towers, bastions and crenelated walls” (Samford 1997:16). Floral designs peaked around 1833-1849 and
showed various images focusing on Flowers. Japanese Aesthetic depicted images of, “fans, half circles filled with decorative patterns, ...blossoms, bamboo, birds and butterflies” (Samford 1997:19). While all the transfer printed ceramics were available in a variety of colors, Samford indicated that blue was without a doubt the most popular (Samford 1997:21). Little explained that, “blue printed ware has been produced in every conceivable shade, varying from a very light to a very dark, sometimes almost purple blue” (Little 1969:34). This corresponds to work done by Chapman (1993) who indicated that Blue was a characteristic of transfer printed ceramics from 1810 through 1850's. Ross (1977) acknowledged that shipments of Spodeware to the Northwest “consisted primarily of cobalt blue patterns” (1977:195).

All other colors were used throughout the early to mid Nineteenth century.

Besides the traditional transfer printed ceramic with the clean lines, Flow Blue was a popular Transfer Printed variety. Samford indicated that this was begun around the early 1830's and was achieved by adding a chemical into the kiln during firing which allowed the color to run and create a blurred look to the image (Samford 1997:24).

Many suppliers stocked the Pacific Northwest with transfer printed ceramics. Fort Vancouver carried a wide variety of transfer printed ceramics, specifically carrying Spode/Copeland pottery around 1836 (Sussman 1979:8). According to Sussman (1979), Josiah Spode of Staffordshire, had established his own pottery around 1776, after this his son, Josiah Spode II and his Grandson William Spode, entered into partnership with William Copeland and his son. Thus, the name of the
company changed numerous times over the course of the Nineteenth Century and included, Josiah Spode (1778-1805); William Spode & Co. (1805-1811); Spode & Copeland (1811-1823); Spode, Copeland & Son (1824-1826), and Spode & Copeland (1826-1833). Ross (1976) noted that after this, William Taylor Copeland joined forces with Thomas Garret, leaving the name of the company to change again to Copeland & Garrett, Late Spode & Copeland, and after 1847 to W.T. Copeland, Late Spode and W.T. Copeland & Sons (Ross 1976:260-261). Ross noted that over 60 distinguishable Spodeware patterns were shipped to Fort Vancouver between 1836-1853, in at least 10 different shades of blue as seen in Table 6. At least 25 of these patterns are represented among the five assemblages from French Prairie. Tables 7 through 11 indicate the specific Transfer Printed patterns and the number of vessels associated with each site. Vessels that were among the assemblages, but did not match with specific patterns

Table 7. Ceramic Shades of Blue, Adapted from Ross 1976

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ceramic Shade</th>
<th>Color Code</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Blueish Green</td>
<td>2.5BG3/4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greenish Blue</td>
<td>7.5BG3/4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Light Blue</td>
<td>7.5B4/8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greyish Blue</td>
<td>2.5PB2/4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flow Blue</td>
<td>2.5PBP2/4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saxon Blue</td>
<td>5PB3/10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Light Purpleish Blue</td>
<td>5PB3/8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purpleish Blue</td>
<td>5PB2/8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dark Purplish Blue</td>
<td>5PB1/8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flow Purplish Blue</td>
<td>7.5PB2/8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 8. Lucier Transfer Printed Ceramic Patterns with Minimum Number of Vessels

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TRANSFER PRINTS</th>
<th>MVC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adelaide's Bower</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blue Rose</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Broseley</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canton No. 107</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harriet's Llama</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harriet's Rose</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harriet's Scaley Back</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lily</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lobelia</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statice</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Union</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Watteau</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Willow</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unidentifiable</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>18</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 9. Bellique Transfer Printed Ceramic Patterns with Minimum Number of Vessels

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TRANSFER PRINTS</th>
<th>MVC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Antique Vase</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B700</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>British Flowers</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Broseley</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Camilla</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conova</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crystal Palace</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excelsior/violet</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lily</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Persian Vase</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warwick</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Watteau</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Willow</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unidentifiable</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>22</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
were listed as "Unidentifiable". An example is found among the Lucier ceramics where at least 4 vessels of various colors were noted among 31 assorted fragments. Colors found among the assemblages included Blue, Sepia, Pink, Black, Purple, and Green. The mean ceramics dates for all five sites, based on the mean date of manufacture, are between 1840 and 1850, and consistently fits with the occupation period of all five families on French Prairie. Note that the pattern Lily (Figure 4A, Appendix A) was found among the Lucier and Bellique assemblages in two colors, blue and sepia. Also, the pattern Field Sports, was found in the Newell assemblage in

Table 10. Despard Transfer Printed Ceramic Patterns with Minimum Number of Vessels

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TRANSFER PRINTS</th>
<th>MVC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Antique Vase</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blue Rose</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>British Flowers</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Broseley</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conova</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chinese Export Boat Pattern</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chinese Flowers</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>French (Radiating) Sprigs</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lily</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Macaw/Pagoda</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portland Vase</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Star</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swiss/Canton</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Venetian Scenery</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Venestus</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Violet</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Willow</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Willow Variant</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unidentifiable</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>24</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
three different colors, green, pink, and blue. Table 12. shows that most frequently represented patterns among all five sites, and can be viewed in Appendix A, Figures 1A through 6A, courtesy of Fort Vancouver. It should be noted that Antique Vase was present among Munnick’s ceramics from the Lucier site.

A total of 34 patterns were found to be unique to the five sites based on the initial French Prairie sites used for this study. However, once these patterns were compared to the Munnick Study based on Chapman’s 1993 work, only 14 patterns remained unique to these sites. However, the Bellique site, had no unique or distinguishing patterns. Table 13 shows the remaining patterns, unique to each site, while table 14, shows the mean ceramic dates, color, and manufacturer for each of these patterns.

Hand Decorated

Hand Decorated ceramics includes a variety of decoration, that was specifically applied by hand on to a refined white, buff or yellow earthenware. These include, Cottage Ware, which included a floral and lined design, Banded Yellowware, several varieties of Shell Edged decoration, Banded Mocha and the Mocha Tree pattern, Spongeware, Spatterware, and Stamped ware. All of the mentioned decorations have been found on French Prairie specifically at the five sample sites and have been shown to be available within the Willamette Valley. All five sites produced the Floral and Lined painted ceramics, as seen in Figure 7A in Appendix A. Cottage
Ware as described by Ross (1976) was, “Polychrome floral decorations consisting of flowers, leaves, and vines,” and Banded as “solid, multicolored bands circumscribing the ware, and usually applied over the slip” (Ross 1976:251). While found on tea services and flatware, this type of decoration is also noted on Chamber Pots (Ross 1976:188).

Table 11. Longtaitn Transfer Printed Ceramic Patterns with Minimum Number of Vessels

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TRANSFER PRINTS</th>
<th>MVC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aesop’s Fables</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B700</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B772</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>British Flowers</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Camilla</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Columbia</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Convolvus</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unidentifiable</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>9</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Explained to be, “cheaper than transfer ware” (Chapman 1993:74) Cottage ware was present at every site.

Another Hand Painted ceramic recovered at all five sites included the Shell Edged decoration. Chapman noted its popularity between 1780 and the 1850’s (1993:71). Frequently, the Shell Edged patterns contained a molded relief, with the edges being Scalloped or Unscalloped and painted in Blue or Green. However, sometimes the edges were unmolded with only the coloring in a band, in blue, brown, green and red (Sussman 1977:108). Sussman wrote that, “the molded
relief on early shell edge dinnerware is most frequently an intricate ruffle that is presumably intended to represent naturalistic shell rims. Another frequently occurring early version of the shell edge pattern consists of a series of closely spaced impressed vertical lines” (Sussman 1977:106-107). She also noted a Chicken Foot pattern as well as other variations. The rest of the vessel was plain, with the only coloring on the edges. Chapman noted that after 1815 “vast quantities were shipped to America from England”, with makers including “G. Phillips, Davenport, Clews, T. Mayer, Herculaneum, Adams and Enoch Wood” (1993:71).

Table 12. Newell Transfer Printed Ceramic Patterns with Minimum Number of Vessels

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TRANSFER PRINTS</th>
<th>MVC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Abbey</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alhambra</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Antique Vase</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B772</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>British Flowers</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doria</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Field Sports</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hudson</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lily</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louis Quatorze</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marino</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pattern 65-JC</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhone Scenery</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seasons</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Violet</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Watteau</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unidentifiable</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>22</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Yellowware was associated with all five of the sample sites, and was located on the Lucier, Bellique and Despard sites as found in the Munnick collection recorded by Chapman (1993). Lehner (1980) explained that Yellowware, "...was the cheapest, plainest form of common pottery. Made of yellow clay, it was mostly undecorated, but it sometimes had simple bands of pale blue or smoke colored scrolls with a colorless glaze over a buff body" (Lehner 1980). Beginning in the Eighteenth century in England, production was also established in America during the Nineteenth century (Chapman 1993:83-84). Vessels included all types of mixing bowl and baking vessels, pots, cups, dishes, crocks, and other containers (Chapman 1993:84). Primarily the Yellowware fragments associated with all five sites consisted of a banded design which was frequently used on Yellowware. The banding was typically in light blue with white. Chapman did note that Fort Vancouver had Yellowware available from English makers, but that some could have been American in origin (Chapman 1993:85).

Table 13. Most Frequently Represented Transfer Printed Patterns
(The "m" indicates presence within the Munnick Collection)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pattern</th>
<th>Lucier</th>
<th>Bellique</th>
<th>Despard</th>
<th>Longtair</th>
<th>Newell</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Antique Vase</td>
<td>m</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>British Flowers</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Broseley</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lily</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Watteau</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Willow</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Violet/Excelsior</td>
<td>m</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 14. Patterns Unique to Each Site Based on Initial Sample and Munnick Collection

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Patterns</th>
<th>Lucier</th>
<th>Bellique</th>
<th>Despard</th>
<th>Longtain</th>
<th>Newell</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Canton #107</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harriet's Llama</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;&quot; Sealey Background</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;&quot; Rose</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Union</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Convolvus</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Star</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abbey</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alhambra</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doria</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hudson</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louis Quarterze</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pattern 95JC</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhone Scenery</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mocha ware was represented in the Bellique, Despard, Longtain, and Newell site assemblages from the French Canadian Project, but Harriet Munnick did collect some samples from the Lucier site as recorded in Chapman (1993). Hughes (1968) explained that Mocha ware was an, “...inexpensive decoration on earthenware [and] was originated early in the 19th century by William Adams of Cobridge, and named because of its resemblance to the quartz known as mocha-stone” (Hughes 1980:112). However, Turnbull (1974) explained that, “production of Mochaware began in the last quarter of the 18th century and continued for well over a hundred years” (1974:42), and was available in America after 1815 (Chapman 1993:76). Of the various decoration found on Mochaware, the examples found on French Prairie have been
Table 15. Unique Patterns, Their Colors, Mean Date, and Manufacturer

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Patterns</th>
<th>Color</th>
<th>Mean Date</th>
<th>Manufacturer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Canton #107</td>
<td>Pink</td>
<td>1832</td>
<td>Enoch Wood &amp; Sons</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harriet's Rose</td>
<td>Blue</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;&quot; Scaley Background</td>
<td>Blue</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;&quot; Llama</td>
<td>Blue</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Union</td>
<td>Blue</td>
<td>1834</td>
<td>Copeland&amp;Garrett</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Convoluvus</td>
<td>Blue</td>
<td>1849</td>
<td>W.T. Copeland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Season's Star</td>
<td>Blue</td>
<td>1837</td>
<td>W.T. Copeland; Copeland &amp; Garrett</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abbey</td>
<td>Blue</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>J. &amp; T. Edwards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alhambra</td>
<td>Blue</td>
<td>1865</td>
<td>W.T. Copeland; W.T.Copeland&amp;Sons</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doria</td>
<td>Blue</td>
<td>1848</td>
<td>J. Ridgeway &amp; Co.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hudson</td>
<td>Pink</td>
<td>1840</td>
<td>Thomas Edwards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louis Quarterze</td>
<td>Blue</td>
<td>1844</td>
<td>Copeland&amp;Garrett; W.T. Copeland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pattern 95</td>
<td>Blue</td>
<td>1842</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhone Scenery</td>
<td>Blue</td>
<td>1849</td>
<td>T.J. &amp; J. Mayer</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Banded and/or has the typical Mocha Tree pattern (Figure 8A, Appendix A), which was achieved by dropping either urine or liqueur on the glaze, however, other variations were produced. Turnbell (1974) explained that, “Dinner or tea services were apparently not made in Mocha ware, but single pieces such as tea and coffee pots, sugar bowls, honey and butter pots, condiment pots for salt, pepper, and mustard.....[also] miniature tea and washstand sets, and fine pot pouri bowls were also produced......toilet articles too were commonly made in Mochaware” (Turnbell 1974:43).
Spatterware was recorded in the Longtain collection, while Chapman noted Spatterware among the Lucier, Bellique, and Despard ceramics recovered by Munnick. Robacker (1978) estimated that this type of ware “became important in the years between 1820 and the 1850’s” (Robacker 1978:32). This type of ceramic was extremely decorative. Color was applied using “...feathers, fur, deer’s tail, soft rags, fingers, putty, brushes and whisks...” (Robacker 1978:35) creating a unique blended design. Chapman noted that other methods were also used, including “...dry color on damp surfaces” (Chapman 1993:78). Eight colors were known to have been used including red, yellow, blue, black, pink, purple, brown, and green (Robacher 1978:35). Sometimes painted design was also incorporated on the rest of the vessels, however, the fragments recovered from the Longtain site are too small to indicate another pattern.

Robacker noted that Spongeware was a variation on Spatterware (1978:35). This type of ceramic was recorded among the Lucier and Despard assemblages, while Chapman noted it only among the Lucier assemblage recovered by Munnick.

Chapman noted that this type of ware was “characteristically a heavy utilitarian ware” and that “it was most commonly used in the preparation rather than serving food” (Chapman 1993:79), yet she noted exceptions to this. Spongeware dates to the mid 1800's and was found on a variety of vessels. She notes that samples from French Prairie could indicate either English or American manufacturer (Chapman 1993:79). Some of the sponge designs took the shape of flowers, but included other shapes as well.
Stamped ware is the last Hand Decorated vessel type discussed regarding these five assemblages. It dates to the mid 1800's and is recorded only at the Despard site within my sample of sites, however, Chapman recorded it among the Lucier and Bellique sites as well, within the Munnick collection. Robacker indicated that, “Stamped designs were probably applied to the ware with an instrument such as a root cut from a sponge and shaped into a star, heart, animal, [or] leaf (1978:74), while the example from the Despard site is the Overglazed Dotted design. Chapman noted that on French Prairie, vessels with this design included, “plates, small plates, cups and saucers, bowls, flat dishes, and hollowware serving pieces” (Chapman 1993:80).

Utilitarian

Stoneware fragments were present in the Lucier, Despard and Newell assemblages, with Chapman also noting the presence of Stoneware among the Lucier and Despard collections in the Munnick collection. Specifically, stoneware vessels, beginning in the 1600's, were utilitarian in nature because of their durability and primarily used as storage containers. Stoneware is made adding feldspar and quartz to, “fine, dense clays which ranged in color from near white to red-brown and gray which usually became quite vitrified when fired” (Chapman1993:87). All of the sample fragments from the five sites were salt-glazed, thick, and primarily gray in color. Hughes (1968) explained that, “Stoneware until about 1840 was usually glazed by introducing salt into the kiln. This resulted in a durable, inexpensive, non-poisonous
glaze which gave the surface an attractive sheen” (1968:142). It was also “leak proof and acid resistant, thus it was the preferred ceramic medium for storing, salting, and pickling foods” (Chapman 1993:88) and is commonly associated with beer and liqueur.

It is noted that these types of vessels came from both Europe and the East coast of America. Accounting for some of the samples on French Prairie, Chapman noted that, “The Hudson’s Bay Company was probably a source for French Prairie English beer and ale bottles” (1993:88). Only one fragment, recovered from the Newell site has a linear design, but because of the small size of the fragment, any pattern was undistinguishable.

Redware is typically another Utilitarian type ceramics. It was found in four of the five assemblages, with the exception of the Longtain assemblage. Chapman noted that, “Redware was popular up to about 1850 when it was increasingly supplanted by stone ware and later the introduction of glass and tin storage containers” (Chapman 1993:86). The paste which was very porous, was found in colors “pinkish- buff through red-browns to a true brown” (Chapman 1993:86). Typically the vessels were undecorated, but did have glazes in various colors. The fragments from the Lucier, Despard and Bellique sites, were without decoration, and primarily had clear or brown colored glaze. The fragments from the Newell site, probably a storage container, all had a Metallic glaze on the interior of the vessel. Chapman explained that this was done to “render the vessel body impervious to liquids” and that this type of vessel probably held “milk or apple butter” (Chapman 1993:87).
Chinese Porcelain

Only a few fragments from the five French Prairie assemblages are Chinese Porcelain. Ross (1976) indicated that Chinese Porcelain was available at Fort Vancouver, specifically being brought through the Sandwich Islands, where the ceramics found their way from China. Several patterns of Chinese Porcelain were recovered during Fort Vancouver excavations, unfortunately, the small size of the fragments from the five French Prairie sample sites, makes it virtually impossible to determine the patterns. Ross explained that Chinese Porcelain was made “from various grades of Kaolin clay which were shaped and painted by hand. After decoration, the wares were glazed, fired and packed with straw for shipment. Boston merchants acquired these wares in canton, and presumably sold them to the HBC in the Sandwich Islands” (Ross 1976:240-241). Chapman indicated that “Peak years of export to America in general were 1785 to 1835- at least 20 years later in Oregon” (Chapman 1993:90) and that Chinese Porcelain was also available through the Methodist Mission stores as well as the independent American stores (1993:91).

Fragments of this type of ceramic, were found at the Luicer, Despard, Longtain and Newell sites, however, Chapman noted that Munnick had samples from the Bellique site as well. The fragments found in the four assemblages were of a light grey paste, which is consistent with the various colors of paste available. Typically any design was done in a blue paint on a white or grey paste (Chapman 1993:91). More than likely, these ceramics represent the noted “Canton-type ginger jars” and/or other
vessels as mentioned in Chapman, which were recovered by Munnick at the Lucier, Bellique and Despard sites. These were basically used as storage containers.

Interestingly, in a communication with Helen Austin, Judy Chapman noted that several Chinese lived on the Bellique site temporarily (Chapman 1993:94). While this could explain the presence of the Chinese Porcelain, it leaves more questions than answers.

The minimum number of vessels or minimum vessel count (MVC), for each type of decorated ceramic for each of the five sites on French Prairie can be seen in Table 15. Transfer Printed vessels were the most widely represented, with 95 total vessels. The next most represented ceramic decoration was Mocha followed by Floral Painted or Cottage Ware. Chinese Porcelain and Yellowware ceramics were found at all five sites as was Shell edged with at least 2 vessels at the Despard site. Table 16 indicates Mean Ceramic Dates for the ceramic assemblages for all five sites and actually corresponds to settlement by these families on French Prairie. It should be noted that the Mean Ceramic Date for the Newell site, 1851, could be attributed to the Donald Manson family as was previously noted by Cromwell, Stone, and Brauner (2000), suggesting that these ceramics might not simply be a representative sample of the Newell family but the Manson family as well.

There is a noted absence of certain hand decorated ceramics at the Newell site. And an absence of Utilitarian ceramics at the Longtain site. Also, Salt Glazed Stoneware and Spongeware were both absence from the Bellique site. The representation of Hand Decorated ceramics on the five sites is relatively consistent
Table 16. Ceramic Decoration represented at each site.  
(Representation among the Munnick Collection noted with “m”).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DECORATION</th>
<th>Lucier</th>
<th>Bellique</th>
<th>Despard</th>
<th>Longtain</th>
<th>Newell</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Floral Painted</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chinese Decor.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>m</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transfer Printed</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salt Glazed Stone.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shell Edged</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spongeware</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Redware</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yellowware</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mocha</td>
<td>m</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stamped</td>
<td>m</td>
<td>m</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spatterware</td>
<td>m</td>
<td>m</td>
<td>m</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

with Chapman’s (1993) estimates that, early Hand Decorated Ceramics, as well as Spode/Copeland material would be found at French Canadian associated sites (1993: 111-112). The Longtair site was the smallest sample and may have effected the study and outcomes. The Newell site, which had a total of 32 vessels, was composed primarily of Transfer Printed ceramics with only a few hand painted vessels, pointing to a more refined table setting consistent with an American entrepreneur.

The Transfer Printed ceramics, have the most potential of telling us anything about these families and consumer choice. Yet the largest discrepancy is color. Blue
Table 17. Mean Ceramic Dates for Sites based on Mean Date of Manufacture

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SITE</th>
<th>MCD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lucier</td>
<td>1841</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bellique</td>
<td>1849</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Despard</td>
<td>1844</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Longtain</td>
<td>1846</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newell</td>
<td>1851</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

was the most widely represented color, however, as explained earlier it was also the most readily available color. Of the most frequently represented patterns, as seen in Table 12, the Longtain assemblage only had one of these patterns, notably British Flowers. Lily, which was found at all sites except the Longtain homestead, was found in multiple colors at the Lucier and Bellique sites in Blue and Sepia. The pattern Violet or Excelsior was found at four of the five sites, again the exception being the Longtain site. Interestingly, Spedula (1988) noted in her study, that Violet/Excelsior had never been found at an American site on French Prairie; This can now be dispelled considering it was present at the Newell site. The pattern Season’s Star or Star was found only at the Despard site and is a relatively early pattern. The Canton #7 and Union patterns, recovered from the Lucier site are both early and are consistent with the Lucier occupation. The Newell site ceramics prove to be the most interesting. They are consistently later period ceramics 7 of which are found exclusively at that site. All seven were found in Blue except Hudson which was found in Pink. The most
significant Transfer Printed pattern at the Newell site, was Field Sports which was found in three colors and whose center motif depicted hunting scenes.
The objective of this research project was to attempt to identify the ethnicity or Native affiliations of the women on French Prairie through an analysis of archaeological material, specifically ceramics. Here again are the research questions which guided this study:

1) Are we able to identify ethnic markers in the archaeological record which reflect the native background of these women?

2) Are ceramics the best tools with which to examine ethnicity?

3) Can we see that ethnicity affected consumer choice behavior among Native and Metis women on the Prairie?

In seeking to identify ethnic markers among the archaeological record, which reflected or identified the Native background of the women on French Prairie, this researcher could establish no conclusive results. Considering the ceramic assemblages analyzed, few conclusions can be drawn. Because transfer printed patterns were well represented among the assemblages, they remained the best possible indicators of ethnic markers or preference within this study. Among the French Canadian/Native households only seven patterns can be distinguished as unique to those households. However, the Bellique assemblage revealed no unique patterns whatsoever, but did contain all seven of the most frequently represented patterns, as noted in Table 12, which was similar to the Despard and Lucier assemblages which each contained six of the seven most frequently represented patterns. The Despard and the Longtain
assemblages contained only one unique pattern for each site, not enough to suggest any ethnic markers. Even the Newell site contained five of the seven frequently represented patterns which were either floral or Chinese themes. While the Longtain site contained only one of these patterns, it should be noted that the actual size of the Longtain assemblage was small compared to the rest of the assemblages containing only 17 total vessels 9 of which were transfer printed. This small sample size made it difficult to draw conclusions based on ceramic presence and absence.

The Newell ceramic assemblage did contain 5 of the 7 most frequently represented Transfer Printed patterns, however, it lacked both of the Chinese motif patterns, Broseley and Willow. Seven transfer printed patterns were also noted as unique to the Newell site, all seven having late mean dates of manufacturer than those found at the Lucier, Bellique and Despard sites, with the exception being the Longtain site, where Convoluvus had a registry date of 1849 according to Sussman (1979).

Chapman (1993) suggested that future American sites on French Prairie might have "American or local crockery, non-Spodeware transfer patterns, utilitarian white wear and yellow wares, American spongeware, Rockingham and Parian ware, outdated English decorated tea and table wares, and possibly overseas Chinese Porcelain" (1993:111-112). According to the Newell assemblages, at least one Yellowware as well as one Chinese Porcelain vessel were represented within the collection, while the transfer printed ceramics were primarily manufactured by Copeland & Garrett and/or W.T. Copeland, J. & T. Edwards, J. Ridgeway & Co., T.J. & J. Mayer, Thomas Edwards, G. Phillips, and John Thomson; The majority being manufactured by
Copeland & Garrett. Because of the late mean ceramic date for the majority of these ceramics, it does coincide with the Newell/Kitty occupation of the site; However, as Cromwell, Stone and Brauner (2000) pointed out, these ceramics may also be attributed to the Donald Manson homestead. Another interesting fact revealed by the data, is that the pattern Field Sports was represented in multiple colors among the Newell assemblage. Field Sports specifically depicts hunting scenes, with some hunters on horseback. Two points came be inferred from this information: 1- Newell was a retired trapper, accustomed to hunting on brigades, and 2- Kitty was Nez Perce, a people whose everyday life revolved around a horse culture. However, based on the registration date of the Field Sports pattern, 1846, we can eliminate the second factor because Kitty died on French Prairie in 1845, having had little influence on consumer choice. It is more likely that the hunting scenes depicted in Field Sports spoke to Robert Newell’s days abroad, or quite possibly Donald Manson’s past.

Ceramic color specifically among transfer printed ceramics, had the potential to indicate ethnic markers. By examining the issue of color, we begin to see that the majority of transfer printed ceramics were observed in various shades of blue. Over half of the transfer printed ceramics at each site were found in Blue, while the Longtain site had 8 of it’s 9 patterns noted as Blue. Unfortunately, the most widely available color during the early Nineteenth Century, as well as in the Pacific Northwest, was Blue, as researchers indicated (Ross 1977; Chapman 1993). The distinct presence of blue pattern ceramics at French Canadian/ Native households, does coincide with the bead color preference of the Natives as early travelers such as
Lewis and Clark noted (Rhonda 1984:201), and as Ross (1976) pointed out among the bead collections recovered from Fort Vancouver (1976:674). While it is a possibility that the Native women within these households chose ceramics based on the colors, such as blue, it is even more likely that Blue, being the most widely available, was the color chosen simply based on that factor. To add to this dilemma it is a possibility that Native women were not the ones doing the trading or purchasing of ceramics.

Based on the above information the only conclusions that can be drawn reflect the American origins of Robert Newell and his American wife Rebecca Newman, or simply, his late arrival on French Prairie. However, it should be noted that the ceramics might also reflect Donald Manson, a Scotsman and his Metis wife Felicite Lucier. On the other hand the French Canadian/Native households of Lucier, Bellique, & Despard, all maintained a variety of floral and Chinese motif ceramics. Despard’s wife, Lisette Tchinook (Tchinouke), was said to be of the Chinook nation; Bellique’s wife, Genevieve St. Martin was Metis, but whose mother was Chinook. Lucier’s second wife Margueritte Tchinook was also from the Chinook nation. It is possible that any similarities among these assemblages might be attributed to these women being of the same Native affiliation. Only two inference can be made based on the ceramics and possible Native affiliations. Among the Lucier, Bellique and Despard assemblages, all contained transfer printed ceramics with Chinese Motifs, specifically the Broseley, and Willow patterns, while the Longtain and Newell assemblages were without these patterns. Also the Lucier and Bellique sites both contain the transfer printed pattern Lily in two colors, blue and sepia. More specifically, the patterns found
at the Lucier, Bellique, and Despard sites are relatively early corresponding to their settlements on French Prairie. However, it is this researcher's opinion that this information is not strong enough to conclude ethnic markers for wives within these families, or even for the men within these families. Several factors force this conclusion:

1- The sample size was too small.

2- Women might not have purchased or traded for these items, suggesting that this information may reflect the ethnic affiliations of the men within these families instead of the women, or a multi-ethnic household.

3- The Native affiliations of the women might be incorrect, due to the issue of slavery among the Native peoples.

The ceramic assemblages attributed to these families was minimal, case in point being the Longtain assemblage with a minimum vessel count of 17.

Hypothetically, if all of the vessels were of the same type of ceramic, one could make some very obvious conclusions perhaps, but because the assemblage was so varied, it is impossible to draw conclusions of ethnic markers. What can be said about all of these assemblages is that there was an obvious preferences for transfer printed ceramics, even among the Newell assemblage. This factor alone, as discussed in the previous chapter, could be based on availability issues, as well as economics.

On the issue of women purchasing these goods, the evidence is inconclusive. An examination of the Fort Vancouver Sales Shop and Trade Store account books, revealed activity on the Lucier and Despard accounts, but was unclear as to who was
actually purchasing or trading for items at the shops. No documentation suggested that Lucier himself came in to make a purchase, or his wife for that matter. It is a possibility that these wives could have been present when items were purchased or traded. A painting by Frederick Remington, depicts the interior of the trade shop at Fort Edmonton, 1866. The store is well stocked with a variety of goods. The shop is filled with traders and officers, as well as some Natives. In the rear of the shop speaking with the clerk, a trader is standing at the counter. To his right is a Native woman, and at his feet, sitting on the floor, is a Native woman holding a child. This image alone does suggest that these women might have been present in the sales shops purchasing goods or influencing their husbands choices. However, Chapman (1993), declared that, “Ceramic dishes were obtained by the men of the house during the process of trade at fur posts and later, mercantile store” (1993:101). This was also purported by Pyszczyk (1989) whose own study focused on identifying possible ethnic markers among fur trade employees. He assumed that men were doing all of the purchasing; However, he did find differences of material use based on cultural affiliations. Yet these statements are unsupported, and leave room for speculation that in fact the women might have at least been present during trade situations. Another factor supporting the likelihood that women were present during these times, is based on the fact that women tended to venture on the fur brigades with their husbands. These brigades frequently stopped at fur posts, and it is very likely that members of these families traded for certain materials, including the women. Regardless, the possibility that Native women purchased or traded for these ceramics should not be
dismissed. To simply associate the ceramic assemblages with the men within these families does an injustice to the role that other individuals played within the families, specifically women.

The fact that we might not know the exact ethnic affiliation of the wives on French Prairie complicates things even further. The factor of slavery is pertinent to this issue. Because all of the Native cultures as mentioned in Chapter 2, practiced slavery, this suggests that there is the possibility that the women who married at least the French Canadian men, were of a different ethnic background. Concerning Newell and his wife Kitty, we know from historians like Josephy that Kitty was the daughter of a Nez Perce buffalo hunting chief, and therefore we could speculate that she was at least Nez Perce, and retained the cultural characteristics of her people. The Okanagon, incorporated many of their women obtained through trade or war, into their tribes or groups, so it is possible that Nancy Okanagan could have been obtained from another Native group. Genevieve St. Martin, who was Metis, and whose mother was Chinook, probably obtained characteristics from her Native mother and her French Canadian father, and therefore would be an exception. She herself might have exhibited qualities of a French Canadian or multi-ethnic culture. However, Josephette Nouite and Lisette Chinook, as well as Lucier’s second wife, could very well been of other ancestry. These factors suggest that establishing ethnic markers for the women within these families might be next to impossible.

Based on these factors no ethnic markers were established within the ceramic assemblages which represented the women within the French Prairie families. The few
similarities within the assemblages appears to reflect the period of settlement and the availability of material in the region. It could be inferred however, that these assemblages reflect the families as whole cultural entities and not simply one individual within the family. These French Canadian and American men together with the Native and Metis women created unique cultural families, products of the fur trade era. Lightfoot (1995) indicated that "culture contact studies", need to be examined as a "multi-ethnic experience" dealing with many groups (1995:209). Fur trade families were unique in that they were made up of various ethnicities. While we cannot find specific ethnic markers for the wives within these families, the assemblages do represent the families as whole cultural units and not only reflect the period of settlement on French Prairie, but a possible preference towards transfer printed material, specifically patterns with Floral and/or Chinese motifs.

It was hoped that by using the ceramics from the French Prairie homesteads we might be able to address ethnicity and consumer choice issues. However, this study confirms that using only ceramics for such a study is problematic. The ceramics themselves were consistent with the occupation of the families on French Prairie and in the case of the Newell assemblage possibly pointed to his fur trading past with the presence of Field Sports in various colors. The presence of certain ceramics also fits with the availability of material in the region, but in no way indicates possible ethnic markers, whether it be native affiliations of the women, or the French Canadian or American ethnicity of the men. Lynda Gullason’s (1990) study suggested that an examination of European goods alone might not reflect the Native affiliations of these
women. She found that by looking at whole collections she was able to see other obvious markers of Native cultural maintenance associated with the women married to traders, but not by specific tribe or group. She noted that certain tools for sewing replaced some traditional materials but not all, as did some decorative items. This was also the case with the study of Fort D'Epinette artifacts by Elisabet Bedard (1990). She found that because of certain tasks attributed to the Native women, such as sewing, it was easier to identify their presence at the fort site, yet she does not rule out the possibility of identifying tribal or ethnic affiliations. Concerning French Prairie, we know from the ethnohistorical information that these women were present at the households; It is this type of information that supported and truly explores the ceramic assemblages. A study which looked at the collections in their entirety, not one type of artifact, and explored the issue of ethnicity might be able to explain more about the relationships and ethnic backgrounds of the people within these families.

CONCLUSIONS

Based on the analysis of the archaeological material as well as the examination of the documentation and ethnohistorical information, it is apparent that using the ceramics alone, identifying ethnic markers for the Native women on French Prairie was unsuccessful. Also important is the consumer choice behavior conclusions that can be drawn from this study, which were inconclusive. Yet the possibility does exist that women might have at least been present during the purchasing or trading of goods.
It is this researchers opinion that further study using the entire archaeological collections from these sites, may yield potential information concerning ethnicity and consumer choice behavior.

However, this study did contribute to our knowledge of these fur trade era wives on French Prairie and the possible roles that they may have played within their families. The possibility that these women acted in a consumer choice capacity is still there, and has not been dismissed. We now know that European ceramics may not have been the best conduit with which to identify the ethnicity of these Native women. More importantly this research suggests that any future study concerned with ethnicity or tribal affiliation, should consider that attempting to establish ethnicity for Native groups during the fur trade era, can be difficult due to the multi-cultural atmosphere of the period. This researcher recommends that any future study should examine the families as a whole cultural unit, instead of as separate members. This would enable the researcher to form stronger conclusions as to the roles and relationships individuals had with one another and their material culture. Our ability to learn more about these past individuals and families contributes to our understanding of French Prairie and the general atmosphere and cultural climate of the Pacific Northwest during the fur trade period.
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Appendix A

CERAMIC PATTERNS

Figure 1A. Antique Vase, Courtesy of Fort Vancouver National Historic Park.
Figure 2A. British Flowers, Courtesy of Fort Vancouver National Historic Park.
Figure 3A. Broseley, Courtesy of Fort Vancouver National Historic Park.
Figure 4A. Lily, Courtesy of Fort Vancouver National Historic Park.
Figure 5A. Watteau, Courtesy of Fort Vancouver National Historic Park.
Figure 6A. Floral Painted, Courtesy of Fort Vancouver National Historic Park.
Figure 7A. Mocha Tree, Courtesy of Fort Vancouver National Historic Park.
APPENDIX B

GENEALOGY FOR FRENCH PRAIRIE

All information within the following pages has been put together from various published and unpublished sources, for the purposes of research. Names and spellings for all Native groups have been unchanged. Settlement dates were taken from an unpublished report on the French Canadian Archaeological Project headed by Dr. David Brauner. Published Catholic Church records were used to locate and determine specifics within the genealogies. Only French Canadians and their families which have been associated with positive archaeological sites have been researched for this project. Within these families, only those of the first and second generation who lived on the French Prairie have been included.

Abbreviations Index:

- C = Child
- M = Marriage
- D = Death
- B = Birth
- FP = French Prairie

Arcouet, Amable – 1802-1880 — French Canadian— settled FP 1837
m. Marguerite, Jan. 21, 1839 – d. 1870 – Chinook
  c. Amable the Second– b.1831
    m. Marie Ann Norwest, 1848
    c. Leon – b.1842
    c. Michael – 1834-1915
    c. Marguerite – b.1846
      m. Isadore St. Martin
    c. Lissette – b. 1836
    c. Jean – b.1839
      m. Christina Sanders, 1862
    c. Isaac – b.1843
Arcouet, Amable – b.1831 – Metis – settled FP 1837
  m. Marie Ann Norwest, 1848 – Metis
    c. Pierrette – b.1853
    c. Francois Napoleon – b.1855
    c. Amable – 1857-1860
    c. John – b.1859
    c. Hyacinthe – b.1862

Aubichon, Alexis – 1787-1867 – French Canadian – settled FP 1840
  m. Marie Ann Chinook (Elmermach), July 8,1839 – 1820-1880 – Chinook
    c. Catherine – 1837-1902
      m. Michael Pellicier, 1854
    c. Elizabeth (Isabel) – 1843-1933
      m. Joseph Bertrand, 1862
    c. Emelie – 1830-1922
      m. Amable Petit the Second, 1845
    c. Julie – 1833-1902
      m. Antione Lucier
      m. Joseph Roberts
      m. Price ?
    c. Sophie – 1826-1905
      m. Joseph Laferte, 1845
    c. Philomene – b.1840
      m. F. Xaxavier Roi, 1855

Aubichon, Jean Baptiste – 1790-1879 – French Canadian – Settled FP 1839
  m. Marie Tsaliie, May 1839 – d.1847 – Chinook (Tsaliie?)
  m. Isabelle, 1847 – d.1854
    c. Jean Baptiste – b.1849
    c. Marie – b.1850
    c. Antoine – 1852-1854
Aussant, Louise – 1800-1856 - French Canadian – Settled FP 1840
  m. Catherine Kohassa, 1839 – 1809-1848
  c. Josette – 1838-1850
  c. Francois – b.1836
  c. Rose – b.1829
    m. Francois Xavier Mathieu, 1844
    c. Louise – b.1832
  m. Mary Molalla, 1848 – Molalla

Barnabe, Joseph – b.1812 – French Canadian – Settled FP 1841
  m. Isabelle Boucher, November 1839
    c. Adelaide – b.1838
      m. Joseph Roussin, 1855
      c. Francois – b.1841
      c. Francois Xavier – 1843-1843
      c. Gedeon – b. 1843
      c. Joseph the Second – b. 1852
      c. Theresa – b. 1847
      c. Julienne – b. 1848
      c. Christine – b. 1851
      c. John – b.1853

  m. Genevieve St. Martin, January 21, 1839 – b.1814-d.1904 - Metis
    c. Pierre – 1836 - 1913
      m. Anne Gagnon
    c. Sophie – 1832-1920
      m. Narcisse Cornoyer
    c. Esther – 1840-1915
      m. Joseph Herbert
      m. Moise Tessier
    c. Joseph – 1843-1847
    c. Cyprien – 1848-1914
      m. Julienne Bergevin, 1873
    c. Geneiveve – 1834-1890
      m. Felix Gregoire, 1857
    c. Jean Baptiste - 1845- 1925
Bergevin, Louise – 1808-1876 – French Canadian – settled FP 1843
m. Magedeleine Servant, 1848 – Metis
  c. Moise – b. 1850
  c. Charles – b. 1851
    m. Rosa Mathieu, 1875
  c. Juienne – b. 1853
    m. Cyprien Bellique, 1873
  c. Soulanges – b. 1854
    m. Francis Dompierre, 1873
  c. Jean Baptiste – b. 1856
    m. Solome Picard, 1881
  c. Louise – b. 1858
    m. Rosa Virginia Picard, 1884
  c. Amable – b. 1860
  c. Marie Madeleine – b. 1862
  c. Firim Edouard – b. 1863

Bonenfant, Antoine – b. 1794 – French Canadian – Settled FP 1842
m. Marie Spokane – Spokane?
c. Martain – 1830-1858
  m. Angelique Laroc, 1853
c. Antoine – b. 1831
m. Francoise Dupate, 1842 – Metis
  c. Marie Ann – 1845-1850
  c. Angelique – b. 1853
    m. John Baptiste Dompier, 1872
  c. Charles – 1847-1850

Bourjeu, Sylvain – 1807-1871 – French Canadian – Settled FP 1841
m. Josephte Sok (Chinook), 1839 – d. 1857 – Chinook
  c. Jean Baptiste – b. 1837
    m. Genevieve Martineau, 1858
  c. Helene – b. 1841
    m. Theodore Lacourse, 1856
  c. Elisabeth (Betsy) – b. 1833
    m. Joseph Jacques, 1850
  c. Magdeline – b. 1845
m. Francois Dubreuil, 1861
c. Joseph – b. 1847
c. Unknown – 1849-1849
c. Louise – b. 1850
c. Catherine – b. 1853
m. Angele Tichailis (Perault), 1957

Brisbois, Oliver – Settled FP 1843
m. Catherine Cayuse – Cayuse
c. Catherine – b. 1847
  m. Monzona Katona, 1861
m. Jean Clementine Flett, 1852 – Metis
c. Jean Thomas – b. 1853
*(More children than this existed, but he settled much later)

Chalifoux, Andre – 1789-1851 – French Canadian – Settled FP 1838
m. Catherine Russi, Sorel, Canada 1837
  c. Michal – 1838-1838
  c. Charles – 1835-1838
  c. Lucie – 1839-1849
  c. Andre – b. 1842
    m. Josephette Petre, 1859
    m. Emerance Mongrain, 1871
  c. Catherine – b. 1844
    m. Charles Dupre, 1860
  c. Louise – b. 1846
    m. Julienne Picard, 1872
  c. Rose – b. 1834
  c. Marie Philomene – b. 1848
  c. Sophie – b. 1851
    m. Francois X. Martineau, 1866
Deguire, John B. – 1810-1878 – American – Settled FP 1840
  m. Marie Ann Perrault, 1840 – Metis
    c. Jean Baptiste – b. 1841
    c. Eulalie – b. 1848
    c. Thomas – 1851-1853
    c. William – b. 1857
    c. Joseph – 1860-1862
    c. Eulalie – 1855-1873

Delard, Joseph – 1792-1869 – French Canadian – Settled FP 1832
  m. Lisette Shuswap, 1839 – Souchouabe
    c. Pierre – b. 1824
      m. Josephette Lapierre, 1846
    c. Catherine – b. 1822
      m. Jean Baptiste Lussier, 1841
      m. William Lassante, 1851
    c. Augustine – b. 1827
      m. Zoe Quintal, 1857
    c. Basile – b. 1833
      m. Rose Porier, 1854
    c. Marie Ann – b. 1836
      m. Louise Vandal, 1848
      m. Medard Foisy, 1860
    c. Antoine – b. 1838
      m. Marie Vandal, 1859
      m. Mary McKay, 1874
  m. Marie Poirier, 1843 – Metis
    c. Marguerite – 1847-1853
    c. Cecile – b. 1852
    c. Marguerite – 1857-1880
    c. Catherine – b. 1862
Depot, Pierre – 1799-1868 – French Canadian – Settled FP 1839
m. Susanne Tchinook – d. 1838 – Chinook
  c. Pierre – b. 1833
    m. Marie Banak, 1851
  m. Marguerite Klamak, January 1839 – d. 1850 – Clamak
    c. Pierre – b. 1839
    c. Adelaide – 1842-1858
    c. Etienne – b. 1847
  m. Lizette, August 1858 – Metis
    c. Catherine – B. 1859
      m. Louise Bourdignon, 1876
      m. Francois Dubreuil, 1888
    c. Marcelline – b. 1868

Despard, Joseph – 1788-1875 – French Canadian – Settled FP 1830
m. Lisette Tchinouke, January 1839 – 1804-1851 – Chinook
  c. Marguerite – b. 1838
    m. Leon Morel, 1855
  c. Mary Ann – b. 1834
    m. Joseph Rivet, 1846
  c. Rose – b. 1836
  c. Joseph – b. 1827
  c. Marie – b. 1840
    m. Francois Berneir, 1858
  c. Victoire – b. 1843
    m. Roque Pichet, 1858

Dompierre, David – d.1849 – from the east – settled FP 1837
m. Marguerite Soulier, 1838 – Metis
  c. Joseph – ?
  c. Marie – 1834-1893
    m. Pierre Pariseau, 1850
  c. John – ?
    m. Angelique Bonenfant, 1872
  c. David – 1837-1859
  c. Julien – 1839-1840
  c. Philomene – 1843-1854
  c. Louis – b.1847
  c. Francois Xavier – 1845-1911
DuBois, Andre – 1803-1898 – French Canadian – Settled FP 1840
m. Marguerite, 1840 – d. 1844 – Cree
c. Basile – 1829-1857
  m. Marguerite Sanders, 1852
c. Joseph – b. 1827
m. Josette Marie Quesnal, 1845
c. Andre – 1849-1850

Ducharme, Jean Baptiste – b. 1800 – French Canadian – settled FP 1841
m. Flathead woman – Flathead
c. Lucie – 1836-1895
  m. Gedeon Senecal, 1850
m. Catherine Hu (Paul), 1841 – Metis
c. Marie – b. 1843
  m. Joseph Lonetain, 1859
c. Henriette – 1846-1853
c. Esther – 1851-1853
c. Jean Baptiste – d. 1851
c. Antoine – 1854-1854
c. Francois – b. 1855
c. Benjamin – b. 1857
c. Baptiste – 1848-1851

Felix, Antoine – 1805-1861 – French Canadian – Settled FP 1843
m. Marguerite des Chaudieres, 1845 – d. 1848 – Flathead?
c. Emanuel – b. 1831
  m. Sophie Dubreuil
c. Guillaume – ?
c. Narcisse – 1830-1848
c. Marguerite – b. 1841
  m. Al. Plourde, 1863
c. Antoine – b. 1837
c. Francois – 1838-1846
c. Pierre – b. 1844
  c. Unknown – 1845-1846
  c. Marie – 1847
m. Marie Archange Hubert, 1848 – Metis

Gagnon, Luc – 1807-1872 – settled FP 1843
m. Julie Gregoire
  c. Emerence – b. 1836
    m. Hubert Petit, 1849
  c. Marguerite – b. 1838
    m. Antoine Moray, 1856
  c. Helene – b. 1840
    m. Louise Lemery, 1858
  c. Sophie – 1853-1855
  c. Marie Olive – b. 1856
  c. Anne – ?
    m. Pierre Belique, 1869

Gervais, Joseph – 1777-1861 – French Canadian – settled FP 1830
m. Chinook woman?
  c. David – 1823-1853
    m. Marie Ann Taupin
  c. Julie – b. 1820
    m. Francois Xavier Laderoute, 1839
  c. Mary – ?
  m. Marguerite Coboway (“Yiamust”), 1839 – 1815-1840 – Clatsop
    c. Theodore – 1829-1902
      m. Angele Lafantasie
    c. Francoise – 1832-1842
    c. Isaac – b. 1825
      m. Lizzie Gingrass
    c. Edward (“Edouard”) – 1836-1912
    c. Adelaide – 1838-1841
    c. Francois Xavier – baptized 1844
      m. Marianne Despard, 1853
  m. Marie Angelique Tchinook, 1840 – d. 1853 – Chinook
Gregoire, Etienne – 1793-1867 – French Canadian – settled FP 1837
  m. Marguerite – 1790-1860 – Kamloops
    c. Julie – 1819-1877
      m. Luc Gagnon, 1841
    c. Sophie – 1828-1900
      m. William Porteous, 1842
    c. Antoine – b. 1823
      m. Therese Ouvre, 1849
    c. Felix – 1834-1906
      m. Genevieve Bellique
    c. Simon Etienne – 1834-1892
      m. Victoire McMillan

Labonete, Louise – 1780-1860 – French Canadian – settled FP 1830
  m. Marguerite Clatsop “Kilkot-akah”, 1839 – d. 1873 – Clatsop
    c. Louise – 1818-1911
    c. Julienne – b. 1831
      m. Narcis Vivet, 1858

LaChapelle, Andre – 1802-1881 – French Canadian – settled FP 1841
  m. Adrienne Lucier, 1841 – Metis
    c. Adrienne – b. 1845
      m. Arthur Grenier, 1860
    c. Felicite – b. 1842
      m. Amedee Seguin, 1857
    c. Amedee – b. 1858
      m. Euphemie Chamberlin, 1879
    c. Joseph – b. 1847
      m. Therese Gyere, 1866
    c. Victor – b. 1848
      m. Christine Laderoute, 1870
    c. Adelaide – b. 1849
      m. Joseph Lavigueur
    c. Catherine Leocadie – b. 1851
      m. James McCauley, 1873
      m. Fabien Chamberlin, 1880
    c. Blandine – 1853-1862
    c. Prosper Pierre – b. 1855
      m. Clotilde Mortineau, 1894
m. Helena Vandale
  c. Clementine – b. 1857
  m. Jean Baptiste Vandale, 1874
  c. Marie Adele – b. 1862
  c. Helena (Ellen) – b. 1865
    m. George Hardey Cumming, 1882

LaCourse, Pierre – 1792-1864 – French Canadian – Settled FP 1843
  m. Archange Tchinook, 1840 – Chinook
    c. Alexis – 1834-1847
    c. Culbert – 1836-1854
    c. Rose – b. 1824
      m. Joseph Rivet, 1839
    c. Marguerite – b. 1840
      m. Dominique Pichet, 1856
    c. Joseph – 1842-1861
    c. Claude – b. 1833
    c. Pierre – 1828-1861
    c. Louis – b. 1846
      m. Josephte Sinemaule, 1850 – Nez Perce

Laderoute, Francois Xavier – 1800-1864 – French Canadian - settled FP 1838
  m. Julie Gervais, 1839 – d. 1845 – Metis
    c. Francois Xavier – b. 1844
    c. Isadore – b. 1841
    c. Joseph – b. 1835
      m. Rosalie Gervais, 1857
      m. Marg Morais, 1872
    c. Victoire – 1838-1906
      m. Fabien Malouin, 1850
  m. Marie Ann Ouvrie, 1847
    c. Julien – b. 1843
    c. Francois – b. 1854
    c. Charles – b. 1856
    c. Marie – b. 1863
    c. Julie – 1847-1848
    c. Louise – b. 1849
    c. Gedeon – b. 1851
c. Christine – b. 1853  
   m. Victoire La Chapelle, 1870

m. William – b. 1859

m. David – b. 1861  
   m. Mary Odilla, 1880

LaFrambois, Michael – 1790-1861 – French Canadian – settled FP 1838
   m. Emile Picard, 1839 – 1822-1900 – Metis  
   c. Michael – 1837-1895 – birth mother was a “Sassete Woman”  
      m. Margaret McKay
   c. Josette – 1831-1837 – birth mother was Tsaleel
   c. Rose – b. 1849
   c. Josephte – 1838-1879  
      m. Louise Labonte the Second
   c. Joseph – 1841-1855?
   c. Jean (Eugene) – 1835-1854
   c. Abraham – 1840-1840
   c. Anastasie Lousie – 1844-1928  
      m. Henry Hilleary
   c. Angelique – b. 1851  
      m. George Hilleary

Laprate, Alexis – 1794-1871 – French Canadian – settled FP 1842
   m. Nancy Pion, 1842 – 1824-1847 – Metis
   c. Alexis – b. 1842
   c. Charlotte – b. 1843  
      m. Joseph Minor, 1859
   c. Rosalie – ?  
      m. Edourd Laflamme, 1853
   c. Mary Ann – ?  
      m. Andre Roi, 1859
   c. Jean – 1847-1847
   m. Louise Okanogan, 1848 – b. 1817 – Okanogan
   c. Angelique – b. 1857
   c. Rose – b. 1860  
      m. Anthony Favre, 1879
   c. Thomas – 1850-1851
Lonetain, Andre – 1793-1879 – French Canadian – settled FP 1837
   m. Nancy Okanagan, 1839 – 1809-1876 – Okanagan
       c. Joseph – 1838-1859
           m. Marie Ducharme, 1859
           c. Genevieve – 1840-1923
               m. Thomas Herbert, 1858
           c. Henriette – 1824-1913
               m. Thomas Moisan, 1842
           c. Catherine – 1825-1858
               m. John Howard, 1842
           c. Luce – b. 1843
               m. Joseph Osborn, 1858
           c. Angelique – 1830-1887
               m. Francois Toupin, 1847
           c. Thomas – 1845-1881
               m. Julienne Montour

Lore, Moses – French Canadian – settled FP 1842
   m. Marianne Sanders, 1842 – Metis
       c. Pierre – 1846-1848
       c. Clementine – b. 1851
       c. Moyse – 1854-1854
       c. Marie Adele – 1855-1857
       c. Virginie – b. 1857
       c. Joseph – b. 1859
       c. Marcel – 1861-1863
       c. Esther – b. 1863

Lucier, Etienne – 1793-1853 – French Canadian – settled FP 1826
   m. Josephette Nouette, 1839 – 1790-1840 – Northern Vancouver Islands?
       c. Felicite – 1814-1867
           m. Chief Trader Donald Manson, 1828
       c. Adrienne – 1824-1919
           m. Andre LaChapelle, 1841
       c. Louise – 1832-1860
           m. Celestine Gervais
       c. Michel – 1835-1860
       c. Joseph – 1838-1907
m. Louise Martineau, 1857
c. Pelagie – 1827-1857
m. Francois Bernier, 1843
m. Margueritte Tchinook, 1840 – Chinook
c. Pierre – 1842-1913
m. Thais Senecal, 1871
c. David – 1843-1852
c. Etienne – b. 1844

Masta, Antoine – ?? – settled FP 1839
m. Sophie Tchinook, 1840 – Chinook
c. Catherine – 1839-1839
   c. Victoire – ?

Menard, Pierre (Peter) – 1803-1877 – French Canadian – settled FP 1842
m. Josephte Youte, 1842 – d. 1851 – Youtes
c. Pierre – 1840-1908
   m. Elizabeth Sanagratte, 1869
c. Jean Baptiste – 1843-1897
   m. Elizabeth Petit, 1882
   m. Catherine Voutrin,?
   c. Joseph – 1839-1852
   c. Paul – b. 1845
   c. Andre – b. 1850
   c. Xavier – 1848-1852
m. Marie Blackfoot, 1852 – d. 1857 – Blackfoot
m. Therse Sastes, 1861

Moisan, Thomas – 1809-1888 – French Canadian – settled FP 1842
m. Henriette Lonetain (Longtain), 1842 – d. 1913 – Metis
c. Francois Xavier – b. 1845
   m. Victoria Manning, 1872
   c. Alexandre – b. 1849
   m. Margeret Stravens
   c. Mary – ?
   c. Philomine – b. 1848
   m. Frank Bolter Jr., 1874
Papin, Pierre (LaChance) – 1820-1888 – French Canadian – settled FP 1843
m. Suzanne Goodrich, 1844 – Metis
  c. David – ?
  c. Thomas – ?
  c. Pierre – b. 1845
    m. Amanda Grimm, 1870
  c. Julius – 1846-1881
    m. Elizabeth Yamhill
  c. Julie – b. 1848
    m. John Dowd, 1865
  c. Marie – b. 1851
    m. Israel Langlois, 1867
  c. Joseph – b. 1853
  c. Celestine – b. 1854
  c. Clementine – b. 1856
    m. Alexandre Labonte, 1878
  c. Adolphine – b. 1858
    m. Samuel Brothers, 1872
  c. Delma Jeanne – b. 1860
  c. Unknown – 1867-1867
  c. Thomas – b. 1867
  c. Eleonore – 1868-1870
  c. Marcelline – 1871-1872
  c. Narcisse – b. 1875

Petit, Amable – 1797-1867 – French Canadian – settled FP 1842
m. Marianne Baudrie of Canada(?)
  c. Amable – 1817-1890
  c. unknown – ?
m. Suzanne Tawaka, 1838 – b. 1820 – Iroquois
  c. Marie – b. 1840
    m. Regis Picard, 1854
  c. Celeste – 1842-1858
  c. Pierre – b. 1845
  c. Charles – 1837-1873
    m. Sophie Gendron, 1860
  c. Francoise – b. 1850
  c. Louise – 1853-1854
  c. Louisa Philomena – b. 1855
    m. Anton Deniople, 1875
  c. Flavie – b. 1857
  c. Catherine – 1848-1859
Petit, Amable the Second – 1817-1890 – French Canadian? – settled FP 1842
   m. Angelique Aubichon, 1846 – Metis
      c. Marie Adelle – b. 1845
      c. Amable – d. 1848
      c. Hubert – b. 1849
         m. Annie Sweeny
         m. Frances Sweeny
         m. Mary Greenleaf
      c. Charles Henrey – b. 1861

Pichette, Louis – 1797-1876 – French Canadian – settled FP 1842
   m. Marguerite Bercier, 1840
      c. Dominique – b. 1837
         m. Marguerite LaCourse, 1856
      c. Roc – 1838-1902
         m. Victoire Despard, 1858
      c. Esther – 1840-1860
         m. Joseph Lavigueur, 1859
      c. Louise – b. 1833
         m. Genevieve Vandale, 1853
      c. Charles – b. 1842
      c. Catherine – b. 1844
         m. Augustin Lambert
      c. Emilie – 1845-1919
         m. Dieudonne Maneigre, 1861
      c. Unknown – b. 1847
      c. Marie – ?
      c. Marguerite – b. 1851
         m. Narcisse LaFontiane, 1869
      c. Marie – 1853-1879
         m. Felix Deslie, 1873 (?)
      c. Unknown – 1854-1854
      c. Cecile – b. 1856
      c. Julianne – b. 1857
      c. Narcisse – 1860-1863
      c. Louise Soulange – b. 1848?
         m. Jacques Coutoir, 1863
Plourde, Francis – 1793-1906 – French Canadian – settled FP 1841
  m. Suzanne Dubois
    c. Alexandre – b. 1842
    c. André – ?
      m. Sophie Sanders, 1857
    c. Basile – b. 1846
      m. Elizabeth Lafleur
    c. Monique – 1838-1919
    c. Albert – b. 1844
    c. Eleanore – b. 1849
      m. Louis Dalcour
    c. Ambroise – b. 1852

Raymond, Augustine – 1811-1873 – French Canadian – Settled FP 1841
  m. Marie Servant, 1843 – b. 1829 – Metis
    c. Joseph – b. 1846
    c. Marcelle – b. 1848
      m. Odile Raymond, 1873
    c. Emilie Caroline – b. 1850
      m. Julien Provost, 1867
    c. Augustin – b. 1852
      m. Josephine Mongrain, 1879
    c. Francois – b. 1854
      m. Angelica Dupre, 1882
    c. Alexandre – b. 1857
    c. Rosalie – b. 1858
      m. Isaas Crete, 1874
    c. Salomee – 1860-1912
      m. Eusebe Forcier, 1882
    c. Madeleine – b. 1863
    c. Alfred – b. 1865
    c. Theodore Camille – 1867-1868
    c. Philomene Zelia – 1869-1871

Rivet, Francois – 1759-1852 – French Canadian – settled FP 1839
  m. Therese Flathead (Teteplatte), 1839 – Flathead
    c. Princess Julie – ? (from Thereses’ previous marriage)
      m. Peter Skene Ogden
    c. Antoine – 1809-1886
m. Emilie Pendiorielle
c. Joseph – 1816-1852
   m. Rose LaCourse
   m. Marie Ann Despard

Rondeau, Charles – 1792-1855 – French Canadian – settled FP 1837
   m. Lizette Bellaire – ?
      c. George – b. 1833
         m. Marguerite Dumont, 1853
      c. Genevieve – b. 1835
         m. Charles LaFantasie, 1853
      c. Angelique – b. 1827
         m. Etienne Bernise, 1846
      m. Agatha Depatie McKay, 1839 – d. 1848
         c. Jean Baptiste – b. 1842
         c. Charles – b. 1844
         c. Thomas – b. 1847
   m. Elizabeth ?, 1849

Senecal, Gideon – 1812-1896 – French Canadian – settled FP 1842
   m. Marie Grenier, 1843 – 1826-1850 – Metis
      c. Unknown – 1846-1846
      c. Unknown – 1848-1848
      c. Pierre – 1849-1850
   m. Lucie DuCharme, 1850 – Metis
      c. Dalbert – b. 1862
      c. Marcelline – b. 1851
         m. Jean Baptiste Vandal, 1868
         c. Thais – b. 1853
         c. Joseph Marcel – b. 1855
         c. Gedeon – 1857-1857
         c. Basilesse – 1858-1860
         c. Alfred – 1860-1861
         c. Vital – b. 1864
         c. Prosper – b. 1867
         c. Remey – b. 1866
         c. Joseph Avila – b. 1874?
         c. Pualine Selina – b. 1874?
Servant, Jacques – 1795-1854 – French Canadian – settled FP 1841
m. Josephte Sinemaule, 1842 – Nez Perce
  c. Marguerite – 1832-1848
    m. Cyrille Bertrand, 1846
  c. Antoine – b. 1836
    m. Louise Gingras, 1858
  c. Angelique – 1838-1849
  c. Pierre – 1841-1887
  c. Elizabeth – 1842-1845
  c. Madeleine – 1825-1863
    m. Charles Jeaudoin, 1843
  c. Marie – b. 1829
    m. Augustin Remond, 1843
  c. Francois Xavier – b. 1847
  c. Moyse – 1850-1879
  c. Josephte – 1845-1857

Vandal, Louise – 1798-1862 – French Canadian – settled FP 1842
m. Unat Nankaselias (Catherine Porteuse?), 1841 – d. 1866 – “Carrier Woman”
  c. Louis – 1834-1852
  c. Genevieve – b. 1839
    m. Louise Pichette, 1853
  c. Catherine – b. 1847
    m. Francois Mainville, 1862
  c. Marie – b. 1842
    m. Antoine Dellart, 1859
  c. Cecile – b. 1844
    m. Julenne Manning