

Ramsay Cook

The John P. Robarts Professor
Of Canadian Studies

THE SEVENTH ANNUAL ROBARTS LECTURE
14 October 1992

York University, Toronto, Ontario

A member of York's History Department since 1969, Professor Cook is author of several books: *The Politics of John W. Dafoe and the Free Press*; *Canada and the French Canadian Question*; *The Maple Leaf Forever, Canada, Quebec and the Uses of Nationalism*; and *The Regenerators: Social Criticism in Late Victorian English Canada*. The last mentioned was awarded the Governor General's Literary Award for Non Fiction in 1985.

1492 and All That: Making a Garden out of a Wilderness

*"The Land is a Garden of Eden before them, and behind them a desolate wilderness."
Joel 2:3*

For Howard Lamar

1492 and All That - Part 1

"Is not America," Fernand Braudel asks in *The Perspective of the World*, the third volume of his magisterial *Civilization and Capitalism*, "perhaps the true explanation of Europe's greatness? Did not Europe discover or indeed 'invent' America, and has Europe not always celebrated Columbus's voyages as the greatest event in history 'since the creation'?" And then the great French historian concludes that "America was . . . the achievement by which Europe most truly revealed her own nature." Braudel wrote without any intended irony, but that final remark about Europe truly revealing "her own nature"¹ is perhaps what is really at issue in the current reassessment of the implications of Columbus's landfall at Guanahari, or San Salvador, as he named it in his first act of semiotic imperialism. ("Each received a new name from me,"² he recorded.)

That "nature" is captured by Marc Lescarbot in a sentence from his remarkable *History of New France*, published in 1609, which goes right to the heart of what we have apparently decided to call the "encounter" between the Old World and the New that Columbus symbolizes. Acadia, he wrote "having two kinds of soil that God has given unto man as his possession, who can doubt that when it shall be cultivated it will be a

land of promise?"³ I hardly need to explain why I think that sentence is so revealing of the European "nature," but I will. It forthrightly articulates the renaissance European's conviction that man was chosen by the Creator to possess and dominate the rest of creation. And it further assumes that, for the land to be fully possessed, it must be cultivated: tilled, improved, developed. The result: a promised land, a paradise, a garden of delights. Lescarbot's observations seemed so axiomatic then, and for nearly five centuries afterward, that almost no one questioned his vision of a promised land - at least almost no European. But that has begun to change. Contemporary Europe, as much in its western as in its eastern portions, struggles to redefine itself. Consequently Europe overseas, as J.G.A. Pocock recently argued in a brilliant essay⁴, is being forced to look again at the meaning of what Gomera in his *General History of the Indies* (1552) called "the greatest event since the creation of the world"⁵ - the meaning of the "discovery of America."

The general shape of that reassessment has been emerging for more than a decade. Indeed the seminal work, Alfred W. Crosby's powerful study, *The Columbian Exchange: Biological and Cultural Consequences of 1492*, is two decades old. In that book Crosby argued that most of the histories of European expansion had missed the real point. It was not principalities and powers but rather organisms, seeds and animals that wrought the most fundamental changes in post-Columbian America. "Pandemic disease and biological revolution," not European technology and Christian culture, allowed Europeans "to transform as much of the New World as possible into the Old World."⁶

If Crosby offered a startling new explanation for the ease with which Europeans conquered the Americas, it remained for a Bulgarian cultural critic, living in Paris, to dissect the language and ideology of Columbian imperialism. In his brilliant, if sometimes infuriatingly undocumented *Conquest of America*, Tzvetan Todorov argued that sixteenth-century Europeans adopted two equally destructive attitudes towards the inhabitants of the New World. On the one hand, Amerindians were viewed as "savages," radically different and inferior to Europeans. Consequently they could be enslaved. On the other hand, the native peoples were seen "not only as equal but as identical." Consequently they could be assimilated. Whether "noble savage" or just "savage" Amerindians were never accepted on their own terms - different but equal. "Difference," Todorov wrote, "is corrupted into inequality; equality into identity."⁷ The *Conquest of America* is, in essence, a subtle questioning of Eurocentricity; an assertion that the conventional story of 1492 had for too long been a monologue in which only European voices and values had been heard. Together, Crosby and Todorov - not just them, though they have been essential - have argued that to understand the coming together of Europe and America the ecological and intellectual worlds of both sides of the encounter must be brought into the dialogue. If Europe discovered America in the centuries following 1492, it is equally true that America discovered Europe - and each revealed its "own nature."

Part 2

What began as a trickle with Crosby and Todorov has since become a near flood. Its most extreme and popularized form is found in Kirkpatrick Sale's recent *Conquest of Paradise*,

a book which has received far more attention, even from serious reviewers, than it warranted. Sale is not just critical of the Admiral of the Ocean Sea, though he certainly is that, but his principal point is an indictment of "the essential unsuitability of European culture for the task on which it was embarking."⁸ In Sale's view, preColumbian America was a continent whose people lived in such harmony with each other, and with nature, as to approximate paradise. The European quest for gold, inspired by greed and God, destroyed that Edenic life. Exaggerated as his claims are, and driven as they are by a kind of moral certainty unbecoming to an historian, Sale's book nevertheless does raise some matters which will increasingly be part of the historian's agenda in examining the early period of the European entry into the Americas.

And that brings me back to Marc Lescarbot and the issues that might be considered in an ecological approach to the early history of Acadia. The history of the environment and the people who lived in pre-contact and especially proto-historical Acadia is not a new subject. Though his name is rarely mentioned in books about Canadian historical writing, the pioneer in environmental history in the maritime region was an extraordinary scholar named William Francis Ganong. A graduate of the University of New Brunswick, Harvard and Munich, Ganong taught natural science - botany was his specialty - at Smith College, Massachusetts, throughout his scholarly life. But he devoted most of his research to the natural history, geography, and general history of Acadia. His maps of early explorations, his editions of Nicolas Denys's *Description and Natural History of Acadia* and Chrestien Le Clercq's *New Relation of Gaspesia*, and his hundreds of articles in a variety of journals represent a contribution to early Canadian history that has yet to be properly recognized - at least by historians. When I set out on my current research work on the natural and anthropological history of early Canada one of my ambitions was to compile an historical bird watcher's guide - a chronology of the discovery of the birds of Canada. I quickly found that Ganong had been there well before me: in 1909 he published in the *Transactions of the Royal Society of Canada* "The Identity of Plants and Animals mentioned by the Early Voyages to Eastern Canada and Newfoundland."

The second Maritime scholar for whom the environment was a necessary component of history was Alfred G. Bailey. His work is more generally known because of the reissue in 1969 of his seminal *Conflict of European and Eastern Algonkian Cultures 1504-1700*, which had first appeared in a small edition in 1937 and then dropped from sight. Professor Bruce Trigger has argued persuasively that Bailey was the first practitioner of what has come to be known as ethnohistory, the synthesis of historical and anthropological techniques. It is also true that Bailey had a profound sense of that symbiosis of environment and culture that made North American societies what they were, and an understanding that, when European social, religious and economic practices altered that environment, native culture could hardly remain unchanged.

Finally, there is the well-known work of the historical geographer Andrew Hill Clark. His *Acadia*, published in 1968, is a model of environmental history, though his emphasis is upon the impact of the newcomers on "the face of the earth," and the modification of European culture in the face of the demands of a new environment. Obviously, then, the foundations of Acadian ecological history have been well laid. A new approach, based on

a wider conception of ecology, is William Cronon's *Changes in the Land* Indians, Colonists and the Ecology of New England. This excellent book has, I think, demonstrated that the early history of North America can be profitably recast. Cronon looks at the manner in which the interaction between natives and newcomers in New England led to alterations in the landscape, the introduction of new crops and diseases, the reduction of animal populations, the clearing of the forest and the establishment of a "world of fields and fences" legally enforced by a system that established rights of private ownership. Moreover, Cronon makes the crucial point that in this encounter the contrast was not, as Europeans usually argued, between wilderness and civilization, but rather "between two human ways of living, two ways of belonging to an ecology."⁹ That this approach might be adapted to the history of Acadia is immediately obvious, especially since Cronon himself often resorted to the evidence of those conscientious French record keepers whose works are so familiar to historians of the French empire in North America.

The process whereby a way of life - the European one - triumphed over the Amerindian one was fairly rapid in New England, being virtually completed by 1800, as Cronon demonstrates. Since the colonization of Acadia, a vast area that included present-day Nova Scotia, New Brunswick, Prince Edward Island, part of Quebec (Gaspesia), and a portion of Maine, advanced at a slower pace, the two ways of life existed side by side, interacting with one another, for a longer period of time. Leslie Upton's study, *Micmacs and Colonists*, noted that at the beginning of this period, the Treaty of Utrecht of 1713, the number of Micmac people of Acadia still roughly equalled European settlers even though the native population had declined drastically. In the seventeenth century Acadia had been the scene of imperial competition and war between France and Britain and that had hardly been conducive to extensive settlement. By 1650 there were some 50 households at Port Royal and Le Have; that population had grown to about 900 souls by the 1680s. So, too, population was spreading from Port Royal to the Minas Basin, to Beaubassin and scattered along the north shore of the Bay of Fundy. "When the British took control for the third and last time," Upton writes, "capturing Port Royal in 1710, there were just over 1,500 native born Acadians with roots going back from two to four generations. The Micmac population stood at about the same number having declined from 3,000 or so at the beginning of the seventeenth century. In one hundred years the French had been able to establish a white population only half the size of the Micmacs' at their first arrival."¹⁰ It is the very slowness of the process, and the richness of the documentation for the seventeenth century, that makes the study of the ecology of contact in Acadia so fascinating.

Between 1604 and 1708 six major writers - of varied background - composed accounts of what Nicolas Denys called "the natural history" of Acadia (and this leaves out Jacques Cartier's sixteenth-century account). Now I think it is highly significant that Denys believed that "natural history" included not just geography, geology, climate, and the flora and fauna, but also the inhabitants of the new land. The model, of course, was Pliny's *Natural History*, a work which played such a large part in determining what was discovered in America that the Roman almost deserves to be ranked with Columbus.¹¹ Nor was Denys in any way unique: Champlain, Lescarbot, Biard, Le Clercq and Diereville, the authors of the other five major contemporary accounts of seventeenth-

century Acadia, all followed a similar recipe though varying the amounts of the ingredients somewhat. Each of these writers approached Acadia from an ecological perspective, setting people squarely in their environment and noting the contrast between European and Amerindian ways of living in, and belonging to, their environment.

Each of these seventeenth-century writers devoted a substantial portion of his book to descriptions of the natural world. There was a certain awesomeness about this wilderness and its abundance of birds, beasts, fish and flowers. In 1604, at Seal Island, Champlain's keen eye identified firs, pines, larches and poplars, and more than a dozen species of birds, not all of which he recognized. At nearly every landing he made similar observations.¹² He identified the skimmer with its extended lower bill, while Denys described the majestic bald eagle carrying off a rabbit in its talon. Marc Lescarbot provided comparable descriptions. His famous poem "Adieu a la Nouvelle France" is a versified catalogue of the environment, including that indigenous marvel, "un oiselet semblable au papillon," the hummingbird. This ornithological marvel, sometimes called the Bird of Heaven, provoked the same sense of admiration in early visitors to North America that the flamboyant parrot produced in explorers of South America, beginning with Columbus. The parrot, captured and transported, quickly became the symbol of America in post-Columbian art. The hummingbird, impossible to rear in captivity, remained in the Americas. Among insects the firefly was highly appealing, the mosquito detested.¹³

Of the creatures of the animal world none attracted more curiosity than the beaver. It became an animal more marvellous in the Plinian imaginations of Le Clercq and Denys than in reality. It performed as architect, mason, carpenter, even hod carrier, walking upright with a load of mud piled on its broad tail. A natural rear end loader! "Its flesh is delicate," Father Le Clercq reported, "and very much like that of mutton. The kidneys are sought by apothecaries, and are used with effect in easing women in childbirth, and in mitigating hysterics."¹⁴ The value of beaver pelts hardly needed comment.

Then there was the moose that cured itself of epilepsy by scratching its ear with its own cloven hoof. At least the flying squirrel was the real thing. Denys's description of the cod fishery, not surprisingly since he was a merchant, was accurate and detailed. On the southeast coast of St Mary's Bay, when the tide dropped, Champlain found mussels, clams and sea snails, while elsewhere oysters abounded. The swarms of fish that swam in the waterways filled these men with excitement. On the Miramichi Denys claimed that he had been kept awake all night by the loud sounds of salmon splashing. The fertility and agricultural potential of the new land was naturally a constant preoccupation. "The entire country is covered with very dense forests," Champlain wrote of the site that would become Annapolis Royal, "...except a point a league and a half up the river, where there are some oaks which are very scattered and a number of wild vines. These could be easily cleared and the place brought under cultivation." Nor did Champlain miss the minerals and metals - silver at Mink Cove, iron further north on Digby Neck.¹⁵

Moreover, it is from these writers that at least a partial sketch of the lives and customs of the Northeastern Algonquian peoples can be reconstructed. Champlain recorded the

practice of swidden agriculture among the Abenaki - corn, beans and squash - and even noted the use of horse shoe crab shells, probably as fertilizer.¹⁶ Hunting and fishing methods were remarked upon, though the lack of detail is somewhat surprising particularly when contrasted with the lengthy accounts of religious beliefs - or supposed lack of them - of the various inhabitants of Acadia. "Jugglery" or shamanism, and also medical practices, were of particular interest - indeed, Diereville even convinced himself of the efficacy of some shamanistic cures. So, too, dress, hairstyles, courtship and marriage customs, and ceremonies surrounding childbirth and death were carefully recorded and sometimes compared to classical and contemporary European practices. Lescarbot, for example, concluded that the Jesuits were quite mistaken in attempting to force Christian monogamy on the Micmacs, arguing that indigenous marriage customs would best be "left in the state in which they were found." In contrast to some Jesuit writers - and Brian Moore - Lescarbot judged the aboriginal people very modest in sexual matters. This he attributed partly to their familiarity with nakedness but chiefly "to their keeping bare the head, where lies the fountain of the spirits which excite to procreation, partly to the lack of salt, of hot spices, of wine, of meats which provoke desire, and partly to their frequent use of tobacco, the smoke of which dulls the senses, and mounting up to the brain hinders the functions of Venus." On the other hand, he believed that one romantic innovation introduced by the French actually contributed to the improvement of aboriginal life: the kiss. Though Professor Karen Anderson has followed up Lescarbot's insight about the impact of the missionaries on marriage among the native people of New France, no one, as far as I know, has advanced our knowledge of the relationship between civilization and osculation.¹⁷

Part 3

Virtually all male European visitors to Acadia were struck by the division of labour in aboriginal communities. Women, it was agreed, "work harder than the men, who play the gentleman, and care only for hunting or for war." Despite this, Lescarbot wrote approvingly, "they love their husbands more than women of our parts." It is interesting that in his discussion of the ease with which Micmac marriages could be dissolved Father Le Clercq remained detached and uncensorious. "In a word," he remarked laconically, "they hold it as a maxim that each one is free; that one can do whatever he wishes: and that it is not sensible to put constraint upon men." And the priest understood that the maxim applied to both men and women.¹⁸

Games and the native peoples' apparent penchant for gambling were described though not always understood. Then there was science and technology. Father Le Clercq, perhaps the most ethnologically astute of seventeenth-century observers, provided an intriguing account of the ways the Gaspesians read the natural world: their interpretation of the stars and the winds, how they reckoned distance and recognized the changing seasons. The usefulness and limitations of indigenous technology was also commented upon. The efficiency of the birchbark canoe won widespread admiration. "The Savages of Port Royal can go to Kebec in ten or twelve days by means of the rivers which they navigate almost up to their sources," Lescarbot discovered, "and thence carrying their little bark canoes through the woods they reach another stream which flows into the river

of Canada and thus greatly expedite their long voyages." While household utensils, manufactured from bark, roots and stumps were ingenious, the French realized that the aboriginals were happy to replace them with metal wares. War and its weaponry drew the somewhat surprised comment that "neither profit nor the desire to extend boundaries, but rather vengeance, caused fairly frequent hostilities between native groups." Torture was graphically described, and condemned, though it was recognized - and judged a sign of savagery - that "to die in this manner is, among the savages, to die as a great captain and as a man of great courage."¹⁹

Much else also caught the attention of these ethnologists: the commonality of property, the importance of gift exchange, the practice of setting aside weapons before entering into discussions with strangers, and the expectation that strangers should do the same. And even though "crafty, thievish and treacherous," Lescarbot admitted somewhat superciliously that "they do not lack wit, and might come to something if they were civilized, and knew the various trades."²⁰

Though observations and judgements were made with great confidence, indeed often rather cavalierly, these Europeans were aware that there often existed an unbridgeable communications chasm between the observers and the observed. Like every explorer before them, the French in Acadia attempted to resolve the problem in two ways. The first was to take young natives back to France for an immersion course in French. ("We had on board a savage," Lescarbot noted in 1608, "who was much astonished to see the buildings, spires and windmills of France, but more the women, whom he had never seen dressed after our manner.")

While these interpreters were doubtless helpful in breaking down the "effects of the confusion of Babel," it was hardly a permanent resolution to what Father Biard realized was a fundamental problem. Yet for the French to learn the local languages was time-consuming and the results often frustrating. Learning words was not the same as learning to communicate. "As these Savages have no formulated Religion, government, towns, nor trade," Biard recorded in exasperation, "so the words and proper phrases for all of these things are lacking." The confusion of words with things, of the sign with the referent was, as Todorov has brilliantly shown, endemic to the European attempt to comprehend America. Acadia was no exception though I have, unfortunately, not found any example quite so delicious as the linguistic dilemma encountered by Protestant missionaries in Hawaii. There the Islanders reportedly practised some twenty forms of sexual activity judged illicit - perhaps better, non-missionary. Each had a separate name in the native language, thus making translation of the Seventh Commandment virtually impossible without condoning the other nineteen forms of the joy of sex! The native peoples of Acadia were apparently much less resourceful - or the celibate Jesuits less well trained as participant-observers.²¹

The natural, ethnographic and linguistic accounts were not, of course, the work of biological scientists, or cultural anthropologists - even taking into account our contemporary scepticism about the objectivity of anthropologists. Rather they were the observations of seventeenth-century Frenchmen taking inventory of a new land they

intended to explore, settle, develop and Christianize - in brief, to colonize. It is in their works that much of what Braudel called Europe's "own nature" is "most truly revealed." In differing ways it is made emphatically plain by each of these authors that the French objective in Acadia, in the words of Father Biard, was "to make a Garden out of the wilderness." Nor should this be read narrowly as simply meaning the evangelization of the people who lived in Acadia.²²

In the revealing introduction to his rich and thoughtful Relation of 1616, Biard wrote: "For verily all of this region, though capable of the same prosperity as ours, nevertheless through Satan's malevolence, which reigns there, is a horrible wilderness, scarcely less miserable on account of the scarcity of bodily comforts than for that which renders man absolutely miserable, the complete lack of the ornaments and riches of the soul." The missionary continues, offering his scientific conviction that "neither the sun, nor malice of the soil, neither the air nor the water, neither the men nor their caprices, are to be blamed for this. We are all created by and dependent upon the same principles: We breathe under the same sky; the same constellations influence us; and I do not believe that the land, which produces trees as tall and beautiful as ours, will not produce as fine harvests, if it be cultivated." Wilderness the expanses of Acadia might be, but a garden it could become, if cultivated. For Father Biard and his contemporaries, "subjugating Satanic monsters" and establishing "the order and discipline of heaven upon earth,"²³ combined spiritual and worldly dimensions. Champlain, for whom the Devil and his agents were as real as for Biard, expressed the same objective in a more secular way when he told the local people he met in the region of the Penobscot River that the French "desired to settle in their country and show them how to cultivate it, in order that they might no longer live so miserable an existence as they are doing." The comment is made the more striking when we remember that Champlain knew that some of the inhabitants of Acadia did practise agriculture - though he never suggested that they "cultivated" the land.²⁴

It is perhaps not too much to suggest that "cultivation" was a distinctly European concept. "For before everything else," Marc Lescarbot maintained, "one must set before oneself the tillage of the soil." At the first French settlement at Ste Croix gardens were sown and some wheat "came up very fine and ripened." The poor quality of the soil was one reason for the move across the Bay of Fundy to establish Port Royal, "where the soil was ample to produce the necessaries of life." But there was more to cultivation than the production of simple foodstuffs. For Lescarbot, at least, the powerful symbolism of planting a European garden in what had been a wilderness was manifest. "I have cause to rejoice," he wrote on his departure from Port Royal to return to France in July 1607, "that I was one of the party, and among the first tillers of this land. And herein I took the more pleasure in that I put before my eyes our ancient Father Noah, a great king, a great priest and a great prophet whose vocation was the plough and the vineyard; and the old Roman captain Serranus, who was found sowing his field when he was sent to lead the Roman army, and Quintus Cinnicinnatus, who, all crowned with dust, bareheaded and ungirt, was ploughing four acres of land when the herald of the Senate brought him the letters of dictatorship. . . . Inasmuch as I took pleasure in this work, God blessed my poor labour, and I had in my garden as good wheat as could be grown in France." While Lescarbot

might be dismissed as suffering from an overdose of renaissance humanism, it seems more sensible to take him seriously. His florid rhetoric should be seen for what it really was: the ideology of what Alfred J. Crosby has called "ecological imperialism" - the biological expansion of Europe. What Lescarbot, and less literary Europeans, brought to bear on the Acadian landscape was the heavy freight of the European agricultural tradition with its long established distinction between garden and wilderness. In that tradition God's "garden of delight" contrasted with the "desolate wilderness" of Satan. Though the concept of "garden" varies widely, as Hugh Johnson notes in his *Principles of Gardening*, "control of nature by man" is the single common denominator.²⁵

The transformation of the wilderness into a garden is a constant theme in the early writings about Acadia. Father Biard had brought European seeds with him when he arrived in 1611 and at St Saveur "in the middle of June, we planted some grains [wheat and barley], fruit, seeds, peas, beans and all kinds of garden plants." On Miscou Island (Shippegan Island), Denys discovered that although the soil was sandy herbs of all sorts as well as "Peaches, Nectarines, Clingstones" and what the French always called "the Vine" - grapes - could be grown. But, as so often is the case, it is Lescarbot who provides the most striking account of what gardening meant. At Port Royal, he "took pleasure in laying out and cultivating my gardens, in enclosing them to keep out the pigs, in making flower beds, staking out alleys, building summer houses, sowing wheat, rye, barley, oats, beans, peas and garden plants, and in watering them." European seeds, domestic animals - chickens and pigeons, too - fences - mine and thine.²⁶

Of course before a garden could be planted, the land had to be cleared. Denys described that work - and its by-product: squared oak timber that could fill the holds of vessels that would otherwise have returned empty to France. If clearing the land did not produce enough space for the garden, then the sea could be tamed too. In the Minas basin, where the settlers apparently found cultivating the land too difficult, Diereville recounted the construction of a remarkable piece of European technology. "Five or six rows of large logs are driven whole into the ground at the points where the Tide enters the Marsh, & between each row, other logs are laid, one on top of the other, & all the spaces between them are so carefully filled with well pounded clay, that the water can no longer get through. In the centre of this construction a Sluice is contrived in such a manner that the water on the Marshes flows out of its own accord, while that of the Sea is prevented from coming in." Thus the tidal marshes were dyked for cultivation.²⁷

Pushing back the forest, holding back the water, fencing a garden in the wilderness. The rewards would be great - "better worth than the treasures of Atahulpa," Lescarbot claimed. Was the symbolism intentional? Atahulpa, the defeated Aztec ruler of Peru, offered his Spanish captors led by Francisco Pizarro a room full of gold and silver in return for his freedom. The Spaniards accepted the ransom and then garrotted the Inca. Hardly a scene from a garden of delights.²⁸

Part 4

The French in Acadia were certainly not the Spanish in Peru. Still the garden they planned was intended to produce a greater harvest than just sustenance for anticipated settlers. It was to be a garden for the civilization of the indigenous peoples. "In the course of time," Champlain observed on his initial meeting with the people he called Etechemins (Maliseet), "we hope to pacify them, and put an end to the wars which they wage against each other, in order that in the future we might derive service from them, and convert them to the Christian faith." The words were almost exactly those attributed to Columbus at his first sighting of the people of the "Indies": "they would be good servants ... [and] would easily be made Christians." Even the most sympathetic observers of the native peoples of Acadia were appalled by their apparent failure to make for themselves a better life, a failing which was often attributed to their unwillingness to plan for the future. For Father Biard, Christianity and husbandry obviously went hand in hand. Living the nomadic life of hunters, fishers and gatherers resulted in permanent material and spiritual backwardness. "For in truth, this people," he claimed, "who, through the progress and experience of centuries, ought to have come to some perfection in the arts, sciences and philosophy, is like a great field of stunted and ill-begotten wild plants . . . [they] ought to be already prepared for the completeness of the Holy Gospel... Yet behold [them] wretched and dispersed, given up to ravens, owls and infernal cuckoos, and to be the cursed prey of spiritual foxes, bears, boars and dragons." In Father Le Clercq's view the "wandering and vagabond life" had to be ended and a place "suitable for the cultivation of the soil" found so that he could "render the savages sedentary, settle them down, and civilize them among us. Though Lescarbot's outlook was more secular, he shared these sentiments completely and expressed them in verse:

Ce peuple n'est pas brutal, barbare, ni Sauvage,
Si vous n'appellez tels les hommes du vieil age,
Il est subtile, habile & plein de jugement,
Et n'en ay conu un manquer d'entendement,
Seulement il demande un pere qui l'enseigne
A cultiver la terre, a faconner la vigne,
Et vivre par police, a etre menager,
Et sous des fermes toicts ci-apres herberger.

The leit-motif of this rhetoric is obvious: the images of the Christian garden and the satanic wilderness, summed up in the verse from the Book of Joel, quoted by Father Biard: "The Land is a Garden of Eden before them, and behind them a desolate wilderness."²⁹

Yet it would be quite wrong to assume that these seventeenth-century French visitors to the New World were blind to the potential costs of gardening in the Acadian wilderness. Indeed, there is considerable evidence of nagging suspicions that the very abundance of nature provoked reckless exploitation. Denys witnessed an assault on a bird colony that is reminiscent of the profligacy of Cartier's crew among the birds at Funk Island in 1534. Denys's men "clubbed so great a number, as well of young as of their fathers and mothers . . . that we were unable to carry them all away." And Die'reville captured all too accurately the spirit of the uncontrolled hunt when he wrote that:

....., Wild Geese
And Cormorants, aroused in me
The wish to war on them....

He used the same militant language in his admiring account of the "Bloody Deeds" of the seal hunt, and also provided a sketch of another common pursuit: the theft of massive quantities of birds' eggs. "They collect all they can find," he remarked, "fill their canoes & take them away." Scenes like these presaged the fate of the Great Auk, the passenger-pigeon and many other species.³⁰

These were the actions of men whose attitude towards the bounty of nature contrasted markedly with that of the indigenous inhabitants of North America. In Europe the slaughter of birds and animals was commonplace, indeed it was often encouraged by law. As Keith Thomas remarks in his study of *Man in the Natural World* - which is largely restricted to Great Britain - "It is easy to forget just how much human effort went into warring against species which competed with man for the earth's resources." Without succumbing to the temptation to romanticize the attitude of North American native people towards their environment - they hunted, they fished, some practised slash and burn agriculture - there is no doubt that their sense of the natural world was based on a distinctive set of beliefs, a cosmology that placed them in nature rather than dominant over it. Animistic religion - "everything is animated," Father Le Clercq discovered - a simple technology, a relatively small population, and what Marshall Sahlins has termed "stone age economics," made "war" on nature unnecessary, even unacceptable. "They did not lack animals," Nicolas Denys noted, "which they killed only in proportion as they had need of them." By contrast, the Europeans who arrived in Acadia at the beginning of the seventeenth century belonged to a culture where, in Clarence Glacken's words, "roughly from the end of the fifteenth to the end of the seventeenth century one sees ideas of man as controllers of nature beginning to crystalize." Or, as Marc Lescarbot put it, articulating as he so often did the unstated assumptions of his fellow Frenchmen, "Man was placed in this world to command all that is here below."³¹

The distinction between the "wilderness" and the "garden," between "savagery" and "civilization," between "wandering about" and commanding "all that is here below," is more than a philosophical one, important as that is. It is also, both implicitly and explicitly, a question of ownership and possession. In what has been called "enlightenment anthropology" - though I think that places the development too late - the function of the term savage was to assert the existence of a state of nature where neither "heavy-plough agriculture nor monetarized exchange" were practised and from which, therefore, civil government was absent. Moreover, civil government, agriculture and commerce were assumed to exist only where land had been appropriated - where "possessive individualism" had taken root. Thus the wilderness was inhabited by nomadic savages, without agriculture or laws, where the land had never been appropriated. Consequently, when Europeans set about transforming the wilderness into a garden, they were engaged in taking possession of the land. "The ideology of agriculture and savagery, "in the words of J.G.A. Pocock, "was formed to justify this expropriation."³²

As European gardeners began slowly to transform the wilderness of Acadia so too, as was their intent, they began the re-making of its indigenous inhabitants. And once again, though they rarely expressed doubts about the ultimate value of the enterprise, some Europeans did recognize that a price was being exacted. First there was the puzzling evidence of population decline. In a letter to his superior in Paris in 1611, Father Biard wrote that the Micmac leader Membertou (who himself claimed to be old enough to remember Cartier's 1534 visit), had informed him that in his youth people were as thickly planted there as the hairs upon his head." The priest continued, making a remarkably revealing comparison: "It is maintained that they have thus diminished since the French have begun to frequent their country; for, since they do nothing all summer but eat; and the result is that, adopting an entirely different custom and thus breeding new diseases, they pay for their indulgence during the autumn and winter by pleurisy, quinsy and dysentery which kills them off. During this year alone sixty have died at Cape de la Heve, which is the greater part of those who lived there; yet not one of all of M.de Poutrincourt's little colony has ever been sick, notwithstanding all the privations they have suffered; which has caused the Savages to apprehend that God protects and defends us as his favorite and well-beloved people." ³³

The reality, of course, was more complex than this assertion that God was on the side of the immunized. Though the French were unaware of it, Acadia, like the rest of the Americas, was a "virgin land" for European pathogens. Denys hinted at this when he wrote that "in old times . . . they [the natives] were not subject to diseases, and knew nothing of fevers." Certainly they had not been exposed to the common European maladies - measles, chickenpox, influenza, tuberculosis and, worst of all, smallpox. (The "pox" - syphilis - Lescarbot believed was God's punishment of European men for their promiscuous sexual behavior in the Indies.) The immune systems of the indigenous peoples of Acadia were unprepared for the introduction of these new diseases which were, consequently, lethal in their impact. Father Le Clercq, at the end of the century, reported that "the gaspesian nation . . . has been wholly destroyed . . . in three or four visitations" of unidentified "Maladies." Marc Lescarbot probably identified one important carrier of European infections when he stated that "the savages had no knowledge of [rats] before our coming; but in our time they have been beset by them, since from our fort they went over to their lodges."³⁴

Disease, radical alterations in diet - the substitution of dried peas and beans, and hardtack for moosemeat and other country foods - and perhaps even the replacement of polygamy by monogamy with a consequent reduction in the birth rate, all contributed to population decline. Then there was the debilitating scourge of alcohol, another European import for which native people had little, if any, tolerance. Just as they sometimes gorged themselves during "eat all" feasts, so they seemed to drink like undergraduates with the simple goal of getting drunk. Even discounting Father Le Clercq's pious outlook, his description of the impact of brandy on the Gaspesians was probably not exaggerated. The fur traders, he charged, "make them drunk quite on purpose, in order to deprive these poor barbarians of the use of reason." That meant quick profits for the merchants, debauchery, destruction, murder and, eventually, addiction for the Amerindians. Though less

ensorious, or less concerned, than the priest, Diereville remarked that the Micmacs "drank Brandy with relish & less moderation than we do; they have a craving for it."³⁵

Part 5

Estimating population declines among native peoples is at best controversial, at worst impossible. Nevertheless there seems no reason to doubt that Acadia, like the rest of the Americas, underwent substantial reduction in numbers of inhabitants as a result of European contact. Jacques Cartier and his successors, who fished and traded along the coasts of Acadia, likely introduced many of the influences that undermined the health of the local people. Therefore Pierre Biard's 1616 estimate of a population of about 3,500 Micmacs is doubtless well below pre-contact numbers, as Membertou claimed. Since it has been estimated that neighbouring Maliseet, Pasamaquoddy and Abenaki communities experienced reductions ranging from 67 to 98 per cent during the epidemics of 1616 and 1633 alone, Virginia Miller's calculation that the pre-contact Micmac population stood somewhere between 26,000 and 35,000 seems reasonable.³⁶ That was one of the costs of transforming the wilderness into a garden.

If the effects of disease and alcohol were apparent, though misunderstood, then another aspect of the civilizing process was more subtle. That process combined Christian proselytizing, which eroded traditional beliefs, with the fur trade, which undermined many aspects of the native peoples' way of life. There is among contemporary historians of European-Amerindian relations a tendency to view the trading relationship, that was so central to the early years of contact, as almost benign, a relation between equals. Missionaries, politicians, and land-hungry settlers are credited with upsetting the balance that once existed between "natives and newcomers" in the fur trade. There can be no doubt that recent scholarship has demonstrated that the natives were certainly not passive participants in the trade. Far from being naïve innocents who gave up valuable furs for a few baubles, they traded shrewdly and demanded good measure.³⁷

Nevertheless, it is impossible to read seventeenth-century accounts of the trade and still accept the whole of this revisionist account. These were eyewitness testimonies to the devastating impact of alcohol on the native traders and their families: murder of fellow natives, maiming of women and abuse of children, the destruction of canoes and household goods. Beyond this, brandy, often adulterated with water, was used by Europeans "in order to abuse the savage women, who yield themselves readily during drunkenness to all kinds of indecency, although at other times... they would be more like to give a box on the ears rather than a kiss to whomsoever wished to engage them in evil, if they were in their right minds." The words come from the priest, Father Le Clercq, but the merchant, Nicolas Denys, concurred. That, too, was part of the fur trade.³⁸

Moreover the trade cannot be separated from other aspects of contact that contributed to the weakening of Micmac culture. Fur traders carrying disease and trade goods, unintentionally, contributed to the decline of both traditional skills and indigenous religious belief. Nicolas Denys's discussion of Micmac burial customs illustrates this point neatly. Like other native people the Micmacs buried many personal articles in

graves so that the diseased would have use of them when they disembarked in the Land of the Dead. The French judged this practice both superstitious and wasteful - especially when the burial goods included thousands of pounds of valuable furs. They attempted to disabuse the native of the efficacy of this practice by demonstrating that the goods did not leave the grave but rather remained in the ground, rotting. To this the natives replied that it was the "souls" of these goods that accompanied the "souls" of the dead, not the material goods themselves. Despite this failure Denys was able to report that the practice was in decline. The reason is significant and it was only marginally the result of conversion to Christianity. As trade between the French and the Micmacs developed, European goods - metal pots, knives, axes, firearms - gradually replaced traditional utensils and weapons that had once been included in burial pits. The use of European commodities as burial goods proved prohibitively expensive. Denys wrote that "since they cannot obtain from us with such ease as they had in retaining robes of Marten, of Otter, of Beaver, [or] bows and arrows, and since they have realized that guns and other things were not found in their woods or their rivers, they have become less devout" Technological change brought religious change. It also led to dependence.³⁹

No doubt the exchange of light, transportable copper pots for awkward, stationary wooden pots was a convenient, even revolutionary change in the lives of Micmacs. But convenience was purchased at a price, and the native people knew it. Father Le Clercq was vastly amused when an old man told him that "the Beaver does everything to perfection. He makes us kettles, axes, swords, knives and gives us drink and food without the trouble of cultivating the ground." It was no laughing matter. If, at the outset of European contact the native people of Acadia had adapted to the trade with Europeans rather successfully, they gradually lost ground, their role of middlemen undermined by overseas traders who came to stay. While Nicolas Denys deplored the destructive impact of itinerant traders and fishermen on the native people, his only solution was to advocate European settlement and the enforcement of French authority. "Above all," he concluded his assessment of the changes that had taken place in native society during his time, "I hope that God may inspire in those who have part in the government of the State, all the discretion which can lead them to the consummation of an enterprise as glorious for the King as it can be useful and advantageous to those who will take interest therein." In that scheme, when it eventually came to pass, the Micmacs and their neighbours found themselves on the margin.⁴⁰

To these signs that the work of cultivation produced ugly, unanticipated side-effects must be added the evidence of near crop failure in the spiritual garden of Acadia. In 1613 a disgusted Father Biard reported meeting a St John River sagamore (Cacagous) who, despite being "baptized in Bayonne," France, remained a "shrewd and cunning" polygamist. "There is scarcely any change in them after baptism," he admitted. Their traditional "vices" had not been replaced by Christian "virtues." Even Membertou, often held up as the exemplary convert, had difficulty grasping the subtleties of the new religion. He surely revealed something more than a quick wit in an exchange which amused the Jesuit. Attempting to teach him the Pater Noster; Biard asked Membertou to repeat in his own language, "Give us this day our daily bread." The old sagamore replied: "If I did not ask him for anything but bread, I would be without moose-meat or fish."

Near the end of the century, Father Le Clercq's reflections on the results of his Gaspe mission were no more optimistic. Only a small number of the people lived liked Christians, most "fell back into the irregularities of a brutal and wild life." Such, the somewhat depressed Recollect missionary concluded, was the meagre harvest among "the most docile of all the Savages of New France.. the most susceptible to the instruction of Christianity."⁴¹

It was not just these weeds - disease, alcohol, dependence, and spiritual backsliding - in the European garden in Acadia that occasionally led the gardeners to pause and reflect. Possibly there was a more basic question: was the wilderness truly the Devil's domain? The Northeastern Algonquian people were admittedly "superstitious," even "barbarian," but certainly not the "wild men" of mediaeval imaginings, indistinguishable from the beasts. If they enjoyed "neither faith, nor king, nor laws," living out "their unhappy Destiny," there was something distinctly noble about them too. Despite the steady, evangelical light that burned in Biard's soul he could not help wondering if the Micmac resistance to the proffered European garden of delights was not without foundation. "If we come to sum up the whole and compare their good and ill with ours," he mused briefly in the middle of his Relation of 1616, "I do not know but that they, in truth, have some reason to prefer (as they do) their own kind of happiness to ours, at least if we speak of the temporal happiness, which the rich and worldly seek in this life." Of course these doubts quickly passed as he turned to consider "the means available to aid these nations to their eternal salvation."

Marc Lescarbot, for whom classicism and Christianity seemed to have reached their apogee in the France of his day, and whose fervour for cultivating the wilderness was unlimited, found much to admire in the peoples of Acadia. They lived "after the ancient fashion, without display": uncompetitive, unimpressed by material goods, temperate, free of corruption and of lawyers! "They have not that ambition, which in these parts gnaws men's minds, and fills them with cares, bringing blinded men to the grave in the very flower of their age and sometimes to the shameful spectacle of a public death." Here surely was "the noble savage," a Frenchman without warts - "a European dream," as J.H. Elliott remarks of the Humanists' image of the New World, "which had little to do with American reality."⁴²

There was yet another reason for self-doubts about the superiority of European ways over Amerindian ways; the native people struggled to preserve their wilderness, refusing the supposed superiority of the garden. Even those who had become "philosophers and pretty good theologians," one missionary concluded, preferred "on the basis of foolish reasoning, the savage to the French life." And Father Le Clercq found that some of the people of Gaspesia stubbornly preferred their movable wigwams to stationary European houses. And that was not all. "Thou reproachest us, very inappropriately," their leader told a group of visiting Frenchmen, "that our country is a very little hell in contrast with France, which thou comparest to a terrestrial paradise, inasmuch as it yields thee, so thou sayest, every provision in abundance...I beg thee to believe, all miserable as we may seem in thine eyes, we consider ourselves nevertheless much happier than thou in this, that we are contented with the little that we have." Thus having demonstrated, three

hundred years before its discovery by modern anthropology, that having only a few possessions is not the same as being poor, the Algonquian leader then posed a devastating question: "If France, as thou sayest, is a little terrestrial paradise, are thou sensible to leave it?" No reply is recorded.⁴³

It is simple enough to imagine one. Even those who could describe as "truly noble" the aboriginal people of Acadia remained convinced that civilization meant cultivation. "In New France," Lescarbot proclaimed, "the golden age must be brought in again, the ancient crowns of ears of corn must be renewed, and the highest glory made that which the ancient Romans called gloria adorea, a glory of wheat, in order to invite everyone to till well his field, seeing that the land presents itself liberally to them that have none." The state of nature, a Hobbesian state of nature without laws or kings or religion would be tamed, "civilized," when men "formed commonwealths to live under certain laws, rule, and police." Here, in Braudel's phrase, Europe's "own nature" was revealed.⁴⁴

Perhaps such thoughts as these filled the heads of the Frenchmen who, according to Micmac tradition, gathered to enjoy one of the "curious adventures" of Silmoodawa, an aboriginal hunter carried off to France "as a curiosity" by Champlain or some other "discoverer." On this occasion the Micmac was to give a command performance of hunting and curing techniques. The "savage" was placed in a ring with "a fat ox or deer . . . brought in from a beautiful park." (One definition of "paradise," the OED reports, is an Oriental park or pleasure ground, especially one enclosing wild beasts for the chase.) The story, collected in 1870 by the Reverend Silas Tertius Rand, a Baptist missionary and amateur ethnologist, continues: "He shot the animal with a bow, bled him, skinned and dressed him, sliced up the meat and spread it out on flakes to dry; he then cooked a portion and ate it, and in order to exhibit the whole process, and to take a mischievous revenge upon them for making an exhibition of him, he went into a corner of the yard and eased himself before them all."⁴⁵

If, as Lescarbot's contemporaries believed, the wilderness could be made into a garden, then the unscripted denouement of Silmoodawa's performance revealed that a garden could also become a wilderness. Or was he merely acting out the Micmac version of Michel de Montaigne's often quoted remark about barbarians: we all call wilderness anything that is not our idea of a garden?

Endnotes

¹ Fernand Braudel, *The Perspective of the World* (London: William Collins and Son 1985), 387, 388.

² Cecil Jane, ed., *The Journal of Christopher Columbus* (New York: Bonanza Books 1989), 191; Patricia Seed, "Taking Possession and Reading Texts: Establishing the Authority of Overseas Empires," *William and Mary Quarterly*, XLIX, 2, April 1992, 199.

³ Marc Lescarbot, *History of New France* (Toronto: The Champlain Society, 1914), 111,246. The theme of my lecture might have benefited had I been able to substantiate the claim, sometimes made, that "Acadie" is a corruption of "Arcadie" - an ideal, rural paradise. Unfortunately the claim, sometimes made on the basis of Verrazzano's 1524 voyage when he described the coast of present-day Virginia as "Arcadie," is unfounded. "Acadie" likely is derived from the Micmac word "Qioddy" or "Cadie," meaning a piece of land. The French version became "la Cadie" or "l'Acadie," even though the French sometimes thought of the area as a potential "Arcadie." See Andrew Hill Clark, *Acadia: the Geography of Early Nova Scotia* (Madison: University of Wisconsin Press 1968), 71.

-
- ⁴ J.G.A. Pocock, "Deconstructing Europe," *London Review of Books*, 19 December 1991, 6-10.
- ⁵ J.H. Elliott, *The Old World and the New 1492-1650* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press 1989), cited 10.
- ⁶ Alfred W. Crosby, Jr, *The Columbian Exchange: Biological and Cultural Consequences of 1492* (Westport, Conn.: Greenwood Press 1972), 67.
- ⁷ Tzvetan Todorov *The Conquest of America* (New York: Harper Colophon 1985), 146.
- ⁸ Kirkpatrick Sale, *The Conquest of Paradise: Christopher Columbus and the Columbian Legacy* (New York: Knopf 1991), 129.
- ⁹ William Cronon, *Changes in the Land Indians: Colonists and Ecology in New England* (New York: Hill and Wang 1983), 12.
- ¹⁰ Leslie Upton, *Micmacs and Colonists: Indian-White Relations in the Maritimes 1713-1867* (Vancouver: University of British Columbia Press 1979), 25.
- ¹¹ Peter Mason, *Deconstructing America: Representations of the Other* (London: Routledge 1990), and Antonello Gerbi, *Nature in the New World* (Pittsburg: Pittsburg University Press 1985).
- ¹² *The Works of Samuel D. Champlain* (Toronto: The Champlain Society 1922), I, 243.
- ¹³ Lescarbot, III, 484-5; Nicolas Denys, *Description and Natural History of the Coasts of North America (Acadia)* (Toronto: The Champlain Society 1908), 393, 390; Hugh Honour, *The New Golden Land: European Images of America from the Discovery to the Present Time* (New York: Random House 1975), 36-7.
- ¹⁴ Denys, 362-9; Le Clercq, *New Relation of Gaspesia* (Toronto: The Champlain Society 1910), 279.
- ¹⁵ Le Clercq, 275; Denys, 257-340; Champlain, 368, 247; Denys, 199.
- ¹⁶ Champlain, 327; for a discussion of the distribution of native peoples, see Bruce J. Bourque, "Ethnicity in the Maritime Peninsula, 1600-1759," *Ethnohistory* (1989), 36: 257-84.
- ¹⁷ *Sieur de Diereville, Relation of the Voyage to Port Royal in Acadia* (Toronto: The Champlain Society 1933), 130-41; Lescarbot, III, 54, 205, 164; Karen Anderson, *Chain Her by One Foot* (London: Routledge 1990).
- ¹⁸ Lescarbot, III, 200-2; Le Clercq, 243.
- ¹⁹ Le Clercq, 135-9; Denys, 420; Marc Lescarbot, *The Conversion of the Savages in Reuben Gold Thwaites, ed., The Jesuit Relations and Allied Documents* (New York: Pageant Books 1959)1, 101; *Jesuit Relations*, 111,83; Le Clercq, 265, 273.
- ²⁰ Le Clercq, 243; Lescarbot, 111, 333.
- ²¹ Lescarbot, III,365,27, 113; *Jesuit Relations*, III, 21; Todorov, *Conquest*, 27-33; Marshall Sahlins, *Islands of History* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press 1985), 10.
- ²² *Jesuit Relations*, III, 33-5.
- ²³ *Jesuit Relations*, III, 33.
- ²⁴ Champlain, 295.
- ²⁵ Clarence J. Glacken, "Changing Ideas of the Habitable World," in William L. Thomas, ed., *Man's Role in Changing the Face of the Earth* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press 1956), 70-92; Lescarbot, III, 241, 351,363-4; Alfred W. Crosby, Jr, *Ecological Imperialism: The Biological Expansion of Europe, 900-1900* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press 1986); A. Bartlett Giamatti, *The Earthly Paradise of the Renaissance Epic* (Princeton: Princeton University Press 1969); Hugh Johnson, *The Principles of Gardening* (London: Michael Beazley Publications 1979), 8.
- ²⁶ *Jesuit Relations*, III, 63; Denys, 303; Lescarbot, I, xii.
- ²⁷ Denys, 149-50; Diereville, 94-5; see Andrew Hill Clark, *Acadia: The Geography of Early Nova Scotia* (Madison: University of Wisconsin Press 1986), 24-31.
- ²⁸ Lescarbot, 11,317; John Hemming, *The Conquest of the Incas* (London: Penguin Books 1983), 77-88.
- ²⁹ Champlain, 272; Jane, *Columbus*, 24; Le Clercq, 115; *Jesuit Relations*, III, III; Le Clercq, 205; Lescarbot, III, 487.
- ³⁰ Denys, 156; Diereville, 75-7, 102, 122-3.
- ³¹ William M. Denevan, "The Pristine Myth: the Landscape of the Americas in 1492," *Annals of the Association of American Geographers*, 8a (3), 1992, 369-85; Keith Thomas, *Man and the Natural World* (New York: Pantheon Books 1983), 274; Le Clercq, 331; Marshall Sahlins, *Stone Age Economics* (Chicago: Aldine Publishing Co. 1972); Denys, 403; Clarence J. Glacken, *Traces on the Rhodian Shore: Nature and Culture in Western Thought from Ancient Times until the End of the Eighteenth Century* (Berkeley: University of California Press 1967), 494; Lescarbot, III, 137. See also Richard White, "Native

Americans and the Environment," in W.E. Swagerty, ed., *Scholars and the Indian Experience* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press 1984), 179-204; Lescarbot, III, 137.

³² Lescarbot, III, 94, 127; J.G.A. Pocock, "Tangata Whenua and Enlightenment Anthropology," *The New Zealand Journal of History*, 26, I, April 1992, 35,36, 41. Pocock bases much of his intricate argument on late seventeenth and eighteenth century sources, yet Marc Lescarbot's *History of New France*, first published in 1609, already articulates and assumes, though in a somewhat unsystematic way, a fairly full-blown version of the theory; see also John Locke's chapter "Of Property" in his *Essay Concerning the True Original Extent of Civil Government* (1640). Professor John Marshall has pointed to the importance of domestic animal imports as disease carriers by drawing my attention to Jared Diamond, "The Arrow of Disease," *Discover*, October 1992, 64-73.

³³ Lescarbot, III, 254; *Jesuit Relations*, I, 177.

³⁴ Denys, 415; Lescarbot, III, 163; Le Clercq, 151; Lescarbot, III, 227.

³⁵ Le Clercq, 254-5; Diereville, 77.

³⁶ Dean R. Snow and Kim M. Lamphear, "European Contact and Indian Depopulation in the Northeast," *Ethnohistory* (1988), 35: 15-33; Virginia P. Miller, "Aboriginal Micmac Population: A Review of Evidence," *Ethnohistory* (1976), 23: 117-27, and "The Decline of Nova Scotia Micmac Population, A.D. 1600-1850," *Culture* (1982), 3: 107-20; John D. Daniels, "The Indian Population of North America in 1492," *William and Mary Quarterly*, XLIX, 2, April 1991, 298-320.

³⁷ Bruce G. Trigger, *Natives and Newcomers* (Montreal: McGill Queen's Press 1985), 183-94.

³⁸ Le Clercq, 255; Denys, 449-50.

³⁹ Denys, 442.

⁴⁰ Calvin Martin, "Four Lives of a Micmac Copper Pot," *Ethnohistory* (1975), 22: 111-33; Le Clercq, 277; Denys, 452. See also Wilson D. Wallis and Ruth S. Wallis, *The Micmac Indians of Eastern Canada* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press 1945), and Bruce J. Bourque and Ruth Holmes Whitehead, "Tarrentines and the Introduction of European Trade Goods in the Gulf of Maine," *Ethnohistory* (1985), 32:327-41.

⁴¹ *Jesuit Relations*, I, 166-67; Le Clercq, 193-4.

⁴² Denys, 437; *Jesuit Relations*, III, 135; Lescarbot, III, 189; Elliott, *The Old World*, 27.

⁴³ Le Clercq, 125, 104.

⁴⁴ Lescarbot, III, 256-7, 229

⁴⁵ Rev. Silas Tertius Rand, *Legends of the Micmacs* (London: Longmans, Green and Co., 1894), 279