EARLY CHIPPED STONE INDUSTRIES OF THE
CENTRAL COAST OF BRITISH COLUMBIA

by

BRIAN CARL APLAND
B.A., Simon Fraser University, 1973

A THESIS SUBMITTED IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF
THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE OF
MASTER OF ARTS
in the Department of
Archaeology

© BRIAN CARL APLAND, 1977
SIMON FRASER UNIVERSITY
April 1977

All rights reserved. This thesis may not be reproduced in whole or in part, by photocopy or other means, without permission of the author.
Name: Brian Carl Apland
Degree: Master of Arts
Title of Thesis: Early Chipped Stone Industries of the Central Coast of British Columbia

Examinining Committee:
Chairman: D. Erle Nelson

Roy L. Carlson
Senior Supervisor

Knut R. Fladmark

Philip M. Hobler

Michael C. Roberts
External Examiner
Associate Professor
Department of Geography

Date Approved: April 15, 1977
PARTIAL COPYRIGHT LICENSE

I hereby grant to Simon Fraser University the right to lend my thesis or dissertation (the title of which is shown below) to users of the Simon Fraser University Library, and to make partial or single copies only for such users or in response to a request from the library of any other university, or other educational institution, on its own behalf or for one of its users. I further agree that permission for multiple copying of this thesis for scholarly purposes may be granted by me or the Dean of Graduate Studies. It is understood that copying or publication of this thesis for financial gain shall not be allowed without my written permission.

Title of Thesis/Dissertation:

Early Chipped Stone Industries of the Central Coast of British Columbia

Author:

(signature)

Brian Carl Apland

(name)

April 15, 1977

(date)
ABSTRACT

Chipped stone technology was once thought to have been very rare or non-existent in the central coast area of British Columbia. Recent discoveries in that region now indicate that this trait is neither absent nor rare, but simply early. This thesis examines a series of chipped stone assemblages recovered between 1970 and 1974 from 38 sites in the Bella Bella/Bella Coola and Quatsino Sound regions of the central coast. All of the material was collected from the surface of the intertidal zone of various beaches during the course of three major research projects with which the author was personally involved.

The main part of the thesis consists of discussions concerning the nature and geographical distribution of the data, as well as related discoveries in other parts of the central coast. These discussions are accompanied by a detailed description and analysis of the artifacts. It is concluded that there were two technological traditions on the central coast prior to 1,000 B.C. and, further, that these traditions were geographically distinct. On the northern part of the central coast a generalized prepared core-flake tradition seems to have appeared as early as 7,000 B.C., and persisted until at least until 1,000 B.C. This tradition has been divided into two phases: an early Namu phase dating between 7,000 and 4,000 B.C., and a later Cathedral phase dating between 4,000 and 1,000 B.C. Cultural affiliations appear to be to the north for this prepared core-flake tradition. The second tradition is a pebble-spall tradition which was present in the Quatsino Sound region of the south-western central coast prior to 3,000 B.C., and appears to have had strong affiliations with the cultures of the southern inner coast.
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CHAPTER I
INTRODUCTION

This thesis is concerned with the analysis and description of a series of chipped stone collections recovered from 38 sites in the central coast region of British Columbia. The recovery of these collections took place over a five year period from 1970 to 1974, as a result of the following three archaeological research projects: (1) Kwatna Inlet (Carlson 1970c, 1971, 1972; Hobler 1970); (2) Quatsino Sound (Carlson and Hobler 1974); and (3) the Bella Bella survey (Pomeroy 1971; Pomeroy and Spurling 1972; Apland 1974). To varying extents the author has had personal experience with each of those projects. The aims of the following analysis are: (1) to identify and outline the nature and extent of early chipped stone industries on the central coast, (2) to place these industries in time, and (3) to make cross-cultural comparisons of these chipped stone assemblages with similar material recorded from other areas of the Northwest coast.

Ethnographic descriptions by Boas (1963:17) suggest that stone chipping was neither a well developed nor commonly practiced form of tool manufacture among the Bella Coola and Kwakiutl speaking peoples of this region. Specific ethnographic accounts, such as those on the Bella Coola (MacIllwraith 1948), Owikeno and Bella Bella (Olsen 1954, 1955), make no mention of the use of chipped stone by those peoples. This absence could be construed as supportive negative evidence for the lack of such a trait. Early archaeological work (Smith 1907, 1909a; Drucker 1943) implied that this lack of a chipped stone technology in the tool making industries of the central coast peoples extended far back into prehistory. Recent
discoveries of chipped stone artifacts in virtually all parts of the central coast (the collections mentioned above are only a portion of the total evidence now known), necessitate a re-evaluation of the distributional patterns of these tools along the entire coast of British Columbia.

All of the material included in this report (consisting of 1850 specimens) has been collected from the active intertidal zone of various beaches, and as such has suffered severe surface attrition through natural weathering processes, particularly beach rolling. These effects have virtually precluded specific functional identifications based on wear patterns, and have caused confusion in the use of edge angle studies for the establishment of generalized functional groupings. For functional inferences pertaining to the artifacts I have largely relied on morphological attributes which were also used as criteria for classification. Since the classification of this material itself was based solely on morphological attributes related to form, it is strictly descriptive. The reader is asked to keep in mind that the classification offered herein is not to be considered closed to future additions or change.

Due to an extreme amount of variation in survey conditions from one project to the next, the degree to which collected assemblages are representative of total site content is almost impossible to ascertain. Conclusions resulting from inter-site comparisons are therefore considered only tenuous at best. At least two and possibly three regional industries are suggested by this material, and these will be outlined in the following pages. It will be up to future research in the area to more fully define them.

The ultimate value of this thesis is seen as four-fold, but it is hoped that it will serve many purposes not presently realized. First, this study offers raw data concerning archaeological material which until now
has been only marginally reported in the literature. Secondly, a re-
evaluation of the presently accepted ideas of chipped stone distributions
along the coast will clarify some long standing misconceptions. Further,
the thesis alerts the reader to some of the many existing problems in
coastal archaeology, and offers suggestions for future research.
Lastly, a tentative cultural-historical sequence based upon the slowly
eerging regional data is offered.
CHAPTER II

STUDY AREA

The central coast as it will be referred to in this thesis is geographically defined as that area of coastal British Columbia which encompasses the numerous islands and waterways from Johnstone Strait in the south to Milbanke Sound in the north (Fig. 1).

The term 'central coast' connotes more than simply a geographical segment of coastal British Columbia. It has often been used in archaeological discussions and reports to denote a specific region of study with cultural sub-area implications. This to a large extent is a carry-over from early ethnological research. In Kroeber's (1939) North American cultural and natural area breakdown, the territories of the Kwakiutl and Bella Coola were considered to be representative of a distinct variant of the "central maritime area", a sub-area of the overall North-west Coast culture area. The broader "central maritime" sub-area included the Nootkan territories of west coast Vancouver Island and the Olympic Peninsula.

Philip Drucker's (1943) description of the archaeology of coastal British Columbia, hypothesized a breakdown of the coast into three regional aspects, based on a horizontal distribution of artifacts. The "Milbanke Sound - Queen Charlotte Sound aspect" of Drucker's scheme closely coincided with Kroeber's "north central maritime area". Drucker (1965) later stated that the Nootka also exhibited enough cultural similarities to be included into the generalized "central coast province". The central coast therefore, is often anthropologically defined as the
territories of the Wakashan (Nootka-Kwakiutl) and Bella Coola (Salish).

Archaeological work in these regions is still in its infancy, and as such, the 'central coast' as it has been defined for this thesis can be viewed primarily as a convenience construct. Perhaps when more archaeological work is done, especially in the Nootkan regions, culture-area divisions can be more adequately examined and tested.

The geographical boundaries for the central coast study area therefore were not established entirely on an arbitrary level, but are closely coincident with the territories ethnographically described as having been occupied by the Bella Coolan (Salish) and various Kwakiutl speaking peoples of coastal British Columbia (Fig. 1).

Physiographic setting:

The central coast study area lies within the western system of the Canadian Cordillera, and is dominated by two major physiographic zones: (1) the coastal trough and (2) the coast mountains (Holland 1964) (Fig. 2). The western portion of the central coast consists of the numerous islands of the coastal trough zone, and is flanked by the Nawitti lowlands to the southwest, and the Hecate lowlands to the northeast. The topographic relief within this region is low, with elevations rarely exceeding 150 metres (500 ft.). Drainage is poor, and swamps, bogs, and muskeg are not uncommon. Moving eastwards from the coastal trough, the terrain grades steeply into the coast mountain zone, a region dominated by high peaks, of which many reach elevations in excess of 2,743 metres (9,000 ft.). Deeply incised by long winding river valleys, inlets and channels, such as Roscoe and Cascade inlets, Dean and Burke channels, and the Dean and Bella Coola river valleys, this region is the embodiment of the classic Northwest coast setting of long, narrow steep-walled fjords, winding
Figure 1: Central Coast Study Area
Ethno-Linguistic Boundaries of
Coastal British Columbia
Figure 2: Central Coast
Major Physiographic Zones
between enormous mountains which often jut directly out of the sea.

For example, along the Bella Coola valley there are differences in elevation of 8,341 ft. (2542 m.) in 2½ miles (4 km.) (Bella Coola valley floor to top of table top mountain) and 7,944 ft. (2421 m.) in 2½ miles (3.6 km.) (Bella Coola valley floor to top of Nusatsum Mountain) (Baer 1973:4).

Climate, Flora, and Fauna:

The central coast area falls into the littoral climatic zone described by Kendrew and Kerr (1955:52) as experiencing mild winters (January mean -1.11 - 4.44°C), warm but not hot summers (July mean 15.56°C), and fairly long periods of transition (spring and autumn about 3 months). Annual precipitation is generally described as moderate to high, with an average of about 228-254 cm. per year.

The plant and animal communities which inhabit this region are characteristic of the Coast Biotic area described by Munro and Cowan (1947). The most common floral communities consist of a climax forest dominated by Sitka spruce, western hemlock, mountain hemlock, western red cedar, yellow cypress, and grand fir. Douglas fir, broad-leaf maple, and red alder are characteristic of the pre-climax forest, and in most areas undergrowth is heavy and dominated by salal, red huckleberry, devils club, and salmonberry (Munro and Cowan 1947:32; Cowan and Guiguet 1956:25).

The major mammalian fauna most common to the area include black-tail deer, black bear, marten, mink, raccoon, river otter, sea otter, American beaver, hair seal, northern fur seal, northern sea lion, bard dolphin, and Pacific killer whale (Cowan and Guiguet 1956).

Numerous varieties of fish occupy the riverine and littoral aspects of the environment in sufficient quantity to support a major fishing industry. The littoral zone also hosts an abundance of various
edible mollusks, and crustaceans. The anadromous fish are perhaps the most important, with all five species of Pacific salmon (sockeye, coho, chum, chinook, and pink) occurring in enormous quantities along with eulachon and, to a lesser extent, steelhead. Other major varieties of fish include halibut, cod, herring, rock fish, and a wide variety of bottom feeders.

The dramatic physiographic relief described earlier for the central coast area, can naturally be expected to have pronounced local influences on the climate, flora, and fauna. The above description is therefore only offered as an overview. Localized variations within the area are numerous and in many cases extreme. An in-depth discussion of the nature and extent of these variations is beyond the scope of this thesis, however, a few brief examples are included to make the reader aware of the complexity of the environment throughout this area.

Temperature variations between the inner fjord headlands and the outer islands are such that freeze-over is common in the inner fjords but never occurs in the outer islands. Annual precipitation can vary regionally as much as 381 cm. per year, with the middle transition zone between the fjord headlands and the outer islands receiving the majority of moisture. Over a distance of 104.6 km. from Bella Bella in the outer islands to Ocean Falls 56.3 km. inland, and Bella Coola situated an additional 48.3 km. inland in the inner fjord headlands, precipitation patterns such as those summarized below are not uncommon.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Annual precip. in inches (cm.)</th>
<th>rain (in.)</th>
<th>snow (to convert to rain -10)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bella Bella</td>
<td>115.0 (292.1)</td>
<td>112.2</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ocean Falls</td>
<td>178.8 (454.1)</td>
<td>173.4</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bella Coola</td>
<td>51.9 (131.8)</td>
<td>46.2</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Kendrew and Kerr 1955:79)
Regional variations express themselves in the faunal make-up of the area as well, and localized populations of mountain goat, elk, grizzly bear, and wolves are also present.

**Post-Pleistocene Sea-levels:**

"Within the last 13,000 years the Northwest Coast has been subjected to high magnitude shifts in sea level" (Fladmark 1974:167). These shifts are extremely significant to the understanding of past settlement patterns along the coast. Land-sea relationships through time are one of the major governing factors indicative of where, and when suitable habitational localities were available to man.

Studies along the coast of British Columbia over the past two years have not produced enough information to significantly alter Fladmark's (1974:143-171) synthesis of the data concerning post-glacial sea-levels along the Northwest Coast. In this work Fladmark (1974:167, 293) concluded that the area north of Johnstone Strait experienced higher sea-levels than at present between 3,000 and 7,000 B.C. It must be kept in mind, however, that Fladmark was synthesising the sea-level data for the entire Northwest Coast, and as he states:

> Sea-level curves from different locales exhibit considerable variation (1974:167).

Differential ice-loading on a local scale can have dramatic effects upon local sea-level changes, since excessive ice in one valley will exert more pressure in the form of isostatic depression than in another where ice build-up had been less. The results are obvious, the valley with the more massive ice pack will exhibit much more pronounced shifts. There is no indication that ice build-up was uniform over the entire coast, so regional variations must be expected.
Retherford's (1972) report on the post-pleistocene environments of the Bella Bella/Bella Coola region offers a detailed description of the local history of sea-level fluctuations in that region over the past 12,000 years. After studying features being dissected by present tides including shell middens, glaciomarine sediments, raised deltas and fill terraces, Retherford developed a tentative sea-level curve (Fig. 3) for the Bella Bella/Bella Coola region. This curve suggests that the relative sea-level has fallen from a position approximately 10 m. higher than at present to its present equivalent between 7,500 and 4,000 B.C. After 4,000 B.C. the sea-level fell slowly to a position 2 or more metres below present by 1,000 B.C., after which it rose gradually to its present position.

Andrews and Retherford (1976) have recently presented a sea-level curve for the Bella Bella area which is significantly different than Retherford's earlier one outlined above. This curve suggests a much more rapid submergence, immediately following glacial recession, with a relative sea-level drop from +120 metres ca. 10,000 B.C. to the present equivalent by 5,500 B.C. The period of below normal falling of sea-levels therefore is pushed back 1,000 years over Retherford's earlier work, and falls between 5,500 and 2,000 B.C. Andrews (pers. comm.) suggests that the inconsistencies which exist between the two curves are due to "slopiness" of the curve between 7,000 and 1,000 B.C.

At present there is no available data on post-pleistocene sea-levels for any other areas of the central coast, although Heusser (1960:194) records evidence from Hope Island of two transgressions at around 100 ft. (30 m.) and 15 ft. (5 m.) with the lower stratigraphically pre-dating a peat formation. Using pollen stratigraphy Heusser placed a 1,500 B.C. date on the lower section.
Figure 3: Proposed Sea-Level Curve

Bella Bella/Bella Coola Region
Considering the regional variability of sea-level shifts, it must be kept in mind that any statements made concerning areas of the central coast, outside the Bella Bella/Bella Coola region, can only be considered speculative at best. However since the majority of the sites to be discussed herein have been recorded in the Bella Bella/Bella Coola region, this sea-level information gives us important data concerning when these sites were occupied, which will be discussed in Chapter IV.
CHAPTER III
THE EVIDENCE

The chipped stone artifacts which form the primary data base for this report are by no means the only archaeological evidence for a relatively early and widespread use of chipped stone by the prehistoric inhabitants of the central coast region. This chapter outlines the presently available evidence concerning the overall distribution of chipped stone artifacts in the study area.

The first recorded evidence of chipped stone artifacts in the central coast were two leaf-shaped points from a site near the mouth of the Bella Coola river, described by Smith in 1909. Smith preferred to view those points as indicative of trade with the interior plateau rather than representative of an indigenous industry, and felt that the distribution of such artifacts along the coast of British Columbia did not extend north of the Comox area of eastern Vancouver Island (Smith 1909a:359).

The first major archaeological work done in the central coast, other than Smith's meagre recordings (Smith 1909a,b), was a survey conducted by Drucker and Beardsley in 1938. The results of that survey, which extended from Prince Rupert to Rivers Inlet, appeared to substantiate Smith's beliefs concerning the distribution of chipped stone, and the presence of such a trait in the central coast area was described as "absent or rare" (Drucker 1943:124).

It is not surprising that Drucker observed a noticeable lack of chipped stone in the central coast area since:

The aim of the survey was to apply the direct historical approach to the regional archaeology, testing sites which on historic or other evidence were known to have been
inhabited during historic times, to define if possible the historic and protohistoric horizons, and to set the stage for linking them with or distinguishing them from, the prehistoric cultures of the area (Drucker 1943:24).

Drucker's data lacked appreciable time depth and only offered archaeological support to a pattern of tool technology which had already been described ethnographically. As pointed out by Boas (in his early notes):

In modern times the Kwakiutl have not practiced the art of stone flaking; archaeological evidence shows that it was practiced only in the crudest way, if at all, and very infrequently in the territory inhabited by them (Boas 1963:17).

Mitchell (1969) published a report on a series of intermittent surveys conducted in the Johnstone Strait-Queen Charlotte Strait area between 1966 and 1968. More than 400 sites were recorded in the course of those surveys, with some 37 of them yielding evidence of chipped stone (Mitchell 1969:206; Fig. 4). The discovery of this material led Mitchell to conclude that, although the Kwakiutl did not employ stone chipping as a means of lithic tool manufacture in ethnographic times, "at some earlier period relatively more emphasis had been placed on the production of chipped-stone tools" (Mitchell 1972:42).

The results of Mitchell's surveys contradicted Smith's beliefs and indicated that the distribution of chipped stone artifacts along the coast of British Columbia was not restricted to the areas south of Comox. However, we would have to modify Smith's conclusion that the Comox area marked the northern limit to the distribution of chipped-stone artifacts (Smith, 1907, p.308; 1909, p. 359). The boundary may lie further north near the mouth of Knight Inlet, and it might more accurately be described as marking a relative difference in the use of stone-chipping technology rather than any absolute break in the distribution (Mitchell 1972:41).

Although Mitchell has suggested that there may be no absolute break in the distribution of chipped stone implements, his implied northern
Figure 4: Distribution of Sites Yielding Chipped Stone Artifacts in the Johnstone Strait Region
boundary (the mouth of Knight Inlet) is now known to be non-existent. Considering the geographical extent of archaeological research in the central coast at that time, it was predictable that Mitchell's boundary, like Smith's, would not stand the test of time. As Baker pointed out:

As more work is done north of Knight Inlet, the possibility exists that the known distribution of chipped-stone will be increased (1973:59).

Chipped stone artifacts have now been found in virtually all areas of the coast north of Comox (MacDonald 1969; Hester 1968, 1969a,b; Kenady 1960; Simonsen 1970, 1973; Carlson 1971, 1972; Pomeroy 1971; Hobler 1972a,b; Pomeroy and Spurling 1972; Fladmark 1969, 1970a,b, 1971a,b; Chapman 1973, 1974; Mitchell 1969, 1972, 1973; Apland 1974; Carlson and Hobler 1974; Hobler 1976).

Figure 5 indicates the presently known central coast distribution of chipped stone artifacts which have been recorded through archaeological surveys, excavations and by occasional reports from local 'relic' hunters.

During the summer of 1970, Carlson discovered quantities of chipped stone artifacts in the intertidal zone of a beach fronting a small midden deposit (FbSu 1) at Cathedral Point in Burke Channel. Later that season similar material was recovered from the intertidal zone of two beaches in Kwatna Inlet (FaSu 18, 19). Although the artifact assemblages from all 3 sites were remarkably similar, the latter 2 differed from the first in that they were not associated with any additional evidence of human occupation, such as midden deposits. This observation prompted Carlson to conduct a series of low-tide investigations of the Kwatna Inlet region upon his return in 1971. The result of those investigations was that another intertidal 'beach site' was discovered (FaSu 21) (Carlson, pers. comm.).
Figure 5: Distribution of all Reported Sites Yielding Chipped Stone Artifacts in the Central Coast
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At the time of Carlson's 1971 research in Kwatna Inlet, Pomeroy was conducting a survey of the Bella Bella territory. Pomeroy also adopted low-tide beach investigations with some success:

In 1971 it was pointed out by Dr. Carlson that numerous artifacts were being found on beaches at a distance from middens. When this approach was followed more artifacts were found (1971:5).

and later:

The only chipped-stone artifacts found on the survey were found on the beach near a stream in front of the main midden (1971:13).

Carlson considered the chipped stone assemblages recovered from the four sites in the Kwatna Inlet region to be indicative of an early phase of cultural activity in the region. He termed this early phase "Cathedral" and suggested that it dates to a period of reduced sea-levels.

The geological picture suggests that the sites of this phase belong in a period of time when sea level was lower than it is today, at least in the Kwatna locality (Carlson 1972:43).

In 1973 I assisted Carlson and Hobler on a site survey of the Seymour Inlet system, as well as the northwest coast of Vancouver Island. Low-tide beach investigations were a standard procedure during that survey and as a result three additional intertidal beach sites represented solely by chipped stone were recorded in Quatsino Sound. One of these sites (EdSv 1) had been previously recorded by Kenady (1969) during his 1969 survey.

During the summer of 1974, Pomeroy and I conducted a survey of the Bella Bella region. In consideration of the increasing body of information suggesting a much wider distribution of chipped stone artifacts than previously known, one of the primary objectives of the survey was to obtain information concerning the overall distribution of
chipped stone in the Bella Bella region (Apland 1974:1). Thus low-tide investigations were again a standard procedure of the survey and as a result, chipped stone artifacts were recovered from some 28 sites in the Bella Bella area as well.

In summary, chipped stone artifacts are now known from all areas of the central coast; assemblages from 38 sites have been analysed here. Table 1 summarizes those sites with reference to the chipped stone artifacts recovered, and the locations of the sites are shown in Figure 6. Although no individual site descriptions are offered, there are sufficient shared characteristics which enable them to be classified into three main groups (Table 1): (1) midden sites; (2) beach sites; and (3) fish trap sites.

(1) Midden sites:
Shell middens are the most common type of site on the coast of British Columbia, and are characteristic of the majority of sites under discussion here (Table 1). Evidence for the use of chipped stone at these sites ranges from one retouched flake or core, to over 200 specimens, representing a variety of tool types. Only 2 of these sites have been test excavated, however, (FbSu 1; E1Tb 10) and both produced indications that the chipped stone material from the beach fronting them, might not associate with the midden deposits.

It is not uncommon to find artifacts on beaches fronting midden deposits due to natural erosion from rain, wind and wave action. The first assumption one often makes when discovering such material is that it has been washed from the midden deposit. However, it is apparent that in some cases at least, these assumed relationships are not necessarily true.
| Artifacts                          | EdSv 1 | EdSv 3 | EdSv 10 | EdSv 3 | ERSx 1 | ERSx 3 | ERSx 9 | ERSx 10 | ERSx 18 | ERSx 19 | ERSx 28 | ERSx 30 | FaSx 3 | FaSx 10a | FaSx 18 | FaSx 19 | FaSx 21 | FaSx 35 | FaSx 44 | FaSx 3 | FaS | Farb 14 | Farb 16 | Farb 20 | Farb 25 | Farb 7 | Farb 11 | FaSx 1 | FeSx 1 | FeSx 10b | TOTALS |
|----------------------------------|-------|-------|--------|-------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|
| Bifacially flaked points         | 1     | 3     | 9      | 1     | 1      | 1      | 4      | 1      | 4      | 1      | 1      | 4      | 1      | 4      | 1      | 4      | 1      | 4      | 1      | 4      | 1      | 4      | 1      | 4      | 1      | 4      | 1      | 4      | 1      | 4      | 1      | 4      | 1      | 4      | 1      | 4      | 1      |
| Flakes                           |       |       |        |       |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |
| ERSx 18 | ERSx 19 | ERSx 28 | ERSx 30 | FaSx 3 | FaSx 10a | FaSx 18 | FaSx 19 | FaSx 21 | FaSx 35 | FaSx 44 | FaSx 3 | FaSx 10a |FaSx 18 | FaSx 19 | FaSx 21 | FaSx 35 | FaSx 44 | FaSx 3 | FaS | Farb 14 | Farb 16 | Farb 20 | Farb 25 | Farb 7 | Farb 11 | FaSx 1 | FeSx 1 | FeSx 10b | TOTALS |
| ERSx 30 | ERSx 9 | ERSx 10 | ERSx 18 | ERSx 19 | ERSx 28 | ERSx 30 | FaSx 3 | FaSx 10a | FaSx 18 | FaSx 19 | FaSx 21 | FaSx 35 | FaSx 44 | FaSx 3 | FaSx 10a | FaSx 18 | FaSx 19 | FaSx 21 | FaSx 35 | FaSx 44 | FaSx 3 | FaS | Farb 14 | Farb 16 | Farb 20 | Farb 25 | Farb 7 | Farb 11 | FaSx 1 | FeSx 1 | FeSx 10b | TOTALS |
| FaSx 19 | FaSx 21 | FaSx 35 | FaSx 44 | FaSx 3 | FaSx 10a | FaSx 18 | FaSx 19 | FaSx 21 | FaSx 35 | FaSx 44 | FaSx 3 | FaSx 10a | FaSx 18 | FaSx 19 | FaSx 21 | FaSx 35 | FaSx 44 | FaSx 3 | FaS | Farb 14 | Farb 16 | Farb 20 | Farb 25 | Farb 7 | Farb 11 | FaSx 1 | FeSx 1 | FeSx 10b | TOTALS |
| FaSx 35 | FaSx 44 | FaSx 3 | FaSx 10a | FaSx 18 | FaSx 19 | FaSx 21 | FaSx 35 | FaSx 44 | FaSx 3 | FaS | Farb 14 | Farb 16 | Farb 20 | Farb 25 | Farb 7 | Farb 11 | FeSx 1 | FeSx 10b | TOTALS |
| FaSx 44 | FaSx 3 | FaSx 10a | FaSx 18 | FaSx 19 | FaSx 21 | FaSx 35 | FaSx 44 | FaSx 3 | FaS | Farb 14 | Farb 16 | Farb 20 | Farb 25 | Farb 7 | Farb 11 | FeSx 1 | FeSx 10b | TOTALS |
| FaSx 3 | FaSx 10a | FaSx 18 | FaSx 19 | FaSx 21 | FaSx 35 | FaSx 44 | FaSx 3 | FaS | Farb 14 | Farb 16 | Farb 20 | Farb 25 | Farb 7 | Farb 11 | FeSx 1 | FeSx 10b | TOTALS |
| FaSx 10a | FaSx 18 | FaSx 19 | FaSx 21 | FaSx 35 | FaSx 44 | FaSx 3 | FaS | Farb 14 | Farb 16 | Farb 20 | Farb 25 | Farb 7 | Farb 11 | FeSx 1 | FeSx 10b | TOTALS |
| FaSx 18 | FaSx 19 | FaSx 21 | FaSx 35 | FaSx 44 | FaSx 3 | FaS | Farb 14 | Farb 16 | Farb 20 | Farb 25 | Farb 7 | Farb 11 | FeSx 1 | FeSx 10b | TOTALS |
| FaSx 19 | FaSx 21 | FaSx 35 | FaSx 44 | FaSx 3 | FaS | Farb 14 | Farb 16 | Farb 20 | Farb 25 | Farb 7 | Farb 11 | FeSx 1 | FeSx 10b | TOTALS |
| FaSx 21 | FaSx 35 | FaSx 44 | FaSx 3 | FaS | Farb 14 | Farb 16 | Farb 20 | Farb 25 | Farb 7 | Farb 11 | FeSx 1 | FeSx 10b | TOTALS |
| FaSx 35 | FaSx 44 | FaSx 3 | FaS | Farb 14 | Farb 16 | Farb 20 | Farb 25 | Farb 7 | Farb 11 | FeSx 1 | FeSx 10b | TOTALS |
| FaSx 44 | FaSx 3 | FaS | Farb 14 | Farb 16 | Farb 20 | Farb 25 | Farb 7 | Farb 11 | FeSx 1 | FeSx 10b | TOTALS |
| FaSx 3 | FaS | Farb 14 | Farb 16 | Farb 20 | Farb 25 | Farb 7 | Farb 11 | FeSx 1 | FeSx 10b | TOTALS |
| FaS | Farb 14 | Farb 16 | Farb 20 | Farb 25 | Farb 7 | Farb 11 | FeSx 1 | FeSx 10b | TOTALS |
| Farb 14 | Farb 16 | Farb 20 | Farb 25 | Farb 7 | Farb 11 | FeSx 1 | FeSx 10b | TOTALS |
| Farb 16 | Farb 20 | Farb 25 | Farb 7 | Farb 11 | FeSx 1 | FeSx 10b | TOTALS |
| Farb 20 | Farb 25 | Farb 7 | Farb 11 | FeSx 1 | FeSx 10b | TOTALS |
| Farb 25 | Farb 7 | Farb 11 | FeSx 1 | FeSx 10b | TOTALS |
| Farb 7 | Farb 11 | FeSx 1 | FeSx 10b | TOTALS |
| Farb 11 | FeSx 1 | FeSx 10b | TOTALS |
| FeSx 1 | FeSx 10b | TOTALS |
| FeSx 10b | TOTALS |

Table I: Distribution by Site of Chipped Stone Artifacts in Study Area
Figure 6: Distribution of Sites Included in This Study
Test excavations in the midden at Cathedral Point (FbSu 1), the type site for the Cathedral phase (Carlson 1972), produced lithic artifacts which differed significantly from the chipped stone assemblages from the beach. These excavated assemblages were more comparable typologically with the lithic components of two relatively late cultural phases from nearby sites.

Carlson describes the differences in these assemblages as follows:

The chief difference lies in the basic tool manufacturing techniques. Tools of the Cathedral phase were made by chipping or flaking stone whereas during the Anutcix and Kwatna phases stone tools were made primarily by grinding, polishing, and pecking (Carlson 1972:43).

This technological shift through time indicated in the above description has been evidenced in the north coast region as well. In his report on the Prince Rupert Harbour sequence, MacDonald (1969:250-253) describes chipped stone as the dominant lithic tool type in his "lower horizon" (ca. 2500 B.C.-500 B.C.), but virtually absent from the "upper horizon (ca. A.D.500-1800). A similar transition also occurs in the Strait of Georgia, and Mitchell uses it as a major distinguishing characteristic of his early "Lithic Culture type".

This type is characterized mainly by an absence of ground-stone forms of any kind, except possibly those produced through food-grinding activity or used in the production of bone, antler, and possibly wood artifacts (Mitchell 1971a:59-60).

Excavations at ElTb 10 indicated a pattern remarkably similar to that at Cathedral Point. ElTb 10 is a large midden site on the north end of the northernmost island of the McNaughton group. Numerous chipped stone artifacts were recovered from the beach fronting this site, and yet excavations conducted by Pomeroy in 1972, and Carlson in 1974, found virtually no evidence of such material within the midden deposits (Carlson 1975; Pomeroy, pers. comm.).
Pomeroy's excavation, a 2 metre wide trench perpendicular to the beach front which cross-sectioned the midden, found that (Pomeroy, pers. comm.; Pomeroy and Spurling 1972), chipped stone occurred only infrequently in the bottom of the trench near the front of the midden (Pomeroy, pers. comm.).

A lack of chipped stone material within the midden deposit was also observed by Carlson (1975) during his 1974 excavations, where only two specimens were recovered from beneath an old humus layer on the island. This paucity of chipped stone in the midden contrasted strongly with the relative abundance of such artifacts on the beach (116 specimens), and suggests that perhaps the chipped stone beach material has not washed out of the present midden, but is instead from an earlier, fully eroded site deposit.

Carlson identified a series of 9 spatially defined artifact assemblages from the McNaughton site. The first of these, mainly from the beach, he described as characterized by chipped stone which "can be considered as part of a component of the Cathedral Phase" (Carlson 1975: 6). Carlson (1972:43) had earlier suggested that the Cathedral phase material from Kwatna Inlet may have been deposited during a period in which the sea level was lower than it is today. This may account for the peculiar distribution of chipped stone artifacts at the McNaughton Island site (ELTb 10).

The midden at ELTb 10 surrounds the eastern and southern margins of a small lagoon, extending to cover a bedrock peninsula between the small lagoon and another larger lagoon situated farther inland. At high tide this peninsula becomes an island, yet at low tide the small lagoon fronting the midden becomes almost totally drained of water.
Figure 7: McNaughton Island Site (ELTb 10)
showing Extent of Excavations by
Pomeroy (1972) and Carlson (1974)
(from Carlson 1976:3)
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Figure 7
Fluctuations in the land-sea relationships of the Bella Bella/Bella Coola region, as we have mentioned earlier, have been fairly dramatic within the past 12,000 years. The relatively significant drop in sea level from its present equivalent ca. 5,000 B.C. to 5 or more metres below its present level by approximately 2,000 B.C. would have virtually eliminated the lagoon fronting ElTb 10, leaving only a dry beach area. It is this point which I would like to explore further with reference to the peculiar distribution of chipped stone at that site.

Chipped stone occurs relatively early along the coast of British Columbia (as almost everywhere in the world) and was eventually replaced by ground, pecked and polished stone. If we consider the presence of the chipped stone material from ElTb 10 to be indicative of an early (relative to the non-chipped stone assemblages) occupation during a period of reduced sea level, that occupation in all likelihood was situated farther forward (toward the water) on the beach than the presently extant midden. Subsequent rises in sea level would necessitate a backward shift of later occupational events, in response to a rising shoreline.

The effect of this hypothetical progression of events would be to see the earlier cultural deposits become slowly submerged. Continual exposure to rising and falling tides would wash away such things as shell, bone, 'soil', charcoal, and ash, etc., leaving only the heavier, more durable elements of material culture such as those made from stone, exposed on the beach.

If land-sea relationships were stable, normal midden growth would tend to expand outward toward the water. Under these conditions the oldest deposits would normally be located near the bottom at the back of a midden. Under rising sea-level conditions such as those described above, this handy 'rule of thumb' does not work, since the depositional
sequence would be altered. This situation should always be kept in mind when planning midden excavations on the coast; it helps to explain why Pomeroy found chipped stone only at the very bottom near the front of the midden. If the early beach occupation hypothesis is true, then Pomeroy in all likelihood had managed to transect the remnants of an earlier deposit. The sequential stages of occupation hypothesized for the McNaughton Island site are shown in Figure 8.

(2) Beach sites:

There are 10 sites among the 38 under consideration here which can be classified into this group (see Table 1). Beach sites have not yet gained full recognition in the archaeological literature, but are defined by artifacts on a beach, the presence of this material being the only recognizable evidence of past human activity. In the case of the 10 sites mentioned above, this artifactual material was comprised solely of chipped stone.

All of the beach sites included here share a number of characteristics other than those which have been used to define them. These sites are usually situated in small protected coves. In all cases they are located on relatively wide intertidal shelves, which become exposed during periods of low tide and, characteristically, the terrain immediately behind the beaches slopes steeply upward, leaving little, if any, land suitable for habitation above the high tide level.

Artifact assemblages are on the whole very similar between these sites, as well as with assemblages from the midden sites discussed earlier. The only exceptions are the 2 beach sites EdSv 1 and EdSv 10, from Quatsino Sound, where the artifact assemblages, although similar to each other, differ from all other beach sites. However, these 2 assemblages do compare well with chipped stone assemblages
Figure 8: Schematic profile of McNaughton Island Site (ELTb 10) showing proposed occupational sequence with reference to past sea level fluctuations.

1. - cultural deposition during period reduced sea level, pre-1000 B.C. Chipped stone dominant.

2. - rise in sea level, shoreline encroaches upon cultural deposits, subsequent deposits developing further back. Older deposits being submerged and washed out.

3. - present position of the sea, midden deposit eroded by high tide. Older chipped stone bearing deposit only a remnant at bottom front of midden. Heavy artifacts (chipped stone mixed with later artifacts) on beach.

- present midden deposit.

- early cultural deposit

- sea level

- bedrock
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collected at 3 midden sites in the same area (EdSv 3, EdSw 1, EdSw 10). In total, these 5 sites represent a unique regional manifestation of a chipped stone industry distinct from that of the Bella Bella/Bella Coola region, as we shall see later.

Beach sites in general are considered to have depositional histories like those of the midden sites. Initial occupation would have occurred during a period of reduced sea-level, when the present intertidal shelf upon which they rest was exposed and formed an open beach area suitable for habitation. Subsequent sea-level rises submerged and eroded the early deposits, and the relatively steep hinterland precluded later occupational events, such as those which produced the midden sites.

Carlson and Hobler (1974:11) suggested that the beach sites with chipped stone were explicable as lithic quarries or as old habitation sites washed out by rising sea levels (as described above), or both. There is little doubt that raw materials for stone tool manufacturing were gathered at these sites, suggesting that either the first or last explanation would best describe them. However, upon closer inspection we find that the most extensively utilized raw material (andesite/basalt) is found in abundance among the natural cobbles existing on virtually all beaches in the area. This would suggest that the primary reason for site locations was not simply oriented towards quarrying. Furthermore, the variety of tool types found associated with these sites indicates a number of activities were in all likelihood carried out there, and that site functions were somewhat complex.

One site has been recorded 'undecided' (FaSu 10a). It is represented by 9 badly waterworn specimens of chipped stone, recovered from a gravel bar in the Kwatna river near a large midden site, FaSu 10, excavated by Carlson in 1972. The overall appearance of this material
is identical with the Cathedral phase material known from 4 sites in Kwatna Inlet. Although some chipped stone was found near the bottom of the deposit at FaSu 10, that material differs typologically from the pieces recovered from the river. At present it is difficult to place this material in any particular site group, given the limitations of sample size, external wear through natural erosional processes, and lack of direct site association.

(3) Fish-Traps:

Four sites have been included in this group (see Table 1). Fish-traps are a very common site group in the Bella Bella region, and vary greatly in form and construction, depending upon where they are located (Apland 1974:4-5; Pomeroy 1976). They consist of rows of rocks piled several courses high, positioned in the intertidal zone of beaches, at or near the mouths of large rivers and streams, across small shallow lagoons, or across the heads of shallow coves, or simply along open shorelines.

These fish-trap sites are in fact, on the beach. However, since a specific function (fishing) can be identified for them, they are classified separately from 'beach sites'. Chipped stone artifacts found at these sites may not be directly associated with the traps. Since there is no stratigraphic control it is difficult to establish the degree of association, if any, between the artifacts and subsistence features. These artifacts may represent old beach sites, upon which later fish traps were constructed, or they may represent tools related to particular functions associated with the fish traps themselves, such as fish cutting implements.
CHAPTER IV

DATING

The term 'early' has been used consistently in conjunction with the chipped stone evidence from the central coast. This chapter will examine the problem of dating that material. There are no absolute dates yet available which can be directly associated with any of the collections. However, there is a fairly large body of indirect data which allows us to bracket this material into a relatively well defined time span, ranging from ca. 4,000 to 1,000 B.C.

General observations:

Carlson (1972:43) has suggested that chipped stone can be viewed as an horizon marker, separating early cultures in which chipped stone is common, from relatively late cultures in which chipped stone is rare. It could be argued that in relation to entire assemblages, the relative rarity or abundance of chipped stone may only reflect differential preservation of the more perishable aspects of any given assemblage. However, when one simply considers the lithic aspect of material culture, a pronounced shift away from stone flaking and towards pecking, grinding, and polishing, as a primary means of lithic technology does appear to have occurred throughout the Northwest Coast at various times in different regions.

Chipped stone was certainly not a characteristic trait of the central coast in the late-prehistoric and early historic periods, as was mentioned in Chapter III. The recent discovery of a wide distribution of this material throughout the area suggests as Mitchell points out that
it is not necessarily rare, but simply an early cultural trait in the area.

This temporal distribution of artifacts is therefore in agreement with Boas' observation that within recent times the Kwakiutl did little stone-flaking. However, it suggests, that at some earlier period relatively more emphasis had been placed on production of chipped-stone tools (Mitchell 1972:42).

Radio carbon dates:

The active intertidal zone of a beach is not noted for its preservational qualities, and as such, no organic matter suitable for C\textsuperscript{14} dating found to be directly associated with the chipped stone assemblages under study here has been obtained. However, radio carbon dates received from a number of midden sites within the region are useful in estimating when stone chipping was in vogue throughout the central coast.

Mitchell received 14 radio carbon dates from the sites in the Johnstone Strait region. Upon plotting site collection lists with C\textsuperscript{14} estimates, he found that:

An arbitrary selection of 1550 B.C. (mid point of the range) as the boundary between "early" and "late" couples 89 per cent of the artifacts with early, and 11 per cent with late estimates. When we consider only chipped-stone items the proportions are 95 per cent early, 5 per cent late (Mitchell 1972:42).

All of Mitchell's dates were obtained from shell samples, (in thirteen cases Saxidomus giganteus; and in one instance Schizothaerus capox) taken from immediately beneath the humus layer of their respective middens (Mitchell 1969:200).

Mitchell (1972:42) expressed concern over the association of the artifacts with the dates, since they were all surface collected from the beaches fronting the middens.
Although it must be acknowledged at the outset that each collection may be drawn from more than one component and that the relation of dated samples to artifacts is best termed imprecise.

I feel that as long as the artifacts can be assumed to be associated with their respective middens, then the consistent practice of 'top-dating' those sites, employed by Mitchell, allows one to assume that the artifacts are either contemporaneous with, or older than, the latest or top occupational zone of the middens.

Two \(^{14}C\) dates were obtained from the basal levels of FbSu 1, the type site for the Cathedral phase assemblages. One sample (Gak 3907-soil with plant roots) yielded a date of 260±130 B.C., and the other (Gak 3906-charcoal) was dated at 340±80 A.D. (Carlson and Hobler 1972:4). Test excavations of the midden deposit at this site revealed materials "typologically younger" than those from the beach (Carlson 1972:43), thus suggesting a pre-260 B.C. date for the Cathedral phase component (Carlson and Hobler 1972:4).

During his excavations at the McNaughton Island site (ElTb 10) in 1972, Pomeroy found that the chipped stone artifacts which had been recovered in quantities from the beach were not similarly common throughout the midden deposit. Only one small scraper and a few unaltered flakes were found near the base of the midden close to the beach front (Pomeroy, pers. comm.). Two \(^{14}C\) dates were obtained from the bottom of the deposit, both were on charcoal and dated to 570±90 B.C. and 470±95 B.C.

At the O'Connor site (EeSu 5) near Port Hardy, Chapman found evidence of a chipped stone component in the basal deposits of the midden. Small obsidian flakes were found throughout the deposits, but these did not relate to the early chipped stone component which was marked by 3 leaf-shaped points and some unifacially retouched flakes. Three \(^{14}C\) dates
were obtained from this site, all taken from the mid-range of the deposit, stratigraphically well above the chipped stone bearing strata. These dates (2 on charcoal, and 1 on fragmented shell and ash) were found to center around 760 B.C. (Gak 4917 - 1050±90 B.C.; Gak 4918 - 740±90 B.C.; Gak 3901 - 590±120 B.C.) (Chapman 1976).

Excavations on the central coast have resulted in the testing of 27 sites to date, 8 of which were major excavations (Drucker 1943; Capes 1960, 1964; Simonsen 1970; Hester 1968, 1969; Hobler 1969, 1970, 1972a,b; Carlson 1970c, 1971, 1972, 1975, 1976; Chapman 1971, 1972, 1973, 1974, 1976; Pomeroy and Spurling 1972; Mitchell 1973; Cybulski 1975). Unfortunately the relative recency of excavation projects coupled with the inevitable time-lag in published accounts, has resulted in very little information being available at this point, concerning the results of those projects. If the apparent scarcity of chipped stone from excavated assemblages post-dating 1,000 B.C. continues to prevail (and there are no indications that it will not) a terminal date for the prehistoric use of chipped stone as a primary lithic tool manufacturing technique in the central coast sometime prior to 1,000 B.C. is strongly indicated. This is not to say that stone chipping was totally abandoned by the prehistoric peoples of the central coast, but simply that there was a major shift in emphasis in stone tool technology. Plain and retouched flakes, cores, along with other more formal chipped stone tools have been represented on a minor scale in excavated assemblages from the area post-dating 1,000 B.C. (Luebbers 1971; Carlson 1972; Hobler 1973; Chapman 1971, 1974, 1976).

The only site which has yielded datable cultural deposits extending back over 3,000 years in the central coast is Namu (ElSx 1). The Namu sequence as described by Luebbers (1971) supports the trends and dates offered in the above discussion. According to Luebbers (1971:106)
artifact description through time, chipped stone was the only artifact type present from 7,000 to 3,000 B.C. However, ground stone "celts" (adzes) began appearing between 2,000 to 1,000 B.C. and, by the time of Christ, chipped stone had virtually disappeared.

The lowest depositional phases at Kisameet Bay (ElSx 3), also described by Luebbers (1971:108), were dated between 410 B.C. and 90 A.D. These deposits were also devoid of chipped stone artifacts. The Namu sequence appears to have chipped stone extending longer in time than is indicated by other sites in the area. It must be kept in mind, however, that the dates given are minimums, and that chipped stone had virtually disappeared from the sequence sometime before the birth of Christ.

Sea-Levels:

As seen previously (Chapter III), the various assemblages under discussion probably date to a period of reduced sea-level. This is especially true in the case of the beach sites. Since the relative sea-levels, of at least the Bella Bella/Bella Coola region, were much higher than present prior to 5,500 B.C. (Andrews and Retherford 1976) the occupation of all of the sites under discussion here must logically post-date that time period.

Sites occupied prior to 5,500 B.C. should be expected to be located on raised beaches, terraces or strand lines, as Retherford points out:

...because of these sea level shifts, the likelihood of finding midden sites much older than Namu is not good unless much higher elevations are surveyed (Retherford 1972:94).

If the 1,000 B.C. date can be accepted as the terminal date for the use of chipped stone as a primary method of lithic tool manufacture
on the central coast, then the various assemblages to be described in the next chapter must date to 5,500-1,000 B.C., a period very close to that predicted by Carlson of 4,000 to 1,000 B.C. for the Cathedral phase (Carlson 1972:41).
CHAPTER V  
THE ARTIFACTS

This chapter offers a description and discussion of 1850 artifacts collected from the 38 sites previously discussed. This description is presented in the form of a loose system of classification, with the various artifact groups being solely defined on attributes of morphology. Specimens were classified according to 2 sets of criteria: (1) shared technological attributes of manufacture (e.g. bifacial and unifacial flaking); and (2) shared formal attributes (e.g. cross-sections, and outlines). This classificatory procedure was used to maintain consistency and descriptive continuity. It must be kept in mind however that the rather loose taxonomy developed here should not be considered definitive, and may be subject to future modification and change as more work is done in the study area.

Functional interpretations for the various artifact groupings have been offered on a speculative level. These interpretations were not used as a criterion for classification, since it is felt that many of the present problems in archaeological analysis (especially of chipped stone artifacts) lie in misconceptions generated through a much too liberal use of functional terminology. Before embarking on the descriptive portion of this chapter, a brief explanation of the above statement is offered.

The recent revival of functional studies, which gained a great deal of impetus after the English translation of Semenov's Prehistoric Technology in 1964, resulted in a controversy between
so-called "functionalists" and "morphologists" (or "typologists") (Tringham et. al. 1974:172). Morphologists traditionally classify artifacts into functional groupings based on the assumption that form dictates function. Functionalists on the other hand argue that such an assumption is not necessarily true, and suggest that morphological studies tend to "...overlook the fact that tools of a single shape can and have been used for different purposes and that tools of different shapes have been used in performing the same task" (Nance 1970:66).

It would appear that the crux of the argument centers around the degree to which functional interpretations are to be taken. To a large extent, form does dictate function, or at least severely limit it, especially when viewed in context of entire tool assemblages within particular environments. With reference to Nance's statement above, it might be argued that although tools of one form may have served more than one function, the various functions to which that tool was put to use were most likely closely related. The classic example, of course, is the projectile point which in reality may have been a knife (Ahler 1971; Nance 1971; Hester and Heizer 1973). One can argue that the basic function of both the projectile point and the knife is the same, that of cutting. A projectile point however has other requirements as well; although cutting features are important, a piercing attribute is a necessity, thus limiting the projectile point to one basic form. Such a form could indeed be used as a knife if the need arose. The variety of forms to which the nebulous term 'Knife' can be applied, on the other hand, are numerous, and not all are useful to describe
projectile points. If functional interpretations are to influence (or be reflected in) classificatory terminology, then the initial functional intent which was in the mind of the artifact manufacturer must be reflected. This, of course, is impossible to accomplish with any high degree of certainty, and as such, a certain amount of caution should be exercised when making functional interpretations.

The functional versatility of artifacts must always be kept in mind when analyzing various tools. If the archaeologist is to reconstruct past life-ways, he must not restrict the interpretive potential of his data; an unavoidable consequence of functional terminology. Function-specific terminology can create more problems than simply restricting the appreciation of the diversity of tool-use. Such a practice can and has resulted in the creation of misleading and in some cases totally misrepresented tool types.

The recent study by Henry Wylie (1975) on chipped stone artifacts from Hogup Cave, clearly pointed out some of these problems. According to Wylie, the traditional approach to stone tool classification has been based upon morphology and intuited function. The resulting typologies reflect this in the terminology used, which is both functional and descriptive (i.e. side scrapers) (1975:28). Wylie conducted use-wear analysis as well as experimental replication studies on the Hogup Cave artifacts. The assemblage had previously been subjected to traditional classificatory analysis. His results were as follows:
...the traditional approach frequently over emphasizes or misinterprets certain tool attributes especially shape and secondary flaking features. This commonly results in misleading and inaccurate tool designations such as, in the Hogup Cave sample, "side scrapers" for tools which are frequently neither scrapers (actually backed saws) nor side-utilized instruments, or "domed scrapers" which are just as often used as adzes (1975:29).

It is the use of function-specific terminology which can be misleading and in some cases incorrect. To delete such terminology from classificatory nomenclature in no way hampers functional interpretations of artifacts. Returning to the material at hand, as was mentioned earlier, all of the specimens to be described herein have been collected from the surface of the intertidal zone of beaches and as such have been subjected to numerous erosional agencies such as beach rolling, atmospheric weathering at low tide, and chemical alteration from sea water. The result of such erosional processes, however, is one of "rounding" on the sharp edges of angular particles. The process of rounding in a relatively high energy environment of which beaches are an example usually occurs relatively rapidly. It is interesting to note, however, that although all of the artifacts to be described herein exhibit sufficient surface damage in the form of rounding, to preclude wear pattern analysis, flake scars remain very distinct. This may suggest that these specimens have not been continuously exposed to the weathering agents associated with their beach environment for any significant periods of time. This may further suggest that they have emerged from the beach gravels relatively recently. Every specimen was observed under a low power microscope (20X) and, with the exception of two pieces, no function-specific wear patterns in the form of striations, polish, or micro-flaking could be confidently identified.
Before embarking upon the detailed descriptions of the chipped stone assemblages under consideration, I would like to mention that a number of ground stone specimens were also recovered from 4 of the sites included in this study (EkTa 10, E1Tb 10, FaTb 13, FbSu 1). These specimens were in the form of ground greenstone adzes or adze fragments, and the sites from which they came were all associated with midden deposits. Two of those sites (E1Tb 10, FbSu 1) were test excavated as was mentioned in Chapter III and it was found that although comparable groundstone artifacts were present in the middens, chipped stone was absent or rare. Considering the lack of groundstone implements in the assemblages from the majority of sites under consideration, I felt that these implements, where encountered, were likely associated with a different and later cultural component than the chipped stone. For this reason these specimens have not been included in this analysis.

Procedures:

The initial analysis began with the separation of the material into two main categories: (1) tools: any object exhibiting characteristics considered indicative of use of that object as a tool; and (2) waste: any and all objects which did not exhibit evidence of use as a tool. The microscopic analysis at this point revealed that a large number of flakes exhibited edge damage which could not be positively identified as either
intentional or 'use' retouch, or due to some form of post-depositional damage arising from non-cultural activities. The problems of surface attrition on these artifacts have already been mentioned. Numerous researchers dealing with chipped stone have stressed caution, especially when making functional interpretations, or establishing that an object was actually utilized in the first place (Nance 1970; Sheets 1973; Wylie 1973, 1974; Keeley 1974). The flakes mentioned above exhibited edge damage in the form of micro-flake scars, representative of snap-fractures and step-fractures, which did not conform to any apparent patterning. Several 'fresh-looking' scars were also noted, suggestive of damage during collection, shipment from the field, and storage. Although the latter damage was easily identified, it did tend to obscure positive identification of previous wear patterns which may have existed on the specimens. Lack of positive identification for the origin of the edge damage on many of these specimens resulted in the inclusion of a third general artifact category, 'miscellaneous flakes'. Maximum length, width, and thickness measurements were recorded for all specimens, and weights were recorded for the heavy implements of the pebble-tool and core-tool groups. Edge angles were also taken with the aid of a pocket goniometer.

Raw materials:

Obtaining raw materials for stone chipping was not a problem for prehistoric peoples in the central coast. The most common type of stone utilized was readily available among the natural pebbles and
cobbles found on all beaches in the area. This material was a fine grained igneous rock of the basalt/andesite range (Crampton pers. comm.). It would require a chemical and/or mineral analysis to distinguish between these two types, a procedure not performed since it was apparent that the material was chosen for its accessibility and fine grained nature, rather than its chemical composition.

A.J. Baer's (1968) geological study of the Bella Coola-Ocean Falls region, however, gives us some insight into the basic rock type common to that region:

Volcanic rocks in the Bella Coola-Ocean Falls region are most commonly dark green with a purplish tint and appear black on weathered surfaces. Their composition is primarily andesitic and rarely basaltic (1968:1433).

This describes the majority of the material in the assemblages studied. It also resembles the type of rock observed among the chipped stone components included in the assemblages recovered from Namu, and Grant Anchorage (pers. observ.). Mitchell's (1972) descriptions of the Johnstone Strait assemblages indicate that it dominated chipped stone components there as well. The material described above represented more than 95% of the rock type utilized. Other raw materials included obsidian (2.33%) and to a lesser extent milky quartz, grey vitrious basalt, and quartzite (less than 1% total). Of these materials, obsidian deserves special mention.

Obsidian is the only raw material represented which is not indigenous to the immediate area. Sources of obsidian are not as widespread as most other rock types, and as such only a small number of geological sources are presently known in British Columbia (Nelson
and Will 1976:151). Obsidian was recovered from 6 sites in the Bella Bella/Bella Coola region (ElTb 10, EkTa 10, EkSx 1, FaTb 13, FaSu 18, and FbSu 1), and the majority of it has been identified as having come from the Rainbow mountain area, east of Bella Coola. More specifically it has come from 2 sources in particular, Obsidian Creek and MacKenzie Pass. One specimen from FbSu 1 has come from the Ilgachuz mountains on the Chilcotin plateau, and another from a source on Mount Edziza (Nelson 1976: pers. comm.).

The presence of obsidian at these sites can only be explained in 2 ways: either it was traded in, via the Dean and/or the Bella Coola vallies, or it was imported directly, which would require travel to the source areas. Information concerning early obsidian trade is presently being studied by Carlson and Nelson (pers. comm.), and should reveal important data concerning early cultural contacts between the coast and the interior plateau. The presence of this obsidian in the study material also has implications concerning site functions, and will be considered in more detail in Chapter VI.

**Classification:**

**Tools**

A total of 550 specimens were identified as tools on the basis of secondary flaking features. Secondary flaking, or retouch, as it is more commonly referred to, is indicative of either intentional tool shaping to meet a predetermined form, or simply a means of re-sharpening, or conversely dulling, an edge to perform a specific task. Either way any specimen exhibiting such a feature was considered a tool.
Only 29 of the sites represented yielded artifacts specifically identified as tools. Those artifacts have been sub-divided into six major classes, the distribution of which is given in Table 2.

I. Bifaces  
No. = 48

Bifaces are defined by those artifacts which exhibited extensive secondary flaking over two entire surfaces. The extensive flaking on those artifacts has resulted in their exhibiting forms which were apparently predetermined by the manufacturer, and as such, they correspond to the "formed bifaces" described by Sanger (1970:71) and Von Krogh (1976:92). Four sub-classes of bifaces have been identified.

A. Points  
No. = 33

Sites: EdSv 1, EKTa 10, ElTb 10, FaSu 21, FaTc 7, FaTb 13, FbSu 1  
Figures 9, 10

Bifacially flaked points are represented by 33 specimens of which only 19 were complete enough for formal classification (Fig. 9), the remaining 14 were fragments representative of point tips, mid-sections, and bases (Fig. 10). Points are characterized by relatively thin blade edges which converge to a point at one end, while the other, or basal end, normally exhibits some form of hafting element such as notches, stems, or basal thinning (Loy et al. 1974b:25).

Points could have served a variety of functions; however, they most likely were used as arming tips for weaponry such as arrows, or spears, and for this reason the common phrase "projectile point"
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>I. Bifaces</th>
<th>II. Unifaces</th>
<th>III. Notches</th>
<th>IV. Spurs</th>
<th>V. Microblades</th>
<th>VI. Edge Modified</th>
<th>D. Pebbles &amp; Cobblest</th>
<th>TOTALS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A. Points</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 leaf-shaped</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 side-notched</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3 stemmed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B. Backed</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C. Large Crude</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>D. Miscellaneous</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EdSv 1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EdSv 3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EdSv 10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EdSw 1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EdSw 3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EkTa 10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EkSx 1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ElSw 3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ElSx 3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ElTb 9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ElTb 10</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ElTb 19</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FaSx 3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FaSx 18</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FaSx 19</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FaTa 21</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FaTa 35</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FaTa 44</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FaTb 3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FaTb 12</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FaTb 13</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FaTb 14</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FaTb 16</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FaTb 17</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FaTb 20</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FaTb 24</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FaTc 7</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FbSu 1</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FcSx 14b</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TOTALS 15  1  3  14  3  9  3  31  12  12  2  130  29  114  75  71  26  550

Table II: Distribution by Site of Tools
Figure 9: Bifacially Flaked Points

Type 1a leaf-shaped convex base e-i,m
  1b leaf-shaped triangular base j-l,n
  1c leaf-shaped straight base o-p
Type 2 side notched d
Type 3a rectangular stemmed a-c

Site Provenience:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Site</th>
<th></th>
<th>Site</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a</td>
<td>EkTa 10</td>
<td>k</td>
<td>FaSu 21</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b</td>
<td>FbSu 1</td>
<td>l</td>
<td>ElTb 10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c</td>
<td>ElTb 10</td>
<td>m</td>
<td>FaTc 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d</td>
<td>ElTb 10</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>EdSv 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e</td>
<td>ElTb 10</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>ElTb 10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f</td>
<td>FbSu 1</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>FbSu 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g</td>
<td>ElTb 10</td>
<td>q</td>
<td>ElTb 10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h</td>
<td>FbSu 1</td>
<td>r</td>
<td>EkTa 10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i</td>
<td>ElTb 10</td>
<td>s</td>
<td>EkTa 10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>j</td>
<td>ElTb 10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 10: Bifacially Flaked Point; Fragments

Type 1a leaf-shaped convex base  
Type 3b contracting stemmed  

Site Provenience:

<p>| | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a</td>
<td>ElTb 10</td>
<td>h</td>
<td>FbSu 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b</td>
<td>FbSu 1</td>
<td>i</td>
<td>ElTb 10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c</td>
<td>FaSu 21</td>
<td>j</td>
<td>EkTa 10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d</td>
<td>ElTb 10</td>
<td>k</td>
<td>FaSu 21</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e</td>
<td>ElTb 10</td>
<td>l</td>
<td>FaSu 21</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f</td>
<td>FbSu 1</td>
<td>m</td>
<td>EkTa 10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g</td>
<td>FaSu 21</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>FaTb 13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 10
is often used to describe artifacts of this sub-class (Sanger 1970:36; Stryd 1973:322; Ham 1975:124). Three basic types and five sub-types of points have been identified.

Type 1: Leaf-shaped
No. = 15
Sites: EdSv 1, EdTa 10, ElTb 10, FaSu 21, FaTc 7, FbSu 1

These points were generally leaf-shaped in outline with little evidence of a basal hafting element. Blade edges were primarily excurved, and cross-sections bi-convex, although a few specimens exhibited an asymetrical cross-section which could be construed as rhombic in form (Fig. 9 e,f,h). Flaking characteristics ranged from very crude, as indicated by broad, randomly oriented flake scars (Fig. 9 f-h) to very fine, exhibiting long narrow, almost parallel scars (Fig. 9 l,m).

Three sub-types of leaf-shaped points were identified using base form as a criterion for subdivision. The standard metric attributes of leaf-shaped points are as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attribute</th>
<th>range</th>
<th>mean</th>
<th>number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>length</td>
<td>4.8-11.0</td>
<td>6.68</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>width</td>
<td>1.7-3.0</td>
<td>2.33</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>thickness</td>
<td>0.6-1.3</td>
<td>0.87</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1a. Convex base: This sub-type was represented by six specimens (Fig. 9 e-i,m). Blade edges form a continuous arc at the base and the widest point on the specimen is usually near the mid-section. One of the fragmented specimens (Fig. 10 i)
may represent a basal section of a leaf-shaped point of this sub-type.

1b. Triangular base: The four specimens of this sub-type (Fig. 9 j-l,n) have relatively straight basal edges which converge to a point. The maximum width of these specimens was in the lower third.

1c. Straight base: These specimens of which only two were complete (Fig. 9 o,p) represented leaf-shaped points with the development of an incipient stem. The lateral edges below the widest point were straight, and formed an angle of close to 85° with the base, which was also straight. Three additional specimens (Fig. 9 q-s) may also fall into this sub-type; although the bases of those specimens were broken, they appeared to exhibit a relatively symmetrical basal constriction immediately below the widest point.

One specimen (Fig. 9 p) of this sub-type exhibited a burin-like facet from the tip down one edge (Fig. 11). Mitchell (1972:28) illustrated a similar piece from a site in the Johnstone Strait region (EaSh 23) which he described as a 'burin'. It is entirely possible that points such as these may have been burinated through use (by striking a hard object such as bone or stone), rather than intentionally manufactured as a burin. Such accidental occurrences of burin-like spalls removed from points have been recorded by others as well (Ahler 1971; Epstein 1963).
Figure 11
Burinated Point (FbSu 1)

Type 2: Side-notched
No. = 1
Sites: ElTb 10
Figure 9d

The characteristic feature of this point type was the presence of a well developed notch on each side, near the base. These notches were presumably to facilitate hafting. The single specimen representative of this type exhibited straight blade edges forming a triangular blade, and was thinly bi-convex in cross-section.
The base was bifacially thinned, and convex in form. General flaking characteristics were very fine, suggestive of pressure flaking. Since the tip was missing, no length measurement was recorded; however, the maximum width was 1.7 cms. immediately above the notches, and the maximum thickness was 0.6 cms. Points of this type are known from Kwatna Bay (FaSu 2) and have come from cultural deposits much younger than the time period to which the majority of this chipped stone has come. It is probable that this point type relates to a later time period as well.

Type 3: Stemmed

No. = 3 (4)

Sites: EdTa 10, ElTb 10, FbSu 1

Figure 9 a-c

These points have a well developed stem to facilitate hafting to a shaft of some sort. Three specimens were manufactured out of fine grained basalt, and flaking characteristics were suggestive of soft hammer percussion with very thin broad flakes removed. Flake orientation was random. A fourth specimen (Fig. 10 j), although fragmented, was considered to be representative of a stemmed point. This specimen was based on andesite. Two sub-types of stemmed points were identified.

3a. Rectangular stem: These specimens possessed stems with straight edges that met the base at right angles (Fig. 9 a-c). Only two specimens were complete enough for length measurements and these were found to range
from 3.2 cm. to 6.2 cms. The width and thickness of all three points were remarkably uniform, with the thickness of all three being 0.5 cm. and the widths ranging from 2.1 to 2.2 cms.

3b. Contracting stem: This sub-type was represented by only one basal fragment (Fig. 10 j). The edges of the stem converged to form a pointed or steeply convex base. The cross-section of this specimen was biconvex although somewhat skewed to one side , and the thickness was 0.8 cm. The maximum width was assumed to be immediately above the shoulders of the stem and thus measured 3.6 cms.

B. Backed bifaces
No. = 3
Sites: FaSu 21, FbSu 1
Figures 12, 13

Backed bifaces were represented by relatively large percussion flaked objects which had been longitudinally split. Well pronounced bulbs of percussion as well as negative bulbs occurring on the steep, flat, longitudinal and transverse edges, in conjunction with localized impact crushing, suggest that these specimens were intentionally split (Fig. 13). It is presumed that this particular manner of splitting was done to form a backing for hand held use of the implement in cutting (heavy) or sawing functions. Overall flaking was fairly crude on two specimens (Fig. 12 b,c) but was finely executed on the third (Fig. 12 a). Assuming symmetry in
Figure 12: Backed Bifaces

Site Provenience:

a  FaSu 21
b  FaSu 21
c  Fbsu 1
Figure 12
Figure 13: Backed Biface (FbSu 1)
the original form before splitting, the cross-sections of all three specimens would have been bi-convex. The standard metric attributes of backed bifaces are summarized as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attribute</th>
<th>range</th>
<th>mean</th>
<th>number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>length</td>
<td>3.1-8.7</td>
<td>5.63</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>width</td>
<td>2.5-4.1</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>thickness</td>
<td>1.0-2.1</td>
<td>1.37</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

C. Large crude bifaces

No. = 9

Sites: FaSu 18, FaSu 21, FbSu 1, ElTb 10

Figure 14

This class of artifacts consists of nine specimens, only one of which is complete (Fig. 14 f). These objects exhibit large, crude, randomly oriented flake scars over both faces, indicative of a heavy percussion technique of manufacture. They may conceivably have been used as cutting tools however, there is some evidence that suggests that they were blanks for the production of either points or backed bifaces.

One specimen (Fig. 14 i) exhibits a snap fracture at the base. One face of that specimen showed relatively fine soft hammer flaking, commonly attributed to biface thinning, with a relatively even, slightly convex surface. The opposite face exhibited crude flaking near the fractured end, and a small amount of very fine well directed flaking at the tip. This flaking pattern suggests that the object was broken during manufacture, and thus represents an unfinished tool in the preform stage.
Figure 14: Large Crude Bifaces

Site Provenience:

a  FaSu 18  g  FaSu 21
b  FbSu 1   h  FaSu 21
d  ElTb 10  i  FaSu 18
e  FbSu 1   j  FaSu 21
f  FaSu 21
A second specimen (Fig. 14 g) exhibited a well developed cone-of-percussion in the center of the broken surface, suggestive of intentional splitting or truncation. This may be indicative of one stage in the production of a backed biface. It would have required only a single blow on the truncated surface to produce a longitudinal fracture resulting in the formation of a backed biface similar to those described above (Fig. 15).

![Figure 15](image)

Production of Backed Bifaces

The standard metric attributes of large crude bifaces are as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attribute</th>
<th>range</th>
<th>mean</th>
<th>number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>length</td>
<td>10.6</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>width</td>
<td>3.0-5.9</td>
<td>4.41</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>thickness</td>
<td>1.3-2.0</td>
<td>1.57</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
D. Miscellaneous bifaces

No. = 3
Sites: FaSu 21, FaTa 35, FbSu 1
Figure 16

These specimens were unclassifiable as to form, and all exhibit extensive bifacial flaking. They also all appear to be broken, although severe wear from beach rolling and other natural agencies make it difficult to determine that for certain.

II. Unifaces

No. = 31
Sites: ElTb 10, FaSu 18, 19, 21, FbSu 1
Figure 17

Unifaces are tools which were formed by unifacial secondary retouch over one entire face. These specimens are similar to those which Stryd (1973:360) referred to as "continuous scrapers", in that there is unbroken retouch around all edges of the tool, making it difficult to isolate any particular edge as the primary working margin. The specimens range in form from ovate to rectanguloid, with cross-sections of basically two forms, bi-plano (4) and plano-convex (27).

Most of the specimens were manufactured from large flakes or split pebbles and cobbles, with the initial bulbar surface having served as the platform for unifacial retouch around the periphery. There is a considerably wide size range with the standard metric attributes summarized as follows:
Figure 16: Miscellaneous Bifaces

Site Provenience:

a  FaSu 18
b  FaSu 21
c  FbSu 1
Figure 17: Unifaces

Site Provenience:

a  EkTa 10  g  FaSu 18
b  FbSu 1    h  FaSu 21
c  FaSu 21   i  FaSu 18
d  FaSu 21   j  FbSu 1
e  FaSu 19   k  FaSu 18
f  FaSu 19   l  FaSu 18
          m  FaSu 18
According to Stryd (1973:352) "unifacially retouched flake and core tools which exhibit an overall form suggesting deliberate shaping by the maker, are identifiable as scrapers". Edge angle measurements tend to support the identification of scraping as the primary function of these tools. Edge angles taken on 29 of the specimens were found to fall into a range from $65^o$ to $80^o$, peaking in the $70^o$ to $75^o$ range (Fig. 18). Wilmsen (1968:156) describes the general edge angle ranges from $66^o$ to $75^o$ as best suited for woodworking, bone working, skin softening, and heavy shredding.

Wylie (1975:4) found that edge angles ranging from $50^o$ to $90^o$ with a mean of $75^o$ were most commonly associated with hard scraping functions, which included the surface modification of fresh wood as well as bone material.

Wylie also found that tools used for chopping and adzing functions exhibited edge angles between $70^o$ to $80^o$ with a mean of $73^o$. These tools were of three basic shapes according to Wylie (1975:22):

- The three basic tool shapes were **thick plano-convex forms** ("domed scrapers") worked unifacially around most of their circumference, thin unifacially retouched flakes, and bifacially flaked blades (underlining by this writer).

The first description compares closely to the unifaces described here, and the last is suggestive of the large crude bifaces and backed bifaces described earlier.

A scraping function is still considered to be the primary
Figure 18: Edge Angles - Unifaces

1 - 0.0° - 4.9°
2 - 5.0° - 9.9°
3 - 10.0° - 14.9°
4 - 15.0° - 19.9°
5 - 20.0° - 24.9°
6 - 25.0° - 29.9°
7 - 30.0° - 34.9°
8 - 35.0° - 39.9°
9 - 40.0° - 44.9°
10 - 45.0° - 49.9°
use to which these unifaces were put. One reason for this is the notable lack of wear patterns, especially in the form of micro-flaking and crushing. If these tools had been used for chopping and adzing purposes, a certain amount of step-fracturing and crushing should be expected along the edges. Such wear should be identifiable even in consideration of the extensive surface attrition displayed on these artifacts.

One of the two specimens which show some evidence of wear is in this group (Fig. 17 i). This specimen exhibits a high degree of polish on the planar surface, immediately behind a slightly beveled rim. This attribute adds additional support to the identification of scraping as the function of these tools.

III. Notches  
No. = 12  
Sites: ElTb 10, FaSu 18, 19, 21, FbSu 1  
Figure 19

The characteristic feature of this class of tool, as the name implies, is a well-developed notch. All of the specimens identified had been manufactured on irregular flakes. Notches were presumably used to scrape, smooth, and shape wood or bone implements such as projectile shafts, fore-shafts, etc., and as such are often referred to as "spokeshaves" (Wilmsen 1968:159; Luebbers 1971:187; Stryd 1973:364; Loy et. al. 1974:37). The standard metric attributes of notches are as follows:
Figure 19: Notches

Site Provenience:

a FaSu 19  
b FaSu 21  
c FbSu 1  
d FbSu 1  
e FaSu 21  
f FaSu 19  
g FaSu 19  
h FaSu 21  
i FaSu 18  
j FaSu 19  
k FbSu 1
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attribute</th>
<th>range</th>
<th>mean</th>
<th>number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>length</td>
<td>3.5-8.7</td>
<td>4.65</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>width</td>
<td>1.2-4.5</td>
<td>3.11</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>thickness</td>
<td>0.5-1.5</td>
<td>0.96</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>notch mouth</td>
<td>0.9-1.3</td>
<td>1.05</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>notch depth</td>
<td>0.2-0.4</td>
<td>0.29</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Assuming that these notches were indeed used for the shaping and smoothing of shafts (either wood or bone), the notch sizes would suggest that shaft diameters were no more than 1.3 cm. Many specimens exhibited extensive edge damage on the leading surface within the notch. This damage was in the form of step-fractures and crushing, again suggesting heavy use of these tools for scraping. Edge angles ranged from 70° to 85°, peaking in the upper end of that range between 80° to 85°.

IV. Spurs

No. = 12

Sites: ElTb 10, FaSu 18, 19, 21, FbSu 1

Figure 20

Spurs are defined as artifacts exhibiting pronounced projections in the form of a point or tip; all were manufactured on irregular flakes. These tools are presumed to have served general piercing or engraving functions, on relatively soft materials such as hides, bone, wood, or even soft stone. In many cases, parallels may be drawn with those tools referred to as gravers and perforators by others (Sanger 1970; Luebbers 1971; Crabtree 1972; Carlson 1972; Loy et al. 1974b). On many specimens, minute micro-flake scars were
Figure 20: Spurs

Site Provenience:

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a</td>
<td>ElTb 10</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b</td>
<td>FbSu 1</td>
<td>f</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c</td>
<td>FaSu 21</td>
<td>g</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d</td>
<td>FaSu 21</td>
<td>h</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Only 1.06 microblade fragments were recovered from the site.

These specimens were manufactured from chalcedony, a fine-grained quartz-ferrosilite. They measure 0.5 cm. in length, 0.3 cm. in width, and 0.3 cm. in thickness.

Figure 20
noticeable on alternating faces of the projections, suggesting a twisting motion during use. Since these scars occurred most predominately on the points as opposed to other areas of the flake, they are assumed to be use-related.

The standard metric measurements for spurs are as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attribute</th>
<th>range</th>
<th>mean</th>
<th>number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>length</td>
<td>2.7-6.9</td>
<td>4.38</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>width</td>
<td>2.5-8.0</td>
<td>4.27</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>thickness</td>
<td>0.5-1.5</td>
<td>0.83</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

V. Microblades  
No. = 2

Sites: FbSu 1, FaSu 18

Figure 21

Only two microblade fragments were recovered from the sites. These specimens were manufactured from obsidian, a feature of all the microblades from Namu (Luebbers 1971). They measured 1.5 cm. and 0.9 cm. in width by 0.7 and 0.9 cm. in thickness. The sides of the fragments were parallel.
VI. Edge Modified Tools

Edge modified tools are defined as irregular, unformed cores and flakes exhibiting either unifacial or bifacial secondary flaking on one or more edges. This class of tools represents the largest single group of tools identified, and is a major reason why these assemblages in general look quite crude. Subdivision within this class was based on two sets of criteria: (1) whether the tool was manufactured on a core or flake; and (2) the type of edge modification (i.e. bifacial or unifacial).

A distinction was made on the sub-class level between core- and pebble-tools, as well as flake- and spall-tools. Pebble-tools and core-tools are in all probability equatable in functional usage, the pebble-tool differing only in that there remained original cortex over most of the surface. Spall- and flake-tools are also in a sense the same; a spall is simply a large primary decortication flake.

These distinctions were maintained primarily because of the predomina-
ance of simple pebble-tools in many south coast sites, and because two regional patterns in tool technology are recognizable among the assemblages on the basis of this pebble-/core-tool, spall-/flake-tool distinction. These patterns will be discussed in more detail in the following chapter.

A. Flakes  No. = 130

Edge modified flakes are perhaps one of the most common single groups found in any chipped stone assemblage, and consist of irregularly formed flakes (usually primary percussion flakes), which exhibit some form of secondary retouch along one or more edges. Normally referred to as "retouched" flakes, these artifacts are "often assumed to have served as short use, all-purpose cutting and scraping implements" (Stryd 1973:365). Stryd describes three types of retouched flakes, "unifacial, bifacial, and alternate". Only unifacially retouched flakes were noted among the study material.

Type 1: Unifacially modified flakes

No. = 130

Sites: EdTa 10, EkSx 1, ElSw 3, ElSx 3, ElTb 9,10,19, FaSu 18,19,21, FaTa 35, FaTb 3,12,13,14,16,20, FbSu 1, FcSx 14b

Figure 22

The flaking characteristics exhibited by retouch on these specimens range from fairly thin short flakes, to large and broad ones leaving a denticulated edge (Fig. 22). Carlson (1972:43) has stated that some of the specimens from the sites in Kwatna Inlet are in fact "denticulates". No such distinction has been made
Figure 22: Unifacially Edge Modified Flakes

Site Provenience:

a  FaSu 18  
b  FaSu 18  
c  FaSu 18  
d  FbSu 1   
e  FbSu 1   
f  FbSu 1   

Figure 22
here, since the term "denticulate" is somewhat ambiguous. Crabtree (1972:58) and Loy et. al. (1974:10) define a denticulate as simply a "tooth-like surface", or serrated edge. Given such a definition there is no doubt that many of these unifacially modified flakes could be called denticulates. However, there is no indication (and again, this may simply be due to the condition of the artifacts) that those implements exhibiting a slightly serrated edge were used any differently than the other unifacially edge modified flakes. Hayden (1974:23) suggests that notches and denticulates are simply stylistic variants of the same functional tool. This implies that a denticulate then could be described as "two or more adjacent notches". The problem becomes one of where to draw the line between a denticulated edge resulting from the intentional production of functional notches (and it must be noted that such notches do not have to have been produced all at the same time), or simply from relatively crude heavy retouch.

There are a number of terms used throughout the literature to describe artifacts of this type: "retouched flakes" (Stryd 1973:365), "Flake scrapers" (Simonsen 1970:107, 1973:36), "Flake unifaces" (Mitchell 1972:31), "Unformed unifaces" (Sanger 1970:80; Hansen 1973:169; Ham 1975:131; Von Krogh 1976:111), "Developed flakes" (Luebbers 1971:89), as well as "Unifacially modified flakes" (McMurdo 1974:45). A brief summary of attributes for these unifacially modified flakes is as follows:
Attribute range mean number
length 2.2-11.4 5.28 121
width 1.75-10.9 4.28 126
thickness 0.33-3.5 1.21 130

Edge angle measurements were found to exhibit a bimodal distribution (Fig. 23) with an angle of 50 degrees representing a dividing line. Out of the 130 specimens studied, 36 (27.69%) exhibited angles clustering in a range from 20 to 49.9 degrees, while the remaining 94 (72.31%) clustered in a 50 to 89.9 degree range.

Wylie (1974:30) suggested that an angle of 60 degrees appears to be a rough dividing line between general cutting and scraping tools. In his sample, the cutting tools exhibited a mean edge angle of 48 degrees whereas soft scraping tools averaged 60 degrees, and heavy scraping 75 degrees. Ham (1975:139) on the other hand found that the edge angles of his "unformed unifaces" exhibited a bimodal distribution similar to the one shown in Figure 23, with an "acute angle group" ranging from 15.6 to 47.5 degrees, and a "steep angled group" ranging from 47.6 to 79.5 degrees. Ham suggested the two groups represented the difference between general cutting and scraping tools, with the acute group representing the cutting tools.

Although all three studies have resulted in similar bimodal distributions, Wylie's identification of 60 degrees as the probable transition point is somewhat higher than that noted in this study (+10) or Ham's (+13). A close correlation has been noted between Ham's study and this one; however, the significance of this
Figure 23: Edge Angles - Unifacially Edge Modified Flakes
pattern may only reflect differences in raw material. Ham was
dealing primarily with basalt, which is extremely close in physical
properties to the andesitic material studied here. Wylie, on the
other hand dealt almost exclusively with chert, chalcedony,
obsidian, and Ignimbrite. All of these stones would produce
slightly more friable edges than basalt and andesite and thus
would require steeper edge angles for scraping tools, to give
added strength to the working edge.

B. Spalls No. = 29

Spalls are essentially primary decortication flakes struck from
cobbles and pebbles, which retain their original cortex over most
if not all of the dorsal surface. As with the edge modified flakes,
spalls are often found to have been modified through peripheral
retouch and subsequently used as tools. A number of terms have been
encountered throughout the literature which appear to be synonymous
with implements of this sub-class: "cortex-flake tool" (Coulson
1971:102), "Boulderchip scraper-knives" (Mitchell 1963:70), "Boulder
spalls" (Calvert 1970:66; Mitchell 1971:102), "Spalls" (Stryd 1973:
368), "Teshoa" (Eyman 1968), and "Cortex Spalls" (Von Krogh 1976:
119). As with the previously described unifacially modified flakes,
only unifacial modification was noted among the spall-tools as well.

Type 1: Unifacial Spalls

No. = 29

Sites: EdSv 10, FaSu 21

Figure 24
Figure 24: Unifacially Edge Modified Spalls

Site Provenience:

a EdSv 10  
b EdSv 10  
c EdSv 10  
d EdSv 10
Figure 24
Retouch on these specimens was initiated from the bulbar or ventral surface produced by the initial removal of the spall. Flaking appears to have been primarily percussion induced, leaving relatively deeply indented or denticulated edges (Figure 24). The standard metric measurements taken on these specimens are as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attribute</th>
<th>range</th>
<th>mean</th>
<th>number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>length</td>
<td>5.2-10.8</td>
<td>7.04</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>width</td>
<td>4.0-10.8</td>
<td>6.81</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>thickness</td>
<td>1.2-4.3</td>
<td>2.76</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>weight</td>
<td>144-473</td>
<td>255.38</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>edge angle</td>
<td>43-88</td>
<td>7.2.88</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ham (1975:149-165) describes two basic types of spall-tools: (1) those with polished edges, to which he infers a hide-scraping function; and (2) those with chipped edges, which he suggests were used for chopping wood, or other material. With the exception of one specimen, all of the unifacial spall tools described here exhibit edge angles between 55 and 95 degrees (Figure 25) with a mean of 72.88 degrees. This corresponds with the edge angles Wylie (1974:28) describes as suitable for chopping and adzing functions (i.e. 60 to 80 degrees with a mean of 73 degrees). According to Wilmsen's (1968:156) function related edge angle groupings, these tools fall into the range for which woodworking, bone working, skin softening, and heavy shredding has been postulated. Considering the coastal orientation, the rather large size, and the fairly heavy weight of these tools, it is most likely that they were used as chopping and adzing implements, for working both wood and bone.
Figure 25: Edge Angles - Unifacial Spalls

Class Intervals

1- 0.0°- 4.9°
2- 5.0°- 9.9°
3-10.0°-14.9°
4-15.0°-19.9°
5-20.0°-24.9°
6-25.0°-29.9°
7-30.0°-34.9°
8-35.0°-39.9°
9-40.0°-44.9°
10-45.0°-49.9°
11-50.0°-54.9°
12-55.0°-59.9°
13-60.0°-64.9°
14-65.0°-69.9°
15-70.0°-74.9°
16-75.0°-79.9°
17-80.0°-84.9°
18-85.0°-89.9°
19-90.0°-94.9°
20-95.0°-99.9°
C. Core-tools  
No. = 189

This sub-class of tools is represented by a number of multi-directional core specimens which exhibit intentional edge formation, either unifacially or bifacially, which resulted in the creation of one or more working edges. These tools are assumed to have served a variety of heavy chopping, adzing, and scraping or shredding functions. A core, by definition, is simply "any object from which a flake has been removed" (Loy et al. 1974b:9). The term core has been applied to this sub-class for want of a better descriptive term, but is recognized as somewhat ambiguous. As Crabtree (1972:56) points out, "carried to its logical end, any stone tool which has had a flake removed could be justifiably termed a core-tool". To clarify this ambiguity I shall herein follow Carlson's (pers. comm.) definition of his term 'core': a remnant of a nodule from which flakes have been struck. It may be the primary objective in flake removal in which case the end product is a core-tool, or the flakes removed may be the primary goal in which case the core is merely a remnant of the original nodule, a by-product of flake removal.

Type 1: Unifacial core-tools
No. = 114
Sites: EdSw 3, ElSw 3, ElTb 10,19, FaSx 3, FaSu 18,19,21, FaTa 35, FaTb 13,14,20,24, FbSu 1, FcSx 14b

Figure 26

Manufactured from cores or very large heavy flakes, these specimens exhibit intentional edge formation through unifacial flaking along one or more edges. Flaking in all cases was
Figure 26: Unifacial Core-Tools

Site Provenience:

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a</td>
<td>FaSu 21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b</td>
<td>FaSu 19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c</td>
<td>FbSu 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d</td>
<td>FaSu 19</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
percussion induced with no apparent orientation, other than that
dictated by the particular edge which was being flaked. The standard
metric attributes of unifacial core tools have been summarized
as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attribute</th>
<th>range</th>
<th>mean</th>
<th>number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>length</td>
<td>2.8-12.9</td>
<td>7.85</td>
<td>114</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>width</td>
<td>2.3-13.0</td>
<td>5.84</td>
<td>114</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>thickness</td>
<td>0.9- 5.9</td>
<td>2.78</td>
<td>114</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>weight</td>
<td>7-928</td>
<td>193.7</td>
<td>114</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>edge angle</td>
<td>42-92°</td>
<td>71.22°</td>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As mentioned earlier, these tools in all probability served
as heavy duty chopping, adzing and scraping tools, primarily in
woodworking.

Type 2: Bifacial core-tools

No. = 75

Sites: EkTa 10, ELTb 10,19, FaSx 3, FaSu 18,19,21, FaTa 35,44
       FaTb 3,13,14,16,17,24, Fbsu 1, FcSx 14c

Figure 27

Bifacially edge modified core-tools exhibit the same
characteristics as the unifacial core-tools, with the exception
of the secondary edge modifications which are bifacial. On the
average, these tools are somewhat heavier, and are assumed to
have served primarily as chopping and heavy cutting implements.
All of the heavy chopping tools recovered at Namu, were of this
general sub-class (Luebbers 1971:88), and were referred to by
Luebbers as "choppers". The attributes for these implements
have been summarized as follows:
Figure 27: Bifacial Core-Tools

Site Provenience:

a  FaSu 19  
b  FaSu 18  
c  FaSu 19  
d  FaSu 19
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attribute</th>
<th>range</th>
<th>mean</th>
<th>number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>length</td>
<td>4.0 -16.1</td>
<td>8.08</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>width</td>
<td>2.75-13.3</td>
<td>6.43</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>thickness</td>
<td>1.2 - 7.1</td>
<td>3.04</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>weight</td>
<td>40.5-1383.3</td>
<td>282.14</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>edge angle</td>
<td>62-86.6 °</td>
<td>73.58 °</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

D. Pebble-tools  
No. = 97

These specimens are tools based on rounded beach cobbles and pebbles which exhibit crude percussion flaking on one or more edges, and yet retain the original cortex over most of the surface. Since the rocks from which these tools have been manufactured span the cobble-pebble size range, the term "pebble tool" was applied in discussions of these implements, following Borden's definition of "pebble-tools", i.e.

...heavy, crudely percussion flaked core tools, commonly based on whole or split pebbles and cobbles (1969:9).

These pebble-tools are equivalent in many respects to what have been referred to as "Cobble-core tools" (Mitchell 1971:106; Simonsen 1970:108, 1973:37; Percy 1974:64), or "Pebble-Choppers" (McMurdo 1974:53). They are assumed to have performed heavy cutting, chopping, rasping, and shredding functions, and as such compare closely to the previously described core-tools.

Type 1: Unifacial Pebble-tools
No. = 71
Sites: EdSv 1,3,10, EdSw 1,3
Figure 28
Figure 28: Unifacial Pebble-Tools

Site Provenience:

a  EdSv 10 
d  EdSv 10
b  EdSv 10 
e  EdSv 3
c  EdSv 10
Figure 28
Artifacts of this type were made from beach pebbles and cobbles through the removal of large, crude flakes by percussion from one edge while retaining the original cortex of the pebble/cobble over the majority of the remaining surface. The standard metric attributes of unifacial pebble-tools have been summarized as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attribute</th>
<th>range</th>
<th>mean</th>
<th>number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>length</td>
<td>3.8-19.1</td>
<td>8.26</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>width</td>
<td>3.1-12.9</td>
<td>8.13</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>thickness</td>
<td>2.2-9.1</td>
<td>4.73</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>weight</td>
<td>67-1737.5</td>
<td>517.69</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>edge angle</td>
<td>67-94°</td>
<td>80.36°</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Of the two types of pebble-tools identified, the unifacial pebble-tools are most likely more functionally generalized than the bifacial, and are sufficiently adequate to have performed all of the functions described above. Edge angles on these tools are fairly steep, with the majority exhibiting angles between 80 and 85 degrees. This distribution is somewhat higher than that exhibited by the unifacial core-tools, the majority of which fall between 70 and 75 degrees (Fig. 29). The differences in edge angles between those two forms of tools may be primarily due to differences in sample size (63 as opposed to 120), however, the differences may also be function-related. The pebble-tools on the whole are much heavier than the core-tools and may have served primarily heavy chopping and adzing functions.
Figure 29: Edge Angles - Unifacial Core-and Pebble-Tools
Type 2: Bifacial Pebble-tools

No. = 26

Sites: EdSv 10, EdSw 3

Figure 30

These implements differ from the unifacial pebble-tools only in the flaking of the working edge, which in this case is bifacial. These particular tools were probably more limited in their functional usage than the unifacial implements, and probably served (similarly with the bifacial core-tools) heavy chopping and cutting functions. The standard metric attributes for the bifacial pebble-tools are summarized as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attribute</th>
<th>range</th>
<th>mean</th>
<th>number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>length</td>
<td>5.7-16.4</td>
<td>9.21</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>width</td>
<td>5.3-11.2</td>
<td>7.67</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>thickness</td>
<td>2.3-7.3</td>
<td>4.83</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>weight</td>
<td>168-1891</td>
<td>540.56</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>edge angle</td>
<td>70-88.30</td>
<td>78.07</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The overall edge angle measurements taken on the bifacial core- and pebble-tools are very similar to the core-tools exhibiting a slightly wider range, as would be expected considering the differences in sample size (Fig. 31). Hayden (1976) found a remarkably similar edge angle distribution exhibited by those tools from Papunya identified as primarily chopping implements.
Figure 30: Bifacial Pebble-Tools

Site Provenience:

a EdSv 10  c EdSw 3
b EdSv 10  d EdSv 10
Figure 31: Edge Angles - Bifacial Core-and Pebble-Tools
Miscellaneous Flakes

A total of 229 flakes are subsumed under this general category. In all cases, these specimens consist of irregular primary flakes which exhibit edge damage to one or more edges. This damage, however, could not be confidently identified as to origin, and was found most commonly in the form of small micro-flake scars, usually along the thinnest edge, which occur in two basic types, either unifacial or alternating discontinuous. The presence of this damage, which in some cases was fairly localized, suggested that it might represent 'use-retouch', and indeed, the in-field identification of most of these specimens was invariably noted as "utilized flake" (a nebulous term quite often applied to flakes which exhibit edge damage not indicative of intentional modification).

Microscopic analysis indicated that no particular patterning was displayed by the flake-scars, arguing against identification as intentional retouch. In all cases these scars led back from the edge and indicated either complete micro-flakes, or truncated step fractures. Considering the presence of the damage, as most commonly displayed on the thinnest edges, in view of the rather violent environment from which those flakes had come (i.e. intertidal beach zone), it would be rather presumptuous to definitely identify such damage as 'use-retouch'. Beach-rolling can produce very similar results (Tringham et.al. 1974). However, considering the localized nature of much of the damage, it would also be rather presumptuous to cite beach-rolling as the causal factor. Beach-rolling does not necessarily select specific edges, unless some other factor such as
partial burying, protects the other edges. There was no indication of such a condition having existed, since water rounding had affected all edges of the flakes fairly evenly. The standard metric attributes of these miscellaneous flakes are summarized as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attribute</th>
<th>range</th>
<th>mean</th>
<th>number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>length</td>
<td>1.8-9.9</td>
<td>4.84</td>
<td>185</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>width</td>
<td>1.7-8.8</td>
<td>3.86</td>
<td>188</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>thickness</td>
<td>.25-2.3</td>
<td>1.06</td>
<td>229</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Considering the possibility of the edge damage on these specimens having been culturally induced through use, edge angle measurements were taken on several of the specimens (182) and were found to range from 20 to 80 degrees with a mean angle measurement of 44.29 degrees (Fig. 33). Since 'use-damage' as opposed to 'intentional-retouch' was considered, the angle measured was an extrapolation of the natural or spinal (Tringham et al. 1974) angle of the flake (estimated from the angle of convergence of the two faces) (Fig. 32).
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Figure 33: Edge Angles - Miscellaneous Flakes

Class Intervals

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Class Intervals</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1- 0.0°-4.9°</td>
<td>11-50.0°-54.9°</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2- 5.0°-9.9°</td>
<td>12-55.0°-59.9°</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-10.0°-14.9°</td>
<td>13-60.0°-64.9°</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-15.0°-19.9°</td>
<td>14-65.0°-69.9°</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-20.0°-24.9°</td>
<td>15-70.0°-74.9°</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-25.0°-29.9°</td>
<td>16-75.0°-79.9°</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7-30.0°-34.9°</td>
<td>17-80.0°-84.9°</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8-35.0°-39.9°</td>
<td>18-85.0°-89.9°</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9-40.0°-44.9°</td>
<td>19-90.0°-94.9°</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10-45.0°-49.9°</td>
<td>20-95.0°-99.9°</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The fact that the specimens in this category could not be positively identified as 'utilized', although frustrating was not too surprising. As Hayden (1975:5) discovered when studying the Puntupi, Yankeentjara, and "Waugkayi" speaking peoples of Australia's Western Desert region:

...perhaps the biggest surprise, and "disappointment" was the unbelievable lack, or rarity, of fabrication of "tools", or at least what the archaeologist calls "tools".

Hayden had found that simple, unaltered, primary flakes were the most commonly employed tool for everyday use, especially with respect to shaving and scraping wood. These implements often showed little evidence of actual wear, even without having spent several hundreds of years rolling about a gravelly beach. It would not be out of the question at all for these flakes, as well as many of those identified as waste flakes to have been utilized without exhibiting recognizable evidence of such use.

The majority of these specimens exhibit edge angles under 50 degrees (70.33%) with the highest concentration falling into the range between 35 to 50 degrees. This under-50 degree range, as mentioned earlier, is considered to be more closely related to cutting than any other types of functions. Semenov (1957:20) suggested that edge angles between 35 to 40 degrees are optimum for whittling, and Gould et. al. (1971) suggested that edge angles between 19 and 59 degrees were best suited for cutting sinew, flesh, and vegetal fibres. If indeed these specimens represent utilized flakes, it is most likely that they served a variety of primary cutting functions, which may
have included shaving and scraping, as well as sawing of materials such as bone or wood. Wylie (1975) found that edge damage in the form of alternating discontinuous micro-flaking could often be associated with sawing functions. Preliminary experimentation personally conducted using freshly produced flakes, and sawing, carving, and shaving relatively dry soft wood (pine), produced similar alternating discontinuous micro-flake scars (after sawing). It was also noted that very little evidence of wear was exhibited by the flakes (all andesite) other than small amounts of micro-flake damage to the edges.

Waste

As with most chipped stone assemblages, the majority of the material collected exhibits no evidence of utilization or secondary modification indicative of predetermined shaping. Such material, in the form of plain flakes, spalls and cores, is normally considered representative of waste or 'debitage', left over after tool manufacturing.

I. Flakes  
No. = 741

Waste flakes comprise 40.08% of the total number of specimens collected and include all flakes which do not exhibit any form of modification other than the original detachment from a core. The standard metric attributes of these specimens are as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attribute</th>
<th>range</th>
<th>mean</th>
<th>number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>length</td>
<td>1.2–10.3</td>
<td>4.26</td>
<td>532</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>width</td>
<td>1.1– 9.6</td>
<td>3.73</td>
<td>587</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>thickness</td>
<td>0.3– 3.9</td>
<td>1.11</td>
<td>741</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The unifacially modified flakes on the average are slightly larger than the waste flakes which might indicate preferential selection; however, the differences are not great, and most likely only reflect the fact that the very small flakes (<2 cm.) were of little practical use and thus were not represented in the tool groups.

Carlson (1972) suggested that a number of "prepared flake cores" as well as "flakes with prepared butts" were contained in the Cathedral phase assemblages from the Kwatna locality. In anticipation of a prepared core-flake technique being represented, all flakes which exhibited observable striking platforms were studied with the result that three types of platforms were noted: (1) Plain - initiated on the original (cortex) surface of the rock, (2) Single faceted - initiated on flake scar surface, and (3) multifaceted - initiated on an arete between two adjacent flake scars, thus exhibiting more than one previous flake scar facet. The latter two types of platforms could easily be considered as "prepared", and probably were, however no identifiable preparation in the form of grinding, nibbling, or crushing was observed along the edges of the platforms. Only 319 flakes exhibit observable platforms of which 61 (19.12%) were plain; 168 (52.66%) were single faceted; and 90 (28.12%) were multifaceted; thus more than 80% could be considered prepared.

Aside from the platforms, a number of flakes (Fig. 34) exhibit characteristics suggestive of well controlled and predetermined detachment. Hobler (1976) recovered similar material from several sites in the Queen Charlotte Islands. Although the present evidence is still quite scanty, there is some suggestion that an
Figure 34: Prepared Flakes

Site Provenience:

a  FaSu 21  
b  FaSu 21  
c  FaSu 18  
d  FaSu 21
Figure 34
early prepared core-flake industry exhibiting some Levallois-like characteristics may have been present in the Pacific Northwest prior to 8,000 B.C. (Munto and Leonhardy 1975; Hobler 1976).

During the analysis all flakes were specifically examined for the presence of original cortex. Only 110 specimens exhibit such a characteristic. This would suggest that the primary decortication of the cores had been performed elsewhere than at the sites from which the material came. Again, such information might support the identification of a form of prepared core industry being represented.

II. Spalls  \text{No.} = 18

Only two sites yielded spalls exhibiting no evidence of secondary modification (EdSv 10, FcSx 14b). The majority of these specimens (16) came from only one of those sites (EdSv 10). These specimens were large crude primary flakes removed from water worn pebbles and cobbles. The standard metric attributes of these spalls are summarized as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attribute</th>
<th>range</th>
<th>mean</th>
<th>number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>length</td>
<td>5.2-10.8</td>
<td>7.17</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>width</td>
<td>5.4-10.5</td>
<td>7.24</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>thickness</td>
<td>2.7-4.3</td>
<td>3.35</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

III. Cores  \text{No.} = 312

The term core was defined earlier; this particular category under that definition represents those cores not used as tools, thus they are the by-product of flaking, representing the remains of the original rock. Three distinct core types have been identified.
1. Multidirectional cores  
No. = 254

Multidirectional cores are defined as cores which exhibit numerous flake scars oriented in several directions (Stryd 1973:370). A total of 254 cores and core remnants were observed; these range in size from very small (i.e. 3.2 x 1.3 x 1.1 cm.) to very large (i.e. too large to remove from the beach) (Figs. 35, 36).

A number of well prepared cores were also observed (Fig. 35 d-f), again supporting the identification of a prepared-core-flake industry.

2. Pebble-cores  
No. = 57

Pebble-cores are large beach pebbles and cobbles from which a few flakes have been removed (Fig. 37). They differ from pebble-tools only in that they exhibit no discernible evidence of intentional edge formation.

3. Micro-blade cores  
No. = 1

A micro-blade core is defined as "the prepared nucleus from which microblades were removed" (Loy et.al. 1974:20). As with the micro-blades, micro-blade cores are represented by a single specimen recovered from the site at Cathedral point (PhSu 1). This specimen was based on a thick flake, 2.2 x 4.5 x 1.9 cm., of fine grained andesite, and exhibits 7 parallel sided flake scars along one half of the perimeter. The flake scars (blade-scars) measured 1.1 to 1.3 cm. in length and 0.4 to 0.7 cm. in width, and were detached from the core at an angle of 80°, with the
Figure 35: Multidirectional Core

Site Provenience:

a  FaSu 21
da  FaSu 21
b  FaSu 21
e  FaSu 21
c  FaSu 21
f  FaSu 21
Figure 36: Large Multidirectional Core (FaSu 19)
Figure 37: Pebble-Cores

Site Provenience:

a EdSv 10  
b EdSv 10  
c EdSv 10  
d EdSv 3
Figure 37
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Figure 37
original bulbar surface of the flake having been used as the striking platform. These characteristics fall within the size range of the micro-blades described by Wyatt from the Lochnore-Nesikep locality (Sanger 1970). The overall fluting pattern exhibited by this specimen is also reminiscent of that described by Fladmark (1970a:44, table 1) for micro-cores from the Queen Charlotte Islands, and the core itself is very similar to Sanger's (1970:58) group 2 micro-blade cores from the Lochnore-Nesikep locality (Fig. 38).

Figure 38

Microblade Core (FbSu 1)
CHAPTER VI
RESULTS OF ANALYSIS

The previous chapters have offered a detailed description of data on the chipped stone assemblages from the central coast. The presentation of that information has realized one of the primary functions of this thesis: to provide raw data concerning archaeological materials at present only marginally reported in the literature. Attention must now turn to the correlation of those data in view of the stated aims of this study. Reiterated, these are (1) to identify the nature and extent of early chipped stone industries on the central coast, (2) to place those industries in time, and (3) to provide cross-cultural comparisons with similar material from other areas of the Pacific Northwest.

In consideration of the above aims, it is clear from the descriptive analysis that there are at least two basic technological patterns represented by the studied assemblages. These patterns appear to be fairly well defined geographically within the central coast area, and are best described in terms of technological traditions. The term tradition is taken here to mean the occurrence of a distinctive set of technological traits which persist through time and space. The two basic traditions identified are first, a generalized pebble-spall tradition represented by the Quatsino Sound assemblages, and secondly, a distinctively different prepared core-flake tradition evidenced by the various assemblages recovered from the Bella Bella-Kwatna Bay region. These traditions exhibit no detectable overlap in distribution as presently defined and appear to have fairly strong affiliations outside the central coast.
Pebble-spall tradition:

The pebble-spall tradition, as indicated above, is known primarily from the Quatsino Sound assemblages. A total of 231 artifacts were collected from the five sites on Quatsino Sound (EdSv 1, EdSv 3, EdSv 10, EdSw 1, EdSw 3) and of those artifacts 186 (80.52%) were classified into the various pebble and spall categories. This contrasts remarkably with the artifact distributions from the assemblages in the Bella Bella-Kwatna Bay region where only 14 out of 1535 (.91%) specimens were classifiable into the pebble and/or spall groupings. Although collecting conditions varied somewhat from site to site, it is highly unlikely that such a distribution is a result of sampling error.

The Quatsino Sound material features a fairly homogeneous complex of traits which includes a predominance of large, crudely percussion-flaked pebble tools and cores, associated spalls and spall tools as well as a number of large crude flakes. Flaking is primarily unifacial, however some bifacial flaking was observed, and three large or medium sized leaf-shaped points were recorded from two of the sites. (Only one of the points from EdSv 1 was described, however a similar point from the same site and one from EdSv 3 were observed in local private collections.)

With the exception of the leaf-shaped points, the above complex of artifacts mirrors the descriptions of the Pasika phase material described by Borden (1968a:6:12; 1975:56) from the South Yale locality in the Fraser Canyon. Borden considers the Pasika material to date as early as 11,000 to 12,000 years. Such antiquity has recently been questioned by Matson (1976:283) who cites pollen evidence as suggesting that the pebble tools from the Yale area are somewhat less than 9,000 years old. Pebble tool complexes, however, do appear to have a very
early and primarily southern distribution in the Pacific Northwest. Along the southern coast of British Columbia they are a characteristic feature of virtually every early cultural assemblage predating the time of Christ, particularly in the Fraser Valley and Gulf of Georgia regions (Borden 1968; Calvert 1970; LeClair 1976; Mitchell 1965, 1971a; Percy 1974; Matson 1976; VonKrogh 1975). To the north however, such tools are not as predominant. Matson (1976:283) points out that a very different cultural complex is found in northern coastal sites of comparable age to those pebble tool producing sites on the south coast. This is not to say that pebble tools do not exist in northern sites, as indeed they do (Ackerman 1968, 1974; Fladmark 1970; MacDonald 1968; Simonsen 1973), but rather it points out that they do not appear in as high a frequency as in southern coastal sites.

Pebble tool complexes have a very widespread and early distribution in many areas of the New World (Kreiger 1964). They appear with leaf-shaped points and other more generalized tool forms such as retouched flakes and scrapers in many of the earliest cultural assemblages from the intermontane areas of the Columbia Plateau (Cressman 1960; Butler 1961; Leonhardy and Rice 1970). Matson (1976) argues quite successfully that the basal component at the Glenrose site, which is dated between 8,500 and 5,500 B.P., represents a coastal variant of a generalized "Old Cordilleran" cultural pattern. In support of this suggestion he cites the predominance of pebble tools along with leaf-shaped points as distinguishing characteristics. Matson sees this early "Old Cordilleran pattern" as being fairly widespread in the Pacific Northwest prior to 5,000 B.P., with influences extending throughout the Fraser delta and Gulf of Georgia area.

Mitchell's (1971) synthesis of the prehistory of the Gulf of
Georgia offered a similar suggestion. In that synthesis, Mitchell identified an early "Lithic Culture Type" which he felt was indicative of the initial stages of cultural activity in the Gulf of Georgia prior to 5,000 B.P. The distinctive characteristics of that culture type were cited as medium to large chipped stone points (generally leaf-shaped) accompanied by a wide variety of ("cobble") pebble tools. After 5,000 B.P. pebble tools appear to drop in frequency throughout most of the southern inner coastal area. However, they do persist at least until the time of Christ and perhaps afterwards (Percy 1974; Von Krogh 1975).

In summary, it appears that the early chipped stone assemblages recovered from Quatsino Sound represent a regional industrial complex, distinct from the rest of the assemblages studied, yet perhaps closely affiliated with the southern cultures of the inner coast. This complex is referred to as the Pebble-spall tradition and is characterized by crude percussion-flaked pebble and spall tools as well as leaf-shaped points. Typologically this tradition appears to date prior to 5,000 years ago, and may extend back as far as 8,500 years or perhaps earlier. Until such time as there are controlled dates for archaeological data from the Quatsino Sound area, chronological positioning of the pebble-spall tradition will have to remain tentative.

Prepared Core-Flake Tradition:

This tradition is known from the assemblages recovered in the Bella Bella-Kwatna Bay region. It appears to be distributed along the mainland and immediately adjacent islands of the north central coast. Judging from the descriptions of the chipped stone material from Johnstone Strait (Mitchell 1971) it may also extend into that area as well.
Unfortunately there is no clear picture from the Northeast coast of Vancouver Island to indicate where that area stands with respect to these early traditions. Although Chapman's (1976) excavations at the O'Connor site yielded an early chipped stone component, it was evidenced by only three leaf-shaped points and a single uniface. Such traits could easily fit into either of the identified traditions.

The prepared core-flake tradition is characterized by a complex of specialized cutting and scraping tools based on well-developed or prepared cores and flakes. The majority of these implements exhibit little or no original cortex, a trait fairly diagnostic of the pebble-spall classes of artifacts. The production of useable flakes appears to have been the focal point of this tradition, with flakes and flake tools representing more than 87% of the total artifact inventory. This also contrasts with the previously described pebble-spall tradition assemblages where only 20% of the specimens were represented by flakes and spalls. A number of basic flake tools (notches, unifaces, spurs, and unifacially edge modified flakes) have been identified. Accompanying those tools are a variety of heavier chopping and scraping implements in the form of unifacial and bifacial core tools. These latter implements in all probability served the same functions as pebble tools. They are, however, classified separately here because they are all based on well-developed cores as opposed to pebbles.

The above description omits the various artifacts classified under the general category of Bifaces. Those implements, although present in the assemblages studied, are felt to be representative of a relatively late phase of the prepared core-flake tradition, and perhaps indicative of southern or eastern influences. Carlson's (1972) initial "Cathedral Phase" designation is retained here for this late manifestation of the
central coast prepared core-flake tradition. Bifacial flaking was at no
time a major aspect of the prepared core-flake tradition, and in fact less
than 20% of the artifacts exhibited such a trait. The basic complement
of artifacts described for the prepared core-flake tradition appear very
early in the central coast and are associated with the basal component
at Namu dated to between 7,000 and 3,000 B.C. (Luebbers 1971; pers.obser-
vations). Also associated with the early Namu component is a well-
developed microblade industry, a feature only scarcely represented in
the study assemblages by 2 broken microblades and a possible core.

Fladmark (1974) has recently indicated that an Early Coast Micro-
blade Complex, characterized by a paucity of bifacial flaking and near
absence of bifacial projectile points, was widespread throughout the
northern coast north of Johnstone Strait prior to 3,000 B.C. Since the
basic prepared core-flake tradition is considered to be present in the
earliest component at Namu, a northern coast affiliation is inferred.
The microblade industry on the north coast, however, appears to have
faded sometime around 3,000 B.C. In the Namu sequence this decline was
evidenced somewhat later around 2,000 to 2,500 B.C. (Luebbers 1971:
109) and was succeeded by the appearance of bifacially flaked points in
greater frequency. Although a few bifaces were recorded from the Prince
Rupert Harbour area (Carlson 1973; MacDonald 1968), there does not
appear to be a comparable increase in the frequency of such implements
throughout the general northern coast area. This may suggest the possi-
bility of interior or south coast influences in the later component of
the prepared core-flake industry represented by the study assemblages.
Such influences, however, are not considered to have overshadowed the
basic northern affiliation of the prepared core-flake tradition.
During the course of intensive site surveying along the coast of Moresby Island in 1975, Hobler (1976) discovered a few beach sites exhibiting similar characteristics to those of the Cathedral phase described in Chapter III. Artifact assemblages from those sites essentially duplicated the Cathedral phase material, with the exception that they lacked bifaces. The characteristic feature of those assemblages, according to Hobler (1976:8), "is a prepared core and flake technology strongly reminiscent of the Levallois technique of the Old World". Hobler considers the material to be very early and suggests a pre-8,000 B.C. time period based on local sea-level fluctuations. If that time estimate is correct the Charlotte material would appreciably pre-date all of the prepared core-flake tradition material from the central coast and might suggest an early northern source. Whether or not Hobler's dating is validated will have to await future research. In any case, very close relationships between his material and the basic prepared core-flake tradition evidenced on the central coast are clear.

The prepared core-flake tradition therefore is seen as a basic tool complex, comprised of a predominance of unifacially edge-modified flakes, accompanied by notches, spurs, unifaces as well as heavier unifacially flaked (and to a lesser extent, bifacially flaked) core tools. This tradition is represented by two fairly distinctive phases: (1) an early Namu phase dating from 7,000 to 4,000 B.C., which is characterized by the addition of a well-developed microblade industry to the basic tool complex, and (2) a later Cathedral phase dating from 4,000 to 1,000 B.C. in which the microblade industry which was characteristic of the earlier phase disappears and an increase in bifacial flaking is apparent.

In his recent discussion on the origins of Northwest Coast
culture, Borden (1975) hypothesized that the early northern microblade complex is indicative of the initial settlement of the northern coast by people associated with an 'Early Boreal Tradition' of which the characteristic feature is the presence of a well-developed microblade industry. Borden sees this tradition as having originated in Eurasia and Greater Beringia during the upper Paleolithic and early Mesolithic, and having spread quickly from there into northwestern North America immediately following deglaciation. Namu, according to Borden (1975:101), presently represents "the most southern known outpost of Early Boreal expansion".

Borden further suggests that a separate early settlement occurred on the southern coast, immediately following the retreat of the Fraser glaciation. This settlement saw the expansion of a distinctive southeastern interior 'Proto Western Tradition', characterized by the presence of a crudely percussion-flaked pebble tool complex which included the distinctive leaf-shaped point, into the area from the Interior Plateau. That tradition can be seen as incorporating Matson's (1976) "Old Cordilleran Component", Mitchell's (1971) "Early Lithic Culture Type" and the previously identified 'pebble-spall tradition'. Borden sees these "Proto Western" groups as having come into contact with the early Boreal peoples in the Johnstone Strait region sometime prior to 3,000 B.C. A mutual sharing of technological adaptations subsequently brought some specialized fishing practices to the south coast, and several technological traits pertinent to the manufacture of terrestrial hunting implements (i.e. bifacial flaking) to the northern coast.

The northern microblade tradition (included in the 'early boreal tradition') has been discussed by many scholars (Ackerman 1968, 1974; Borden 1968, 1975; Fladmark 1971a, 1974; Morlan 1970; Sanger 1968, 1970) therefore no detailed description of it will be offered here. This
Microblade tradition is clearly early in northwestern North America but its relationship with the Namu phase of the prepared core-flake tradition is not fully understood. The presence of a well-developed microblade industry in the Namu phase may indeed reflect a coastal manifestation of the northern microblade tradition, however it may also reflect a co-occurrence of two distinct traditions (i.e. prepared core-flake and northern microblade). At present it has not been established whether the northern microblade tradition is actually earlier than the prepared core-flake tradition. The early microblade industry of the Namu phase may also simply reflect a specialization within the overall prepared core-flake tradition, and as such may have been indigenous or at least coastal development which was independent of the interior northern microblade tradition.

Ackerman (1968) recorded a number of similarities between the material from the early component at Ground Hog Bay (ca. 8,000 B.C.) and artifacts recovered along the Pacific Coast of Asia, including much of the early material known from Australia. He also recorded the early appearance of microblades in Japan at 12,300±700 B.C. (1968:76). Although not proposing direct ties between the early Alaskan material and that from the east Asiatic Coast, he does leave one with the impression that an ultimate Asian origin for the early microblade industry on the Northwest coast is possible. During the meetings of the 13th Pacific Sciences Congress held in Vancouver, Rhys Jones (pers. comm.) noted that, without the bifaces, the Cathedral phase assemblages would "duplicate any lithic assemblage from the Western Desert in Australia prior to 8,000 B.C.".
early Australian material is seen as having ultimate links with the Chopper Chopping Tool Tradition of Asia. Such a link is certainly not impossible, for the early lithic cultures of the Northwest Coast as well. One must not rule out the possibility that "when more information becomes known...specific similarities between early cultures there and our own initial coastal occupation will be found" (Hobler and Carlson 1974:5).
Summary of Conclusions:

It seems clear from the foregoing analysis that chipped stone industries in the central coast do represent a horizon marker segregating relatively early cultures with such a technology from later ones which employed pecking and grinding as the primary techniques in lithic tool manufacture. The shift from chipped to ground and pecked stone seems to have been virtually completed in the central coast by 1,000 B.C. This suggests that the ethnographic Kwakiutl pattern recorded by Boas in which stone chipping was characteristically absent from standard lithic tool manufacturing techniques, extends back only 3,000 years into the prehistory of the central coast.

Two distinctive technological traditions were identified from the chipped stone assemblages studied. The pebble-spall tradition identified among the material from the Quatsino Sound area of northwestern Vancouver Island was characterized by crude percussion flaked pebble and spall tools and medium to large sized leaf-shaped points. No firm dating is available for that tradition, however fairly clear southern affiliations suggest a time period predating 3,000 B.C. and possibly extending back as far as 6,500 or even 9,000 B.C. The second tradition identified was a prepared core-flake tradition characterized by a wide variety of specialized cutting and scraping implements based on well-developed cores and flakes. Two phases of this tradition were noted: an early Namu phase characterized by the presence of a well-developed microblade industry accompanying the standard tool complex outlined above, and a later Cathedral phase, lacking the microblade industry and exhibiting a higher frequency of bifacially flaked points. The Namu phase, dating from about
7,000 B.C. to approximately 4,000 B.C. may ultimately have ties with the Pacific coast of Asia, or may reflect a coastal manifestation of the northern microblade tradition of northwestern North America; it will require much more research in the area to establish cultural affiliations more clearly. The Cathedral phase, however, dates to a time period between 4,000 B.C. and 1,000 B.C. and is characterized by the disappearance of the earlier microblade industry and an increase in the frequency of bifacially flaked implements, especially points. This latter trait strongly suggests either interior or south coast influences or perhaps both. Figure 39 illustrates the correlation of these early chipped stone traditions from the central coast with previously established cultural historical sequences outlined for the north central coast by Hobler and Carlson (1974).

Future Research:

It is evident from the results of the foregoing analysis that much more research will be required in the central coast before any well defined cultural/historical sequence can be worked out for the area. In anticipation of such research, I would like to briefly discuss a few thoughts which have occurred to me during the writing of this thesis. Some are more directly pertinent to the research data than others, yet all relate in one way or another to future research in the central coast area particularly and to the Northwest coast in general.

During the discussion in Chapter III concerning the beach sites, I outlined three hypothetical explanations for those sites which had been proposed by Carlson and Hobler (1976); they represent (1) lithic
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quarries, (2) old habitational sites washed out by rising sea levels, and (3) both of the above. Given only those three alternatives, it was concluded that the last was perhaps the most acceptable, however such a decision is only arbitrary. Since the object of this discussion is to offer my own personal viewpoints, I would suggest that the ultimate functions of these sites were much more diversified than those outlined above. Some of these sites may represent brief stop-overs, where emergency repairs on broken or leaky watercraft were carried out. There have been many instances today in which commercial fishermen have pulled into a small cove or bay to make repairs on their boats or to replace broken stabilizing poles. If they had been reliant on chipped stone technology to get the job done, they would have probably manufactured their tools on the spot. There is also the possibility that some of these sites may represent other types of procurement centers than simply lithic quarries. Many of the sites, especially those from Quatsino Sound which are characterized by a high predominance of large heavy chopping and scraping tools, may simply represent wood-procurement centers analogous to modern day logging camps. The true nature of these sites therefore is clearly not well understood. In consideration of the uncertainty surrounding the nature of these sites, I would like to offer a number of suggestions for future investigations which may produce information to help clarify this situation:

(1) intensive systematic collections from some of these sites with good locational provenience on all artifacts may yield information pertinent to specific beach erosional processes and how they affect the distribution of artifacts (i.e. are the larger and heavier materials
higher on the beach, lower, or are all materials uniformly distributed?). Such data may in turn yield some insights into why certain artifacts are present while others are not.

(2) It would also be useful to sink a test-pit into the actual beach itself on some of these sites, to test for undisturbed deposits beneath the beach gravels. If, indeed, these sites were habitation sites occupied during a period of reduced sea-level, there may be the possibility that some remnants of the original deposits have remained under the beach gravels.

(3) It might also be useful to test the backing shoreline of several of these sites, especially those with no associated midden deposits. Since the proposed time span associated with these sites extends to the time when middens first appear (ca. 8,000 B.C. (Fladmark 1974)) these may be remnant cultural deposits at present undetected.

Turning now to those general aspects of coastal archaeology, I would like to conclude by restating an observation which has been previously made by a number of coastal researchers, most notably Fladmark (1974), Larsen (1971), and Retherford (1972): past sea-level fluctuations have had extremely significant effects upon past settlement patterns along the coast. It is imperative, I feel, that future researchers gain an appreciation of this fact before any clear understanding of coastal archaeology in general can be attained. As we have seen, the archaeological evidence pertinent to a fairly lengthy period of central coast prehistory (i.e. 4,000 - ca. 1,000 B.C.) is presently in a state of partial submergence with respect to the present sea-level. On the other hand, data relevant to even earlier cultural activity (pre-5,000 B.C.)
will, in all likelihood, be found well above the present shore-line, in association with raised beach terraces.

Sea-level fluctuations, however, have in no way been uniform along the Northwest Coast in general. Where a period of relatively lower sea-levels on the central coast has been in effect for much of the last 7,000 years, land-sea relationships in the Gulf of Georgia and Puget Sound regions have been relatively stable for the past 5,000 years. This southern region, however, experienced a comparable period of relatively reduced sea-levels somewhat earlier, between 8,000 and 3,000 B.C. The importance of this major shift in sea-levels with respect to the local archaeology of the Gulf of Georgia and Puget Sound region was pointed out as early as 1971 by Curtis Larsen in his thesis concerning the relationships of relative sea-level change to social change in the pre-history of Birch Bay.

While both the central coast and southern inner coastal areas have experienced major periods of reduced relative sea-levels within the past 10,000 years, the North Coast region has not. In that region land-sea relationships have been characterized by continually higher sea-levels relative to the present stand from late Pleistocene times until the present day. This brief overview has attempted to demonstrate some of the significant differences which exist between relatively broad regions of the coast with respect to past sea-level changes. It must be kept in mind that even more localized differences may exist within each of the regions discussed, further complicating the archaeological picture. In this respect, I would suggest that future research along the North-
west Coast should attempt to include glacial geological studies to help elucidate localized variations in past sea-level fluctuations particular to specific areas of study.
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