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ABSTRACT

The central problem addressed in the thesis is the nature of the relationship between the contemporary Carrier feast and the realities of the social-economic context of Carrier life outside the feast hall. In Part I an ethnohistorical analysis of Carrier society is first presented, indicating a pattern of changing social structure relating to shifting ecological and economic conditions. Through an analysis of certain protocols of the Carrier feast, it is then argued that the "surface" structures manifest at the feast are related to Carrier social history through principles operating at unconscious levels of structure. This analysis is intended to elucidate the "meaning" of the feast from within the feast hall.

Part II contains an examination of the changing nature of Bulkley River Carrier (Hwitsowitenne) social-economic conditions primarily since 1950, focussing on hereditary authority, property relations and supporting indigenous laws. It is argued that a dependency relationship has developed between government and industry, on the one hand, and Hwitsowitenne society, on the other. This is seen to effect change in the Hwitsowitenne structure of authority and system of property relations which, in turn, places stress on the feast as it is described in Part I.

Conclusions arising from both parts of the essay discuss the relationship between ritual and social structure and the significance of the contemporary Hwitsowitenne feast.
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INTRODUCTION

This dissertation concerns two subgroups of Carrier Indians living in northwestern British Columbia, namely the people at Babine Lake and those located along the Bulkley River slightly to the west. The primary focus is on the second group who are known among the Carrier as the Hwitsowitenne. They are centred in two reservation communities, Moricetown and Hagwilget, comprising 71 households (about 383 individuals) and 27 households (about 133 individuals), respectively. These communities appear typical of the depressed Indian villages familiar to Canadians through the public media. They are characterized by poor housing and inadequate facilities such as roads and water supply. Health standards and levels of scholastic achievement are lower than in non-native Canadian society. The people here would seem to the casual observer to be generally less active and less productive than elsewhere; in Moricetown and Hagwilget, for example, the unemployment rate for employable adults recently reached 80 percent. Cash income derives primarily from government transfer payments and to some extent from minimal opportunities in wage labour associated mainly with the forest products industry. Subsistence production in the forms of hunting, fishing and berry picking is significant and some individuals trap in order to sell furs on the national market. The Carrier attempt to combine these activities in a way that will enable them to meet the basic living requirements of the wider society. Success in those attempts is generally borderline, apparently as a result, in part at least, from association with the Canadian political-economic system. This was summed up for me by one of my most helpful informants who explained that his village,
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Hagwilget, was established in its present location because of the ideal fishing and because it was a strategic point on the trade route between coastal and interior groups. He pointed out that in this location the people once thrived, but observed that "Now we're just here." The implication, of course, is that Hagwilget is not what it was once.

The Carrier first appeared to me to operate according to a "mode of adaptation" common to other hinterland groups in Canada (in outport Newfoundland, for example). It soon became apparent, however, that there is something that clearly distinguishes Carrier culture from non-native Canadian culture; namely, that the "potlatch," or the "feast" as it is known here, is still a common aspect of Carrier community life. This was an unexpected discovery. My earlier reading on the potlatch of the northwest coast had indicated that it was a ceremony with important functional implications for economy and social structure within a precapitalist mode of production and a "traditional" society. What relevance, therefore, did it have to people caught up in an industrial capitalist society? After preliminary enquiry, I faced a paradox. Elders and chiefs described the feast to me as an umbrella under which all aspects of Carrier society are included. They explained that the feast operates as a forum at various levels: for community recognition of significant events in the life of an individual or group, including the inheritance of status, territory and responsibility; for renewal and validation of the existing authority structure and the system of territorial ownership and use; for the affirmation of religious ideology; for the giving of gifts and the repayment of debts; and for the education of the young in the ways of their culture. An outsider attending a
feast could deduce that Carrier society continues to operate tra
ditionally according to matrilineal descent and inheritance, inherited
juridicial-political authority, inherited hunting, trapping and fishing
territories, status distinctions among chiefs and between chiefs and
commoners, communal economic arrangements according to phratric and
clan affiliation, a complex system of reciprocity and redistribution,
and a distinctive religious ideology. The paradox lies in the fact
that the social structure and economic organization that currently exist
outside the feast hall belie the events within.

Thus, the central problem addressed in this essay is the
following: What is the nature of the relationship, if any, between the
contemporary Carrier feast and the realities of the social-economic
context of Carrier life outside the feast hall? While the potlatch has
surely been one of the most pondered phenomena in anthropology, authors
generally have focussed on the historical potlatch to the exclusion of
its contemporary significance. (An exception is Codere in her work on
the Kwakiutl potlatch; Codere, 1950). Moreover, ethnographers have
tended to work with the coastal tribes to the exclusion of the Carrier
in their analyses of the potlatch and in their more general cultural
studies. This essay is somewhat unique, I think, in that it examines
the contemporary significance of the Carrier feast both within and without
the feast hall.

Given the central problem as stated above, the question of
theoretical approach becomes crucial. In this regard, Sahlins (1976),
among others, has addressed a problem of central importance to anthro-
pology: What is it that has primacy in defining the logic and code of
behaviour by which people of a given culture tend to act—material conditions or a symbolic scheme? Immediately upon thinking of human behaviour as being defined in some way, the spectre of determinism, either cultural or material, might arise. I am reminded, however, of Foster-Carter’s plea to reconsider Marx’s adage that "people make their own history, but they do not make it exactly as they please" (Marx quoted in Foster-Carter, 1978: 68). Foster-Carter’s reading of this passage suggests that an approach is required which locates the activities of individuals in a particular historic set of conditions—material and cultural. It must be recognized also that man creates the conditions of his own existence and in turn is created by them. Thus human activity is not necessarily determined by either cultural or economic conditions but rather may be "guided" by either one or both at any given time. I do not, therefore, view the question of primacy as particularly important as far as human behaviour is concerned.

The question remains, however, as to what approach is to be taken: a structuralist analysis of symbolic expression or a materialist analysis of conditions facing decision making and production and exchange. On this problem I agree with Leach:

The rival theories of anthropologists are themselves parts of a single interacting whole. Both viewpoints accept the central dogma of functionalism that cultural details must always be viewed in context, that everything is meshed in with everything else. In this regard the two approaches, the empiricist (functionalist) and the rationalist (structuralist), are complementary rather than contradictory; one is a transformation of the other. (1976: 5)

In this light, I have chosen to adopt aspects of both approaches—structuralist and materialist—and to relate them in a way that effectively addresses the central problem of the essay.
The essay is in two parts. Part I represents an explanation of the meaning of the feast from within the feast hall; Part II examines the contemporary context of Hwitsowitenne social-economic life without the feast hall and attempts to bridge the apparent gap between the two contexts.

Within Part I, Chapter 1 follows the materialist path inasmuch as it develops, in ethnohistorical terms, a model representing Carrier social history. The history begins with a hypothetical system of so-called composite bands in the Yukon-Mackenzie woodlands, and continues, following their move to the present setting, as a stage of salmon-promoted segmentary elaboration of the bands, termed the sept system. The sept stage is succeeded by what I term a sept/phratri stage, representing the Carrier social structure described by a number of research scholars who have worked among the Carrier from the turn of the 19th Century (the Oblate missionary-scholar A.G. Morice) to the present (notably Jenness, Goldman, Hackler and myself). The sept/phratri stage arose with an overlaying of the septs, to a considerable extent under the impetus of the fur trade, by a system of coast-derived, territory-claiming, matrilineal crest-divisions, classes, ranks, and a feast cycle which effects a ceremonial articulation of these various categories of Carrier society.

Generally, I have taken a structuralist approach to studying what I term the "meaning of the feast"; that is, the symbolic significance of the ritual events that take place within the feast hall. This essentially is the gist of Chapter 2 wherein I present a detailed analysis which ascribes unconscious symbolic significance to the seating
and to the prestation-distribution orders of the Carrier feast. Of course, I am aware that the legitimacy of predicating to individuals any patterns of cognition which do not correspond directly to their own utterances (that is, a fortiori unconscious symbolic patterns) is a matter of continuing dispute among students of human behaviour. I shall not consider that debate, as such, in this essay. Suffice it to say, however, that I regard such an assumption as legitimate and essential for complete explanation in light of the subject at hand.

I am indebted to Diamond Jenness for his precise data on the seating structure of the Hwitsowitenne feasts (Chapter 2, Section 1). The information concerning prestation-distribution procedures is contributed by my own fieldnotes, also obtained in this instance from interviews with Hwitsowitenne informants. There is always a risk in combining data obtained at different times (there is a forty year span between Jenness' record and my own) as aspects of a single phenomenon. I have taken that risk in a number of contexts, but not without secondary support or without acknowledging the uncertainty to the reader. In this case, for example, my own data on seating, though perhaps not as rich as Jenness', solidly confirm in outline what Jenness' statements and his "Tables of Peerage" (1943: 491-495) convey in wonderful detail. That fact substantially diminishes the risk of linking the information on spatial patterning to my own data on distributional order.

The central thesis of Chapter 2 is that the ceremonial seating and distributional arrangement of the major parameters of Carrier society (chiefs, nobles, commoners, clans, phratries, septs) is motivated in consideration of the epi-ceremonial connotations of these categories,
especially by connotations proper to the diachronic perspective (that is, by both ideologies of continuity and folk-historic aspects of social structure). The spatial/temporal arrangements of the feast are treated, following the linguistic model, as "surface" structures which manifest meanings out of principles of motivated syntax operating at "deep" (i.e., unconscious) levels of structure. These "deep" level principles of space/time syntax are expressed as simple analogies, and it is suggested that the motivation behind these patterns may derive from certain givens of perceptual experience. Clearly the theoretical orientation of this analysis is "structural" in the current sense.

Part II represents a study of social change among the Hwitsowitenne, primarily in the last thirty-two years. In Chapter 3 I first examine the so-called traditional concepts of power and chieftainship as a prelude to analyzing the ways in which the Hwitsowitenne have been affected recently by relations with the wider society. Following in Section 2 of Chapter 3 are observations and conclusions regarding the actual operation of the authority and economic system in recent years. The thesis that there has developed a dependency relationship between the Hwitsowitenne, on the one hand, and government and industry, on the other, is presented in light of recent socio-economic data. While undertaking this analysis, I attempt to relate throughout to the traditional authority system described in Section 1. Finally, in Chapter 3, Section 3, I study the implications of the role of the federal government and its imposed structure of elected Band Councils for the traditional authority structure and the economic behaviour of individual Hwitsowitenne.
In Chapter 4, concluding observations are offered with respect to the relationship of the contemporary social context to activity within the feast hall. It is clear that the changing situation without the feast hall is placing stress on the feast itself, as it is discussed in Chapter 2 of Part I.

The focus in Part II is on Hwitsowitenne property relations and the laws that support those relations; my study of change therefore concerns primarily those aspects of Hwitsowitenne society. Of course, it is essential in such a study to concern oneself with the authority structure and economic activity; however, the focus provides an effective means to relate social change to the feast inasmuch as the feast is so concerned with property relations and law. I should note here that I use the term "law" in the sense outlined by Hoebel (1979). The concept "law" is characterized by three main elements: (i) a normative element, (ii) a recognized authority carrying the privilege of making judgements and exercising sanction through force, if deemed appropriate, and (iii) regularity in application.

In terms of methodology and presentation, I have used in Chapter 3, Section 2 the case method approach; that is, I have presented specific cases which demonstrate the Hwitsowitenne system of property relations and authority in action, indicating as well the effects of wider society contact on that system.

The subject of this essay derives from both theoretical and purely pragmatic interests. On the theoretical side I have been concerned to address various issues, including social change within an interior British Columbia native group, the feast as a symbolically
structured institution, and the broader question of the structuralist-materialist dilemma. The pragmatic interest in the exercise arose from my work with the Gitksan-Carrier Tribal Council Association in preparing for the various aspects of its land claim effort. There are four processes facing the Tribal Council in 1983 which will be based, in large part, on the research that I and my colleagues within the Tribal Council have been undertaking. Specifically, those processes are a court case intended to gain control over rights of access to and use of fish migrating past Carrier and Gitksan villages; a public hearing and court case on the issue of the construction of a large hydroelectric dam in Hwitso-witenne territory; and negotiations with federal and provincial governments aimed at settling the claim to traditionally held lands. This dissertation is likely to be significant as support information and as evidence in each of those events. Thus, as a condition to preparing and submitting the dissertation, the Tribal Council has requested that its access be restricted for the time being and that certain data concerning the actual quantities of fish and game taken not be used. With respect to the first point, I have made the appropriate request to the University of Edinburgh. Concerning the second request, I am confident that the essay does not suffer from the exclusion of these data. It will be interesting, however, at some later date to carry out further research incorporating this information.

I must also make a note with regard to orthography. The reader will undoubtedly find that Part I presents a complicated analysis, partly due to the many place, sept and chief names presented. This is further complicated by the fact that in working with the ethnographic
literature authored by Morice, Jenness and Duff, I have had to use three different ways of spelling the same words. I felt that in order to be consistent when referring to the literature I was obliged to use the spelling of the individual author in those contexts which related to quotes from that author's work. While I have attempted to ameliorate the possible confusion by including a page showing sept and place name equivalents from the three major ethnographic sources, I must ask the reader to bear with me. Throughout the essay, when not referring to the literature, I have used a relatively straightforward Athapaskan orthography designed by Dr. James Kari, a linguist from the University of Alaska.

Finally, I would like to acknowledge with sincere thanks the invaluable assistance of several people. First, I want to express my gratitude to the Gitksan-Carrier Tribal Council Association, and particularly to Neil J. Sterritt, for the opportunity to work on the land claim and to prepare and submit this dissertation. Second, I will be forever indebted to the Carrier people who welcomed me into their homes, camps and feast halls. In particular, I wish to acknowledge the help of three people of high birth whose friendship I value much more than even the detailed information they have provided; they are Alfred Joseph, Leonard George and Charles Austin. As well, I can now express my admiration of the research team in the Gitksan-Carrier Land Claims Office. It is largely thanks to their encouragement that this thesis has been completed and to their hard work that the land claim will be a success. My friends at Carleton University, particularly Dr. Jacques Chevalier, Dr. John Cove and Dr. Bruce Cox, over the years have given me much
moral support and concrete advice. This has been particularly important whenever we have managed to cross paths during my period of "anthropological isolation" in the North. Many thanks to Anne Maclean for typing a difficult manuscript so well and so good naturedly. I have for my thesis supervisor, Dr. Anthony Jackson, a great admiration in light of his extreme patience and continual support. Many thanks. And finally to my wife, Janyce, who has borne the brunt of these past seven years as the wife of a doctoral student (and an anthropologist at that!), I give infinite thanks. It is to Janyce and my children, Jessica and Daniel, that this thesis is dedicated.
PART I: THE MEANING OF THE FEAST
Chapter 1: CARRIER ETHNOHISTORY

1. Ecology and Distribution of the Septs

This essay is largely concerned with spatial arrangements. It is fitting that I introduce the reader to the Carrier people from the point of view of the distribution of their territorial divisions across their land. First the land.

The region in which the Carrier live lies within the Subalpine Forest Biotic Area described by Cowan and Guiguet. I shall quote them at length:

The Subalpine Forest lies south of the Boreal Forest and generally above the elevation of 4,000 feet. This base-level becomes lower toward the north and along the western slope of the Coast Range and is subject to much local variation. Its upper limit is timber-line on the mountainsides.

The dominant climax tree species are Engelmann spruce (Picea engelmanni) and Alpine fir (Abies lasiocarpa). Mountain rhododendron (Rhododendron albiflorum) is probably the most widely distributed shrub in the undergrowth, along with huckleberries of several species. In the drier regions, as in the Rocky Mountains, mountain cranberry (Vaccinium vitis idoea) is common.

The winters are moderately cold, the summers cool and moist. Average annual precipitation at Glacier is 53 inches, but there will be wide variation from this in both directions (Cowan and Guiguet, 1956: 23).

Cowan and Guiguet (1956: 18) note major climatic and biotic variation within the subarea occupied by the Carrier. Along the Skeena River watercourse, "... the influence of humidity extends inland hundreds of miles and modifies the flora and fauna of the inland plateaux." A further modification is provided by the existence in the Nechako and Bulkley Valleys of isolated areas ecologically similar to the Cariboo
Parklands Biotic Area:

The winters are cold, summers warm with frequent rain showers; precipitation is generally light.

The parklands proper are undulating, set with frequent lakes and ponds and dotted with clumps of aspen and lodgepole pine, or they are wooded with the same species. Forests are open with a light underbrush of willow and buffaloberry. (Cowan and Guiguet, 1956: 21).

In the Subalpine Forest, Cowan and Guiguet (1956: 23) report that: "The mammal fauna is closely similar to that of the Boreal Forest." The animals most sought by the Carrier and something of their ecological seasons will be described later in the chapter.

The various Carrier populations had few difficulties of access to one another. Although it falls within a topographic zone designated the Interior Plateau, the area is by no means flat. Rather, it is hilly, and regularly spotted with mountains which can approach altitudes of 8,000 feet. Nevertheless, the district is richly reticulated with lakes (it has a number between 100 and 200 square miles in area) and rivers which converge upon two drainage basins—the Skeena draining the north-west, and the Fraser the remainder. Therefore, it would have been relatively easy to reach—by aboriginal poplarbark boat—all areas excepting the northwest corner without portage. Only the portages between the Fraser and Skeena break the water network, and these are, for the most part, relatively short and generally well-cleared footpaths. As we shall see, the hiatus between these water systems is somewhat paralleled in cultural differences between the Skeena and the Fraser peoples. These differences concern primarily details of social structure which closely identify the Skeena basin Carrier culture with the coastal peoples to whom they are linked through the Skeena River watercourse.
The portages may indeed have been just difficult enough for significant trade missions to account, along with sheer mileage, for the difference apparent in the degree of assimilation of the coast culture by the two water basins.

The rich stock of fishes yielded to the Carrier peoples by their water systems is discussed in the course of this and later chapters.

In terms of ethnographic focus this essay pertains largely to particular aspects--symbolic, legal, material--of the northwestern Carrier feast. The symbolic representations of seating arrangements and the patterns of the distribution of prestational materials will receive considerable attention. These ceremonial details are treated analytically as condensed representations (symbols) of categories and processes which compose the time span between ceremonial events. Therefore, every step in the analysis of the particulars of the Carrier feast carries our attention to details not unique to the feast. In fact, as part of the attempt to identify the current significance of the feast, the analysis is extended beyond the parameters of Carrier culture to examine the contribution of the wider society in establishing the contemporary political-economic context for Carrier life. Further, the feast--perhaps more than any other ritual form in its own setting--when ever it occurs expresses virtually the entirety of the culture in which it is embedded. This has been expressed to me recurrently by Carrier people and was well articulated by Rosman and Rubel (1971). Writing on the Kwakiutl potlatch these authors state the following:

The potlatch involves in simplest terms the amassing of property and its subsequent distribution in a ceremonial context.
Though this amassing and redistribution of property is obviously a central feature of the Kwakiutl economic system and has been so considered by Boas, Codere, Drucker and Heizer, Vayda, Belshaw, Piddocke, and others, the essential elements of the potlatch also intersect with other subsystems of Kwakiutl society....The potlatch is thus a drama in which are played out the essential elements of Kwakiutl culture and society, while revealing the components of social structure (Rosman and Rubel, 1971: 157).

The detail of ceremonial protocol will be given as the analysis develops but it will be useful to outline some of the wider dimensions of Carrier culture in advance. Again, the territorial aspect is most important here.

The sources on Carrier ethnography have recorded, in all, something over a dozen Carrier names signifying an ideological segmentation of the Carrier-speaking peoples in terms of territorial differentials. These names usually contain a suffixed element meaning, approximately, "inhabitants of..." which has been variously transliterated according to the preference of the reporter; ?tenne by Morice, otenne by Jenness, woten by Duff, and by myself witenne.¹ That is, all names which contain this suffix clearly designate constellations of people.

At the same time, as will be made clear, most of the root elements to which this suffix is compounded may occur independently and constitute place names. Typically, indeed, when their meanings can be identified, these root elements make specific reference to waterbodies. The nine "sept" names listed by Morice (1893: 24-7) include, for example, the names Nazku?tenne, people of the Naz (probably the West Road) River, 7-tha-koh-?tenne, people of the 7tha (Fraser) River, and Hwotsa?tenne,

¹. No doubt dialect variations have also contributed to the differences in these renderings.
people of the Hwotsotsan\(^2\) (Bulkley) River.

To each of the "sept" names in his inventory Morice subtends a number of village names. Some of the village names, like the "sept" names, refer to places, again frequently waterbodies, but none in Morice's lists contain the component ?tenne. However, in other records it does occur in combination with the village names. At the time of Morice's (1893: 25) writing, the "sept" Nu-tcah-?tenne inhabited four separate villages, and several stood empty. Two of these villages, 7ka-tco and 7us?kaz, appear on Duff's (1964: 33-4) list of the Carrier "tribes," where he has registered them as the Algatcho and Kluskoten respectively. Note that the latter name, Kluskoten, is formed by affixing the element "-(w)oten" to a contraction of the village name 7us?kaz recorded by Morice. Similarly, the name Tha-toe, of one of the villages of Morice's T?ja-tenne "sept" has been graduated from a mere place name into the name of a societal division by Jenness (1943: 476) whose map of the Carrier "subtribes\(^3\) includes regions allocated to the "Tachetenne," and by Duff who lists a "Tachiwoten" tribe.

According to Morice's information, then, the Carrier universe is divided into a set of territorially differentiated societal categories to each of which are subtended a series of place name terms. Now if, as the more recent reports from Jenness and Duff suggest, names which appear in one context strictly in the sense of place names (Morice's village names) may be syntactically modified in another so as to convert the place name into a specifically societal category, then we might wish

\(^2\) Hwotsotsan also means "spider" (Morice, 1893: 27ff).
\(^3\) For Jenness, all speakers of the Carrier tongue, taken together, comprise the Carrier "tribe." Thus, Jenness' "subtribe" corresponds to Duff's "tribe," and both to Morice's "sept." Elsewhere Duff (1951) uses the term "subtribe" to denote this category; see references later in this chapter.
to consider the possibility that we are here confronting a segmentary structure somewhat in the Evans-Frithchardian tradition. Do we not seem to have two taxonomic levels (distinguished through their relations of inclusion) of territorially differentiated societal segments? I am encouraged to explore the matter a little further.

The ethnographic sources provide only sparse commentary on the matter of the political manifestations of these territorial segments. Typically the remarks are of only a very general cast. Speaking of his category of "Western Dene" tribes (i.e., the "Nahanais," the "Sekanais," the "Chilcotins," the "Babines," and the "Carriers"), Morice (1906: 5) observes that: "None of them originally had any kind of village chiefs in our sense of the word....As to the Babines, the Carriers, and the Chilcotins, they possessed what they called toeneza, hereditary 'noblemen,' who owned the hunting grounds and were the honorary heads of various clans or gentes." Jenness (1943: 481) makes the same observation concerning the Bulkley River Carrier, who recognized

... no ruling chief or established council to control the actions of the different families and govern their relations with the outside world. Like other Carrier subtribes [but by no means all, as we shall see], the Bulkley natives were divided into a number of fraternities or phratries [Morice's "gentes"], each intimately associated with the others, yet politically independent.

More to the point, perhaps, the territorial segments are--on the face of it--of little significance in the issues which lie at the heart of the classical segmentary structures; levels of opposition which manifest themselves, above all, in the feud and warfare. Witness Morice (1893: 195): "But hostilities were seldom of so general a character as to involve whole villages, though some such cases are recorded in the
traditions of the tribes. More commonly they were restricted to two different gentes...." Again, Jenness' conclusions support Morice. Jenness (1943: 482-3) speaks of the phratries as being war "units" which, far from being unified on a territorial basis (i.e., among the phratries of a "sept" or village), "...associated at will with foreign peoples even when these might be hostile to others of their countrymen." Nevertheless, like Morice, Jenness (1943: 481) interjects a note of qualification and cedes that the phratries apparently "... united at times to repel a common danger."

Morice relates a tradition concerning a war, fought circa 1745 between the Carrier and Chilcotins, which appears to illustrate the military allegiance of territorial segments on a rather wider scale than the above conclusions from Morice and Jenness would--without their important qualifications--lead us to anticipate. A party of Chilcotin warriors annihilated very nearly the entire population of the village of Chinlac, situated near the confluence of the Stuart and Nechako Rivers. Three years later one of the few survivors of the Chilcotin attack, a man described as the principal toeneze (chief) of Chinlac, name of Khadintel, heads a successful reprisal. His vengeance party is described as "... a large band of braves he had gathered from among the few survivors of the Chinlac population and the allied villages of Thachek, Nulkreh (Stony Creek) and Natley (Fraser Lake)" (Morice, 1906: 16). Morice (1906: 14) had already pointed out that the Chinlac population "... was allied by blood and dialect to the Lower Carriers of what is now called Stony Creek." In Notes on the Western Denes, Morice does not include the Stony Creek population among his "septs" and villages.
However, in an appendix to his Bulkley River study, Jenness notes that the Yuta?wotenne or Stony Creek subtribe occupied—before being confined to a single reserve—two villages on Nulki and Tatchik Lakes.\footnote{The Yuta?wotenne "subtribe" appears on Jenness' map (1943: 476) as well as in the appendix (1943: 586).} In other words, two of the villages which contributed to Khadintel's revenge party, Thackek (i.e., Jenness' Tatchik) and Nulkreh (Jenness' Nulki) together constitute the Stony Creek division to which Chinlac was allied "by blood and dialect."

**Chinlac** itself is listed (Morice, 1893: 25)—rendered toinlak—as an extinct village of the Tano?tenne "sept" which also inhabits the village of Fort George, or 7eitli. Although Morice (1906: 19) does not mention any contribution on behalf of the village of Fort George to Khadintel's retaliatory force, nevertheless Fort George figured in the denouement of the tragic sequence: "In the course of time, a few persons who had escaped the massacre of 1745 settled among their friends of Thacheek and 7eitli (Fort George)." In this instance, we not only find a military allegiance which transcends the village level of social structure, but which draws participation from no less than three distinct supravillage segments, two of Morice's "septs," the Natley-hwo?tenne (Fraser Lake) and the "sept" of the Chinlac, Tano?tenne, and one of Jenness' subtribes, Yuta?wotenne.

These observations establish that, in terms of the societal taxonomy posited by Carrier culture, we must recognize a segmentary arrangement of territorially differentiated categories manifesting at least two levels of inclusion. I shall refer to these hereafter, following Morice, as villages and septs. There are traditions, furthermore,
which support a notion that these territorial segments, qua territorial segments, have figured as opposing elements in hostile confrontations. The foregoing illustration involved the engagement of personnel from villages and several septs in a suprasept military allegiance. What remains problematic in this case is the precise place of the phratries in the rationalization of the oppositions characteristic of such widescale hostilities.

I shall now attempt to draw together some of the materials presented by the principal Carrier ethnographers on the territorially differentiated divisions of the Carrier-speaking population. I would emphasize that the expression "territorially differentiated divisions" not only signifies the segmentation of Carrier peoples into named groups with which are identified broad hunting-trapping-fishing territories, but that the divisional names themselves frequently refer (where their etymology is known) to specific places, waterbodies in particular.

The approximately one dozen distinct division names denote populations distributed across a stretch of central British Columbia extending in an east-west direction between the Fraser River and the eastern slopes of the coast mountain range (in the northwest, the Gitksan villages are interposed between the Carrier and the coast mountains), and from 56° latitude at the north central extremity to between 52° and 53° latitude at the southern boundary, contiguous with Chilcotin territory. The core of Part I of this essay is focused upon two divisions situated in the northwest corner of this area; the Natowitenne and the Hwitsowitenne of Lake Babine and the Bulkley River, respectively. However, I shall have occasion to contrast aspects of the social organization
of these groups with various of the other divisions. It will, therefore, be useful to rapidly survey them at this point.

There are some striking variances among the divisional names recorded by the ethnographers. Five of the nine sept names listed by Morice in *Notes on the Western Denes* (he reserves the word "tribe" to designate all Carrier peoples) correspond exactly to ones recorded by both Jenness (1943: 476) and Duff (1964: 33-4). These are cited below with a brief description of their respective territories and villages. The divisional names will be introduced in Morice's orthography.

In order to assist the reader with the following discussion, I have listed in Figure 1 the nine septs identified by Morice, together with the villages he mentions as being within each sept (some villages are now extinct). The corresponding "sept" and village names identified by Jenness and Duff are also listed. Note that the correspondence is not exact.

"7tha-koh-rtenne" (the name means "people of the Fraser River").

They occupy the southeast corner of the Carrier territory. Morice described this group as almost extinct at the time of his writing ("I do not think that fifteen individuals...remain"); and yet, miraculously, they have persisted and appear on Jenness' map ("tlautenne") and in Duff's table ("Tauten"). Morice specifies a single village, "Stella," adjacent to the old Fort Alexandria (the present town of Alexandria on the Fraser River between 52° and 53° latitude).

"Nazkutenne" ("people of the River Naz"): immediately north, on the Fraser, of the "7tha-koh-rtenne," they inhabited two villages, Quesnel and Blackwater, in Morice's time. Jenness and Duff render the name "Naskotenne" and "Nazkoten" respectively.

5. "Koh" = "river".
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Morice</th>
<th>Jenness</th>
<th>Duff</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Nazku'tenne</td>
<td>Naskotenne</td>
<td>Nazkoten</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quesnel Blackwater</td>
<td></td>
<td>Quesnel Nazko</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. 7tha-koh-ntenne</td>
<td>Tauteenne</td>
<td>Tauten</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stella</td>
<td></td>
<td>Alexandria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Hwotso tenne</td>
<td>Hwitsowitenne</td>
<td>Witsiwoten</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tse-tcah</td>
<td>Tsekya</td>
<td>Moricetown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moricetown</td>
<td>Moricetown</td>
<td>Tsitsk (Hagwilget)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ackwilgate</td>
<td>Hagwilgate</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dizkle</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Nu-tcah-ntenne</td>
<td>7'ka-tco</td>
<td>Alagatcho + Kluskoten</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7'us?kaz</td>
<td></td>
<td>Ulkatcho</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Kluskus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. T'jaz-tenne</td>
<td>Tatchetenne</td>
<td>Tachiwoten</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tha-tce</td>
<td></td>
<td>Stuart-Trembleur</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sasuchan</td>
<td></td>
<td>Lake (mostly at</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sas-thút</td>
<td></td>
<td>Tache and Fort</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>?ka?ztce</td>
<td></td>
<td>St. James)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ya-ku-tce</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Tano-ntenne</td>
<td>Toinlak</td>
<td>Chinlac</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7eitli</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Natley-hwo'tenne</td>
<td>Natlewitenne</td>
<td>Natliwoten +</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natleh</td>
<td>Natlehin</td>
<td>Stellaawoten</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stella</td>
<td>Stella</td>
<td>Stellawaquo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Fraser Lake</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Takla Lake</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Nato'ntenne</td>
<td>u?anwitenne</td>
<td>Nataotin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hwo?tat</td>
<td></td>
<td>Lake Babine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latharkra?zla</td>
<td></td>
<td>(mostly at Fort</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N s qoll k</td>
<td></td>
<td>Babine and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Burns Lake</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Na?kraztli</td>
<td></td>
<td>Necoslie (Fort</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pintoe</td>
<td></td>
<td>St. James)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Figure 1:** The nine Carrier septs and their villages identified by Morice; corresponding septs and villages identified by Jenness and Duff.
**Tano-ʔtene** ("people a little to the north"): inhabited a village adjoining Fort George at the confluence of the Nechako ("Nutcakoh") and Fraser Rivers. They traversed hunting territories which extended east of the Fraser to the western slopes of the Rocky Mountains. In addition to "ʔeilili" (Fort George village), the extinct village of "Tcinlak" had belonged to this sept.

**Natleh-hwoʔtene** ("people of Natleh"): one suspects that "Natleh" is the name of Fraser Lake, but Morice does not explicitly state it. He specifies that two villages, "Natleh" and "Stella", belong to this sept. Jenness, on the other hand, speaks of a "subtribe" at the east end of Fraser Lake, corresponding to "Natleh," and one at Fort Fraser, corresponding to "Stella," at the west end of Fraser Lake. Yet, the sense of discrete social units carried in this latter reference (see Jenness, 1943: 482) is not carried over onto his map where the whole of Fraser Lake is enclosed and labeled "Natlewitenne," suggesting a single societal category encompassing the entire Fraser Lake population. Duff's table lists two "tribes," "Natliwoten" and "Stellawoten." The sense of a conception of separate societal divisions is stressed here by the occurrence of the suffix "-woten" with the name "Stella."

Thus, Duff's data suggest two discrete societal divisions bearing names having place references ("Stella" = "the cape"). At face value, Morice's data suggest two distinct places associated with a single societal division; Morice's village names do not carry the humanizing suffix "-hwoʔtene." However, without pretending to arrive at a firm conclusion, I would suggest that this merely reflects an almost inadvertent syntactical device whereby Morice has stressed the sense of the societal unity of the sept in the face of its lack of the concrete sense of unity imputed to a village simply in virtue of its coresidential unity—even wanting the
optional suffix "-hwotsonne."

Hwotsonne ("people of the River Hwotsutsan"): Morice mentions four settlements. Two of these are given no mention in Jenness, neither did I hear any reference to them at Moricetown. The third, "Tse-toah," probably corresponds to the village which Jenness records as "Tsekya" (= "Rockfoot"), a village established 20 miles below Moricetown on the Bulkley River following a rock slide which partially blocked the river just above the site of "Tsekya." In Jenness' time "Tsekya" was abandoned, and its population had either returned to their original home at Moricetown, the fourth village cited by Morice, or had moved to a site above the escarpment of the Hagwilget Canyon where they established the second "Hwotsutsan" village in use during Jenness' time (in addition to Moricetown), namely, Hagwilget.6

The remaining four sept names from Morice are not duplicated in the records of either Duff or Jenness. The Lake Babine people are given the same name by Duff, "Nataotin," as by Morice, "Nato?tenne," but are labeled the "u?anwitenne" on Jenness' map. The etymologies of these names are not available. In Notes on the Western Denes, Morice indicates, without naming them, three villages on the northern half of Lake Babine.

Early Hudson's Bay Company records in New Caledonia, cited by Morice in The History of the Northern Interior of British Columbia, establish that most of the Lake Babine population inhabited a village named "Hwo?tat" at the north end of the lake at the point of effluence of the Babine River (Morice, 1905: 208 et seq.). The first trade post on Lake Babine had been erected in 1822 at a point of land, some 35 miles south of "Hwo?tat,"7 where Taklah Arm joins the main body of the lake. As ever, the trade post drew a contingent of the local population to its perimeter, and they came to be known as the niydoi7ac"whid?eyny

6. Morice makes no mention of Hagwilget.
7. Rendered Hwitat in current Babine dialect.
(= "white man-outside-they-stay"). By 1836, however, this location had proved less than satisfactory as it had failed to attract the trade of a significant portion of the lake's population; they preferred to continue to trade their furs at Hagwilget with their fellow Carrier or at the Bulkley-Skeena junction with the Gitksan and Coast Tsimshian; "... the Babines of that lake (especially those inhabiting its northern extremity) were in the habit of trading almost exclusively with the Tsimpsians of the Pacific Coast or their own congeners of what was then called the Fallen Rock--now Ackwillgate...." (Morice, 1905: 209). Morice goes on to make the point that the barter terms in this trade were better than offered by the Hudson's Bay Company because they were better, by far, at their source among the sea traders who had patrolled the coast since the sea otter trade with China had developed circa 1785. It is rather curious that Morice does not recognize the role of the Gitksan in this trade chain whereas Jenness (1943: 478) notes: "The Gitksan controlled the trade route down the Skeena river to the coast that brought to the Carrier objects of shell and copper in exchange for moose hides and various furs." It may be, however, that Morice based his comment on a particular period when the Coast Tsimshian established direct trade with the Carrier at the Bulkley-Skeena junction. Thus, Jenness (1943: 478) continues the foregoing remark as follows: "The Coast Tsimshian, who were the principals in this trade, tried to eliminate the Gitksan middlemen about 1850, and, themselves ascending the Skeena, established a yearly market on an open flat at the junction of

8. A map adjoining Morice's (1892: 108-9) article "Are the Carrier Sociology and Mythology Indigenous or Exotic?" shows a village at the corresponding location which bears the name "Latharkrezla."
that river with the Bulkley."

With a view to more effectively intercepting the Babine trade, instructions went out in 1836 to William McBean—who was then in charge of the post at Fort Kilmars (the initial post, which has since been named Old Fort Babine)—to prepare a new post at "Hwo'tat." In addition, further to intercepting the trade in furs, the planned post at "Hwo'tat" was intended to ensure access to trade for the Babine salmon which had become perhaps the most important food source to the personnel at the Hudson's Bay Company trading posts throughout New Caledonia. For various reasons the post at "Hwo'tat," New Fort Babine, was not completed until circa 1890.

In addition to Hwo'tat and niydowac'whidzevnyn there is presently a village on the northern half of Lake Babine at Topley Landing (situated on the west shore). This may represent the third village referred to by Morice.⁹ At the present time niydowac'whidzevnyn is vacant and Hwo'tat reduced to about 100 souls since, about 15 years ago, most of the present Babine population moved to a reserve adjacent to the town of Burns Lake and to Pendleton Bay, encouraged by the Indian Affairs Branch administrators of the Babine band to seek work with logging camps at the south end of the lake and at the Pendleton Bay sawmill.

Na-²kra-ztli-ʔtenne: Morice indicates that this name means "people of Stuart's Lake," and that the sept inhabited two villages, "Na'kraztlı" and "Pintoe." My own information confirms these village names and indicates that the former name denotes the village at the site

⁹. On the other hand, it may be a village named "N s qoll k" which appears on Morice's map of 1892, situated on the east shore of the lake between "Hwo'tat" and "Lathakražla." There is certainly no contemporary counterpart to this village, neither have I heard of it otherwise.
of the present town of Fort St. James and can be translated as "the outlet of Stuart Lake," where the suffix -ztli represents a contraction of the word teztli, meaning "lake outlet." The village of Pintce is situated at the halfway point along the eastern shore of Stuart's Lake where the Pintce River enters the lake (see also Morice, 1905: 26ff). I cannot confirm it from my own data, but it will become clear through some of Morice's village name etymologies to follow that the suffix which he renders "-tce" (as in Pintce) means a "confluence of waters."

Duff's table gives the corresponding tribe name "Necosliwoten," and Jenness' map separates out a territory, under the label "?Kotene," which would correspond to that of Morice's "Na-?kra-ztli-?ttenne." Morice also records an equivalent of the name "?Kotene" but he specifies that the name "?Kutene" designates the combination of the "Na-?kra-ztli-?ttenne" with their neighbours to their immediate north, described below.

T?xaz-?ttenne: Morice translates this name "people of the bottom or end of the [Stuart] lake," and asserts that the "original home" of the four villages of the sept was at the (north) end of Stuart Lake. At least one of these villages represented a relatively recent site at the time of Morice's writing. The Sekani bands north of Carrier territory had expanded westward, owing to the harassment of the Beaver and Cree along their eastern boundary. One band, the "Sasuchan" (= "people of the Black Bear"), had occupied the entire basin of the Finlay River and, in the west, the territory around Bear Lake and the northern end of Taklah Lake. In 1826 the Hudson's Bay Company established a post, Fort Connolly, at Bear Lake which drew contingents from the upper Skeena

10. This confirms Morice's (1905: 26ff) translation of the name Y?kuztli as "the outlet of Yako Lake."
Gitksan and from the Carrier as well as from the Sekani "sasuchan."
According to Jenness (1937: 11), owing to the unsettling effects of
friction between the Sekani and Gitksan, the post was moved in 1890 to
Fort Grahame on Finlay River, and the Sekani contingent withdrew to
that place leaving Bear Lake territory to the Carrier and Gitksan groups.
Consistent with this information, then, the Gitksan and Carrier popu-
lations at Bear Lake were established there after 1826.

Morice's information that the Carrier village "near Fort
Connolly," which bore the name "sas-thût" (= "Black Bear bathing place"),
was of the "T?az-?tenne" sept, further suggests that the "sas-thût"
people had moved from their "original home" at the bottom of Stuart Lake
to Bear Lake in connection with the formation there of the Hudson's Bay
trading post. Concerning the Bear Lake area in general, Morice (1905:
25) concludes that, although it had originally belonged to the Sekani,
it had subsequently fallen into the possession of the Carrier who
"... now inhabit the village and hunt in the vicinity of the lake with
the consent of the former [the Sekani]; and the ñnas or Kitiksons
[Gitksan] from the Skeena River who are considered as mere intruders and
as such live there only on sufferance." Since Morice's writing the legi-
timate control of Bear Lake would appear to have shifted from the Carrier
(if, indeed, they ever possessed it as Morice claims); my own informants
consistently identified Bear Lake as Gitksan--indeed, there is now at
Fort Babine a family who had moved there about ten years ago from Bear
Lake, and who regard themselves as Gitksan. This confirms Jenness'
(1937: 12) view that "... now Gitksan Indians from Kiskargas and Kuldo
claim Bear Lake as their territory...."
The remaining villages of this sept are "?Kaz-te" (= "confluence of the ?Kaz River"), on Tachie River, "Ya-ku-te,"\(^{11}\) at the northwest end of Stuart Lake, and "Tha-te" which Morice translates "the tail" of Stuart Lake where Tachie River enters the lake.\(^{12}\)

Neither Duff nor Jenness anywhere record a version of the name "Tr?az-?tenne," but Duff lists a tribal name "Tachiwoten," and Jenness' map sets off an area taking in roughly the same territory (excepting Bear Lake and the north end of Taklah Lake)\(^{13}\) as that assigned by Morice to the "Tr?az-?tenne," under the label Tatchetenne.

My information concerning the immediately foregoing pair of septs raises several very intriguing issues which I can consider only with some trepidation, inasmuch as the data are too scant to be pressed to a final conclusion. Nevertheless, they are too interesting to be wholly omitted.

Consider first the following statement, alluded to above, from Morice (1905: 26): "The original home of all these bands was at

---

11. That is, "Ya-ku-te" means the confluence of the river "Yakuztli" (with Tachie River), while the latter name means the outlet of "Yako" (the stem element of the name "Yakuztli") Lake.


13. The sept affiliations of the north end of Taklah Lake are unclear. Morice and Jenness are in agreement that this was once Sekani territory. Since the withdrawal of the Sekani to Fort Grahame, however, this area has been ascribed by Morice to his "Tr?az-?tenne" sept and by Jenness to Lake Babine. At the present time, there are close links, consanguineal and affinal, between Fort Babine and the populations of Taklah Landing and of the west arm of the lake. I would be very much surprised if these communities, especially Taklah Landing, did not have as many important connections to "tha-te". Without either set of links dominating clearly we could not expect a consensus of the sept identity of these villages among informants viewing them from different positions in the system.
the end of that lake, as is manifest from their common name as a sept: 
\( \text{Tzaz-\text{-tenne}} \), people of the bottom or end of the lake." Now, as it stands, this statement is extremely ambiguous. Does he form an historic conclusion—concerning an "original home"—directly from the etymology of the sept name? Or does the name merely reflect and support a conclusion which Morice has formed concerning an "original home" on independent grounds? Surely the latter. Otherwise, why has he not concluded from the name "Na-kra-ztlile-\text{-tenne}" that its origin point must have been the outlet of Stuart Lake, or that the "Na\text{-zku\text{-tenne}}" had an "original home" on the River "Naz" establishing their Quesnel and Blackwater settlements as issue of that home? It is more likely that Morice is here reporting a tradition which—whatever its historic accuracy—represents the native conception of an historic basis of the "Tzaz-\text{-tenne}" sept.

Of course, utilization of a conception of common "origin" as a criterion of alliance among societal categories in a context of their mutual opposition to counterposed categories is a commonplace in the anthropology of descent systems. In these instances, ideologies which charter modes of personal relationship in terms of the norms of articulation among categories of kinship are transposed with the lexicon of kinship to the articulations and oppositions of descent groups: the affiliations of groups are conceived in the same (kin) terms as the affiliations among persons constituting the groups. Above all, (kin) terms defined \text{vis-a-vis} complementary (kin) terms which are ordered against each other according to a conception of fixed and necessary succession (parent/child) constitute the fundamental metronome of the history of segmentary lineages.
What was distinctive of the classic Nuer system of segmentation was the remarkable articulation of the system of territories to the mechanism of lineage segmentation; the moment-to-moment politics of territorial clusters were thereby projected upon an historic code. As ever, the structures of current relations must be regarded as causal of the current conception of history equally as HISTORY is to be regarded as causal of the structure of current relations.

Our present instance suggests the rationalization of currently linked territorial segments through a notion of successive buddings of new settlements from old. We are missing only indication that the process of budding was expressed in a kinship lexicon.

There is a rather shadowy hint of this conception of a lineal succession of settlements in the relations of the village and sept names in the case of the foregoing pair of septs. Thus, in the case of the "Na-ʔkra-ʔzti-ʔtenne," the sept name is the name of one of its villages. But note that the particular village name applied to this purpose represents a setting downstream (ndee) of the second village (Pintce) of the sept. A similar situation obtains in the case of the sept immediately north of this last. Whether we recognize Morice’s name, "people of the bottom of the [Stuart] lake," or Jenness’ name "Tachote-tenne," a priority is assigned to a site downstream of the other villages of the sept; "Tha-toe" is downstream of "ʔkəztce," "ʔa-ku-tce," and even of "sas-thút" (in the sense that it would require a lengthy upstream voyage—along the Taklah Lake and the Driftwood River—to reach the portage which must be crossed to attain "sas-thút" at Bear Lake).

Of course, this observation of the assignment of stress to settings which happen to be in the downstream position may represent a
spurious connection. However, the image of a succession of settlements cast in the upstream direction along any delineated segment of a watercourse is also, I would point out, in accord with the strategies of salmon trapping: downstream sites have first access. This apparent stress on downstream sites could reflect a dominance of the downstream populations, at a given time, as easily as any de facto historic antecedence. Similarly, a conception of historic priority might reflect de facto dominance and dominance, in turn, might reflect the ecological advantage of the downstream site.

This image of the upstream succession of settlement buds, taken either as a statement of an actual historic pattern, and/or as the projection of current power relations upon an historic code, may also account for the additional name, "?Kutane," given by Morice. Although Jenness claims that the same name—"Kotene"—applies particularly to the southern sept only, my own information tends to support Morice's: according to a Babine informant, the name q'uwdinee (dinee = man; q'uw = ?) denotes all of the people of Stuart Lake which includes, of course, those of "Tha-tce" and "Ya-ku-tce" as well as the two villages of the southern sept. In addition, living as he did for many years at the Fort St. James mission, Morice would surely have been in a more favourable position than Jenness (working out of Moricetown) to obtain precise discriminations in the meanings of names applied to the Stuart Lake peoples.

We appear to have in the name q'uwdinee then, a third level of inclusion in the taxonomy of the Carrier territorial divisions. In this case, we have no further information to indicate that the q'uwdinee
constituted a segment conceived of as having a common history among its divisions. Nevertheless, a rather striking sense of the unity of all villages of Stuart Lake—transcending their partition into two septs—is projected in the etymology of the village names: all five of the villages are locationally differentiated by the name of a river,\textsuperscript{14} but all river names are linked to a morphemic modifier which connotes the conjunction of the river with another waterbody. One of the names, "K\textsuperscript{3}z-toe," signifies the confluence of the River "?K\textsuperscript{2}z" with the Tachie River. The remaining four names connote the conjunction of rivers with Stuart Lake; two of these names are allocated to the southern, and two to the northern sept. Thus, the names "Tha-toe", "Pintce," and "Y\textsuperscript{4}kutzte," fully translated connote the places where the "Tha," "Pin," and "Y\textsuperscript{4}kutzli" Rivers, respectively, empty into (the suffix "-toe") Stuart Lake (understood without explication in the name). As I have noted, "N\textsuperscript{4}kraztli" signifies the outlet of Stuart Lake.

Of course, these village names may reflect nothing more than the simple fact of the location of the villages at the confluence of the several rivers with Stuart Lake. The villages do, indeed, seem to have been thus located (see Morice, 1905: 66 for statement on the locations of Pintce and Tha-toe, for example). On the other hand, if we are to credit Morice's following general conclusion beyond Stuart Lake, one wonders why many more village names do not specify confluences, in particular, of waterbodies. Morice (1893: 184) states: "The villages are generally situated at the confluence of rivers, or on the northern banks of lakes, so as to have the benefit of the sun's rays from the opposite

\textsuperscript{14}. This may also have been true of the village of "sas-th\textsuperscript{4}vt" at Bear Lake, but I have no information on this point.
side.” Yet, of the other village names on record, only "7eitli" (= Fort George) carries either of the suffixes "-tli" or "-tee" which indicates specifically a point of conjunction of waterbodies. The village of Hwitat (Hwo tat; New Fort Babine) for example, is situated exactly at the point where the Upper Babine River empties the lake at its northmost point. I have also noted that the extinct village of "Chinlac" was situated at the point of confluence of the Stuart River (= "Na?qra-koh"; Morice, 1905: 25) and the Nechako River ("Nucha-koh"; Morice, 1905: 25). The village of "Natleh" was situated at the east end of Fraser Lake where it is emptied by the Nechako River. In none of these instances do we find specifically reflected in the village names the fact of a village set at a place where waterbodies join.

Could the image in these names, rivers of a common lake, be symbolic of a wider sense of unity? In the teeth of the separation of the villages by sept, the village names reiterate what is asserted by the name q'uwdinee that what is set apart at one level may be bonded at another.

I might note, in passing, that the argument concerning a stressing of the downstream position by manifesting it in sept names is illustrated also in a case considered earlier, that of the sept "Natleh-hwo-?tenne." This sept name is merely the name of the village of the east (downstream) end of Fraser Lake.

As I have noted, these patterns of naming—whereby stress is given a downstream site by generalizing its name to the entire sept—may

---

15. I presume that his last point implies that the doorways of the houses faced the water—as one would expect—and would, therefore, open to the sunlight when the houses are situated on the northern lakeshore.
represent a sense of the dominance of the downstream site, reflecting in turn an ecological advantage, as easily as a sense of settlement succession or, of course, the convergence of the two. I do not think it can be considered fortuitous. The sense of dominance of the downstream site is manifest, for example, in the following remark from one Hans Helgeson in a report dated 1904 to his superior, the Inspector of Fisheries at Port Essington: "The owners of the upper barricades had certain rights in the fish, yet they had to depend largely on the clemency of the people of the lower one, to let the fish through for their supplies." Mr. Helgeson refers here to two very large (200 ft. wide) barricades owned by the Hwitat population, and situated along a stretch of the Babine River, some seven miles downstream of the village, one-half mile apart. The point is made even more vividly in the following statement from the daily journal of William Brown, a Hudson's Bay Company trader, dated October 12, 1822:

Stuarts Lake. The Indians on our arrival stated 'that there was no salmon at the Babines' but a man who arrived since...states 'that the people at the river had barred it so effectually in three places as to prevent the salmon from entering the lake. Consequently none had been killed at Tachy and Casepin's place....'

It is apparent that the downstream positions did, in fact, afford a significant ecological advantage. For example, there are some indications that, typically, the downstream villages of the septs were larger than those further along the migratory path of the salmon. Recall that the point of the intended shift of the Hudson's Bay Company trading post, circa 1826, from Ft. Killmars to Hwitat, was to intercept

16. His report concerns the successful outcome of his mission to the country around Babine Lake and the Skeena headwaters. His mission was the destruction of all fish barricades.
trade in furs and salmon with the main body of the Babine population (see Morice, 1905: 194-5, 209). Having estimated the population living around the weir sites at the outlet of Stuart Lake, at the turn of the 18th Century, at about "three hundred souls," Morice (1905: 66) describes Pintce as "somewhat less numerous, though more sedentary."

He describes the village of "Tha-tce" of the northern Stuart Lake sept (Jenness' "Tatchetetenne," Duff's "Tachiwoten") as "a very large settlement" (Morice, 1905: 66). Likewise, the fact that the Hudson's Bay Company established and maintained its trade post on the eastern rather than the western shore of Fraser Lake suggests that it was at the outlet of the lake at its eastern extremity that they found the bulk of the Fraser Lake population.

I shall now examine some of the salient aspects of the ecology of the Carrier Indians. In the first place, there is no question but that the Pacific salmon was the single most substantial element of the Carrier diet. Morice (G.D.R.: 185; 1905: 84) frequently refers to the salmon as the "staple food." No doubt John Stuart distorts on several counts in the following statement from a letter (dated 1815):

The salmon failed with us last season [he writes].
This generally occurs every second year, and completely so every fourth year, at which period the natives starve in every direction....We have no buffalo or deer, except the caribou (reindeer); and not many even of those; so that, properly speaking, we may say that water alone supplies the people of New Caledonia with food.

Although the spectre of starvation in every direction with a salmon failure may exaggerate the case, the point is clearly made that an ample store of dried salmon, taken from May to November, was essential to a secure winter.
Five salmon species and one andromalous trout species called steelhead run up the Carrier rivers to spawn, each species migrating during a specific period in the May to November time frame. Sockeye (talok), coho (dedzikh), chinook or spring (ggees) and steelhead (tesdlee) are eaten fresh and preserved by smoking and, recently, also by canning. Pinks (adimon) and chum salmon (ggenes) which generally are of lower quality were avoided through manual selection when fish traps and weirs were in use and latterly by the strategic setting of nets. Undoubtedly, salmon, particularly sockeye and chinook, was and still is a year-round staple for most Carrier families (more to be said on production and use in later chapters).

Various other species of fish are taken throughout the year. The trout (= dik'ay) are thick in the streams during the salmon spawning. Char (= beet) are fished through August and September, and dried with the sockeye for winter use. Char is also obtained by ice-fishing in February and March.

Through October and November, the whitefish (= lhokh) is netted in the shallows of various lakes. This approximates the whitefish season that is indicated by Morice to have obtained on Stuart Lake. His report on this point is confirmed in the name assigned by the Stuart Lake Carrier to the month of October, "moon of the whitefish" (Morice, 1893: 106). Similarly, judging from the names of the moons of other northern Carrier tribes, their whitefish season also fell from mid- to late-autumn. The name assigned by both the Bulkley and Fraser Lake septs for the moon of September-October is "Little Whitefish Moon" (Jenness, 1943: 530). The whitefish season seems to have fallen at about the same period among most of the northern Carrier septs.
The importance of salmon must have been further amplified with the advent of the fur trade for two reasons. Firstly, the greater concentration in the winter months upon the trapping of the fur-bearing species would have cut into time which could otherwise have been used to obtain animals which provide a more substantial yield of meat.

The caribou (= widziyh) was apparently once the main meat source in the area as had been the elk before it (Morice, 1893: 93). The latter, however, had disappeared by Morice's time, and the caribou has— at least in the areas of the Bulkley, Babine and Stuart Lake Carrier— disappeared since his time. These have been replaced by the moose (= khida) as the principal winter meat throughout the area. The mountain sheep (= dibiyh) and goat (= lhiyil) are hunted in August on the slopes of the western mountains, along with the mountain groundhog or marmot (= ditnee). The Bulkley River calendar gives to the moon of July-August the name "Time Top-of-mountain Hunting People Go Out" (Jenness, 1943: 531). Deer (= nilto') are scarce and Morice (1893: 93) indicates that this was also true in his time and locale, although they may have been more plentiful elsewhere among the Carrier (Borden, 1952: 31). Black bear (= sis) have always been hunted in fall, and killed in their winter lairs, throughout the area.

Of these large land mammals, only the moose is presently obtained with any regularity through the winter months, and by no means in sufficient quantity to sustain the population without very major supplementation. In the event of a salmon failure, various small animals, the porcupine (= 'ugune'), the lowland groundhog (= dik'a'n), the
squirrel (= tsalic), and above all the rabbit (= ggikh),17 were depended upon to stay famine.

Many of the species of value in the fur trade were not used also as a meat source. Excluded as sources of meat were the marten (= ciniyh), the fisher (= ciniyhoc), the lynx (= wesiy), the wolverine (= nusteel), the fox (= neggizgee), the wolf (= yis), the coyote (= dicinti lhie), the weasel (= nibey), the mink (= tecihwts'iy). The important fur species which were also used as a meat source include the black bear, the muskrat (= tsakw'it), and, above all, the beaver (= tsa), the single most important fur trade species throughout the area. As I shall note later, the beaver figures as a most important ceremonial food; this could, in turn, relate to its importance in the fur trade (see below, p. 230).

That is, the focus--through the fall and winter months--upon small and scattered species which often were not even used as food, rather than upon equally scattered, perhaps, but very much larger food species must, perforce, have placed a further stress upon the storing of ample supplies of dried salmon.

Secondly, the dried salmon itself became an important trade item; it became the staple winter food of the personnel of all of the Hudson's Bay Company trading posts throughout New Caledonia. In fact, the trade in salmon was more important on the Bulkley than the trade in furs, for reasons already alluded to and emphasized in the following

17. The rabbit figures as an important supplementary food throughout the Athapaskan world (Honigmann, 1946: 38; Helm, 1961: 25). Osgood (1931: 42), writing of the fish-reliant Great Bear Lake Indians (Satudene), states: "Rabbits are found throughout the whole of the timber country. They are naturally most important for food where other game animals are rare, and particularly where there is a scarcity of fish, as on Mackenzie river."
remark:

[The Bulkley] was famous for the quantity of salmon it yielded. From the point of view of a trader it was a place of but secondary importance, many of the Indians there taking their pelts to the Skeena river for barter with the native adventurers from the coast (Morice, 1905: 176).

The Fort St. James post was largely responsible for obtaining the winter supply of salmon for the personnel of the trade posts throughout the New Caledonia area which included Fort Chilecotin, Fort Alexander, Fort George, Fort McLeod, Fort Fraser, Fort Connolly, and Fort Babine. Vast quantities were purchased on both Stuart and Babine Lakes. Here are the records of salmon purchases at Fort Kilmar through the summer into the fall months of the year 1825 (recorded by one Charles Ross):

Aug. 23 "...220 fresh salmon..." obtained.
Aug. 30 "...227 fresh salmon..." obtained.

"...only one band of salmon made their appearance in Stuart's Lake--since which time none have been seen--consequently both our people and the Indians in that quarter are starving."

Reference is made often to salmon caught in nets operated by company personnel. These only number a few per day.

Sept. 5 Salmon were reported to be "...abundant at Tachy..."
Sept. 12 "...22 large salmon, 373 small salmon, 2 bladders salmon oil..." obtained.
Sept. 16 "...525 fresh and dry salmon..." obtained.
Sept. 25 "...1,036 small salmon and 12 large salmon..." obtained.

"The salmon of this year appear to be much inferior in quality to those of last season--neither have they been so abundant--consequently a scarcity may be apprehended should we be obliged to supply the other establishments as on former occasions" [my emphasis].

Sept. 27 "...bought 6,945 salmon, 5 bladders oil..."
Oct. 2 "...from them 1,360 salmon..."
Oct. 7 "...received from the former 1,515 salmon..."

Oct. 8 "...received 1,530 salmon..."

"...received 630 salmon..."

"There are now upwards of 20,000 salmon in store--and there is reason to suppose that we may procure as many more so that our apprehensions of a scarcity were rather premature."

We have had indication of some staggering of the arrival times of the salmon runs (see above, pp.37-8). Also, an earlier citation from the trader John Stuart presents a picture of striking and regular inter-yearly patterns in the abundance of the Stuart Lake salmon runs (see above, p.37). Certainly it will need detailed and expert historic and biological information to confirm and, if confirmed, explain Stuart's contention of regular biennial shortages and quadrennial failures in the Stuart Lake salmon run. The facts of the spawning cycles of the various salmon species (e.g., sockeye are on a four-year, and humpback on a two-year cycle), the staggering of migratory routines of discrete populations of a given species and, no doubt, the wider eco-rhythms of local spawning areas, could easily combine to produce such an inter-yearly rhythm. Suttles (1960) has clearly established such rhythms as a feature of Pacific Coast ecology.

For the moment I am content to accept Stuart's statement as prima facie evidence of periodic major salmon failure and of regular scarcity on Stuart Lake. Perhaps, too, these happenings reveal discernible inter-yearly rhythms; I cannot be so confident of this without further supporting data. There might be grounds for anticipating such rhythms along the Skeena basin as well, though Suttles states that the salmon populations along the northern, Nass and Skeena courses are less
synchronized than the Fraser populations in their migrations to and from the sea, so that generally speaking one expects less year-to-year fluctuation along the northern paths than along the Fraser (Suttles, 1960). In any event, we can be certain that the years of fat and the years of lean did not always coincide on the basins of these two river systems and, as a result, that we must seek evidence of a well-established commerce in salmon between the aboriginal populations of the two zones, whether in the form of obligatory affinal exchanges associated with intervisiting a la Salish (Suttles, 1960), and/or as simple barter. Morice (1905: 187) speaking particularly of the interests of the personnel of the trading posts, summarizes nicely what I am here proposing concerning aboriginal relationships:

Lakes Babine and Connolly belong to the basin of the Skeena, while all the other posts, with the exception of that on McLeod Lake [Sekani territory], whose waters are tributary to the Mackenzie, are situated within the valley of the Fraser. This was a most fortunate circumstance, for the salmon failing in one of the larger rivers and tributaries, its run was not necessarily small in the other.

It seems probably that such commerce would have most frequently involved the populations separated by relatively short portages: the Stuart and Babine Lakes peoples, on the one hand, connected by a ten-mile portage between the northwest corner of Stuart Lake and the southern tip of Babine, and the Bulkley and Fraser Lake populations, on the other, also divided by an approximately ten-mile portage between Decker and Bulkley Lakes. Even at the present time the people at (New) Fort Babine have numerous affinal links to the people of Taklah and Stuart Lakes, but none to my knowledge with Fraser Lake. On the other hand, it is most interesting to read the following comment from Jenness (1943: 584)
on the Fraser Lake "subtribe": "The phratries in this subtribe coincide with those of the Bulkley Indians, and the chiefs of the Bulkley phratries were regarded as the real chiefs of the Fraser Lake phratries as well."

Of course I do not suggest that exchange of food and other items was not undertaken among more widely spaced populations; indeed they were. Our present concern is one of degree, and the general point is only that ecological variation between the two river systems of Carrier territory may well have prompted its peoples to frequent crossings of the portages which divided them. Under these circumstances, cultural transmissions could not have been long delayed by paucity of contact.

As the moment approached for the arrival of the salmon, the people commenced to converge upon the sites of the river barricades. The barricade sites were the ecological core of most of the villages of at least the extreme northwestern zone of Carrier territory. I have already noted the frequent location of villages at points of confluence between rivers and of rivers with lakes. The point is underlined in the following statement from Morice (1893: 184): "In any case, the location [of the village] is chosen in such spots as seem to promise the greatest fishing facilities."

More specifically it seems that, in the case of the northwestern septs, each village was served by its own salmon trapping places

---

18. Assembly of the village populations developed progressively throughout the spring, beginning in early May, until the arrival of the salmon. The populations generally hovered loosely around the villages, moving out for duck-hunting and lake-fishing expeditions. In some cases there was a measure of concentration of the village populations at sites somewhat removed from the village area proper: "...as spring opened, the ancestors of the population now stationed near the southern end of Lake Stuart moved generally to the mouth of Beaver Creek, some five miles to the southwest of the outlet of that lake, There they subsisted mainly on small fish, carp and trout, with an occasional duck or moose...." (Morice, 1905: 21).
situated in the vicinity of the village. I can cite a few specific instances. The village at the outlet of Stuart Lake did in fact build its weirs at that spot: "...until the middle of August, when they transferred their penates exactly to the outlet of the lake, where they set their weirs and traps" (Morice, 1905: 21). The Bulkley River village of Moricetown had to move its village site when a landslide 20 miles below partially blocked the passage of salmon. Thus it was that the new village of Tsekya was established (Jenness, 1943: 485) in the area of the new weir sites. The village of Hwitat was served by weirs seven miles downstream on the Babine River, and according to one octogenarian lady, before her time the original village had been situated rather nearer to the barricade locations. I have been told that there were large weirs spanning the Fulton River near its confluence with Lake Babine, which served the village at that site, now Topley Landing; some rather inconclusive information indicates that this village was named Tha-tec.

However, this pattern—clear enough among these northwestern septs—is confronted with contrary cases. A division which is listed among Jenness' (1943: 586) "subtribes," the "Yutaʔwotenne," but not named as one of Morice's septs, corresponds to two villages located one on each of Nulki and Tachik Lakes in the area southeast of Fraser Lake. While he does not recognize any superordinating division corresponding to Jenness' "Yutaʔwotenne," Morice write in several contexts

---

19. At that time, she added, the fishing grounds, "and all the country around" belonged to the Laksamshu phratry.
of the villages of "Thackek" and "Nulkre." The reader may recollect that these figured in the account, provided by Morice, of Khadintel's vengeance (see p. 19 above). It was noted, there, that these communities recognized close bonds with Chinlac; some of the Chinlac survivors ultimately settled at Nulki Lake. In Jenness' (1943: 586) brief remarks on the "Yutawoten" we witness an even more significant association between these villages and the Fraser Lake settlements: "Neither lake [Nulki or Tachik] contained salmon, so the Stony Creek Indians used to merge during the fishing season with the Indians of Fraser Lake."

Apparently we have a case here of a routine salmon season assembly constituted out of segments taxonomically distinguished according to locational criteria. Fishermen identified in terms of three distinct places, the "Nulkiwoten," the "Tachiwoten," and the "Natlehwo- ?tenne," at one time worked their salmon traps side-by-side at Fraser Lake. This case, and one other, is interesting because all other Carrier villages on which we have solid information concerning this issue (in effect, the Bulkley, the Babine, and the Stuart Lake groups) are set in the immediate area of their own weir sites and, while some visitors were no doubt permitted to fish among them on occasion, there are no indications of the convergence of village groups for salmon fishing on

20. Jenness notes that the two original communities have since been confined to a single reserve. Duff lists the "Tachickwoten" and the "Nulkiwoten" in his lists of "tribes" and sets them into correspondence with the designation "Stony Creek Tribe or Band" established by the Reserve Commission of 1916. Elsewhere, Duff (1951) states that the Stony Creek subtribe is now called "Saykuswotin." The corresponding name to this last appears on one of Morice's (1892: Plate II; and p. 109) maps rendered Sai'kaz. It appears approximately where one would expect to find Tachik, while no name corresponding to Tachik appears on the map.

21. See Duff, 1951: 29, on the "Cheslatta Subtribe."
a regular basis. In these cases, to be sure, the villages are themselves subdivided into categories bearing secondary territorial associations. The phratries and clans of a village (and a sept, in fact) hold proprietary rights over hunting-trapping territories. But, as I shall explain more fully in subsequent sections, these divisions are semantic categories carrying only secondary territorial connotations. In contrast to the sept and village groups with which I have been concerned in this section, the phratries are conceived as differentiated sets of people with secondarily appended territories, whereas the former categories connotate places with secondarily appended people. As I have said, the names which have concerned us throughout this section possess a striking syntactic feature; they are the names of places which may be animated with people by the optional concatenation of the suffix -witenne. In this schema of nomenclature, it is as if people are the contingencies of places.

I am reminded of an account, from Jenness, of the formation of a new Sekani band. A man named Davie establishes his family on unoccupied territory. This family, under Davie's most capable leadership, becomes the nucleus of a new group.

In time it developed a spirit of antagonism, or at least of independence, towards its former home and people. The new environment proved favourable, outsiders who married the sons and daughters remained there, and within half a century the one family became the nucleus of a new tribe that claimed a definite territory and possessed a definite name. Davie's band took the name and territory of a kindred band that had recently dissolved [my emphasis] (Jenness, 1937: 15).

Being a Sekani band, we do not expect that the mode of kinship linking Davie's band to the one which preceded it in the area could be reduced to any clear principles. We are only told that Davie, himself a witenne,
had acquired hunting rights through "marriage with a Tseloni [yet another band] woman." Among many Athapaskans, including the Sekani, there are no principles for the constituting of groups out of metaphors of trans-generational continuity predicated directly to human beings; in effect, no group-constituting rules of descent. It may be that the sense of continuity in such Athapaskan cultures focuses more sharply around a taxonomy of continuing, broad ecozones than around any idea of the continuity of a somewhat uniquely-constituted collection of people specified through some metaphor of identity-continuity, such as our "blood."

The territorial nomenclature which has held my attention through this section supports such a view. Among the Carrier of the northwest reaches of the region, however, this territorial schema is counterposed in a keen dialectic against a system of descent categories. I leave until later a fuller examination of the articulation of the descent and territorial schema.

One final observation is required to close this section. There seems to be a tendency for the northwestern septs to hold a correspondence to more or less discrete segments of the migratory path of the salmon. Sept villages are arranged along this path, typically situated in the vicinity of salmon-weir sites at confluences of streams or of streams and lakes. The villages furthest downstream are the largest in their septs and in some instances are stressed in the nomenclature where the village name becomes also the general sept name (Na-?kra-ztl-i-?tene and Natleh-wo-tenne) or is otherwise referred to in the sept name (Tjaz-?tene). In addition to having first access within the sept, these downstream sites have the advantage of being invariably situated...
at confluences which lead directly to the final spawning creeks. This is true, for example, of the upstream sites on Lake Babine (e.g., Fulton River site, Taklah Arm site), on Stuart Lake (e.g., Pintce, on the Pinchie River), and of the village of ?Kaztcce, upstream of Tha-toe, where the ?Kaz River joins the Tachie. The upstream villages of a sept therefore have access to relatively smaller runs of salmon, and are somewhat dependent upon the downstream sites which may be able, to some extent, to regulate passage of the migrating salmon. It is as though each sept corresponds to a key strategic weir site which punctuates its segment of the main migratory channel, together with a series of (mostly) upstream satellites which control the final stretches of offshoots of the main body as they approach their spawning grounds. I do not conclude that this pattern reflects an historic settlement sequence, but it certainly seems to me a reasonable hypothesis.
This section contains a number of rather lengthy and involved discussions. Perhaps a brief preamble, outlining the content to follow, will somewhat ease the burden of the reader.

In the previous section I postulated a transformation of Carrier society from hypothetical band stage origins to a segmentary elaboration of the bands, which--following Morice--we termed the sept system, as a consequent of migration from the woodlands of the Yukon or Mackenzie Basin to the present setting along the salmon-spawning grounds of headwaters of the Skeena and Fraser Rivers. The present section develops a hypothetical model of a subsequent transformation involving overlaying of the septs with a coast-derived system of territory-owning crest groups, phratries and clans, due ex hypothesi—at least in part—to a desire to regulate access to fur-bearing species in the previously uncertainly defined meat-hunting hinterlands of the septs. Arguments are advanced as to why the system of phratries was better suited for the appending of specified resource territories than the system of septs, unaided, could have been.

Certain structural consequences of the linkage (initially one-on-one) of phratries to septs will be explored. These include the failure of phratric exogamy to take a firm hold among some of the more easterly septs, and the emergence of multiphratry septs in the northwest of Carrier territory.

In order to obtain a fuller grasp of the nature of the sept system on the eve of the assimilation of the so-called "coast complex"
(matrilineal crest groups, honourific names, rank, class, the feast), I shall undertake an extensive exploration of its roots in the structure of the woodland Athapaskan bands. A model is offered of band structure in terms of preferential modes of marriage and of postmarital residence. Honigmann's distinction between microcosmic and macrocosmic bands is predicated to an opposition of dispersion vs. assembly ecological seasons. The clan sub-divisions of the phratries are envisioned as fur-oriented extensions of dispersion-season hunting units.

The Carrier Indians are one in an unbroken chain of Athapaskan-speaking populations inhabiting the area stretching along the eastern side of the coastal cordillera (and west of the Continental Divide) from the basin of the Yukon River in the north to the region of the drainage of the Chilcotin River in the south. This Western-Cordillera block of Athapaskans differed from their fellow Athapaskans of the Mackenzie basin, east of the Rockies, by virtue of their access to the spawning grounds of Pacific salmon.

In many instances, resemblances have been noted between certain features of the social structure of these Western-Cordillera Athapaskans and corresponding aspects of the society of their respectively closest coastal neighbours. See, for example, Jenness (1963: 369) on the Tsetsaut, (373) on the Tahltan, (402) on the Kutchin; Jenness (1937: 46-8) on the Sekani; Goldman (1941) on the Alkatcho Carrier. Most of the foregoing citations make it clear that their authors believe the observed resemblances to have originated through the borrowing of the relevant complex of features by the Athapaskans directly from their coastal neighbours or, in some cases, through the mediation of an
interposed group of fellow Athapaskans. In sum, wherever Athapaskans have encountered coast populations in trade, war, and marriage, they have tended to assume—in each instance with modifications and with varying degrees of completeness—the articulated coastal complex of matrilineal descent groups, class-rank structure, crests and the feast.

Julian Steward (1955: 176; 1941) has argued that the diffusion of this "Northwest Coast pattern" failed to reach beyond the salmon area because without the salmon the population was unable to accumulate sufficient surpluses of wealth to validate names, and because they were obliged to wander endlessly across vast hunting territories in search of game. We must take notice of the fact, however, that while the Alkatcho Carrier—who had adopted a complex of crests and feasting (but without phratries)—were situated well within the general salmon spawning zone, their catch was poor (Goldman, 1940). Still more unsettling to Steward's thesis is Honigmann's (1949) report that the Kaska, located at the headwaters of the Liard (tributary of the Mackenzie) beyond the coast range, had (through contact with the Taku and the Tahltan) successfully adopted matrimoieties and feasting (but without an associated class-rank structure) in spite of their removal from the salmon area.

By no means do I wish to discredit the relevance of Steward's suggestion. I would only add the qualification that, though the amount

1. The northwestern Carrier (Bulkley, Babine, and Stuart Lake septs) have been recognized as an important relay in the coast-inland diffusion in several contexts; to the Sekani and the Chilcotin as well as to their fellow Carrier to the east and south.
2. He cites Jenness' (1937: 46-8) record of the failure of a phratry-potlatch system to take a lasting hold among the McLeod Lake Sekani.
3. Morice (1893: 119) makes the same arguments respecting the Sekani.
4. Shades of Suttles' theme of coast ecological variation.
of salmon available undoubtedly contributed to the degree of elaboration of the coast pattern (note, e.g., the lack of class-rank structure among the Kaska), and perhaps to the thoroughness of its assimilation, their availability does not seem to have been quite the sine qua non for the diffusion of the pattern as Steward believes.

It will be useful at this point to further orient the reader to the "Northwest coast pattern" by means of an overview of its distribution among the Western-Cordillera Athapaskans. Following this a closer look will be taken at its diffusion to and manifestations among the Carrier in particular. Steward (1955: 176) provides a summary of the distribution of the pattern among the Cordillera Athapaskans:

Other Athabaskans of the Western Cordillera were similar to those of Stuart Lake in that they had a fairly dense population and settled life owing to the presence of excellent fishing streams (Morice, 1909: 583), and many of them had a system of castes, potlatching, and matrilineal clans and moieties. The Babine had matrilineal clans and matrilocal residence (Morice, 1910), the Chilcotin had a somewhat obscure system of clans with the addition of social stratification (Jenness, 1932: 362), the Tsetsaut had matrilineal moieties. The Tahltan had moieties, each subdivided into three clans, which are said formerly to have claimed distinctive territory but now share land communally (Jenness, 1932: 269-70, 372-73). The Nahani (Jenness, 1932: 396-99) and Kutchin or Loucheux (Jenness, 1932: 399-404; Osgood, 1931) had, in addition to independent bands, matrilineal moieties, the relation of which to the economic system is not clear. It is not certain that the Northwest Coast pattern was present in full strength among these tribes, but it seems clear that the cultural ecology permitted sufficient latitude in the basic structure to make diffusion a major determinant.

The coastal derivation of the phratry/class/potlatch complex has been widely accepted by authorities (see Morice 1892; Steward 1955; Duff 1951; Goldman 1941; Jenness 1943). Jenness notes many terms in the lexicon of the Carrier system which are of Tsimshian (especially Gitksan) origin. Morice makes similar observations with respect to several impor-
tant words and their usage.\textsuperscript{5} Perhaps more convincing is Morice's modified version of the age/area argument (Kroeber 1939); he shows that a variety of traits--ones associated with the "Northwest Coast pattern" including totem poles, the use of earrings by nobles, labrets by noblewomen, and the occurrence of phratries--which appear widely and unfailingly on the coast--are distributed only incompletely among the various Carrier septs. Specifically, these traits (including the phratries at the time of contact) did not extend further east than the Bulkley and Babine septs. The Carrier, as an homogeneous linguistic bloc, are taken as an historic unit, and the argument is offered that, had these traits been coeval as between the Carrier and their coastal neighbours, or had they appeared earlier in the interior, then they should be distributed among the Carrier at least as unfailingly as on the coast.

This argument carries us to the point where I will wish to look at some of the possible conditions and mechanisms, besides those quoted from Steward, of this phenomenon of coast-interior diffusion. To do so I shall need to examine, in some detail, the nature and distribution of some aspects of Carrier social structure heretofore referred to, after Steward, as the "Northwest Coast pattern." Once again a summarizing quotation, from Jenness (1963: 366), will serve to rapidly orient the reader, as well as to confirm points that I have already noted:

The influence of the coast tribes on the Carrier was not limited to the external culture; it permeated the whole fabric of the social and political life. The population was divided as usual into nobles, commoners, and slaves, but there was no 'royal class' of rulers such as existed among the neighbouring

\textsuperscript{5} Morice (1892: 118) notes, for example, that the term "\textit{samaqet}," used on the occasion of the assumption of a title among the Carrier, is derived from the Tsimshian word \textit{samaqyt} (meaning "chief through wealth") recorded by Boas. Boas also refers to this term on p. 496 of Tsimshian Mythology.
Tsimshian. Slaves, too, were not numerous, and, except on the border of the Tsimshian territory, a commoner who possessed sufficient energy, and gathered his friends to his support, could readily attain the rank of a nobleman by giving the requisite potlatches and assuming an appropriate title. The western sub-tribes around Stuart, Babine, and Fraser lakes (our information concerning the other Carrier groups is imperfect) were organized into exogamous phratries, clans, and houses, not two phratries only as among the Tlinkit and Haida, or even four as among the Tsimshian, but five. Most of the details of this organization (e.g., the titles of the nobles, their crests and privileges) naturally came from the Tsimshian of the Skeena river, with whom many of the western Carrier intermarried; but the Kwakiutl of Kitimat, and the Salishan-speaking Bella Coola also contributed in varying degrees, depending on the strength of their contacts with the different sub-tribes. The system, therefore, differed slightly from one Carrier group to another....

The territory of each sub-tribe was divided among the phratries and further sub-divided among the clans. In consequence every district and every fishing place was claimed by some clan and considered the property of its chief, who supervised its use for the benefit of his fellow-clansmen and retainers. Yet the final ownership rested with the entire phratry, whose head man (i.e., the chief of the principal clan) could temporarily allot the area to some other clan and assign its usual possessors another district.

First, let me examine the phratry system as manifested particularly among the northwestern septs (Bulkley, Babine, Stuart). Here the phratries, yeetach'nee, are the maximal descent divisions. Membership in them is a universal matrilineal birthright, and marriage among co-members of a phratry is, ideally, strictly forbidden. Each phratry owns names (or titles) which mark the nobility, or dineeza'. The names carry their own mythic cum historic traditions with related narrative and sometimes display (mask and dance) prerogatives. On ceremonial occasions, such as in the feast hall, the dineeza' are arranged and acknowledged strictly according to their rank within the phratry. The highest ranking nobles within each phratry are the chiefs of the phratry sub-clans
or Houses, and the highest among these is the leading chief of each phratry. I have been advised by Babine informants as well as by a Bulkley chief that at Babine there is one chief who stands above all (tyee kio), including other phratric high chiefs, in each settlement. This distinction occurs only at Babine, however, where the influence of bishops and local priests has historically been stronger than in the other septs. It appears, according to my Bulkley informant, that the Church wanted to identify a single leader for each settlement who would shoulder the responsibility of ensuring that the populace adhered to Church dictates and with whom the priest could deal directly as an identifiable leader.

In addition to names, the phratries also each possessed one or more distinctive emblematic forms of crests, termed nettse. Since Jenness does not recognize phratric crests, as such, as a distinct set, I shall need later to discuss the unique display prerogatives which distinguish these from the class of clan nettse.

The clan crests were displayed on clan totem poles, on the fronts of the chiefs' houses, on the ceremonial apparel and graveboxes of chiefs, and were tattooed on the chests of clansmen and the wrists of clanswomen (Jenness, 1943: 495-6).

Many further details of rank, class, crest and prerogative will be central to later arguments and will be brought forward as they are needed. In the succeeding pages I will deal more closely with the

6. I confess to being puzzled by the distinction between "clans, and houses" introduced by Jenness in the foregoing citation. There is, to my knowledge, only a single level of formal (named) matrilineal divisions subtended to the phratries: these may be referred to interchangeably as "clans" or "houses." The Carrier term for these divisions is yux, meaning "houses." See Appendix 1 for a schematic representation of social divisions and corresponding levels of chiefs.
eczological, territorial, and social dimensions of phratries. I propose
to take up these matters in connection with some ideas concerning the
ethnohistory of the Carrier phratry system.

Wilson Duff advances an interesting hypothesis on the question
of the origin of the phratries. He says:

The steps by which these subtribes adopted their present
phratry system seem fairly clear. A first step was for a local
band to take the Tsimshian-derived name of a phratry to the
west and equate itself with that phratry. Thus the Burns Lake
people became Laksilyu, Fraser Lake Jilserhyu, Fort Fraser
Lasamasyu, Tachick Lake Laksilyu, Nulki Lake Jilserhyu. No two
adjacent groups took the same phratry name (Duff 1951: 31).

Duff bases this judgment on local traditions gathered primarily among
informants at Fort Fraser and at the Stony Creek reserve near Vanderhoof.
Their tradition maintains, simply, that formerly all members of each of
the above named septs (Duff's "subtribes") were represented by only one
phratry. To Duff's information I can add that Bulkley informants main¬
tain a similar tradition, affirming that at one time the Laksamshu
(Duff's Lasamasyu) "owned all the land around our villages," and sub¬
sequently permitted the other phratries to assume separate hunting terri¬
tories. To the present day at Hagwilget and Moricetown, the Laksamshu
phratry hold the privilege of sitting along the back wall, the place of
honour during feasts, unless they assume the centre floor as hosts. This
privilege is said to be in recognition of their having been the original
phratry of the sept.7 I might note parenthetically that a similar pro¬
cess to that proposed by Duff has been postulated elsewhere among the

7. The privilege cannot be ascribed to relative present-day power
since, even combined with the tiny Tsayu contingent they are con¬
siderably smaller in membership than either the Laksilyu or
Gitamtan.
Western-Cordillera Athapaskans. According to Jenness on the Tahltan:

In the earliest times the Tahltan seem to have been divided into six loosely organized bands, each of which claimed a definite district as its hunting territory. Close contact with the Tlinkit, however, led to their adoption of the social organization of these neighbors, and long before the coming of Europeans the six bands had become six clans grouped into two exogamous phratries, Raven and Wolf.

The evidence of tradition makes the hypothesis of a stage of one-phratry local groups a plausible one. Yet without a clearer image of the nature of a precursor band, I find the proposed transformation a little difficult to envision. Steward (1955: 148) writes that, "Prior to the Northwest Coast influence the Western Athapaskans probably had composite bands, . . ." Some review of the more salient structural characteristics of the Athapaskan composite band will be in order.

Firstly, they represent named social segments. Honigmann (1946: 23) offers the following generalization concerning the nature of the names which Athapaskan groups typically apply to one another:

"Neighbors often identified groups of people by characteristics of their local area or by peculiarities of assumed or real behaviour." I cannot dwell at length upon the many complex questions relating to Athapaskan band names; however, there are several points worthy of notice.

The greatest percentage of band names, far and away, are of the sort which make some reference to the "local area." Also, we might wish to add to those which specify some mode of "behaviour" the various names which posit an animal association. For example, Jenness (1937: 17) states that the Sekani people of Fort Graham call the Lake Babine Carrier naadotenne (= "fish hawk people"), "because, like hawks, they live mainly on fish; . . ."

9. Witness, e.g., the Sekani bands sas-chüt-genne ("people of the Black Bear"), and Tsa-tq-genne ("Beaver People") listed by Morice (1893: 29), and the Kaska band Espato-tena (= "Goat Indians") mentioned by Honigmann (1949: 35).
the Carrier sept names, like those of the Athapaskan bands, refer to the territory of its inhabitants; specifically to water systems in this case. Although the Athapaskan band names which carry a physiographic reference do not relate to water systems quite as invariably as do the Carrier sept names, it is certainly a common enough occurrence (see, e.g., Honigmann 1949: 33-5 on Kaska band names, and some cases cited in Osgood 1931: 32-5). The Sekani are something of an exception to this, however, only two of the nine names provided by Morice (1893: 28-9) having a vague reference to water systems. The remaining ones have either an animal reference or relate to the Rocky Mountain environs of many Sekani bands. Could the relative paucity of reference to water systems among the Sekani band names reflect the fact that fishing had only a very minor place in the Sekani ecology? According to Jenness (1963: 379): "unlike the neighbouring Carrier, they [the Sekani] hunted in winter and summer alike, and resorted to fishing only when driven by sheer necessity." The question of band ecology will tie in shortly with my next point on band structure.

Among the Mackenzie basin Athapaskans, the collectivity of personnel denoted by the band names never constituted any sort of social unit in the usual sense, and they comprised de facto assemblies only seasonally at best. It will be useful to introduce here Honigmann's distinction between the macrocosmic and the microcosmic band. The macrocosmic band corresponds to the segments explicitly recognized by native names. He states:

The macrocosmic band is referred to when the Slave are described as consisting of four or five groups or bands averaging two hundred and twenty individuals each [these data derive from Morice, The Great Dene Race (1906-10), I: 265] ....It was a pattern for the macrocosmic groups mentioned by these authors to occupy relatively large and recognized tracts of country and to speak closely related dialects.
He describes the microcosmic band, on the other hand, as follows:

We might regard it as a loosely organized and transitory form of the joint family, but lacking the cohesive factor of land to lend it permanency. There is no evidence that this group ever owned any hunting territory among the Fort Nelson people (Honigmann 1946: 65).

Thus, the macrocosmic bands are composed of several of these transitory joint families. As I shall enlarge upon shortly, the latter groups constitute social units above all in connection with the pursuit of relatively scattered species whereas the superordinating units are seasonal assemblies of the microcosmic bands in relation to spatio-temporally concentrated resources.

My immediate concern is with the conditions of the assembly of the macrocosmic band. Honigmann (1946: 65) states: "Functionally it is not likely that such a macrocosmic band ever had too great importance. It seems quite clear that there was never any political unity within it." On the other hand, there are certain indications that these segments did approximate some condition of assembly (however integrated) in connection with specific ecophases of their yearly round. In fact, Steward argues a contradictory position to Honigmann's, positing that these bands may indeed have had some ecological raison d'etre. In particular, among some Athapaskans, they represented seasonal assemblies oriented to the collective hunting of the migrating caribou and musk-ox. Steward (1955: 147) concludes that, "Population, which otherwise had to be distributed over an enormous area, was able to concentrate during these hunts in a group having some temporary centralized authority and thus constituting a political unit." Now, while this may well be a correct account of the patterns of the various "edge-of-the-woods" peoples,
such as the Chipewyans, Yellowknives, Dogrib, and Hare, what of the woodland tribes, Slave, and Kaska, who did not venture to the barrens to follow the migratory herds? Here, too, there are indications of a dispersion/aggregation periodicity. In these cases, however, the band gathered from its scattered hunting grounds around a common fishing station. Thus, witness Honigmann (1946: 61ff), speaking of the Aboriginal Slave pattern:

> When the society moved to the fish-lakes in mid-winter, the entire local group coming together at these fishing sites, [my emphasis], considerable social interaction of the group probably did occur. This is a pattern familiar elsewhere in the Athapaskan area, where the periods of intense mid-winter cold were a time of games and general hibernation. At such times, it would appear, there existed a relatively dependable food supply which could be tapped through ice fishing.

Writing again of aboriginal culture, Honigmann (1949: 39) gives the following account of the Kaska pattern: "In summer a number of bands of one or more adjoining tribes assembled around a fish lake that guaranteed a fairly dependable food supply....With the onset of winter, the families once more congregated at a fish lake and here spent the coldest part of the winter." A similar impression is to be gleaned from Osgood's (1932) account of the Satudene of Great Bear Lake, and from Helm's (1961: 9, 32) observations on Lynx Point.

The reader will appreciate the striking parallel between the ecological manifestations of the Mackenzie basin bands and those, described earlier, of the Carrier septs. What is more, the nearer to Carrier territory, generally speaking, that my comparisons take me, the more complete the similarities would appear to be.10 This last point

10. Though it is true that their neighbours to the immediate north, the Sekani, do not conform to any of these patterns—being year-round hunters of scattered game—their proximity is only very recent. They entered their present territory from across the Rockies at the end of the 18th Century (Jenness 1963: 378). The Beaver, further to the east, are very like the Sekani.
really just repeats my observation that whereas populations situated well within the boreal forest do not have access to the migratory herds, they consequently would alternate the periods when they hunted the scattered species (food and/or fur) with times of congregation around reliable fish-yielding waters. In addition, there is no evidence whatever of the development of band-wide leadership—not even on a seasonal basis, as during the fish-oriented assemblies of the woodland bands—such as Steward refers to in connection with the hunting of the Tundra herds. Other than in the construction of weirs, however, the tactics of fishing in the northern interior do not call for large-scale coordinated efforts as may have been useful in the hunting of the barren land herds.

I may say as a first generalization that the Athapaskan bands of the Mackenzie basin woodlands were acephalic aggregates manifesting a periodic rhythm of dispersion/concentration, and experiencing the greatest union of their personnel at centres of assembly associated with fish-yielding water-systems. The same may be said of the Carrier village units, except that it needs to be added that these are further associated into larger-scale segments than have been described among the Athapaskans without salmon. We can also reasonably assume that it was the relative abundance and reliability of the Pacific salmon that provided the essential ecological condition of this greater elaboration of local group segmentary structure (which may, in turn, have developed, historically, along the lines of the budding pattern alluded to in Section 1). The Carrier septs, corresponding to salmon-yielding water-systems, could usually sustain several distinct fish-oriented local concentrations. In

11. Honigmann (1949) reports the use of weirs (though not in combination with traps) among the Slave.
sum, the septs are a segmentary arrangement of social units which, structurally and ecologically, are homologous with the Athapaskan bands of the Mackenzie woodland type.

I offer the following hypothesis: the Carrier sept system arose out of an antecedent form akin to, and probably originally situated in the midst of aboriginal Mackenzie woodland bands (e.g., Kaska, Slave). Following the migration of these ancestors to their present area, growth of population was stimulated by their adaptation to a salmon-oriented economy. This expansion of population led to a budding of the pioneer settlements, and resulted through time in the tendency to a segmentary elaboration of the initial band units. This hypothesis leads to a number of interesting possibilities concerning the preconditions of other aspects of Carrier social structure.

Although they lacked any central institutions of political and economic integration, the woodland bands were manifestly more of a social entity during their ecophases of fish-oriented assembly than at any other time. In these respects, to repeat, they are the counterpart of the Carrier villages. In the interims the woodland band scattered its members through the territories surrounding its centers of concentration. These were periods oriented to the hunting of meat and, after contact, to the trapping of the fine-fur species. Moose, bear, and beaver were the principal game, but other large animals were available at various times and places (woodland caribou, mountain goat and sheep), as were many smaller species. Throughout these hunting periods the fishing-site assemblies remained fragmented into a set of smaller groups which, after
Honigmann, I have referred to as microcosmic bands.  

Available knowledge makes it quite out of the question to dispute Honigmann's characterization of these units as "loosely organized and transitory" (see citation above, p.60). It seems that some such epithet has been invoked by virtually every Athapaskan scholar in his account of the hunting-trapping units of the north. Nevertheless, in terms at least of certain of the preferred ideals, we can be rather more specific concerning the compositional principles underlying the hunting/trapping units of the woodland Athapaskans.

In the first place, Honigmann himself reports preferential uxorilocal residence among both the Kaska (1949: 41) and the Fort Nelson Slave (1946: 162). Somewhat further afield, an uxorilocal norm has been ascribed to the Chipewyan (Eggan 1955: 541), but the norm is by no means universal to the Mackenzie area (Helm 1961). It is worthy of note, parenthetically, that the practice of bride-service does appear to have been general.

Honigmann's evidence on this matter warrants special attention since it bears specifically upon woodland peoples. Writing of the Kaska of the Upper Liard he tells us that "the recognized form of residence in all but secondary marriages is matrilocal" (Honigmann, 1949: 125). At the same time, he cites cases of virilocal residence following foreign marriages, one external to the Kaska area, another external to the

---

12. Since Honigmann, such units have also been referred to as "local bands" by Helm (1965) and, among Algonkians, as "lodge groups" by Leacock (1954), and as "hunting groups" by Rogers (1963).

13. "Although there is a tendency to restrict marriage within tribal units, many marriages have taken place between these units...." (Honigmann 1949: 131).
band (but among the Kaska), and he later acknowledges an informant's report to the effect that "a man belongs to the country of his father" (Honigmann 1949: 131). Some of the many confusions concerning Sub-arctic Indian residence patterns, generally, might have been avoided (and might yet be unravelled?) with a more thoroughgoing analysis of these patterns (ideal and de facto) according to the levels of social segmentation at which the patterns are predicated. Helm and Leacock (1971: 366) recommend a similar approach to the dilemmas connected with the related problems of band exogamy/endogamy.

Honigmann's information suggests a preference for virilocal residence in the event of marriage beyond the immediate neighbourhood of (macrocosmic) bands, whereas within these bands the uxorilocal mode was in order. The "tendency to restrict marriage within tribal units..." has already been noted. The ambiguity of the expression "tribal units" is appropriate insofar as the boundaries of preferential endogamy must have been variable along parameters of time, place, and even of particular informant. Nevertheless, I think it reasonable to propose that marriages within the band, and/or within an immediate neighbourhood of (macrocosmic) bands, were generally strongly preferred, and that inversion of the residential norm roughly coincided with (or fell a little within) this boundary of preferred endogamy.

Carrying this line of thought a little further, both inversions (of marriageability and residence pattern) probably marked the outer boundary of the domain of relative security. A man far from his homeland was a man orphaned; those obliged to effect retribution against wrongs done him are too remote to do so without great hardship at best.
Honigmann (1946: 66) relates a chilling account of the ruthless murder of a Kaska man married uxorilocaly among the Fort Nelson Slave, and adds the comment: "In the following account of jealous rage leading to murder, this form of retaliatory punishment does not follow, perhaps because the victim, being a stranger in the group, lacked blood relatives to avenge him." The hazards of being alone among strangers were therefore great for men. By the same token, the preference for a virilocal residence choice in cases of foreign marriage is complemented by an Athapaskan warring tradition in which "Wars between cultural groups were often motivated by the desire to capture women" (Honigmann 1946: 72). Conversely, any inclination which might develop among the hunting groups (i.e., the microcosmic bands) to manifest this Athapaskan raiding pattern—killing the men and abducting the women—upon one another could be considerably checked, within the preferentially endogamous neighbourhood of (macrocosmic) bands. This was because the practice of uxorilocal residence among the intermarrying hunting units would tend to effect some scattering among them of patrilineally-related males. In short, the likelihood of such raiding would be much reduced by the increased probability of the pitting of father against son and brother against brother.

A condition of relative amity among propinquitous hunting groups accomplished through this intersecting web of kinship among their men could provide, as well, the structural basis for the operation of the ethic of the free sharing of large game animal meat (e.g., Honigmann 1946: 105-6; 1949: 64-5, 144). Indeed, the game-sharing ethic has

14. Not that this ethic was exclusive to the area of well-documented uxorilocal residence; for example, see also Osgood (1931: 40).
its counterpart in the fact that there had never, traditionally, been
any strict partitioning of the general (macrocosmic) band territories
into hunting areas exclusive to the hunting groups. Most authorities
are agreed that hunting territories only emerge—if at all—with the
development of the fur trade. Steward (1955: 147) summarizes some
opinions on these questions in the following statement:

Speck (1923: 329) quotes various sources to demonstrate
that 'segregated family hunting, trapping and fishing grounds
exist among many of the tribes, especially in the west.' Jen-
ness, as already noted, believes that this is the result of
the fur trade and that the entire band formerly utilized the
land communally. Morice's observations bear the same impli-
cation. He says that 'sedentary' game, chiefly the beaver,
is regarded 'as the object of a strict proprietorship as the
domestic animals or personal chattels,' whereas 'nomadic'
game, the larger animals which are taken primarily for their
meat, is usually shared within the band when killed. Osgood
(1931; 1933: 41, 71) says that individual beaver-hunting
territories exist now among the Satudene and Slave though
they did not formerly.

I recognize that the foregoing arguments are speculative.
They involve the use of uncertain—sometimes seemingly contradictory—
information on marital and residential preferences among the Athapaskans
of the Mackenzie woodlands as a conjectural model of the derivation of
the Carrier septs. The model is complex and warrants a brief overview
at this point. I propose that in general the compositional band of the
Mackenzie woodland is constructed according to a series of priorities
assigned at different levels of social structure. The overriding prin-
ciple at the level of the macrocosmic band (and perhaps, in attenuated
form, at a wider level of a neighbourhood of bands) is a birthright
citizenship: "In general a person seems to belong to the tribal district
or tribe in which he was born and raised, regardless of the tribe from
which his parents originally came" (Honigmann 1949: 131). The endogamic
inclination at this level of structure (see previous citation, ff., p.64) can be seen as a corollary to this principle. In cases of marriage internal to this level (involving the removal of persons from one to another dispersion-season hunting subgroup, i.e., microcosmic band, of a macrocosmic band) we find a uxorilocal preference. However, marriages external to this level do in fact occur, and probably are the primary contributors to "naturalized" citizenships (see citation below, p.75). In these cases, the postmarital residential preference is inverted to the virilocal mode, and amounts to a more vigorous application to men than to women of the birthplace identity principle. This, in turn, probably reflects the warfare factor discussed above and perhaps (following Murdock, 1949) especial difficulties faced by men in adjusting to foreign terrain. "It would appear that a man can learn the terrain and routes of a new area in about two years" (Honigmann 1949: 125).

This will be a useful point to introduce some comparisons involving aspects of the Carrier (northwestern septs) system of clans and phratries. In brief, the clans and phratries of the ethnographic era appear to correspond in particular to the hunting/trapping aspect (i.e., to the dispersed ecophase) of the woodland band.

As economic corporate units, the phratries claim proprietorship over certain hunting areas and over the fruits of these. However, Morice's information, mentioned in the foregoing quotation from Steward (see also Morice, GDR: 183-4), clearly asserts that such territories were exclusive only with respect to beaver and the fine-fur species. While Jenness does not make this important specification, it certainly
accords with my own knowledge of the contemporary Northwestern Carrier. An interesting example is furnished by a group which moved to Moricetown (from Kitsegukla via other locales) some ten years ago. They continue to be regarded as outsiders (the "Kitseguklas"). Three generations of the adult men in this group are native Gitksan but all are married to Moricetown women. No uxorilocal trapline privileges have been extended to these men and they have not been able to obtain their traplines in the Moricetown trapping range (vacant lines are very scarce). And far from being listed as "members" of one of the trapline "companies" whose line is located within the overall territory of their respective phratries (or with the phratry of their wives), they are often embroiled, instead, in disputes concerning their alleged trapping on the lines of others. Yet they hunt moose freely throughout the area (one of them is acknowledged by some to be the finest moose hunter in the community), and other villagers are only too happy to claim a share.

From the economic point of view, then, the system of phratry/clan territories appears to be essentially a system of fur-trapping areas. The foregoing discussion suggests that the system of phratry/clan hunting grounds was adopted by means of a partitioning of the original band cum sept hunting territories, with the explicit purpose of regulating access to the fur resources, and probably with a view to

15. Negotiations between the regional Indian Band Councils, and persons representing the Indian Affairs Agency and the B.C. Game and Fish Department, circa 1946, resulted in the instituting of an interesting system of Registered Traplines involving, at least, the Carrier of Bulkley and Babine. Each line is registered to a "company" of "members" under a specific "head." I know of no limit to the number of members that may be listed to a single company, but a single name may not be placed on more than one list. The lines are "renewed" yearly, and new members may be added, or names deleted, at that time. More will be said on traplines in Part II.
preventing the development of hostilities (both within and between septs) in the heat of competition for furs, and possibly too with a view to administering to problems of conservation.

I am reminded of a comment by Helm and Leacock (1971: 363) on the (primarily) Algonkian hunting territories: "In fact, the 'territories' are, properly speaking, not hunting grounds, but areas surrounding traplines." This statement might well express the concept of the Carrier phratry/clan hunting ground just so long as, in keeping with our historic concern in this part of the paper, we do not take the expression "trapline" to connote specifically the governmental system of Registered Traplines, which were imposed circa 1926, well after the establishment of the Carrier descent group hunting territories. At the same time, there are already before us indications, from Morice and Osgood, of a sense of ownership associated particularly with beaver houses (Morice GDR: 183; Osgood 1931: 71). A similar practice has been reported among the Indians of the Lower Liard River, and the Kaska of Lower Post (Honigmann 1946: 67). Morice made his observation well in advance of the installation of the government system of Registered Traplines, and Osgood, while remarking on the claims to beaver lodges among the Satudene, adds that there was otherwise no ownership of general hunting grounds (Osgood 1931: 41). Finally, whereas Osgood also made the point that there had formerly been no personally-owned beaver lodges among the Satudene, we can be reasonably sure that this institution was catalysed by the opening of the beaver-oriented fur trade.

Taken together, these bits of information imply that the partitioning of the Carrier world into so-called hunting territories was
stimulated by the development of the fur trade. The process may have first appeared in the form of proprietary claims by important hunters over beaver lodges within their customary hunting areas. However, whereas the other fur species, excluding the muskrat (i.e., marten, fox, lynx, mink, weasel, etc.) are "nomadic," they could not be claimed by reference to any specific and conspicuous nest sites. It is therefore with respect to these "nomadic" species that ownership would need to be stipulated in terms of their identification with physiographically-specified areas.

There is little question that the idea of exclusive territories was foreign to the Athapaskan roots of Carrier tradition, or that it was acquired from their coastward neighbours as a part of the coast phratry system; and it seems highly probable that the principal impetus behind the acquisition lies in the context of the coast/interior trade, which flourished under the new stimulus of the European fur trade (I shall consider some of the evidence relating to the exact timing of the process below). It should be noted here that Goldman's (1940, 1941) Alkatcho data do not give any clear indications that their complex of (nonmatrilineal and nonexogamous) crest groups had an appended system of exclusive trapping cum hunting areas. It therefore seems feasible that a crest complex could be assumed from motivation independent of the system of hunting territories which accompanies the phratry structure. For this reason I am unwilling to conclude that the

16. At the same time, Goldman argues that it was, indeed in virtue of the Bella Coola interest in furs for purposes of trade to Europeans that the Alkatcho acquired their titles and crests through marriage and trade with the Bella Coola.
northwestern Carrier septs assumed the entire coastal crest-group complex (of named, crest-bearing, matrilineal, exogamous divisions) as a mere dressing for a system of exclusive fur-trapping areas.

In other words, it remains a logical possibility that a system of crest groups was established among the northwestern Carrier septs even before the addition of an appended idea of hunting grounds; possibly developing out of aboriginal trade contacts previous to the opening of the era of the European sea traders (circa 1785). Though he cites no sources and gives no reasons, Steward (1955: 177) has concluded that: "The system of potlatching, nobility, and moieties was introduced in the late pre-white times among the Stuart Lake Carrier, and it was still spreading among the Carrier further south at the time of white penetration of the area." On the other hand, the fact that the Carrier have specifically modified the coast concept of descent-group-owned resource territories by limiting strict exclusiveness to the fur-bearing species, while retaining the traditionally Athapaskan open orientation toward large food game, persuades me that territorial fractionation of the Carrier world developed only in the wake of the burgeoning fur industry. Furthermore, against a general background of much intensified postcontact coast/interior trade, the system of appended trapping grounds would have considerably deepened the penetration

17. Among the Coast Tsimshian, for example, resource properties belonged to the local descent groups. These "houses" are the representatives in a given winter village ("tribe") of a clan (descendants of putative common ancestry). The clans were grouped, in turn, into four exogamous phratries which were represented in all tribes, but which do not—as such—own territories. In this respect, significantly, the Carrier system differs from the Tsimshian since, among the Carrier, the hunting-trapping territories are ultimately the property of the phratries, and not of the clans' local subdivisions (see Garfield 1939).
into Carrier culture of an hypothetical precontact crest-group system.

The preceding discussion has depicted Carrier society, on the eve of its assimilation of the phratry system, as comprising an array of septs representing a segmentary elaboration of primal Athapaskan (macrococm) bands. Like its band prototype, which I think derives from the Mackenzie woodlands, the idea of the sept is more clearly associated with a sense of spatial focus, of a center of habitation corresponding, in the sept names, to the water systems which provided both transportation routes and the settings of the fish-season assemblies, than with a sense of outer boundary. The characteristic vagueness of the membership criteria of the Athapaskan bands (cum Carrier septs) tends to complement the vagueness of their own territorial limits. I shall expand this point below, but the matter of the compositional fluidity of the Athapaskan (macrococm) bands, of which we have already gained some impression, and the Carrier septs will need some immediate attention.

In spite of the tendency to marriage within the macrocosmic band, it must be recognized that marriages between persons of neighbouring bands has always been common. If present practices are any indication the same is true of the northwestern septs. Further, it is probable that in these cases the residential choices contributing to band composition were a mixture of the uxorilocal ones, typical of marriages among relative familiars, and the virilocal ones preferred in the cases of more remote marriages. This assumption accords with what I have found at contemporary Hagwilget and Moricetown. Marriages between persons of the Bulkley, Babine and Stuart Lake septs have been recorded
and residence choices of both types have been made. Several marriages between the Bulkley sept and Gitksan have also been noted, and these too have produced mixed residence choices. The only recent instances of Bulkley/Gitksan unions are those involving the "Kitseguklas" and these are all uxorilocally. Yet this faction continues to be treated as foreign in a manner which does not appear to apply to men who have married into Hagwilget or Moricetown, uxorilocally, from neighbouring Carrier septs. This is particularly true in the matter of trapline rights. Thus, intermarriage and ambilocal residence results in a fairly easy flux of personnel among neighbouring Carrier septs. Men who have married into the Bulkley sept can expect to be admitted to one of the Bulkley trapline companies, probably to one which holds an area within the traditional hunting territory of the Bulkley contingent of his phratry. The flux of personnel resulting from intermarriage and variable residence choice is what I mean by the boundary fluidity of the Carrier septs.

The Carrier septs, like the woodland bands, oscillate between their hunting hinterlands and their water-system centers (of assembly and identity) in a seasonal rhythm of centrifugal and centripetal movement. A system of territorial specifications effecting the division of these hinterlands with the intention of regulating access to fur species would be incongruous in a context lacking a corresponding means of constraining the admission of personnel. The preceding and present discussion is intended to show that whereas the Athapaskan roots of the Carrier

18. In a later chapter I shall examine the crucial issue of the so-called traditional hunting territory as it articulates with the present system of Registered Traplines run by the trapline companies.
sept system provided no precise devices for thus constraining rights of access to trapping territories, the concept of crest divisions of the northern coast imposed unalterable membership upon its personnel and, where matrilinal descent applied, stipulated clear criteria of continued recruitment. It was for that reason, I think, that the trapping territories came to be appended to the crest divisions rather than to the sept themselves.

However, the composition of the Carrier sept appears to reflect the same principles, in all respects, as I have ascribed above (p.67) to the woodland bands. Why, then, was not the general hunting hinterland simply formally specified (i.e., delimited) and predicated to the sept, and the traditional criterion of citizenship by place of birth (now clarified by a stipulated territory) stiffened? My answer to this, expressed in the most general terms, is just that where a choice exists there is a tendency for elements to cleave to semantic contexts in which they have a traditional place rather than to establish themselves in a new complex.

Thus, although among woodland Athapaskans persons were identified with their general area—and hence band—of birth, the identity was never so rigid that shifts were not feasible (in contrast to the relative fixity of membership in the northern coastal crest divisions).

Speaking of the Kaska, Honigmann (1949: 131) states:

A man who changes his residence with marriage, generally becomes identified with the country in which he takes up residence and begins to trap. For a time, he continues to be referred to as belonging to the district from which he came. As his roots grow deeper in the adopted district, he begins to be identified with that tribe.
In the Athapaskan world one's place—where he stays—is a rather fluid dimension of his person; in contrast, again, with one's crest-division identity among peoples of the northern coast. At the same time, Athapaskan macrocosmic bands (and the Carrier septs) are rather contingencies of their places of assembly (nominally as well as ecologically). Among woodland Athapaskans, then, one's social unit—with one's place—is always a tentative dimension of personal identity defined, as I have said, by flexible priorities. My own experience indicates that this is true of Carrier sept identity; especially in relation to neighbouring septs.

The potential lability of band cum sept identity is antithetical in principle to the idea which the peoples of the northern reaches of the Pacific coast had of their crest-division identity. Phratric identity, in name and totem, is an indelible mark.

The idea of a fixed and univocal identity\(^{19}\)—contradictory to sept tradition—represents a key simplification toward the establishment of a relatively administrable system of admission markers vis-à-vis exclusive territories. Similarly, the adoption of matrilineal descent by most of the northwestern Carrier, in connection with the crest divisions borrowed from the coast, provides another simplification toward control of the continuing distribution of phratric identity and consequently (from our present point of view) toward control of the distribution of admission markers to trapping grounds.

It might be argued, too, that the attachment of trapping terri-
-tories directly to the septs might have been achieved through a sort of compromise involving a stiffening of the birthplace criterion qualified by secondary, but regulated, "naturalizations" to accommodate some of the traditional intersept marriages and residential shifts. This would imply the regulation of admissions to the sept trapping territory (and, as a corollary, of intersept marriages) under the aegis of some form of central policy-setting and administrative authority. There are, however, nowhere any indications of institutionalized central authority for decision making at the level of the macrocosmic band (the microcosmic bands had ad hoc leaders, the hunting unit's "big man"; see Honigmann 1946: 65) among the woodland Athapaskans, or for that matter, in connection with the villages or septs of the Carrier (Jenness 1943: 481). The crest divisions of the northern coast, on the other hand, had established chieftainships with significant power respecting administration of the resource territories of the groups. Generalizing about the crest divisions of the northern coast, Drucker (1955: 120) observes:

"The basic concept was that all of the members of the unit shared in the joint right to these prerogatives, as they are often termed, but that the chief of the lineage was the custodian both of the intangible rights and of the lands and material possessions. The lineage chief was in this respect similar to the executor, in our own culture, of a large estate who manages its various enterprises for the heirs."

Thus, the sept would have been unable to establish more rigorous admission constraints without creating an administrative institution for which it had no traditional counterpart. The structure of coast crest divisions, in contrast, provides a formal mechanism in its chieftainship for regulating (constraining without arresting) the flow of intersept
residence shifts. Immigrants from foreign septs must apply for admission to the trapping territories of their crest-equivalent division to the chief of that division in the newly-adopted sept.

While on the subject, I must emphasize that the role of the chieftainship among the northwestern Carrier groups corresponds well to the "custodial" function that Drucker speaks of. My own information has it that the phratry chief claimed up to one-quarter of the take in furs of trappers operating on his lands. He also retained the theoretical power to orchestrate the use of these lands: "Within the phratric territory each clan had its recognized hunting grounds that were theoretically subject to endorsement by the phratric chief and to any limitations and changes he might make in the interests of his phratry...." (Jenness 1943: 487). Nevertheless, a chief's "ownership" of the divisional territories among the northwestern septs by no means amounted, for example, to a unilateral power to alienate the land. I have, for example, recorded information concerning the leasing—to the Department of Fisheries—of two hunting grounds by nobles of the Babine sept. One was leased at Fulton Lake in the name of Willie George, a Gilserhyu chief, and the other—on Fulton River, upstream of the lake—in the name of Charles Macdonald, bearer of the Gitamta name Medeek. In both cases, my informant Medeek explained, a meeting was held: "Gitamta held a meeting, and Gilserhyu held a meeting to decide whether they would lease the land." In both cases, too, the proceeds ($3,500 for Fulton Lake, $1,300 for Fulton River) were shared by these trapline headmen "with their relatives"; different persons, however, were given different portions of the totals. Ultimately, the hunting/trapping
territories are the corporate properties of the phratries, administered by several coordinated levels of authority including phratry chief, clan chief, and trapline heads (see also, citation from Jenness, p. 78 above). It is clear that this administrative structure did not, however, obviate an effectively guaranteed right-of-access to some place within the division territories to all at-large members of a division who are native to its encompassing sept; the sept tradition of birthright persists among the northwestern Carrier.

Further south, however, Goldman found that the Alkatcho Carrier crest divisions had apparently lost their original local cum territorial concomitants. He envisions original Alkatcho crest division as "a local group whose members lived together as one family in the same village, shared common fishing sites and hunting territory, participated jointly in potlatches, and used as a crest the totemic animal designating the group" (Goldman 1941: 399). Assuming for the sake of argument that Goldman is correct in this conjecture, what might have caused the loss of significant territorial prerogatives by the crest groups? Goldman's view holds that a matching of resource areas to crest groups had failed to stick owing to a want of sufficient congruence in the principles admitting personnel to the crest divisions, on the one hand, and to resource areas on the other. Access to resource areas among the Alkatcho was determined by residence with respect to local groups, and that (under Bella Coola influence) tended strongly to patrilocality (Goldman 1941: 398). The crest divisions, again under Bella Coola tutelage, were "essentially honorific" societies with membership restricted to those who could acquire prerogatives in crests
and names. The transmission of crests, in turn, was governed by "two principles: the daughter inherits a crest from her mother's side and son from the father's side, but on the other hand an individual may inherit crests from both sides" (Goldman 1943: 405). Now, it seems to me that the patrilocal principle--giving rights to resource territories--is sufficiently consonant with these principles of crest succession, notably with the first of them, that incongruence would not account for the hypothetical separation of crest division from prerogatives in resource territories. Where some acquire fathers' crests, they are identified with the same set of persons, approximately, that the residential preferences would have had them live (and hunt) among. I would suggest, rather, that the source of the incongruence would lie in the restriction of crest-division membership and the consequent exclusion, in principle, of non-members from hunting grounds, now claimed by the crest divisions, which would by Athapaskan tradition be the unquestioned birthright of all local group personnel (whatever the residence rules in current practice). That is, an allotment of territories among the Alkatcho crest groups would not merely partition their population vis-à-vis resource regions; rather, they would partition some and de jure (whatever accommodations are made in fact) exclude many others from guaranteed access. Nothing could be more contradictory to the spirit of Athapaskan tradition! The territorial prerogatives of the phratries of the northwestern septs, in contrast, have remained stable in a context of automatic and universal extension of crest identity which accommodates the Athapaskan tradition of access to regional hunting areas as an unchallengeable birthright.
It will be useful to review the preceding arguments. As I have said, there would be little point in fixing a specified territory to a group without a means of constraining admissions to the group. In view of this, I have argued, the traditions underlying the concept of the Carrier sept were not well suited to a direct allotment to them of trapping areas (by formalizing their traditional hunting hinterlands), whereas the crest-division concept of their neighbours of the northern stretches of the coast was well suited to the purpose. A sept is a people designated by a place name, but lacking a clear means of stipulating who the people of the place shall be. Birthright citizenship is not an indelible mark, as is a phratry crest; it does not preclude comparatively free residential shifts among neighbouring septs, and—again unlike the coast crest groups—the septs possess no administrative authority for constraining such shifts. Indeed, the uncertainty of its criteria of human boundaries and continuity goes far in accounting for the prevalence of place-oriented names among the septs (and among the Athapaskan bands generally). Uncertainties concerning the principles of form and substance which define the sept as a human continuum are counterbalanced by the illusion of discreteness and substantial continuity conveyed in place-oriented names.

The matrilineal principle of the northern coast crest divisions, in contrast, provides a means of defining clearly delimitable sets of people to whom specified territories can be usefully predicated. Taken together, these groups subsume all personnel who would also claim birthplace rights with respect to the sept hinterland from which the crest-group territories were cut out. Therefore, hunting/trapping territories
could be usefully identified with the phratries precisely because, in that context, they become the places of a clearly specified people. With adoption of the system of phratries, the Carrier were therefore transformed from peoples marked by places into peoples who own places.

The fact that the crest groups represented more useful structures than the septs themselves to which to attach specified trapping territories does not mean, of course, that the adoption of such territories, induced by the flourishing fur trade, was the only (much less the first) motive for the assimilation of the northern coast crest-group system by the northwestern Carrier. In this connection, it is worthy of note that a system of crest divisions was maintained by the Alkatcho Carrier without any system of associated territories. It must, therefore, be deemed possible that mere fascination (which Goldman speaks of) with the awesome dramatizations of the coast tribes was sufficient to first catalyse the diffusion of the crest complex among the Carrier. That is to say, the earliest stages of this diffusion, among the northwestern septs as well as among the Alkatcho, could well have closely resembled the more recent, reduced Alkatcho version, with a few of the wealthier hunters of a given sept assuming names and crests, and being equated en bloc in name (and totem?) with one of the Gitksan phratries (in the case of the northwestern septs) under Gitksan sponsorship. Thus, the assimilation of names, crests, and the feast could have commenced among the Carrier in the context of coast/interior aboriginal trade, prior to the advent of the European fur trade.

However, it was surely the fur trade that ultimately inspired the carving of the once at most weakly partitioned intersept hinterland
into discrete allotments to be predicated to the phratries that were assigned, initially one-on-one, to the various septs. The conception of these territories as exclusive above all with respect to fur (vs. meat) species attests to this. In addition, allotment of the territories to the crest groups, once instigated, would certainly tend to reinforce and extend whatever hold they might have established beforehand among the Carrier. Thus, in sum, while I do not conclude that the crest-division system was assimilated among the Carrier specifically as a device for the ecological and political management of the fur industry, neither do I preclude it.

In this connection, it is noteworthy that, although coast/interior trade probably expanded during the period of the sea otter trade (after 1785), it would not have been until the subsequent growth of trade in the land species, nearer to the turn of the century, that there would have arisen among the Carrier a specific stimulus for the partitioning of rights with respect to beaver and the other non-aquatic fur species. Steward notwithstanding, I have encountered no clear evidence to confirm a pre-nineteenth century Carrier phratry system. Morice (1892: 119-20), writing of the Stuart Lake peoples, states: "So far as I am aware, the phratries were still unknown among them...when the Carriers commenced looking to others than Coast Indians for models to copy from."

While overlaying the septs, one-on-one, with phratry labels provided a mechanism for converting sept hunting hinterlands into exclusive fur-species territories, it did so without supplanting certain Athapaskan traditions which are clearly in opposition to features of
the phratry complex. Duff's (1951) informants among the Cheslatta Lake subtribe, 20 the Fort Fraser and Fraser Lake subtribes (corresponding to Morice's "Natleh-hwo?tenne"; see above, p. 24), and the Stony Creek subtribe (Jenness' "Yutawotenne" comprising the villages of Nulki and Tachik; see above, p. 20) all dismissed exogamy as a feature of their phratry systems. Duff (1951: 32-3) summarizes his findings as follows:

Descent in the maternal line seems to have been well established, as it has remained to this day. From informants' statements one gets a strong impression that phratric exogamy was never compulsory. Certainly it would be uncongenial to any one-phratry [per local group] organization.

That is, so long as sept and phratry were congruent the rule of phratric exogamy, an important element of the coast complex, was directly countermanded by the sept's traditionally endogamous leanings. In all cases except for Bulkley and Babine, the exogamic principle either lapsed or failed to take over from more traditional practices.

Endogamous leanings notwithstanding, intermarriage among neighbouring septs on a relatively free basis was nevertheless an important tradition. This traditional practice, compounded with whatever recognition was given to the exogamic rule, led inevitably to a folding-in beneath the cloak of each sept, of new phratries under the formal granting authority of the original phratry. Duff (1951: 32) concludes: "Phratric exogamy in a one-phratry [local] group means local exogamy, the women marrying out gave their children their own phratry membership."

Of course, simple continuance of the traditional practice of intersept

20. Duff's Cheslatta Lake subtribe do not correspond to any of Morice's septs, but are named the "Tatchatotenne" according to Jenness (1943: 585).
marriage would have this same effect of introducing members of different phratries (different septs having taken on different phratry identity; see Duff 1951: 32) within the sept. Once such persons had become permanently ensconced and sufficiently numerous, the establishment of independent trapping territories for their respective phratries became inevitable. These areas had to be carved out of the regions claimed by the original phratri of the sept (corresponding to the unspecified but traditional sept hinterlands). In particular, the children of virilocaly in-marrying women were liable to belong to different phratries from their fathers, but were native to their sept. It is my best guess that birthright would remain a fundamental criterion of sept citizenship.

The identification of such persons with the sept "district" into which they were born, affirmed in Athapaskan tradition, would have been denied by the claim of the father's phratry to exclusive ownership of that "district." Resolution of their dilemma required the admission of new phratries to the overall sept "district," but under the formal aegis of the original claimant phratry. At the present time, then, each sept contains a number of phratries, each claiming its own hunting/trapping grounds which are acknowledged by present tradition to have been cut out of a territory once held in toto by the original phratry.

21. It is important to recognize that phratry territories are in fact areas allotted to phratric contingents within particular septs. A Babine-Gilserhyu man has an automatic right to a place on a trapping company on the grounds of the Babine-Gilserhyu. If such a man were to move to Moricetown, he would have no equivalent right, but must sue for admission to a Bulkley-Gilserhyu trapline company, to which he can always be refused entry. Phratry territories remain subareas of an original non-formalized sept hinterland. From this viewpoint, the phratries remain structural subsets of the sept.
in the "district." Duff summarizes available data on the phratric composition of the various "subtribes" in the following table; the numbers represent the phratries as follows: 1. Gitamtan; 2. Gilserhyu; 3. Laksilyu; 4. Laksamshu; 5. Tsayu; 6. Tsuyaztotin. Thus, Duff's (1951: 31) table shows:

DUFF'S TABLE (MODIFIED) SHOWING DISTRIBUTION OF PHRATRIES AMONG SOME CARRIER SUBTRIBES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subtribe</th>
<th>Bulkley River</th>
<th>Cheslatta Lake</th>
<th>Fraser Lake</th>
<th>Fort Fraser</th>
<th>Stony Creek (at present)</th>
<th>Nulki Lake</th>
<th>Tachik Lake</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4+5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bulkley River</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4+5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cheslatta Lake</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fraser Lake</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3(4+6)</td>
<td>4+5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fort Fraser</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3+6</td>
<td>4+5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stony Creek (at present)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>3(+ individuals of 1, 4, 5)</td>
<td>4+5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nulki Lake</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tachik Lake</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The table needs some comment. The "+" sign indicates that, for ceremonial purposes, two or more phratries are united as one. In this connection, I have taken a slight liberty with Duff's table by inserting a "+" between Bulkley River phratries 4 and 5 because these unite ceremonially, just as the same ones are fused at Fraser Lake and Fort Fraser. This seems, simply, to have been an oversight, since Duff

22. Nulki and Tachik are extinct village subdivisions of the present Stony Creek subtribe.
(1951: 28) otherwise acknowledges Jenness' (1943: 485) reporting of the fusion. The Babine system exactly duplicates Bulkley River's, thus:

Babine Lake

\[ 1 \quad 2 \quad 3 \quad 4+5 \]

The ceremonial combining of phratries poses fascinating questions which I can do little more than raise here. Why combine phratries in the first place? Jenness (1943: 485) reports that the Tsayu joined with the Laksamshu after having been seriously reduced by smallpox (circa 1865). My own information, which relates to the Babine as well as the Bulkley, strongly implies that the Laksilyu and the Gilserhyu arose from a single phratry (see later, p. 143) which had acquired "too much money." In general, the combining of phratries seems to reflect the desire to establish and maintain an overall ceremonial structure centered around a set of counterposed superordinate units (phratries and combinations of phratries) of roughly equivalent ritual power (as manifest in display prerogatives and feast wealth).

Is it entirely fortuitous, where five of the six septs effect ceremonial combinations of the five to six phratries represented in each, that nowhere are these collapsed to five or to three ceremonial units instead of to four units (and, in the case of Stony Creek, to two)? Duff (1951: 32) comments on this, but he assumes without evidence that prior to 1865, when the Tsayu joined the Laksamshu, the Bulkley recognized five separate ceremonial units. It is conceivable, to the contrary, that at the time of the Tsayu-Laksamshu union, a single precursor phratry split into the separate phratries Laksilyu and Gilserhyu, thereby retaining four ceremonial units. Indeed, other combinations generating
four ceremonial units may have obtained. Mr. W. Simm, a high chief of Hagwilget, explained that there are "four places" in the feast hall and "that's why there are four [ceremonial units]." This idea of "four places" has a wider domain than the feast hall (incidentally, these four places refer to three walls and the center floor, not to four walls since the doorway wall represents mainly non-participating observers).

One man told me of having once heard an unusual bird call, as a boy, while keeping vigil alongside a beaver lodge on a lakeshore. He became frightened when the sound appeared in a series of converging cycles of successive positions around "the four corners": first "across" (the water), nye'n, then upstream, nu'uw, then "behind" or uphill, yuqw, and finally "to my right", ndee' ( = downstream).\(^23\) His grandfather subsequently explained that what had frightened him, and what he had therefore failed to respond correctly to, had been a guardian spirit visitation.

It is well known, of course, that on the coast four is most commonly the ritual number in mythology and ceremony.

Although my connections here are far from complete, they deserve at least an hypothesis to the effect that among the Carrier (and probably among the Tsimshian as well) four balanced and counterposed blocs constitute an ideal ceremonial structure. This, in turn, would appear to carry the image of a complete and balanced terrestrial world. The fact that four is an even number would seem important to an image of balance cum harmony. The same fact may figure, as well, in the dual ideology among tribes further north such as Tlingit, Haida, Tahltan, etc.

\(^23\) I have not been able to obtain any monolexemic terms for the cardinal directions among the Carrier.
From this viewpoint, a ceremonial objective would appear to be to effect a ritual containment of the changeable fortunes of the phratries. Which phratries, and how many they are, are represented within a sept, their populations and their relative power are variables which converge—on the other hand—to impose moment-to-moment constraints upon realization of an ideal of symmetry. This ceremonial objective is less a denial of history, as Levi-Strauss (1962) has argued, than a ritual assertion of the Heraclitean image of ever-changing waters contained by enduring banks. What, from this perspective, distinguishes the tribal from the urban mind is a question of their respective theories of history (or ethos of history) rather than an acknowledgement of its fact. Tribal "totalization," the quest for all-embracing thematic redundancies, represents an attempt (however apt) to contain contingency without dismissing it (this matter is discussed further in Section 3 of this chapter).

When such contingency conspires, in the Carrier world, against the realization of the quaternary structure, two units remain essential: e.g., everywhere on the coast, funerals are dualistically organized according to the central dichotomy of mourners—the group to which the deceased belonged—and the others, "workers," who discharge the actual interment (see Duff 1951: 29, 31). However, my hypothesis implies more: where four balanced blocs are not attainable through combining (or without) of some phratric contingents, two are not simply a necessary minimum but, since they manifest a balanced (even) number, they are preferred to three or five.

I must emphasize that these ceremonial blocs, while they may
be composed of single phratries or of amalgamations of whole phra-
tries, are not phratries as such. Therefore, we have seen five and
six phratries truncated to four ceremonial units (and two, in the case
of Stony Creek) by combining whole phratries which "act together" as
single units. The present hypothesis would require that in other con-
texts as well, in which are found odd numbers of crest divisions, there
would again be found ceremonial amalgamations of these. On this ques-
tion, my present data are insufficient; e.g., among the Kitimat, the only
coast culture to recognize five crest divisions, or among the Finlay
River Sekani who recognized three (Jenness 1937: 48). Sometimes there
are enticing hints: Osgood (1936: 107) reports three "clans" among the
Peel River Kutchin, and adds the following remark:

I have at times, during my conversation with members of the
Peel River Kutchin tribe, felt that there is a bilateral divi-
sion of clans among them—that is, two clans are more closely
related in contrast to the third. The idea does not seem al-
together strange to informants but under examination no proofs
are forthcoming to support this view.

One final query to arise out of Duff's table concerns the
seeming restrictions upon which phratric combinations are permissible.
Why is Tsayu always combined with Laksamshu? Why is Tsuyaztotin com-
bined with Laksilyu? The same question arises whenever intertribal
ceremonial effects a cross-matching of the respective crest divisions.
Jenness (1943: 483), for example, reports the matching of the Bulkley

---

24. The combination "3(\* individuals of 1,4,5)," which appears in Duff's
(1951: 31) table may be a misleading simplification: what he
actually says is: "There are several members of the Tsayu, Tam-
tanyu, and Lsamasyu phratries in the village [Stony Creek], but they
align themselves for social events with one or the other [?] of the
two parties."
and Gitksan divisions, and of the Gitksan ones against the (Finlay River) Sekani and the Babine Carrier, where he indicates the key to the identifications: "These equations, of course, are not arbitrary, but correlate with the principal crests in each phratry" (1937: 48). However, the correlated crests are not always prima facie the same, and secondary crest (such as those marking subgroupings of the matched crest divisions) are brought into the computations, pushing the frontier of the enquiry to the question of what principles constrain the linkages of the crests internal to a given division. These problems deserve an exhaustive analysis which I shall not now have the time to give them.

The process of the initial incorporation of new phratries into the fold of the sept may have been somewhat hastened by an apparent preference for marriage with the matrilateral cross-cousin; at least to the extent that such a preference would reduce the marital opportunities within the sept for sons of in-marriage women. The following diagram illustrates the hypothetical sequence. The sequence commences with the introduction of phratry "A" within sept II through the virilocal marriage between persons of septs I and II; i.e., female 1, of phratry A, moves in and has children 2 and 3, likewise of phratry A. If the daughter, 2, follows a matrilateral cross-cousin preference (of course, patrilateral from her viewpoint), she will marry a man of phratry B, most probably of sept II, thereby perpetuating the previous introduced phratry A (through children 4 and 5) within sept II. On the other hand,

25. Morice (1889: 119) states: "Now, by way of compensation, and to permit the notable's children who could not otherwise inherit from him, to enjoy at least, as much as was lawful of his father's succession, one of his daughters would be united in marriage with her inheriting maternal first cousin."
if 3, brother of 2, also follows the matrilateral preference, he will seek a wife outside of sept II who is therefore more likely to be of a phratry other than B, introducing therewith a third phratry, C, within the sept, and so on.... Note that this sequence assumes a predominance of the Athapaskan tradition whereby men 3 and 4 retain rights respecting sept II in spite of being members of phratry A.

I am not certain that the matrilateral cross-cousin marital preference derives simply from the Tsimshian. This caution is called for by analogy once again with Honigmann's information on the Kaska. He firmly indicates a matrilateral preference accompanied by a patrilateral proscription among the Kaska (Honigmann 1949: 129). This cannot
be ascribed to the Tlingit, considered the principal tutors to the Kaska in coast folkways, since the latter are believed to maintain --if anything of the kind--exactly the opposite; i.e., preference for marriage with the patrilateral cross-cousin.

In any event, a juxtaposition of matrilateral cross-cousin marriage and uxorilocal residential preference (either or both of which may derive from woodland Athapaskan roots) would tend to reinforce assimilation of the matrilineal principle by establishing the MoBro/SiSo (= F-in-L/So-in-L) dyad as the ideal male constituents of the social units (microcosmic bands) which shared the hunting/trapping phase of the Carrier cycle of ecological seasons.

It is easy to see that, once the hunting/trapping territories are predicated to the phratries, then the phratries may be viewed largely as a dilation of the hunting groups, since these also are predicated to the hunting of meat and, later, to the trapping of fur. As a result, too, the ideal matrilineal aspect of the composition of the concrete hunting/trapping units could be projected upon the phratry as merely an expansion of the hunting groups.

It seems reasonable that, as the traditional hunting groups came to concentrate their energies more upon fur species, especially beaver, and correspondingly less upon the large meat animals, they would tend to crystallize rather more sharply than in the past. This would reflect an inclination to establish continued usufruct with respect to a specific sub-area of the phratry territory. Such would be the outcome of a scramble to fix and maintain control over the fur

26. The Kaska, for example, recognized two matrilineal divisions, and these, since their principal crests are wolf and crow (Honigmann 1949), seem to correspond to the Tlingit moieties wolf and raven.
27. This is tantamount to ascribing an avunculocal residential basis to the core of the dispersion season hunting/trapping units.
species inhabiting an area; again, notably the beaver, since it is both more stationary and of greater overall market value than the other fur species. In addition, limited areas would permit more efficient utilization of the fur species generally.

Jenness (1943: 487) makes the following observation:

At the present time, individual noblemen who are not even clan chiefs claim possession of one or two small hunting grounds, and their claims are recognized by the rest of the Indians even though they admittedly violate the principle of phratric and clan ownership.

I must object to Jenness' conclusion that such claims are a violation of phratric or clan ownership. They appear to be a matter of de facto usufruct only, and do not therefore represent an opposed ownership claim. In fact, as Jenness makes very clear on the same page, the same must be said of the clan's ownership of its hunting grounds; the clans hold a usufruct over parts of phratric territory.

Also, whereas Jenness sees these individual claims as a recent "growth of individual rights...brought about by the decline of the phratries and clans," I see them as merely the continuation of a pattern which emerged in the very earliest years of the fur trade.

The concentration upon fur animals, specifically beaver, could also have contributed to a developing condensation of the hunting groups due to the fact that, in contrast with large meat game, "Only beaver were hunted with some degree of cooperation" (Honigmann 1946: 61; see also 36, 66).

28. Honigmann (1949: 70-71) states that: "Beaver, being less difficult to obtain than fine fur and earning high prices, is regarded as the most important fur to trap."
I suggest, in brief, that the several clans (or as the Carrier call them, "houses") into which each present-day Babine and Bulkley phratry is divided arose as a condensation and subsequent accretion of traditional microcosmic hunting units around fur-trapping tracts within already established phratriic territories. The de jure priority of the phratries over the clans in most matters—which will emerge more clearly as the essay develops—including ownership of the hunting/trapping grounds probably reflects the historic antecedence of the phratries (implied in Duff's one-sept/one-phratry first stage) among the Carrier. Note again that, as concerns resource ownership, this is in contrast with the pattern among, for example, the Coast Tsimshian who allocated resource territories to the smaller, local descent divisions (see above, ff., p.72).

Further important details concerning the sociological nature of the septs, phratries and clans will be brought out where they are of use in later discussions. Hopefully, this first chapter will provide a general framework into which such detail can be fitted. Before proceeding now to a survey of Carrier crest and status structure, a last comment concerning the relationship of the phratry and sept will help to tie this chapter in with later problems.

The sept names convey an image of locational parochialism. This stands in contrast to the relative openness of its criteria of human composition (at least among neighbouring septs). The phratry is, ideologically, also open-ended in human composition: cross-sept crest-equation admits, theoretically, of indefinite extension. In fact, how-

29. Duff (1951: 30) notes: "the beginnings" of such clan divisions at Fort Fraser. They have not to my knowledge been otherwise reported beyond Bulkley and Babine.
-ever, the exclusiveness of phratry territories makes the phratries as parochial as the septs. In combination the two systems achieve a sort of harmony. The ideological universalism of the phratry system is harmonious with traditional sept openness. These catholic tendencies, on the other hand, are counterbalanced against the exclusiveness of the phratry territories which crystallized in the first instance out of hinterlands around the water centers that constitute the parochial roots of sept names. The Carrier phratries arose in predication to the septs, and their ideological universalism is kept in check by the parochial essence of the idea of the sept.
3. Status, Crests and the Feast

Together with the matrilineal nature of phratries, the northwestern Carrier septs also assimilated the coastal system of explicit social classes. This consisted of three classes. The highest, that of the nobles or dineeza' was marked especially by the possession of honourific titles or names. Foremost among the nobles were the chiefs of the clans and of course the phratry chiefs, who were simply the chiefs of the highest ranked clan within their respective phratries in each village. Nobles were set apart from the at-large citizenry (the commoner class) termed auxtadinee, and from the slaves, elnee.¹

The slave class among the Carrier was at no time very substantial. Jenness comments that they:

...seem never to have been as numerous as among the coast tribes, and, indeed, owned by few Indians except the chiefs (Jenness 1943: 485).

In fact, Morice seems not to have remarked upon the slave class at all; not, at least, in several contexts in which he otherwise provides a broad delineation of Carrier society (see, e.g., Morice 1892: 111-114; 1893: 28; 1905: 5-6). This, no doubt, reflects Morice's especial familiarity with the more easterly Stuart Lake Carrier, among whom the various coastal traits did not become firmly established. Speaking generally of the various septs east of Bulkley-Babine, Jenness states:

...the only slaves were prisoners of war, usually, if not always, women and children, who married their captors and obtained the same rights and status as other Indians (Jenness 1943: 584).

¹. It was some time into my fieldwork before I recorded the term elnee, although Jenness appears to have come across it relatively easily.
These statements reveal, then, not only that the Carrier do not appear to have anywhere developed a keen interest in the maintenance of a slave class, they also suggest that the institution developed, again, along a west to east gradient of diffusion.

One further entailment of the last citation deserves notice. The apparent tendency to restrict slaves to women and children is certainly not a coast trait, but neither was slave-capture a characteristic of the woodland Athapaskans (or those of the Tundra, for that matter). What Jenness describes reveals the striking persistence—at least during the early stages of assimilation—of a pronounced Athapaskan flavour in the acquired trait. Recall that, among the victims of woodland Athapaskan raiders, only the women were taken home by the victors, the men usually being killed on the spot; but the women were taken as wives, not as slaves (see above, p. 66).

There is nowhere any indication that the Carrier acquired the coastal practice of killing slaves as a power display in connection with certain celebrations (notably the raising of poles; e.g., see Boas 1916: 435).

Perhaps the ultimate sign of aristocratic status among Carrier adults is the possession of a recognized—as it were, "reserved"—seat at the feast celebrations. This is tantamount, in turn, to the possession of a name. Jenness states:

Every clan boasted the exclusive ownership of a number of titles which carried a more or less definite ranking and alone bestowed on their owners the hallmarks of nobility (Jenness 1943: 489).

Jenness provides several pages of tables displaying the prescribed
seating arrangements of the various titleholders of each of the Bulk-ley phratries, and appends annotations on many of the names (Jenness 1943: 491-4). These several pages represent the empirical backbone of much of Chapter 2. Whereas many details concerning names and seating will be raised during these later analyses, my present discussion will offer only a background to them.

It is worthy of note, to begin with, that many of the names recorded by Jenness had been acquired from the Tsimshian; presumably from the Gitkaan (primarily through intermarriage?) in the main. Jenness comments:

...many of the titles are in the Tsimshian tongue; in some, perhaps most, cases they coincide with titles actually in use among the Tsimshian (Jenness, 1943: 495).

This tends to confirm the general assumption that the Skeena peoples were the principle tutors to the northwest Carrier in the mysteries of coast culture. Following this statement, Jenness remarks that, due to their foreign derivation, many names were used without a knowledge of their "origin or real significance". He promptly add, however:

This does not mean...that the Bulkley natives slavishly copied and borrowed from their Tsimshian neighbors. Their own system, though extremely fluid, was so full of vitality and life that it was capable of absorbing numerous elements from abroad without impairing its essential vigor (Jenness 1943: 495).

Many of my arguments to this point in the essay have been an effort to demonstrate the "essential vigor" of Carrier Athapaskan tradition in the face of coastal influence. The use of the imported names without slavish adherence to their Tsimshian meanings is another case-in-point. It suggests that as well, of course, as being a mark of nobility, the greatest importance of the name among the Carrier was its use as a
vehicle of their own tradition and history. I do not say that the
mythologic sources, where known, did not contribute profoundly to the
dramatic colour of names. It is even possible that the mythic persona
of a name may have been able to generate a degree of self-fulfillment
in the person of their bearers. The same must be said, however, of the
historic persona as it develops through a succession of bearers.

The current bearer of the name *Gitamskanese* (Jenness' Gyedamskanish), who lives at Hagwilget, became eligible to take the
name on the death of his mother's elder brother some fifty years ago
when he was in his early twenties. At that time, however, the young
man's mother pleaded with the chiefs who were to confirm the new re-
cipient of the name that they "spare" her only son from having to bear
the responsibility and the stressful effects that the name apparently
brought to each of its holders. It seemed that the name was so high,
so heavy to bear that it always brought to its holder some form of
emotional deterioration. In this case the chiefs relented and for the
interim appointed the mother's younger brother to receive the name
*Gitamskanese*. When this man died, the current holder was in his early
fifties and accepted the name and the responsibility, albeit reluctantly.
Evidently, the current *Gitamskanese* and his immediate predecessor have
avoided the negative effects of holding the name, although it still
bears the stigma of being "too strong" for most men.

The possible reasons for the relative well-being of the last
two *Gitamskanese* are, of course, near infinite; we might speculate, how-
ever, that the changing role of the chief (that is, the tendency to a
decrease in chiefs' responsibilities, especially in the last thirty
years) might have lessened the tension involved in the holding of a high name. The question of the changing role of the chief will be discussed in a later chapter.

The history associated with names is an accumulation of highlights from the lives of its succession of incumbents. Of course, the feast hall is not only the central theatre where the myth-historic narrations and dramas are performed, it is also one of the key settings wherein the highlights composing the histories and acquired feast successes are vital elements in the histories associated with names. To bear a name, then, is to share in a perpetuity; to have a voice and breath beyond personal mortality. Of course it is a costly privilege. One must pay a price in substance—by prodigal generosity in the feast to one's fellows—during life to provide for a kind of resurrection of the shadow after death.

In large measure the rank gradation among the names of a phratry was seen as a reflection of the relative glamour of their histories. In that connection, the feast record of a name probably loomed large, though non-feast achievements, especially in war, were also significant. Consequently, rank shifts occurred, names rising and falling on the clan and phratry scales. (I shall have occasion to cite examples in a later context.) On the other hand, the various unique prerogatives of the office of clan chief offered especially great opportunities for the compiling of credits to chiefly names. Some of these prerogatives will be discussed in greater detail in a later context (see especially Chapter 2, Section 1), but I shall note them here briefly.

First, in connection with the acquisition of glories through
war, Jenness remarks:

Only a chief could lead a war expedition, because no one else possessed the means to gather the stores of food necessary to feed the warriors from different places who assembled to take part in it; but if he succeeded, he was given all the captives, who thenceforth became his slaves (Jenness 1943: 518).

A chief, therefore, has greater opportunity than lesser nobles of accruing war honours. On the other hand, it seems possible to somewhat overdo the role of warrior, as in the case of Nuwæe. Similarly, failures in great ventures are correspondingly more shameful than the less significant failures of smaller men. Boas relates that the name Legë̄'ex replaced Nës-balas as a clan chief's name of the Eagle Phratry of the G·i-spa-x-lâ'ots tribe, among the Coast Tsimshian, when the name Nës-balas:

...had lost its standing, because the bearer had been killed [during a war] by a chief of a Raven clan and his head put up in the house of the latter (Boas, 1916: 510).

Jenness' point that only a chief could afford the cost of leading a war expedition raises another key issue. How did a chief acquire the extra wealth with which to finance such an expedition? In addition, he was routinely expected

...to keep open house, as it were, to all members of his phratry, to relieve the wants of the poor, and to support his people in their relations with other phratries (Jenness 1943: 518).

The latter obligation included, of course, the most costly of ceremonial obligations, including not only the requirement to be especially extravagant in gifts dispersed in the validation of his name(s) and crest(s), but the expectation of acquiring the most expensive forms of the clan emblems; clan poles, carvings or paintings of clan crests on housefronts,
houseposts, etc. These various exclusively chiefly rights and obligations will be discussed in greater detail in Chapter 2, Section 2. My immediate point is that chiefs not only had to maintain a grand personal style, but had to foot the cost of representing their clans. How were they able to cover such expenditures?

Jenness tells us that a chief had the privilege of "receiving with his fellow-chiefs the largest gifts at every potlatch" (Jenness 1943: 518). I might add that the assistance routinely given by one's phratry-men to cover a person's feast costs was probably more generous in the event of chiefs' feasts, inasmuch as they embody their clans--symbolically--more than do any of the other noblemen. However, the key source of the chief's financial support came, according to my own best informant, from his traditional claim to fully one-quarter of all trappers' take in furs from clan hunting grounds. The chief, in turn, maintained the supply of traps, and various other paraphernalia, on behalf of his clansmen.

The view that I have offered of the names of the dineezia as vehicles of history draws some support from one other distinction. Commoners (and some nobles as well) had personal names which, although their announcement required a feast, did not confer a reserved feast seat (or, therefore, a rank), and carried no expectation of continuous use. When a noble's name, on the other hand, was left vacant by the death of its incumbent, his nephew (his sister's son) was expected--as it were automatically--to assume the name and thereby to guarantee its perpetuity. A common name had no associated expectation of unbroken succession. Such names were often given in the belief that the recipient
was the reincarnation of an ancestor whose name it had been; physical features often served as a sign of such reincarnation. This does not amount, of course, to an ideal of unbroken succession, much less to a continued airing of its story from a permanent seat at the feast.

As with all other aspects of the coast complex, the class system was not well developed in Jenness' time (nor since) to the east of the Bulkley-Babine septs. Jenness states:

Some Carrier subtribes to the eastward ranged themselves into phratries whose chiefs bore hereditary titles; and they adopted crests for these phratries, or for the chiefs who presided over them. Nowhere, however...was society clearly demarcated into three strata, nobles, commoners, and slaves. The nobles comprised only the chiefs and their nearest relatives, who were far outnumbered by the common people (Jenness 1943: 584).

If the early stages in the assimilation of the class system replicated among the Bulkley and Babine what Jenness depicts here for the north-eastern septs, then we can safely conclude that the class of chiefly bearers crystallized around the chiefly offices, and expanded with the burgeoning fur trade. There is no evidence to indicate that any special privileges opposed the noble to the commoner class in general apart from the specifically ceremonial prerogative of having a reserved seat at the feasts and, therefore, a permanent place in formal clan and phratry history.

As I have already shown, the clan - phratry chieftainships, on the other hand, were associated with a number of distinguishing secular and ceremonial roles. Thus, in addition to those already mentioned, the chiefs held the peacemaking roles within their divisions. They had no authority to actually enforce settlements or impose adjustments and retributions. However, they were assigned the traditional task of
cajoling disputants—spreading the white feathers of peace (= ces) on their heads while performing personal power songs and dances—to reach an amicable settlement of their differences.

One other important office proper to the chiefs consisted of special prerogatives regarding the general clan and phratric crests (= nettse). We will be taking up many of the details concerning these prerogatives in a later context (Chapter 2). However, somewhat in anticipation of this and other later discussions, it will be useful here to consider some general matters concerning the Carrier crest system.

A first consideration is the distinction between the clan and phratry crests, on the one hand, and the so-called personal crests (= chanka) on the other. The nettse were the universal emblems which represent their respective social divisions writ large. The people usually nowadays speak of these as the "signs" of the "tribes". In their metonymic capacity vis-a-vis their social divisions these signs could be tattooed on all clansmen, or, nowadays, beaded onto garments and worn as bead pendants. Certain usages, to be considered more fully later, were the strict prerogatives of the group chiefs. In general, the nettse were:

...carved on the clan totem poles, painted or carved on the fronts of the chiefs' houses, painted on chiefs' grave boxes, represented at times on the ceremonial hats and blankets the chiefs wore at dances.... (Jenness 1943: 495).

The chanka were personal both in the sense that only their particular owners had exclusive control of all display prerogatives with respect to these, and that they "could be sold within or without the clan like a garment or a piece of furniture" (Jenness 1943: 501).
That is, generally speaking, the clans and phratries as such had no interest in their allocation. One type of *chanka* represents an exception to this, however; cases, that is, in which a personal crest "coincided with"—bore the same name, and represented the same mythic/historic figure—an honourific name. In these cases, then, honourific name and *chanka* name are inseparable, and honourific names as I have noted were ideally the valued properties of their phratries and clans. These crests had to be given a separate feast validation, but this was usually done at the same time as the assumption of the honourific name.

Jenness' discussion suggests that the *chanka* were used particularly by the nobility, but Morice states that they could be purchased by anyone:

...it was voluntarily assumed with an accompaniment of befitting ceremonies by any titled or untitled individual who wished to advance in social standing. It entitled the owner to special consideration, though the latter could on that account lay claim to the possession of no hunting grounds nor to the exalted rank which was the strict property of the "noblemen" or *taneza* (Morice, G.D.R.: 204).

The ceremonial display privilege associated with the *chanka* involved a dramatic representation of the beings of Carrier and exogenous (mainly Gitksan) legend and history. The display of crests was reserved for separate occasions preceding the actual feast distributions (Beynon, 1945).

Jenness' discussions seem to recognize *nettse* only at the clan level. However, that does not accord either with my own information or with Morice's. Writing of the Stuart Lake Carrier, who had no sub-phratrial (clan) divisions, Morice states:
One totem generally—though not always—corresponds to one clan or gens [i.e., phratry], so that the former and the latter are very often in equal numbers. Four gentes obtain among the Carriers, all of which I herewith submit the native names together with those of their respective totems.

**GENTES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TOTEMS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ʔtʰsamอะ-yu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tsa-yu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y ʰsil-yu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Təmʔten-yu</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(The Grouse)
(The Beaver)
(The Toad)
(The Grizzly Bear)

(Morie, G.D.R.: 203)

Elsewhere, I have listed the pan-phratric nettse of the present-day Bulkley people (see below, p. 148). Thus certain of the nettse are emblematic of the phratries as a whole, while others are reserved as the insignia of particular clans only. Generally speaking, there appears to be no classically totemic orthodoxy associated with these crests.

They are not taboo as foods; the grouse and beaver are regular foods as, of course, is the caribou which is a crest of the Laksilyu. Grizzly is seldom available but is acceptable in principle. The toad, the frog and the wolf (Gitamtan) are not considered edible, but this is manifestly not because they are nettse. On the other hand, as Jenness observes:

> They did, indeed, ascribe a certain kinship between themselves and two or three of the most conspicuous crests, conceiving that the relationship gave them a certain measure of protection. Thus, if a man of the Laksamshu phratry encountered a whale that seemed likely to endanger his canoe, they believed he had merely to call out that he belonged to the Laksamshu phratry (which reckons whale as one of its principle crests) and the whale would leave him unharmed (Jenness 1943: 496).

I have been told the same; indeed, with the same example.

From this viewpoint, then, the crest being is a sort of group
This raises the possibility, suggested by Boas for the Kwakiutl, of a genetic relationship between the concepts of the individual manitou and of the divisional totems. Boas rejects the inclination of Hill-Tout and of Fletcher to widen his suggestion concerning the Kwakiutl in particular into a more general theory of the origin of totemism. The association of group crests with a notion of guardianship is merely a particular element of a specific mode of labelling and is subject, together with similar variables of the content of totemism including "taboos, naming, symbols, or religious practices of various kinds..." (Boas 1916: 516), to indefinite areal/historic variables.

It is a little surprising to find Boas rather deserting his usual caution where he propounds that totemism developed first and mainly as a device for the labelling of exogamic kin divisions under conditions in which their expansion threatens to outpace the ability of the mechanisms of classificatory terminology to maintain delineation of "the incest group" (Boas 1940, and 1916: 517 et. seq.). We have already seen that, to the contrary, the exogamic function was one of the least assimilable of the elements of the coast complex, whereas the system of crests, matrilineal descent, and territories were readily assumed among the Carrier (see also Duff, 1951: 32).

More generally, however, Boas seems to have seen totemism as a specific case of the more general problem of the nature of classification:

...the homology of distinguishing marks of social divisions of a tribe is proof that they are due to a classificatory tendency (Boas 1940: 323).

2. Boas' concept of totemism is as follows: "Its essential feature appears to me [to be] the association between certain types of ethnic activities and kinship groups (in the widest sense of the term), in other cases also a similar association with groups embracing members of the same generation or of the same locality" (Boas 1940: 320).
Levi-Strauss discovers certain inadequacies in this particular principle—of the homology of distinguishing marks applied to given social forms in particular cultures— but acknowledges that Boas' concern with a logic of classifications was an orientation ancestral to his own.

Similarly, although Durkheim and Mauss, in their *Primitive Classification*, reveal the systematic character in several totemic contexts, and seem even to propound it in principle, a fuller development of the theme is aborted by the inability of Durkheim—especially in face of his insistence on "the primary of the social over the intellect" (Levi-Strauss 1963: 97)—to reconcile the idea of an enduring intellectual system with the skewing effects of the currents of social history. As Levi-Strauss states the problem:

It is thus plain that history and demographic development always upset the plans conceived by the wise. In such societies there is a constantly repeated battle between synchrony and diachrony from which it seems that diachrony must emerge victorious every time (Levi-Strauss, 1966: 155).

The tactical breakthrough in the management of this problem, achieved by Levi-Strauss following the lead of Radcliffe-Brown (1951), is based upon, first, recognition of the essentially algebraic character of totemic taxonomies, and second, recognition of the fact that ultimately, of course, "diachrony must emerge victorious":

The systems we have been considering so far on the other hand go from motivation to arbitrariness: conceptual schemes (at the limit, simple binary opposition) are constantly broken open to introduce elements taken from elsewhere; and there is no doubt that these additions often entail modification of the system. Moreover, they do not always succeed in getting incorporated in it and the systematic appearance is then disturbed or temporarily put in abeyance (Levi-Strauss 1966: 157).

---

3. Levi-Strauss states: "The rule of homology....Societies are known which do not comply with it [he doesn't supply an illustration], and it is not thereby excluded that the more complex means of differentiation which they employ shall also form a system" (Levi-Strauss 1963: 12).
Thus, totemic societies are intellectual objects in never-ending repair in the face of the disruptions of historic forces. But the objects have a characteristic form: these societies are conceptualized as whole comprising parts (social divisions) which manifest relationships of simultaneous "solidarity and opposition". Such an image of society, correspondingly, requires representation in terms of a system of signs able to express an isomorphism with these properties of "solidarity and opposition":

To arrive at this end, the natural species are classed in pairs of opposites, and this is possible only on condition that the species chosen have in common at least one characteristic which permits them to be compared (Levi-Strauss 1963: 88).

Eaglehawk and crow, carnivores, hunter vs. scavenger, represent such principles as totems of Darling River moieties; similarly, among the Haida, Eagle and Raven together lick the platter clean.

Therefore, the ability of such systems to accommodate, to a point, the arbitrary disturbances of history reflects persistence in the underlying principles according to which the systems are designed; i.e., as wholes made out of parts which tend to be arranged according to principles of binary opposition expressive of a relationship of complementary solidarity. Pursuant to the matter of the algorithmic nature of totemic systems, Levi-Strauss shows how the vastness and complexity of the matrix of Nature, notably of plant and animal species, affords the necessary range of materials from which to build an expression of the manifold differentiations upon and between levels (relations of part/whole) of social structure, and with which to make the substitutions and equations which may be required in accommodation of diachronic contingency (see
especially his discussion of the "totemic operator", in Chapter 5, 1966). I recall, apropos this discussion, that Levi-Strauss also illustrates the reconciliation of an ideal of balance and complementary solidarity against a reality of imbalance in his essay "Do Dual Organizations Exist?" (Levi-Strauss, 1963). I have offered a similar argument above (Section 2) in connection with the Carrier ideology of four ceremonial (cum cosmological?) units.

It is not surprising that intellectuals, perhaps reading themselves in their objects of study, should be strongly tempted by the Levi-Straussian idea that man is animated by an ineluctable quest to collapse all things to integrated wholes. The notion of the integrated and solidary whole remains as pivotal to the views of Levi-Strauss as it was to his predecessors, Durkheim and Radcliffe-Brown. Of course there are key differences: for Levi-Strauss, the range of the whole has been extended from the emblem-bearing societal subdivisions to the larger societies which these compose, and beyond..., and the urge to holism has been transformed from Durkheim's and Radcliffe-Brown's society-aggrandizing sentiment into an element of "original logic, a direct expression of the structure of the mind (and behind the mind, probably, of the brain)" (Levi-Strauss, 1963: 90). The key place of integration is clear in the following:

The alleged totemism is no more than a particular expression, by means of a special nomenclature formed of animal and plant names (in a certain code, as we should say today), which is its sole distinctive characteristic, of correlations and oppositions which may be formalized in other ways, e.g., among certain tribes of North and South America, by oppositions of the type sky/earth, war/peace, upstream/downstream, red/white, etc. The most general model for this, and the most systematic
application, is to be found perhaps in China, in the opposition of the two principles of Yang and Yin, as male and female, day and night, summer and winter, the union of which results in an organized totality (tao) such as the conjugal pair, the day or the year. Totemism is thus reduced to a particular fashion of formulating a general problem, viz., how to make opposition, instead of being an obstacle to integration, serve rather to produce it (Levi-Strauss, 1963: 89).

It seems to me, incidentally, that positing the urge to holism as the supreme principle in the design of totemic systems has the tactical advantage of yielding as its corollary some accounting of the pre-eminence of binary oppositions in the structuring of these systems. Pairs which are complementary or quasi-complementary are, by definition, ones which taken together manifest a sense of a completed semantic domain. That is, complementary pairs project the sense of a whole constituted out of opposed elements more simply and therefore more forcefully than is possible with more complex symbolic structures. In sum, binary oppositions are pre-eminent in totemic structures because they are the most elegant form for symbolizing a sense of wholeness constituted out of opposition.

By the same token, I am a little puzzled by Levi-Strauss' dismissal of Boas' idea that there is a tendency toward homology among the signs (totems) applied to given kinds of social forms in particular cultures. Does not the notion of an integrated whole virtually entail a mode of homology among the elements of the whole? Notwithstanding Levi-Strauss' alleged exceptions (see above, p. 109), would not the urge to represent the idea of an integrated whole bias the system toward selecting as symbols concrete elements which are the more able to convey a sense of wholeness because they belong to a common domain (whether or not that domain is immediately apparent to the ethnologist); i.e.,
because they are homologous?

Having been convinced by many of Levi-Strauss' analyses, I have attempted to apply his approach to the available Carrier data, thus far unsuccessfully. I have considered various criteria characteristic of Levi-Strauss' reductions--geospheres, seasons, etc.--but none have generated a reasonably consistent schematization of the netsee, showing that these represent exclusive and complementary domains which compose an integrated Whole-of-Nature. The completion of such an analysis would seem to require thorough comparisons of crest systems through a wide region along the coast and adjacent interior, including--as suggested in Section 2--an analysis of a wide spectrum of cross-tribal crest equivalences. Also, such comparisons must be conducted in the context of more penetrating ethnozoological and ethnobotanical data than are presently available.

In a later context, I shall have occasion to develop an observation which, as it bears upon one of the traditional queries concerning totemism, warrants brief notice at this point. As we have said, Levi-Strauss implies, in his discussion of the "totemic operator", that biological species represent an especially favourable realm for the representation of social structure because their scope and complexity permit unique flexibility with respect to key operations such as "totalization" and "detotalization" (whereby, e.g., relationships of part/whole, and generation of different wholes out of the same parts may be expressed), and in the establishment of equivalences and substitutions to absorb the shocks of social change. On the other hand, the discussion of the Carrier sept and village names shows that similar operations are feasible
--perhaps not quite as richly--using other domains of natural phenomena.

I noted the indications that these names may reflect certain differentiations of social structure in terms of such dimensions of water systems as upstream/downstream, lake inlet/lake outlet, principal salmon conduit/terminal conduit, etc.

The concept of a biological species entails a whole constituted of parts (individual animals, plants) which are homologous in the context of contrasts against other species. These contrasts "are adopted as emblems by groups of men in order to do away with their own resemblances" (Levi-Strauss 1966: 107). In addition, however, individuals which compose a species are mortal, while the species as a whole persists; it is an indefinitely continuous succession of homologous individuals. A descent group is conceived in the same way. A rule of unilineal descent cuts out pivotal cohesions (Mo/Child, Fa/Child) from the matrix of kin relations in order to stipulate a particular path of continuity. In sum, natural species represent descent groups as unique successions of homologous individuals.

Waterbodies also manifest a sense of continuity, of course, as do mountains (recall the reference to the names of the Sekani septs), stars, some artifacts, etc., but without an evident succession of parts. As such, they do not reconcile group continuity and personal mortality and cannot, therefore, as effectively symbolize a people. Prior to developing a system of crest groups represented by animal species, the Carrier were peoples of places. Those places subsequently became the places of peoples.
Chapter 2 of this essay is an analysis of some details of the seating and distributional protocols of the Carrier feast. A few general observations will set the stage.

First, this analysis is conducted essentially within the frame of reference established by Barnett (1938): the feast is a ceremonial concerned with the identification and validation of status relations among various categories of social structure. Within this framework, I shall attempt to show, not only how the spatial and temporal arrangements of the ritual mark the various elements of Carrier social structure, but beyond this how they express, as it were in a silent language, many relational dimensions (notably diachronic ones) connecting and contrasting these elements.

I lack the data necessary to explore the regional redistributive consequences of the feast among the Carrier, as Vayda (1961) and Piddocke (1965) have done among the Southern Kwakiutl following the lead of Suttles (1960, 1962, 1968), who used Coast Salish data. I would only note that they seem to me to rest more of their case than is necessary on the difficult-to-establish hypothesis (see Weinberg 1965) of an impelling, regionally staggered, periodic food scarcity; an interest in the variety, alone, of foods and other products obtained from different regions might be sufficient to support the wish to maintain the contribution of the feast to inter-regional exchanges. Among the Carrier, the feast might have directly served a redistributive end with respect, specifically, to food insofar as foods seem to have figured quite significantly among the gifts routinely removed in addition to what was consumed on the spot. My informants speak of sacks of flour, loaves of
bread, sugar, etc., in connection with contemporary feasts, and Jenness (1943: 516) notes similar items for distribution in 1918. On the other hand, while one of Jenness' informants mentions the serving of moose, beaver, and bear during a feast, I nowhere find mention of these or other traditional foods as gifts for removal.

In any case, whatever other ends it may serve, the feast is a ritual of social definition, establishing and displaying the boundaries and relationships among the categories of social structure. The giving of gifts, along with other features of feast protocol, serves as a medium of symbolic articulation. Size of gifts, of course, expresses rank level, chiefs always receiving larger portions than others of food and other prestations. I shall show, too, that distributional patterns manifest important categoric differentiations.

An analysis of detailed data on prestational practices might reveal that particular categories of recipients are typically given particular kinds of gifts. We could even find, if such were the case, that such prestational differentiations might carry a measure of symbolic value reflecting something about the respective recipient categories in addition to simply marking them. In fact, these questions were foremost in my mind when I first attended feasts. I was unable, however, to obtain the details essential to the analysis.

Somewhat in the same vein, I have noticed that--during Morice's and Jenness' times among the Carrier--dressed skins, notably beaver and moose, seem to have been (together with food) the staple prestational element of the feast. For example, in Jenness' records of an informant's account of a name-assumption feast we find the following statements:
The candidate and this phratry feasted the entire assembly, paid the phratry that had just erected a grave-house over the cremation place of the late chief, and distributed moose hides, beaver skins, and other valuable presents among all the guests.

During his acknowledgement speech a guest chief states:

He is a nephew of the old chief; he has provided us with much food and many skins. Hereafter let him take the place and bear the titles of his uncle (Jenness 1943: 515).

Morice's account of the feast series of the Carrier continually refers to the dressed skins (Morice 1889: 149-53). As the guests assembled about him on the occasion of his elevation feast, the candidate "having on none but the most indispensable vestments, stands silent facing the pile of dressed skins which he is about to give away" (Morice 1889: 149).

Although the Carrier feast probably was historically preceded by a traditional woodland Athapaskan funeral-feast (see Osgood 1932: 81; Jenness 1937: 60; Honigmann 1946: 87), I assume that it became elaborated into the dispersion of wealth in addition to food along with the growth of the system of crests and phratries. The growth of the phratries, in turn, was intimately tied to the flourishing of the fur trade. Thus, whereas the phratries were the basic units of the intrasept feast structure (this is developed in Chapter 2), it is not surprising that dressed skins, as the most significant economic item of the phratries, had become the central commodity of the feast. Furthermore, the skins express power to command the products of White-man and, most notably, perhaps, the products of White-man which command power, i.e., guns. The reciprocation of dressed skins among the nobles, as champions of the counterposed phratries, was tantamount to a symbolic and relatively non-violent power contest, reminiscent of the Russo-American space race of the nineteen-sixties.
The Carrier, however, had the advantage of conducting their contests under the ideological aegis of maintaining a phratic balance rather than of creating and maintaining a clear advantage; this matter was touched on in Section 2, and is discussed further in Chapter 2. The reader will recognize shades of *Fighting with Property* (Codere, 1950) in the last remarks.

At the same time, against this backdrop of suspended opposition the reciprocations of food manifest a symbiosis of substance symbolizing the connubial basis of phratic relations. Traditionally, three successive feasts were required to lament the death of a chief, dispose of his corpse (originally by cremation), and elevate his successor. There are always two phratries at the core of these proceedings. The phratry of the deceased mourns the chief, and, at the third post-mortem feast, must replace him. The phratry of the father of the deceased, his halsut, must console the mourners, must dispose of the body of their deceased child, and finally, at the elevation feast, are first to follow the new chief in a ritual procession of acknowledgement (Jenness 1943: 514-15).

A striking feature of contemporary post-mortem feasts involves the posing of a ritual demand by the three guest phratries, led by a spokesman of the halsut who asks "when will you give us our child?" The reply comes from the wife's phratry in the form of food proffered to the halsut (and to the other phratries as consorts-in-waiting) as

---

4. This event is called *lhidab gik ja'at* (= "they eat from the table"). It takes place prior to the actual interment, during preparations for the interment, following the ritual pacification of the mourners, *ces byee abalex* (= "laying on of the white feathers"), which takes place immediately post mortem.
her vow of parturition (the intended successor is in fact announced during this feast). Steamed tail of beaver and berry compote are central elements of this ritual meal, where berries and beaver tail figure as key signs of female fecundity in Carrier mythology.

The host phratry do not eat as they serve and the Carrier woman never dines while her husband eats. In addition, on this occasion, her food signifies a resurrection of the living child. The host phratry, in its maternal pose, does not feed upon the body of her child.

Morice's and Jenness' accounts both specify that, following the elevation feast of the heir to the vacant seat, three additional feasts (making six, in all) completed the full career of a chief's feasts. The career of six feasts represents the traditional complement, but during Jenness' time, and at present, four—at most—compose a full ceremonial round.

These various feasts are alike for the most part in their ritual arrangements. The last of the series, however, is considered the climax of a career, and is always the most significant. Clan totem carvings were unveiled to commemorate the death of the late chief (Morice 1889: 151; Jenness 1943: 516). Visitors foregathered "from all the surrounding country, even from other subtribes and nations" (Jenness 1943: 516). The cottonwood pole used for the totem carvings was supplied by the halsut, in this case of the current chief rather than of his predecessor. The seating arrangements of such pole-raising feasts were, as we shall see, somewhat different from the pattern used during the earlier feasts. The differing seating patterns and other protocols of these feasts form the subject matter of the second Chapter of this essay.
Chapter 2: THE REPRESENTATION OF FORM AT THE FEAST

1. The Representation of the Phratries:
   Nobles vs. Commoners

The Savage mind... builds mental structures which facilitate an understanding of the world inasmuch as they resemble it. In this sense Savage thought can be defined as analogical thought.

But in this sense too it differs from domesticated thought, of which historical knowledge constitutes one aspect. The concern for continuity which inspires the latter is indeed a manifestation, in the temporal order, of knowledge which is interstitial and unifying rather than discontinuous and analogical (Levi-Strauss, 1966: 362).

I have already expressed a view which cannot concede that tribal thought is discontinuous rather than unifying (see above, p. 89). I am more in accord, however, with the opinion that tribal thought is analogical thought, even while I am unclear precisely how this differs from analytic (i.e., "domesticated") thought. Whatever the validity and truth of these distinctions, Levi-Strauss' preoccupation with analogical thought is shared by others: it is virtually definitive of the orientation of componentical analysis (for example, see John Lyons, Introduction to Theoretical Linguistics, pp. 470-1). This and the succeeding sections of this chapter will be much concerned to apply the notion of analogical thought to the analysis of certain protocols of the Carrier feast. I shall begin with an examination of some of Diamond Jenness' data on the protocols of feast seating among the Bulkley Carrier.

For each of the Bulkley phratries, Jenness provides "Tables of Peerage, or Titles and Seating Arrangements." These are presented successively for the Gitamtanyu (Gitamten) phratry, the Gilserhyu phratry,
the Laksilyu phratry, and finally the combined Laksamshu and Tsayu phratries.

On feast occasions the members of the host phratry occupy the center floor and distribute their gifts and speeches among the guest phratries whose members are displayed along the walls assigned to them. Jenness (1943: 491) makes the following introductory comment:

At feasts the clan chief's sat together, the chief of the second ranking clan on the right of the phratry chief (i.e., the chief of the principal clan), and the chief of the third clan, if there were more than two, on the phratry chief's left. The nobles then stationed themselves nearer or farther from their chiefs in accordance with their rank, and directly in front of each man or woman sat the probable successor, nearly always a nephew or niece....

Jenness' tables of the seating arrangements of the peerage are displayed below.

Each of the subscripted capital letters corresponds to a title of the peerage, and the titles themselves are listed beneath the seating plan of the phratric groups in the original tables (Jenness, 1943: 491-4). The "Xs," incidentally, designate titles for which the appropriate clan had not been determined.

I might also note that specific ranking is presumably (Jenness does not discuss the issue) manifest here, as elsewhere at the feast, in the order of receipt of gifts, of delivery of speeches and other performances (songs, dances, various other power displays), as well as in the seating positions. It is doubtful that there were any extra-feast manifestations of precise seriation.
Figure 2: TABLES OF CARRIER PEERAGE (SEATING)

Gitamtanyu Phratry

Clans: A, Grizzly House; B, House in the Middle of Many and Anskaski

Rear Row: \[ B_8 B_7 B_6 B_5 B_3 A_2 B_1 A_1 B_2 A_3 A_4 A_5 A_6 \]

Second Row: \[ B_{3a} A_{2a} B_{1a} B_{2a} \]

Front Row: \[ B_9 B_{10} B_{11} \]

Gilserhyu Phratry

Clans: A, Dark House; B, Thin House; C, Birchbark House

Rear Row: \[ X_1 B_6 B_5 B_4 A_4 A_3 A_2 B_3 B_1 A_1 B_2 C_1 X_2 C_2 \]

Third Row: \[ A_{1a} A_{1b} C_{1a} C_{1b} \]

Second Row: \[ C_3 C_4 B_7 \]

Front Row: \[ C_5 \]

Laksilyu Phratry

Clans: A, House of Many Eyes; B, House of Top of Flat Rock; C, House Beside the Fire

Rear Row: \[ X B_3 B_2 B_1 A_1 C_1 A_2 A_3 A_4 \]

Front Row: \[ B_{3a} B_{2a} B_{1a} A_{1a} C_{1a} \]

Combined Laksamshu and Beaver [Tsayu] Phratry

Clans: A, Sun House, including Twisted House; B, Beaver House; C, Owl House

Rear Row: \[ B_5 B_4 B_3 B_2 B_1 A_1 C_1 A_2 A_3 C_2 X_1 \]

Second Row: \[ C_{1a} \]

Front Row: \[ X_2 \]
As this analysis unfolds I shall try to demonstrate not only the manner in which seating protocol displays the major dimensions of Carrier society—phratry, clan, and class—but that it was also able to project some rather subtle statements concerning the relationship among these elements of structure.

According to seating protocols, the phratric groups are contrasted with respect to one another by the assignment of each to a particular wall in the feast hall. The specific wall (they are distinguished by reference to the hall doorway) to which a given phratry is assigned is a matter of convention. I have recorded several versions of the specific assignments, as has James Hackler (1958: 92-6); these, of course, indicate certain variations according to which phratry is host of the event. However, there are many apparent contradictions beyond these expected variations, and I regret that I am presently unable to define the underlying principles. One suspects in fact that these apparent contradictions reflect—at least in part—conventionalized permutations whereby the phratries assume particular walls on the occasion according to which ones contain the father and spouse respectively of the central celebrant. I shall have to forego the issue until I have the necessary fuller information. Meanwhile, the ideal of the confinement of the phratric groups to separate walls is established.

One curious feature of Jenness' tables may reflect this ideal; namely, the appearance of an extra row—shown in the plans of the Gitamtanyu, the Gilserhyu, and the Laksamshu groups—of noblemen of lesser rank directly in front of the rows of heirs apparent. In the case of
the Gilserhyu, in fact, we note two extra rows, but the frontmost is confined to a single person with a unique history to be cited later. Jenness makes no special note of this phenomenon, and persons to whom I have spoken have always declared the "outside" (i.e., Jenness' "rear") row to be the preserve par excellence of the dineea', with their nephews assigned to seats directly in front of them; just what we see in Jenness' tables.¹ In brief, there are no data in either Jenness or Hackler, nor are there any in my own experience, to suggest that the extra row is set apart to mark some ideologically special category of dineea', except as the preserve of relatively low ranks (whereas the heirs apparent are, in contrast, precisely such a distinctive category and their special row does mark them as such). Neither is there any evidence to suggest that the front row comprises persons with special assignments which would require that position as a practical convenience. In fact, the weight of overall evidence relating to the coast feast traditions suggests that, except in the giving of acknowledgement speeches by the important guest nobles, the guest phratries remain seated and passive throughout the proceedings at feasts. Finally, Beynon's suggestion that the three rows are used (among the Gitksan) in order to create a resemblance to the old type of terraced house (see footnote 1), rather begs the question as I see it, however valid the idea.

Another possibility, far from conclusive, is that a front row of low-rank nobles was routinized to avoid an overspill beyond the ends

¹ Beynon's (1945) notes remark that among the Gitksan seating at pre-feast power and crest performances inverts the arrangement used during the actual feast. The chiefs were seated in the front row with their successors behind them because, in these ceremonies, the chiefs were usually called upon to take part (whereas they are passive as guests at the feast itself). He also notes that three rows are used here to create a resemblance to the old type of terraced house.
of the ideally assigned walls, and possibly, too, to leave some space in the corners to admit a few commoners of their respective phratries (see below). It is interesting to note, in this connection, that both the Gitamtan and the Gilserhyu, both of which employ the extra row, have exactly 14 dineeza' along their most honoured rear rows. The Laksilyu, on the other hand, have only nine dineeza', and lack a front row, while the Laksamshu, with 11 established nobles, have isolated one person to the front position for special reasons, and presumably only as a temporary measure: "X2, Skokamlaxa (Tsimshian word); the possessor of this title came from Gitseguykla (Skeena Crossing), and has no proper seat in the phratry" (Jenness, 1943: 494). Could this mean that 14 represented the established maximum of rear row positions? If so, would this specific figure represent a routinized accommodation to the typical dimensions of the Carrier clan house? Unfortunately, my present information cannot settle the intriguing questions concerning the front row dineeza'.

However, we can be confident of this: from the ideological standpoint, the ceremonial presentation of the phratrial blocs as distinct and structurally equivalent units is achieved by the expedient of a concrete analogy; the discreteness of each phratry, marked by the positional discreteness of the wall to which it is assigned, is asserted against the sameness of these walls which affirms, in turn, the equivalence of the phratries.

I have now to introduce an important qualification to the foregoing conclusion. Although all persons in Carrier society, with the exception of its few slaves, were—and still are—automatically allocated
to the clan and phratry of the mother, the class of the auxtadinee, commoners, seemed to have been waived as concrete codifiers in the ceremonial differentiation of their respective phratries (and ipso facto of the class as well). This conclusion is entailed in the following statement: "The commoners and such slaves as were admitted lined up at the back or wherever they could find room" (Jenness, 1943: 491). It is clear in context that "at the back" denotes the doorway wall rather than a special back row along each wall. Thus, in contrast with the ideal confinement of the phratric bloc, per its nobles, within a single wall, we find no very great effort to similarly and exhaustively so incorporate the body of commoners. Although insufficiency of space along the walls no doubt contributed significantly to this relative indifference to the accommodation of commoners, one wonders whether further front rows might not have been introduced (up to the point, of course, where the center floor becomes overcrowded).

The idea of an extra front row for commoners arises in the history of an extraordinary man who achieves special status. His story begins:

Satsa'n's ancestors, a century ago, were commoners without genealogical history of prominence who occupied at potlatches any place they could find in the vicinity of their fellow phratrymen....

The story goes on to relate his achievements of wealth and renown until, at last,

...he decided to give a potlatch on his own account. He therefore invited all the people, and before distributing his presents stood up and proclaimed, 'Hereafter let me not sit in a corner like a nobody, but in front of my phratry in a special place beside the fire. And let me be known, not by my own name, but as Satsa'n.... (Jenness, 1943: 489-90).

Satsa'n's special station is shown as "C_5," the only front row position in Jenness' table of the Gilserhyu peerage. These were the circumstances responsible for the occurrence of a second extra row in the Gilserhyu
seating plan.

In addition to underlining the possibility of accommodating the phratry commoners in additional front rows among their phratrymen, this narrative helps to fill in the remaining gaps in the matter of the ceremonial seating of commoners. There are several aspects to the overall placement of nobles and commoners which I shall now take up.

To begin with, we have an indication that there was a preference among commoners (witness Satsa'n's ancestors) to find a place "in the vicinity of their fellow phratrymen." However, wanting any special front row for commoners, what space would be available in the vicinity of nobles? Satsa'n's moving plea, "let me not sit in the corner like a nobody," tells us that those commoners fortunate enough to find space in the vicinity of their fellow phratrymen did so by filling in whatever area was left vacant (whether fortuitously or through some measure of predesign such as the delimiting of the number of nobles occupying the rear row) at the remote ends of the wall to which their phratry was allocated. The general pattern is schematized below:

We may note that this arrangement repeats, in the opposition of noble
and commoner, a principle already exemplified in the seriation of the nobles; i.e., "vertical" status diminishes with increase in lateral distance from the ideological center—the station of the phratry chief—of the array of phratrymen.

According to one tradition, at least, the vertical dimension was also employed as an expression of social hierarchy: the centrally placed clan chiefs (bearing the subscript 1) were seated on elevated platforms. We note also in this regard that, in the terraced longhouses of the coast, the rear row would be elevated above the interior ones. The overall principle of these arrangements is expressed, then, by the following simple formula:

Analogy I. Superior:Inferior :: Above:Beneath :: Central:Lateral

The epistemology of this analogy will be considered later in this section.

Of course, if the marginality of the commoners' placement along their phratric walls is to express their lowly status within their respective phratries, then they must somehow be concretely distinguished en bloc from the nobles. At the present time, the bloc contrast between the dineezat and the auxtadinee is given its most precise realization in the order of gift distribution. Besides observation in the feast hall, my best information on this matter derives from a chief of the Laksilyu phratry at Moricetown (who has the title Hagwilnelh). When I spoke to him, he reported that he had accumulated cash and goods in the sum value of $550 toward a feast in which his son was to be elevated to the seat of his (the son's) late mother Gukhwokhw; a father is always expected to contribute generously to the elevation of his son, along with the clan and phratry of the latter, just as a son must contribute to the expenses of his father's funeral.
Hagwilnelh's account of the anticipated feast procedure reveals three overall stages in the distributions. Each stage marks a distinct category of Carrier social structure. The first presentations single out the "big names," the clan chiefs. With the Gilserhyu phratry as hosts occupying the center floor, as would obtain with the elevation of a new Gukhwokhw, the precise sequence of distributions among the clan chiefs is as follows.

First, presentations are made to the three Gitamtan clan chiefs seated on the "left side" (lefthand wall reckoned from the doorway):

1. **Gistehwa**, chief of the House in the Middle of Many; (hereafter, Middle House).
3. **Medeek**, chief of the House of the Big Center Beam; (hereafter, Big Beam House).

Next, at the end wall, the Laksamshu clan chiefs:

1. **Smogehlghem**, chief of the Sun House.
2. **Sa'bek**, mother of the present Smogehlghem and wife of Gistehwa.
3. **Kweese**, chief of Beaver House.

Finally, the presentations are made to the three Laksilyu clan chiefs along the righthand wall:

1. **Hagwilnelh**, House of Many Eyes.
2. **Widak'kwats**, House Beside the Fire; (hereafter, Fire House).
3. **Widalh-kyet**, House on Top of a Flat Rock; (hereafter, Flat Rock House).

Following these presentations, the second stage completes the
dineeza'. Hagwilnelh stated, "Then they finish the outside row; the rest of the dineeza'." This implies that in the present large Moricetown community hall, all dineeza' are accommodated along the rear row without resorting to the extra row of Jenness' time. This stage is initiated with the presentation of gifts to the dineeza' of the phratry of the father of the deceased Gukhwokhw (her halsut). In the present case this was Laksilyu (the same as the halsut of the intended heir). The distributional sequence here reverses the direction of the first stage, moving now from Laksilyu to Laksamshu and finally to Gitamtan until the dineeza' are completed.

Thus, only when all the dineeza' have received their gifts does the third stage of the distribution among the auxtadinee commence. Here again the halsut are singled out as first to receive; that is, when the distributions to the dineeza' are completed, they return to the Laksilyu commoners of the "inside row." When this row is completed among the halsut, the order of the remaining distributions among the commoners "doesn't matter."

An important matter on which I am as yet rather unclear concerns the way in which the heirs apparent receive their gifts. I am constrained to report only an impression; that each receives his presentation immediately following the bearer of the title to which he is presumed successor. This procedure would not greatly blunt the expression of hierarchical distinctions among the senior dineeza' themselves since these are still separated as a group from their respective successors through the separation of rows (i.e., the heirs are still placed in the inside row; as Hagwilnelh's account would imply, and as I have witnessed at Moricetown
and Hagwilget, there are presently only two rows used along both sides and rear wall).

For the present I wish to focus—in connection with Hagwilnelh's account—on the fact that the order of prestational distribution effects a categorical separation between the dineezə' and the auxtadinee. Thus, I can somewhat extend the first analogical formula and add the dimension of temporal order:

**Analogy II.** Superior:Inferior::(Above:Beneath::Central:
Lateral)::Before:After)

I have bracketed-off the visible expressions of the middle analogy thus: "[[]]." In connection with the opposition of the categories dineezə'/auxtadinee, their separation is given concrete visible manifestation only through the separation manifest between them in the temporal order. That is, the visible expression of the social parameters, superior/inferior, are made evident only through their conjunction to an order in time. The bracket "(())" isolates the dyad superior/inferior from the others both in order to reserve it for applications external to the ceremonial arrangements per se, and to assert that—unlike the dyads enclosed within these brackets—it is not proper to either of the dimensions of visual space or temporal order.

I would note, parenthetically, that the marking of the classes is given emphasis through the public announcement (exact prestations being stated) of all distributions to nobles, whereas only those commoners of the halsut who performed special functions in the funeral proceedings might be so honoured. This derives from observing funeral feasts in Hagwilget and Moricetown.
In sum, then, differentiation of the dineeza' and auxtadinee categories was given concrete expression in the feast hall through the structuring of the distribution of prestations (and announcements), and the structure itself is expressed in Analogy II. What I hope to demonstrate now, however, is that these expressions assert more than a mere categorical differentiation; they display—as well—much of what might be termed the sociological content of the categorical contrast. Specifically, the structuring of these concrete differentia assert something of the nature of the ideal meta-ceremonial relations between the opposed categories. Spatial and temporal arrangements within the feast hall represent symbol systems which carry connotations beyond merely denoting the categorical elements of Carrier social structure.

Let us consider, then, what connotations we might find in the ritually asserted analogical matching of the categories dineeza'/auxtadinee with, respectively, the elements of the spatial dichotomy central/lateral. I make the claim that on semantic grounds alone, quite apart from any question of its practicability, an inversion of this analogy (i.e., to noble:commoner::lateral:central) would be highly improbable.

Locating the commoners in the corners of the hall (leaving aside those who crowd against the doorway wall and those who crowd the doorway itself) has the inevitable effect of somewhat blunting the margin of demarcation between the discrete phratries; notwithstanding the punctuation of phratic boundaries by the right angle of the house corners. Commoners are placed shoulder-to-shoulder with commoners of other phratries. One suspects that should an occasion arise where there is
some crowding in the corners, a certain amount of overlap may be permitted. The discreteness of the phratric groups is established most significantly with respect to the matching of the blocs of phratric nobles to their respective walls. Commoners of the various phratries mingle freely, after all, along the doorway wall. Recall, too, that once the halsut have received their gifts no effort is made to distribute among the remaining commoners in strict accordance with phratry; it "doesn't matter."

The specifically lateral placement of the commoner affirms a certain marginality in his identity as a member of his phratry. By the same token, the boundaries of the phratries as a whole are blunted by crowding (and possibly mingling) in the common corners, bespeaking the ultimate indeterminacy of the boundaries. The marginality of the commoner's identity vis-à-vis his phratry is clearest in the diachronous perspective; but the matter is complex and will require some space to recount.

Recall, to begin with, that Satsa'n's ancestors were described as "commoners without genealogical history or prominence." Thus, on the one hand, in his lifetime the commoner is constrained to trap and to do much of his hunting and fishing within the territories of his phratry, and through these and other labours to contribute to the household and ceremonial needs of his chiefs, to accede to their peacemaking decisions, to obey the injunctions to phratric exogamy, and if need be to bear arms

2. I have recorded upwards of a dozen contemporary instances of phratric endogamy at Babine and Bulkley, but none involved titled persons. It is still generally disapproved, but is tolerated among these commoners, as it would probably not be accepted among the nobility— even today.
for his chiefs. On the other hand, with the death of his body his name, and with it his shadow, drifts out of the ritual history, the continued being, of his phratry. True, his name might eventually be passed to a grandson or nephew in the belief--based upon some physical resemblance--that his shadow had returned in the child. However frequently it may have occurred, the essential contingency of this reappearance of a common name is established in principle by its rationalization in terms of special physical signs such as in one case, for example, a birthmark on the foot, and in another the possession of six toes (Jenness 1943: 538). Equally in principle, such signs are entirely unnecessary—which is not to say inadmissible—to the ideal of perpetual reuse of the noble titles.

Also, the sense of exclusive ownership which the phratries scrupulously maintained with respect to the titles of its nobles has no counterpart vis-à-vis the names of common men. It is emphasized that the phratry was ideally the outer limit in the range of shifts admitted to noble titles; it will be noted that we have already witnessed an exception to this ideal in the case of the title Gukhwokhw. But Jenness (1943: 489-490) refers to the ideal of "exclusive" ownership by the clan while admitting that exceptions occurred: "Although a title never passed, apparently, from one phratry to another, it was sometimes transferred temporarily, and perhaps permanently, from one clan to another within the phratry." Thus, while we see that there are, as ever, excep-

3. My own information confirms that the phratry "acted as a unit in resisting aggression by other phratries" (Jenness, 1943: 483). I have been told of a war conducted by the Bulkley Toayu against Prince George. It is said that their victory was costly in terms of crests they gave as payment to other phratries that aided them. We have seen (in the first section) that wars may also extend beyond the phratry, as such.
-tions to the ideals, it remains clear that the noble titles were regarded as valued properties of the clans and phratries.

The titles of the nobility each possessed its own history incorporating fragments—distinguished achievements and adventures—from the personal life histories of its succession of incumbents, along with its origin tradition. The titles—unlike the names of the commoners—are associated with specific rites of ceremonial display in song, dance, and narrative which represent its mythic origin and cumulative historic highlights.

The indeterminacy of phratric identity which is predicated upon the names of commoners by their placement at the lateral extremes of their phratric walls, where they merge with the commoners of the other phratries, is a reiteration of the indeterminacy of identity due to the liability which they have of being discarded from continued association with their phratry following the death of a current possessor. The commoner's name is at the margin of temporal disjunction with its phratry (conceived as a continuing entity) just as, in the feast hall, it is at its margin of spatial disjunction. With his new name, Satsa'n escaped the edge of oblivion at the end of the bench; he may yet acquire a new place and prominence in time as well as space.

The opposition of noble and commoner posed by the system of titles sets the commoner into a relation of marginal disjunction with his phratry, conceived as an entity to which is predicated the perspective of diachronic continuity. Lateral placement is the counterpart in a synchronic and spatial setting of the relation of temporal disjunction. I think, further, that the principle of the spatial laterality of whatever
manifests temporal transience has more concrete parallels. Temporal transition, experienced as the passage from dark to light and from day to night, is everywhere marked at the lateral edges of the world (the center being, of course, every observer) where the earth dissolves into the air. Likewise, the periphery of the field of vision, in contrast to its center, is unstable. In terms of solar imagery, further, the opposition central/lateral is indexically bound to the opposition high/low in that order: the sun, when most lateral, appears lowest in the sky and rises to and falls from its summit where centermost. In this context, the spatial opposition high/low also acquires the connotation of duration state vs. transient state.

Of course, in the feast hall the correspondences that we have seen among the spatial dimensions--central/lateral, high/low--and the societal dimensions superior/inferior (as applied within the ranks of the nobles as well as between the categories noble/commoner) are a matter of explicit ritual protocol. I have no evidence, on the other hand--by way of explicit statements—that there is any recognition among the ritualists themselves that the particular permutation central/lateral (vs. lateral/central) is an appropriate sign of the opposition noble/commoner because the two dyads, so ordered, mutually connote the ordered complementarity duration state/transient state. Yet surely such a link exists, though unuttered, as a contributing element in the sense of virtue, appropriateness, invested by all ritual participants in the ritually affected conjunction between the status-inferior common names and spatial

4. The Carrier word for high noon is dziyniyts where dziyn means "day," and niyts means "middle" or "center."
laterality.

It may be helpful here to briefly generalize and schematize what I see to be the mechanism underlying this unconscious symbolic structure. As between certain complementary terms, such as central/lateral, high/low, etc., which compose the lexicon of the Carrier feast seating protocols, on the one hand, and oppositions which denote the dimensions of Carrier social structure (noble/commoner, etc.) on the other, there obtains a series of fixed analogical relationships (see Analogies I and II) posited by explicit seating rules. These various complementarities, societal and spatial, connote—as features of their culturally conditioned semantic load (and perhaps rather more culture-free in the case of the spatial terms)—certain semantic associations common among them and expressible as additional complementarities (in this case endurance/transience) whose terms must be attributed in a fixed order to the terms of the initial complementarities (which figure as explicit terms in the lexicon of the ritual protocols). The theory here holds first that the order in which the expressed, paired elements of ritual (societal and spatial terms) may be associated with one another (and therefore relate as sign/signified) is constrained by the order in which each pair is associated with a mutually connoted complementary dyad.

Thus, to schematize, if terms A/B (e.g., spatial terms central/lateral) operate as ceremonial signs of terms C/D (e.g., societal terms dineeza'/auxtadinee); that is, if A:B::C:D, then this is so because ex hypothesi, terms M/N (e.g., enduring/transient), although unexpressed in the explicit statements on ritual protocol, figure in that fixed order as important features of the culturally conditioned meanings of each of the dyads A/B and C/D. That is, if A/B→M/N, and C/D→M/N (→ = con-
-notes) then the dyads A/B and C/D may serve as appropriate signs of one another, and their order of signification tends to be fixed. Thus, A:B::C:D, but -[A:B::D:C]. This theory holds, secondly, that even though the basis of the explicit sign relationships, in mutual and ordered semantic connotations, may be quite unconscious to the actor, it nevertheless determines the sense of appropriateness which he invests in these relationships.

Some will find it unacceptable that I posit the existence of a semantic bond between elements—e.g., the ability of lateral placement to be a sign of a commoner's name—which is constituted by a motive force that, since it is not expressly stated by informants, we must assume to be unconscious. That is, as between the sign and what it signifies, I say that there exists a certain unseen connection which is a manifestation of the ability of each to bear common connotations (a fact unnoticed by the actor). Further, I think that the sense of virtue invested in the protocols of spatial arrangement, in this case, or, conversely, the sense of incongruity which would no doubt be felt in the face of a reversal of the positioning of noble and commoner is in part a measure of the force of this invisible bond.

Is not such unconsciousness rather reminiscent of the intriguing paradoxes that have arisen in the studies of the so-called "split brain"? Sectioning of the corpus callosum\(^5\) results in a curious division between the verbal mode and other modes of cognition. Asked to name a familiar object which is placed in the subject's hand—he is not permitted to see it—he is unable to do so as long as he holds it in his left hand (whence sensory output runs to the right cerebral cortex), but has no difficulty

\(^5\) A stock of nerve fibres carrying the bulk of linkage between the cerebral hemispheres which may be damaged by cerebrovascular accidents.
when it is transferred to his right (whence input runs to the left
cortex, the seat of the speech areas). Yet, when asked to make ap-
propriate manipulations of the object--again with the left hand--his
response gives unmistakable evidence that his right cortex fully recog-
nizes, and is able to impose correct manipulations upon, what it is at
the same time quite unable to name. This merely illustrates that it
makes sense to speak of the possession by a person of cognitive patterns
which he cannot utter; i.e., the unconscious.

It is therefore striking that--in contradistinction to what is
most typical of systems of speech--the relationship between the sign
(e.g., seating placement) and what it signifies (i.e., the status cate-
gory), as we have seen it here revealed in an aspect of the feast seating
structure, is clearly a motivated one. Our present case-in-point should
have no difficulty in passing Ullman's (1957: 86) test of semantic moti-
vation: "Is there any intrinsic and synchronously perceptible reason
for the word [read seating structure] having this particular form and no
other? Whenever there is an affirmative reply, the word is to some ex-
tent motivated, i.e., self-explanatory." Ullman's further discussion of
the phenomenon of motivation reveals that, in the case of many motivated
words, there obtains a special relation between properties of the sign
and of its sense (especially resemblance), yet little if any ability (on
the part of the scientist, much less of the actor) to extract precisely
the principles underlying the special relationship. For example:
"'Totter' is motivated by some parallelism or analogy between the sounds
which make up the name and the movement referred to by the sense" (Ullman,
1957: 87). That is, while the typical speaker senses a special epi-
-conventional nexus—"some parallelism"—between such a word and its
sense, the exact nature of the nexus remains unconscious. Now, the
kind of consciousness possessed by the typical ritual participant of
the special relationship between the structure of social categories
and of seating protocol—and the sense of virtue invested in these pro-
tocols—is, I suggest, much like the speaker's consciousness of the
motivation which links the word "totter" to its sense. Thus, the quality
of virtue bound to such ritual protocols as we are concerned with here
carries an additional force for its participants as a direct function of
an unarticulated awareness of an epiconventional link between the ritual
symbols and their objects.

I suggest a corollary to the preceding discussion. To a point,
the greater the span and depth of such epiconventional--iconographic--
+ bonds between particular features of ritual symbolism and the domain of
spiritual events which they are able to represent, the greater the impact
--the sense of virtue--that it will project upon its participants. The
efficacy of ritual is its ability to gather images, like a cat's eye,
from widely scattered scenarios of daily life and thought. The feast in
particular is a focusing lens that collapses unresolved concrete contra-
dictions (e.g., is Satsa'n a commoner or is Satsa'n a noble?) and anom-
lous fragments of daily life within an embracing dialectic among the
categories of Carrier society (noble/commoner, phratry/clan, sept/phratry,
etc.). The dialectic of these categories is mediated, in turn, upon a

6. I suggest, incidentally, that the aspect of motivation in this case
resides primarily in the ability of the articulatory movements--or
of the speaker's kinaesthetic sense of these movements--to resemble
the body movements referred to in the sense of the word. The sounding
of the word "totter" creates a sort of an abstract kinaesthetic image
--in miniature--of the kinaesthetic structure of the word's object.
deeper dialectic conducted in the lexicon (and its corresponding concrete representations) of parameters and poles of Carrier (human?) cognition (high/low, central/lateral, enduring/transient) rather less subject to the temporal contingencies that afflict the realm of phratry, clan and sept. We have already begun to see how seating protocol is an arrangement of social categories in terms of such fundamental parameters. The remainder of Part I of this essay will attempt to show, further, how features of ritual may connote a rather wide array of extraritual relations by binding these to their ritual signs in accordance with the isomorphisms shared by sign and signified. Let us puruse a little further the marginality of the commoner.

The auxtadinee class, in spite of its marginality, is a full-fledged component of the synchronic structure of the phratries. The perspective of the uncertainty of this identity only emerges in connection with the ideology of the transgenerational alienability of the common name, and in his marginality cum exclusion in the feast hall. Otherwise, in his lifetime as we have seen, the common man was subject to the rules of his phratry and might even expect some share in its triumphs. Thus, whereas—in their synchronic perspective—the phratries have a complementary composition of auxtadinee and dineeza', and whereas these are dealt with in contradictory modes in certain ritual protocols (seating), must not we conclude that whatever is asserted in the ritual treatment of the one is ipso facto denied by the contrary treatment of the other; and notwithstanding the imputation of a degree of metonymic specialization to the dineeza'? For as long as the auxtadinee are there, and a part of their phratry, they cannot be entirely denied a metonymic
impact, albeit a shadow image, as well.

The marking of the phratries by the assignment to each of a specific place is a central feature of the expressed feast protocol. Commoners, in contrast to the nobles, are allocated to a lateral shell, at the ends of the phratry wall, sealing off the nobles from the zone of boundary ambiguity. Across this zone, the commoners of adjacent phratries are placed in unbroken continuity and may even intermingle as they do along the doorway wall, just as their gifts are not scrupulously distributed by discrete phratric blocs after the halsut. The contrast in seating of noble and commoner clearly establishes that the bloc of nobles represents par excellence the actualization of the ideology of discretely discontinuous phratries. Ideally the wall marks the phratry, but in practice it is the nobles who mark the wall, and thence the nobles who mark the phratry. But it is more exact to say that the bloc of nobles mark the phratry in one of its perspectives; i.e., in the perspective of synchronic discreteness and diachronic perpetuity. The commoners therefore, mutatis mutandis mark the phratry in its manifestations of transience cum transition.

The transitory perspective of the phratry is its history. The accounts of informants are a testimonial that the overall structure of a sept at a given time, both—as we have seen—with respect to its village composition (Section 1) and its phratry and clan composition (Section 2), has been generated out of the combined effect of the segmentation of earlier divisions in some cases and, in others, from the dwindling of a group to the point where its diminished remains are assimilated (recall Chinlac) within a more viable group.
I have mentioned that the Gilserhyu and Laksilyu arose some time ago by the division of a single parent group (see above, p. 87). An informant explained that they are now "two places" but had come "from one place." They had separated because "both too much money. Got it from selling beaver to Hudson's Bay." This tradition was related to me by a Babine man, but the same tradition surely lies behind the assertion of a Moricetown person that these same phratries are "cousins." I have also remarked that the Tsayu group was assimilated into the Laksamshu as a result of their losses, circa 1865, in a smallpox epidemic. From that time to the present, the Tsayu have held a dual status. Although, nominally, they remain a discrete phratry—in fact they retain their own hunting grounds—and are always cited when one asks for a listing of all the yeetach'nee, they are seated with the Laksamshu and receive their distributions at the feast just as if they were a discrete Laksamshu house division. Assuming—as seems likely—that the separation of the phratries by wall in the potlatch house applied in 1865 as it does today, then it may have occurred at that time, that the sad remnant of a group once proud to command its own wall were obliged to, as it were, cross the floor and join the houses of another phratry.

One revered lady in her 80's said that when she was yet a girl Fort Babine had only three active phratries: Laksilyu, Laksamshu and Gilserhyu. The Gitamtan, some time before, had dwindled out of existence. It was after the death of her father, as she recollected, that "some people get together" and rebuilt the Gitamtan phratry. Unfortunately, I was not able to obtain further detail on this crucial event. How was the reconstitution achieved? Perhaps we can never know with certainty,
but I suggest that it probably occurred through a mechanism similar to the initial creation of the phratries at Babine. I have already considered this matter at some length in Section 2. The following discussion from Jenness (1943: 584) will help to recall my conclusions, and add a few points of relevance to the present question:

The phratry-clan system of organization seems to have extended no farther inland than the Bulkley River and Babine Lake, the two districts that bordered on the territory of the Gitksan. Some Carrier subtribes to the eastward ranged themselves into phratries whose chiefs bore hereditary titles; and they even adopted crests for these phratries, or for the chiefs who presided over them. Nowhere, however, did they subdivide their phratries into definite clans, nowhere did their chiefs erect large semicommunal houses or giant totem poles, nowhere was society clearly demarcated into the three strata, nobles, commoners, and slaves. The nobles comprised only the chiefs and their nearest relatives, who were far outnumbered by the common people; and the only slaves were prisoners of war, usually, if not always, women and children, who married their captors and obtained the same rights and status as other Indians. So unstable even were the phratries that today they are almost forgotten, and only resuscitated when members of these subtribes visit the Bulkley River or Babine Lake.

This suggests what I have already noted, that the system of phratries was historically anterior to the clans, and to the full elaboration of the hierarchic system as well. It would appear that the phratries developed around prominent persons who first became seed crystals by assumption of titles and privileges—purchased from the coast—as pretenders to the chieftainship of groups possibly advocated with a view to the securing and consolidating of trapping territories.

But surely the instability which Jenness ascribes to the eastern phratries does not reflect a dearth of pretenders to chieftainship. Is it not more likely, rather, that it reflects an at-large populace

7. These first chiefs would probably have corresponded to the traditional Athapaskan informal hunting leaders; the "boss" or "big man" (Honigmann, 1946: 65; see also Helm and Leacock, 1971: 367).
8. Jenness (1943: 513), writing of the Bulkley Carrier, states "...the Gitksan, who in earlier years gave them many crests and crest paraphernalia in exchange for the skins of beaver."
reluctant to fall into line with the recommendations of such pretenders (who had no doubt the keen support of prestigious coastward neighbours ever anxious to export their system—if only for profit)? My immediate point is simply—from the viewpoint of the historic development of the Carrier phratries—that some minimal set of titles and their associated privileges were a necessary though not sufficient condition of the rise of the Carrier phratries. I suggest that, in a similar manner, the installation of a minimal set of titled personnel would have been a necessary condition for regeneration of the Babine Gitamtan.

But who were these persons? Could they have been recruited from the ranks of the dineez'a of the extant phratries, or even from among their heirs apparent? This is of course possible, but we must bear in mind that the phratries place a very high premium not only on retaining all titles in their possession (see citation, p. 134), but on utilizing as many of these as possible at a given time. On this matter Jenness (1943: 490) reports that "...there are more titles in each clan than there are people qualified [my emphasis] to fill them." Jenness is speaking, here, of the Bulkley Carrier, of course, but the same kind of report is very common elsewhere on the postcontact coast, presumably reflecting in part the toll of disease (e.g., Boas, 1916: 340). Thus, in spite of the priority probably given to having a fourth ceremonial division (see Section 2), we might expect—as long as other options were open—some reluctance among the dineez'a of the extant phratries to place in jeopardy the perpetuity of their own titles by surrendering their own nobles or the scions of the noble houses to the cause of the reconstitution of the Gitamtan phratry. Would it not cause fewer difficulties
to simply recruit from among the most able of those people who, to begin with, were "without genealogical history" to be ruptured somewhat by a move to another phratry? Was not this, after all, how the Carrier phratries had been created in the first place? This follows from the idea that all Carrier were actually auxstadinee before they assimilated the system of coast crests and titles.

Present information is clearly insufficient to allow secure conclusions. The hypothesis that the Gitamtan phratry was regenerated out of the ranks of the commoners of the extant phratries is based only upon reasonable suppositions. I postulate, then, that the Gitamtan phratry was reconstituted by a shift of personnel both vertically (commoners becoming nobles) and horizontally (from an extant phratry into the Gitamtan).

Thus, history has denied permanence to particular configurations of clans and phratries. The contingencies of the diachronic perspective—manifestly well known to the ritualists themselves—posit an antithesis to the image, carried in the ideal containment of phratic nobles within their assigned walls, of hard-edged phratic disjunction. History recalls the appearance, disappearance and reappearance of particular phratic divisions, qua phratry, often mediated through a dialectic between the structural levels of phratry and clan and of noble and commoner. Thus, a diminished Tsayu phratry becomes reduced ritually to a clan within another phratry. Conversely, the present Gilserhyu and Laksilyu may well have arisen as a separation of clans within a parent phratry. There is some further hint of this last suggestion in the fact that, among the Babines, the name Kwanpe'h-wotenne, "people of the fireside," is used even today as In Jenness' (1943: 482) time as a synonym
for the name Laksilyu. The Bulkley Carrier apply this name only to a particular clan within the Laksilyu phratry. When the Bulkley phratries feast with the Gitksan phratries of Hazelton, the Laxsel (Frog-Raven) group of the Gitksan is equated to the combined Laksilyu and Gilserhyu of Bulkley. These facts suggest that the latter pair of phratries, among the Bulkley and the Babine, arose as divisions of a parent Laksilyu group which had Gilserhyu and Kwanpe’hwotenne houses within it. When the split occurred, at least among the Babine, both clans became independent phratries and retained their original house names as phratry titles. Perhaps because it was the more powerful division, the Kwanpe’hwotenne also retained the original name Laksilyu as a synonym.

In sum, then, whereas the matching of each of the phratries with a discrete wall, in particular through the seating of the nobles, projects an image of clear disjunction among them, the diachronic perspective reveals that there has been in fact a continual interchange among these groups. One phratry may disappear, qua phratry, through its incorporation as a clan within another; others may appear through the elevation of a clan following the fission of an hypertrophied mother phratry; and still another may be regenerated as it were ex nihilo through a vertical and horizontal relocation of capable commoners.

The Carrier phratry has two faces. It exists on one side as a category of Carrier ideology, in which perspective it manifests the properties of synchronic discreteness (expressed, for example, in the principle of inviolable trapping grounds, as in its ideal discrete locus in the feast hall) and of diachronic continuity. The continuity is perhaps most strikingly expressed in the association of the phratries
as a whole with crests which project an assumed eternity.

At the present time, the principal panphratric crests of the Babine and Bulkley phratries are as follows (compare with Morice, GDR: 203, on the Stuart Lake phratry crests, given above, p.107):

| Gillershyu:  | Frog            |
| Laksilyu:    | Caribou         |
| Gitamtan:    | Grizzly, Wolf   |
| Laksamshu:   | Sun or Moon     |
| Tsayu:       | Beaver          |

With the exception of Laksamshu, all phratries bear crest insignia representing animal species, and the same is true of the vast majority of clan nettse as well. The sense of perpetuity conveyed in the name Sa (= sun or moon) is evident. The idea of organic continuity inherent in the concept of a species is also clear. This idea is dramatized in the following words with which Sa consoles his human wife Skawah whose mother he is about to transform into the limb of a tree: "The forests that grow on this hillside never die. As one tree falls another takes its place, so that the forest endures forever" (Jenness, 1934: 217). True, a forest is not as such a species, but I think the parallel presents no difficulty.

I might note that in contrast with the nettse, the personal crests (chanka) have a far greater admixture of representations of rather unique events or objects. Many of these are of unknown origin (e.g., "Hook," and "Back-Pack," Jenness, 1943: 508), others derive from known historic events (e.g., "Club of Antler," p. 506; "Forest Slide," p. 511), and the remainder from myths (e.g., "Sleepy,"9 p. 505; "Rain of Stones,"

---

9. "Sleepy" is the crest with the same name as the title Gukhwokhw, mentioned earlier in this section.
The nonspecies chanka which derive from myths must share some of the mythic quality of timelessness. In fact they frequently represent the kind of unworldly event that imparts the aura of timelessness, in the first place, to the myth. However, this is not tantamount to the more worldly mode of perpetuity conveyed in a redundant succession of daily suns, nightly moons, and of like individuals who make a species. A phratry or clan is such a redundant succession, an ideally perpetual stream of individuals of one tse, "one flesh." This idea filters the domain of the crests and admits only those to be elevated as clan or phratric emblems which share the image of continuity.

The second face of the Carrier phratry tells of its existence as an entity of history in which perspective it is revealed as a fragile child of time. The two aspects, ideal and perpetual on the one hand, actual and contingent on the other, are represented respectively in the feast placement of noble and commoner.

The ritual identification of the idealized phratry with its subset of dineeza', in particular, is rather precisely asserted through the fastidious confinement of these dineeza'—in contrast, as we have seen, with the auxtadinee—within the wall assigned expressly and categorically to their phratry. I must emphasize that the dineeza' become transferrable to the phratry as an idealized category, and vice versa. Thus, the sense of perpetuity predicated to the phratry (through its species crests) and to the dineeza' (the ideal of continued succession of the titles) become mutually supportive and is realized ceremonially in the central placement of the dineeza'.

If the more casual placement of the auxtadinee is a contra-
-diction of the general seating rules apropos the phratries, it is because they are fully members of their phratries. However, it is only with the idealized phratry that the location of the auxtadineee is out of step. The interphratric transition expressed by their mingling at the ends of their phratric walls, together with the sense of diachronic contingency associated with the uncertainty, in principle, of succession to their personal names become—in virtue of the contrasts in these respects with the dineeza'—the ceremonial assertion of the phratry in its perspective of historic flux.
2. The Centripetal Orientation of Chiefs

I will pass now to the matter of seating protocols as applied within the class of the dineeza'. In the analysis to follow, I shall be unable to account for every position shown in Jenness' Table of Peerage; anomalies will remain. These will be recognized as such, but the reader will judge for himself just how compromising they are to the overall case being advanced. I will commence with what is—relatively speaking—the most straightforward case: the seating arrangement of the nobles of the combined Laksamshu-Tsayu phratry. These discussions must be followed with an eye to the appropriate one of Jenness' seating tables, given in the previous section. I shall take the liberty of employing my own means of rendering Carrier names, consistent with those given above (Chapter 2, Section 1).

The rear row of the array of Laksamshu-Tsayu nobles reveals an overall pattern. The pattern may be discussed in terms of several interdependent dimensions. The first factor is an extension of an observation, already quoted from Jenness, which bears repetition at this point. As he remarks, the clan chiefs "sat together, the chief of the second ranking clan on the right of the phratry chief (i.e., the chief of the principal clan), and the chief of the third clan, if there were more than two, on the phratry chief's left" (Jenness 1943: 491). The closeness among these chiefs produces a distinct and discrete bloc of the most exalted personnel at the hub of the array of phratry nobles. This group is set apart, as such, through a contrast between the seating of these chiefs and the arrangement of seating applied to the remaining
nobles; and this brings me to the second aspect of the seating plan. The ordinary dineera', in contrast to the higher chiefs, are foregathered into homogeneous clan blocs.

The following schema represents the seating plan for the Laksamshu-Tsayu nobles, based on Jenness' tables of peerage:

In a similar manner, we may construct the seating organization of the remaining phratries. I shall confine the analysis to the nobles of the "outside" rows. Thus we have:

Laksilyu:

Gilserhyu:
These schema present two overall levels of contrast. Firstly, the bloc of clan chiefs is set apart from the remaining nobles, and secondly, the latter are collected into opposed clan blocs. I shall now undertake an accounting of the blocs of phratric chiefs; that is, I shall confirm that the chiefly titles are arranged as prescribed by Jenness' statement and, while on this subject, I shall incorporate what data I have on contemporary chiefly titles (in these cases using my own transcriptions).

The three *Laksamshu-Tsayu* chiefs are arranged as prescribed. To each of the peerage tables which I have reproduced and schematized above, Jenness had subtended an annotated listing of the corresponding titles. Thus, by way of confirming that the symbols $A_1$, $B_1$, and $C_1$, bracketed off as the bloc of *Laksamshu-Tsayu* chiefs, do indeed correspond to the chiefly titles, I include herewith Jenness' (1943: 494) specifications for each:

- $A_1$, *Smogehlghem* (Tsimshian word of which the last syllable means "sun"); chief of the Sun House (*sa yux*) and principal chief of the combined phratries.
- $B_1$, *Kweese*, chief of the Beaver House and now second chief of the combined phratries.
- $C_1$, *Klo'mkan* (Forest Slide), chief of the Owl House.

None of the remaining titles listed under *Laksamshu-Tsayu* are specified.

1. The name was translated for me as "hot sun man."
to be chiefs' titles. Information given me by one informant--Gistehwa, chief of the Gitamtan House in the Middle of Many (Khayahwa')--suggests that there has been a modification in the standing of the Laksamshu houses since Jenness' day. He was able to describe the placement of some half-dozen of the Laksamshu-Tsayu nobles as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sa'bek</th>
<th>Klo'mkan</th>
<th>Smogelghem</th>
<th>Kweese</th>
<th>Namox</th>
<th>Muht</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A2</td>
<td>B1</td>
<td>A1</td>
<td>C1</td>
<td>C2</td>
<td>C3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The clan chiefs' titles remain the same, but several positional modifications have taken place in the interim; there has been a reversal of the stations of Klo’mkan and Kweese, implying that Beaver House (Tsayu yux) has been eclipsed by Owl House (Musdzee yux) in phratric ranking. Also, if the placements of C2 and C3 given here are accurate, then there has also been some alteration in the placement of the clan blocs. Thus, C2 and C3 are Tsayu yux titles and may represent two members of a complete Tsayu bloc situated to the left of the chiefly groups, whereas these nobles were seated to the right hand side of the chief's bloc in Jenness' time.

The chiefly titles of the Laksilyu phratry in Jenness' (1943: 493) time were as follows:

A. Hagwilnelh, chief of the clan House of Many Eyes and principal chief of the phratry.

B. Widalh-kyet (Big Man), chief of the clan House on Top of Flat Rock and second chief of the phratry.

C. Widak'kwats (Grizzly's Big Dung), chief of the clan House Beside the Fire and the third chief of the phratry.

Gistehwa showed the following arrangement:
This shows that the present chiefs bear the same titles and are arranged in the same order as during Jenness' time. In addition, the titles to the immediate right of the chiefs, widziyh (= caribou), and khikh (= goose) are Flat Rock titles and therefore indicate that that house, at least, is situated as before.

Incidentally, the title corresponding to position B₂ in Jenness' (1943: 510) table is given as Dzi, and Dzi is cited as owner of the personal crest caribou. In this instance, it may be that Gistehwa indicated the seat by its crest rather than by its title. We may also note that the titles Widalh-kyet and Widak'kwats appear to derive from the myth of "The Woman Who Married a Grizzly" (Jenness, 1934: 129-37).

The chiefs' titles of the Gitamtan phratry are described by Jenness (1943: 491) as:

A. Whoss (Whale), chief of the leading clan Grizzly House, chief of the phratry.

B. Gistehwa, chief of the clan House in the Middle of Many and third ranking chief in the phratry.

B₁ Medeek (Grizzly Bear), chief of the Anskaski clan and second ranking chief in the phratry.

Once again, the chiefly titles remain the same. However, the rank has been modified so that the phratry chief is now Gistehwa rather than Whoss, who now ranks second while Medeek, the chief of the Anskaski clan, has

2. The house names are: Flat Rock House = Tse'kalkai yux; House of Many Eyes = Gina'khi yux; House Alongside the Fire = Kwe'nba yux.

3. Jenness' table designates Medeek by the symbol B₁, which incorporates the Anskaski within the House in the Middle of Many whose nobles are also represented by the capital "B." Today there is a sharper distinction between the two clans.
fallen to third place. Several placements were indicated to me by Gistehwa as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Whose</th>
<th>Gistehwa</th>
<th>Medeek</th>
<th>Djolukyet</th>
<th>Yuk’kulakh</th>
<th>Sawees</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B₁</td>
<td>A₁</td>
<td>C₁</td>
<td>A₂</td>
<td>A₃</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The case of Jenness' Gilserhyu chiefs is somewhat complicated by the fact that one of the Gilserhyu houses (Thin House) recognized two chiefs. The chiefly titles are:

A₁ Nedibish (Blue Heron), chief of the Dark House clan and chief of the phratry.

B₁ Gukhlet, chief of the Thin House clan.

B₂ Khasbhut, second chief of the Thin House clan.

C. Samooh’ (species of small bird), chief of the Birch-bark House clan.

The current situation presents two interesting modifications. The relative rank of the three Gilserhyu clans remains unchanged. The bearer of the title Nedibish is, as before, head chief of both the clan Yahtsa'-alges (Dark House) and of the phratry. The current head of Thin Board House (Yahtso'witan), however, is no longer Gukhlet. Indeed that title no longer seems to be in use. The present chief uses the title Khasbhut (= grizzly stomach) which, in Jenness' time, was used by the lesser of the two Thin Board House chiefs. Finally, the chief's title of the Birchbark House (Khai yux) is an especially interesting case. The present chief no longer uses the title Samooh' although he did so before he assumed his present title in 1946. In place of the title Samooh' he adopted the title Satsa'n (none other than the one assumed by the commoner who earned this name due to his special skills as a carver and gambler). What motivated the present chief in assuming the title Satsa’n
and what measure of status it had achieved before this latest elevation remains unknown to me.

That completes the itemization of all titles referred to by Jenness as chiefs' titles and the comparison of these with their current counterparts. I shall have some occasion later to utilize this comparative data. For the present, however, I wish only to establish unequivocally that the particular titles which I have separated out into the blocs of clan chiefs are precisely the same as those which Jenness has described as chiefs' titles.

The seating proximity of the clan chiefs does not of itself warrant the recognition of discrete chiefs' groups. That requires the establishment of some contrast between the clan chiefs, as a collectivity, and the other phratric nobles. In terms of Jenness' tables, the contrast is evident in the separation of the non-chiefly nobles into clan sets. In other words, with the significant exception of the clan chiefs, the phratric nobles are gathered into clan-exclusive sets, and are adjacent to personnel from other clans only at the edges of these sets. The boundary of the bloc of chiefs is somewhat blurred on its right side, where the chiefs of the "B" clans (see the Laksilyu and Laksamshu-Tsayu table of nobles) are abutted to the central margin of "B" clan blocs. In spite of this minor blurring of boundaries, inspection of Jenness' tables makes the contrast between the clan-exclusive blocs of
ordinary nobles and the clan-mingled bloc of chiefs quite unmistakable. However, in Jenness' tables these contrasts—whence we are able to discern the organization of nobles into discrete clan and chiefly blocs—are materially evident simply through marking of the clan identity of the nobles by the device of the distinctive capital letters. Available information does not yield clear evidence whether, during the feast, the nobles routinely bore insignia that could clearly mark their clan identity, and thence the overall seating structure, as do the capital letters of the tables.

Nevertheless, there are substantial indications that the seating structure among the dineeza' is given full concrete display through the organization of gift distributions. The evidence is again from the aforementioned interview with the present Hagwilnelh—concerning the anticipated feast of his son. Recall that the initial stage of the prestational distributions accomplished the presentation of gifts among the clan chiefs of each of the phratries in turn, wall-by-wall, before the distributions are undertaken among the lesser nobles, constituting the second stage of the procedure. These first two stages of the distribution, therefore, are able to effect a ritual display of the categorical contrast

^4. Although I feel that the evidence of a statistical demonstration would be more satisfactory than the evidence of simple inspection, such a demonstration could be readily performed. For example, the number of sides on which ordinary nobles (each noble has two sides excepting those at the ends of the entire array of phratry nobles who count only one) are adjacent to fellow clansmen, and the number on which they are alongside persons of different clans could be compared with similar ratios tabulated for the chiefs (in both cases across all phratries). An hypothesis of no difference between these ratios could be tested against an X² distribution.
between the two levels of phratric nobility, less chiefs vs. clan chiefs, just as the third stage—described earlier—separates the commoners from the nobles.

In the course of his account of the second stage, my informant Hagwilnelh added the point that the dineeza' of each phratry received gifts in separate clan groups. Unfortunately, I was unable to press him into detailing certain key matters such as the rules concerning the specific order of distribution to the clan blocs. I will offer some surmises on this directly, partly based on observation at feasts. Just for now I must register the very important fact that clan blocs are recognized as elements in the distribution ideology. The question, then, is whether—and precisely how—this ideology is concretely manifest in the ceremonial.

Concerning these proceedings I can offer several hypotheses. To begin with, it appears that the order of prestational distribution among the clan blocs of dineeza' is simply a repetition of the order-by-clan established in the initial stage of distribution among the clan chiefs. In other words, I offer the hypothesis that the clan blocs receive their distribution in their rank order. Thus, in Jenness' table, the A-clans would be completed before the B-clans and these, in turn, must be completed before the C-clan dineeza' receive their distributions. In the same vein I will assume that, among the personnel of a given clan, the receiving order is a direct and lineal function of intraclan rank as it is displayed by the subscripted numerals in Jenness' tables. At this point I would only add that I have little hesitation in setting forth these ideas since much of the scholarship concerning aboriginal North
Pacific Coast social structure has taken feast receiving order to be virtually definitive of the phenomenon of rank. Although other ceremonial events—speechmaking, dancing, etc.—certainly manifest ordination as well, they do not routinely provide us as exhaustive a display of the ranking personnel as in the dispersion of prestations.5

Bearing these assumptions in mind, inspection of the seating arrangements of the four phratry blocs reveals that, after the completion of each clan bloc, the distributor—in order to approach the first recipient of the succeeding clan bloc—must reverse the direction in which his distributions had passed in the preceding bloc. The Laksamshu-Tsayu and Laksilyu phratries are straightforward. The following diagrams represent the procedure applied to these phratries:

**Laksamshu-Tsayu:**

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\uparrow \rightarrow \\
B_5 \ldots B_2 \quad (\text{CHIEFS}) \quad A_2 \quad A_3 \quad C_2 \quad X_1 \\
\downarrow \leftarrow
\end{array}
\]

**Laksilyu:**

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\uparrow \rightarrow \\
X \quad B_3 \quad B_2 \quad (\text{CHIEFS}) \quad A_2 \quad A_3 \quad A_4 \\
\downarrow \leftarrow
\end{array}
\]

Thus, the broken lines pass from the last person of a given clan bloc to the first person (i.e., in terms of rank and, therefore, of receiving order) of the next bloc. The solid arrows representing the direction of distribution within particular clan blocs are in the reverse direction.

5. See, for example, Boas, 1897; Drucker, 1939; Codere, 1950.
from the succeeding (not preceding!) broken arrows.

The same principle of distributionally marking the discrete clan blocs by reversal of direction in moving between succeeding blocs may be observed in the following schemata of the receiving pattern among the Gitamtan and the Gilserhyu. These cases also present some curious modifications of the pattern of the first pair of phratries.

**Gitamtan:**

```
B_3 B_2 (CHIEFS) A_2 A_3 A_4 A_5 A_6
```

**Gilserhyu:**

```
B_6 B_5 B_4 A_2 A_3 A_4 X_2 C_2
```

What is curious about the Gitamtan arrangement is the positioning of "A_2." On this question, I will offer only a rather wary suggestion. It will require a lengthy preliminary discussion.

The Middle House and the Anskaski clan were conceived to be of a common source. Neither, however, was generally acknowledged to be the parent division (Jenness 1943: 485). Although they are nominally discrete, their common origin appears to have imposed certain constraints upon expression of their full autonomy. They do not manifest all of the various characteristics that mark the autonomy of most of the other clans. Only the Sun House and Twisted House, being also of common origin, manifest similar limitations to their separateness. Unlike the cases

---

of all remaining clans, these groups share common hunting territories. That is, a series of tracts are assigned in common to the Anskaski and Middle Houses. The same obtains in the cases of the Sun House and Twisted House territories. In other cases, each clan is assigned to its own series of tracts (Jenness, 1943: 581-3).

In the context of his outline of the Anskaski-Middle House territories, Jenness (1943: 581) makes the following observation: "Formerly there existed on Trout Lake a large potlatch house surmounted by the figure of a raven, the principal crest of the conjoint clans." Thus, as well as sharing hunting grounds, these clans share their principal crest. Indeed, in his table of clan crests, Jenness lists three, namely Raven (detsanco), Fungus (tl'eyhtse), and Weasel (nibey), as the common properties of the conjoint clans Anskaski and Middle House. Here too the Sun and Twisted Houses are the only similar cases. Although we do not find with these any shared principal crest, we do find that Jenness has listed a group of clan crests as the common insignia of the Sun House and Twisted House.7

Parallel observations can be made of the relations among these clans as displayed in Jenness' Tables of Peerage. The clans we are here concerned with are not organized—as the others—into discrete blocs. Instead, in the schema of Gitamtan seating we find that Jenness has designated the dineez'a of the Anskaski, and of the Middle House alike, with the capital letter "B." Likewise, in the Laksamshu plan both the Sun

7. These are sa = sun or moon, which is specified as the principal crest of the Sun House (Jenness, 1943: 484), nekhlh = whale, c'itsit = grouse, and weasel skin decorated with the neck skin of a mallard duck.
House and Twisted House personnel are assigned with the capital "A."
I will take Jenness' code at its face value. It would appear that,
although they are distinguished nominally, the differentiation does
not extend clearly in several significant aspects of culture in terms
of which other clans are mutually segmented (territory, principal crest,
and feast structure). Thus, these two pairs of conjoint clans are so
far generally from manifesting full autonomy that their personnel are
mingled and ranked within conjoint blocs to be dealt with in the
distributions as though the conjoint clans represented single ones.

Indeed there is scarcely much left to act as a distinguishing
feature marking the divisions within these paired groupings. In fact,
I have not been able to identify an item, from Jenness' data, which
might have served as an insignia or which might have materially mani-
fested the nominal autonomy of the Twisted House. Jenness does not
provide plans of the villages as they were during his stay among the
Bulkley peoples, so we are unable to decide whether there was an actual
Twisted House structure serving, at that time, as the residence of the
clan chief and as the clan feast hall (as was the case among the other
clans). However, his description of the abandoned village site of Tse Kya
(adjacent to the present Hagwilget) makes no mention of any Twisted House
(nor of a Sun House, for that matter) although he does speak of the re-
mains of an Anskaski House.

There is even some question whether the Twisted House has ever
had a fully recognized chief. Perhaps I should say, rather, that it is
doubtful that its chief was accorded all of the dignities that marked
the chiefs among the other clans. It is true that in view of the
following statement from Jenness (1943: 485) we must assume that there was some concept of a chieftainship attached to the Twisted House; he remarks that "The Twisted House of the Laksamshu phratry was really a part of the Sun or Moon House that separated off under its own chief [my emphasis] when the Sun House became very numerous." Yet, in spite of this general reference to a Twisted House chief, he is nowhere to be seen in the tables of peerage. As we have seen, among the Laksamshu, only three titles are defined as chiefs' titles, and these correspond to the chiefs of the Sun, Owl, and Beaver Houses. If indeed there was a separate Twisted House chief, apparently he was not extended quite the same ceremonial recognition as his fellow chiefs of the other clans. Manifestly, he does not sit among his fellow Laksamshu chiefs, set apart from the lesser dineezas of his clan. One must presume on this evidence that he was also not set apart as a full-fledged chief through receipt of his feast prestations with the chiefly bloc. I am inclined to conclude that a similar situation obtains even today in the case of the Twisted House. My informant, Gistehwa, listed Sa yux, Musdzee yux, and Ya'hostiz (= Twisted House) as the three houses of the Laksamshu titles; none of the titles were specified as belonging to Ya'hostiz, less still was any among them identified as the chiefly title of this clan. It is fair to conclude that on all counts the hypothetical independence of the Twisted House is scarcely realized in practice. In connection with the recognition of an acknowledged clan chief, the Anskaski clan is more expressly differentiated from its linked clan, Middle House, than is the case with Twisted House.
Although he employs the same capital letter, "B," as the clan indicator for the Anskaski chief, Medeek (he appears as B₁ in the table of Gitamtan peers), as he uses for Chief Gistehwa of Middle House, Jenness nevertheless specifies in his title descriptions that Medeek is the Anskaski chief's title.

The position of the Anskaski clan is somewhat ambiguous. Based on what is known of most Carrier clans, one may say that a cluster of features separates them from one another. Thus, most clans were distinguished through proprietorship over a series of hunting territories and fishing sites (Jenness, 1943: 488), the possession of distinctive "principal crests" (Jenness, 1943: 484; 495), and the recognition of a particular chief who, with his family, used the clan feast hall as his personal dwelling (Jenness, 1943: 518). In terms of these criteria, then, the separateness of the Anskaski and Middle House clans is only incompletely expressed. The seating arrangement of the nobles of these clans would appear to assert rather precisely a lasting sense of unity associated with acknowledgement of a recent common origin. This manifestation is extremely subtle. It will be best delayed until after our discussion of the general spatial manifestations of the categoric opposition between ordinary chiefs and the clan chiefs. We are now in a position to clear the way for that wider discussion by taking up the anomalous cases in the Gitamtan and Gilserhyu seating plans.

It is clear that the absence of discrete blocs of Anskaski and Middle House dineezas expresses, among other things, a continued recognition of the special solidarity—based upon common origin—of these houses. From this perspective, the placement of the two B-bloc titles,
Medeek ($B_1$, the Anskaski chief), and Gistehwa ($B_2$, the Middle House chief), give the appearance of a double chieftainship over an effectively single clan. In spite of the primacy of the Grizzly House chief, Whoss, who was the acknowledged phratry chief, this appearance could well have been construed as compromising to the ascendancy of the Grizzly clan. Could not the unexpected position of Djolukyet (= $A_2$) have represented a counterbalance against the double chieftainship of the conjoint Anskaski-Middle House bloc? Perhaps the placement of Djolukyet suggests the extension to him of a kind of liminal chieftainship. His location at the immediate right hand margin of the bloc of clan chiefs would of course mark him as a highly-ranked noble, but his removal from the midst of his fellow clan noblemen is surely a distinction that places him in the special twilight category of a second Grizzly clan chief. Thus, the Grizzly House offers a counterbalance against the ambiguous dual chieftainship of the Anskaski-Middle House bloc, by advancing an equivocal dual chieftainship of its own.

The spatial removal of Djolukyet would be made apparent, of course, if he were the first recipient in the second phase of the distributions among his phratry (see diagram, p. 161). It is not without parallel, however, if Djolukyet was made even more chief-like through receipt of his feast gift among the other Gitamtan chiefs during the first stage of the distributions. The plan of distributions put forward by my informant, Hagwilnelh (in Section 1), has the name Sa'bek included among the first-stage recipients of the Laksamshu. It is true that the perfect accuracy of Hagwilnelh's information is open to some question in face of the presently unaccountable fact that his list of first-stage
Laksamshu recipients does not include chief Klo'mkan of Owl House. If, however, his information is accurate concerning Sa'bek, we are then presented with a case in which a non-chiefly noble is singularly honoured by her inclusion among the chiefs. I would surmise that this woman may be extended a special dignity because she is the mother of the Laksamshu chief, Smogehlghem, and the wife of the Gitamtan chief, Gistehwa. Conceivably, though for rather different reasons, a special honour might similarly have been conferred upon Djolukyet. 8

I shall be able to deal with the case of Ne'k (slave)--listed as title B_3 in Jenness' table of the Gilserhyu peers--more succinctly. If Ne'k were placed where we would normally expect him to be, with the others of his clan bloc, then there would be no reversal in the direction of the distribution in passing between the last person of the A-bloc (Dark House) to B_3, the first member of the B-bloc of nobles. The seating arrangement as shown by Jenness, however, would require precisely such a reversal in moving between A_4 and B_3, thereby punctuating the completion of Dark House nobles and the commencement of distributions to the Thin House personnel. This device--if I have interpreted it correctly--is made necessary in the case of the Gilserhyu owing to the unique placement of the first- and second-ranked clan blocs. The Gilserhyu phratry has placed its leading, Dark House, clan bloc to the immediate right (except for the intervention of Ne'k) of the bloc of clan chiefs. The other three phratic groups have situated their first-ranking clan blocs to the immediate left of the chiefs. In conclusion, then, I suggest that the

8. This possibility is further supported by the fact that Djolukyet seems to have achieved honour through the remarkable possession of no less than four personal crests, including the crest yis which coincided with one of the two Grizzly House clan crests. Several other crest owners are listed merely as "kinsmen" of Djolukyet.
placement of Ne'k represented an accommodation to this modification of the general seating pattern peculiar to the Gilserhyu phratry.

Through the foregoing pages I have gone to some lengths to establish several important aspects of the spatial and temporal structure of feast protocol. First, I have argued that Jenness' tables of peerage reveal an arrangement whereby the nobles of each phratry are gathered into discrete blocs of two kinds; on the one hand, the group of the most celebrated phratry personnel, the clan chiefs and an occasional non-chiefly noble singled out for special honour, and on the other, the blocs formed through the segmentation of the ordinary nobles, the dineeza', according to clan. With support from my own data combined with those of Jenness, I have advanced the suggestion that these structural segments are given concrete delineation through a ritual gift distribution pattern which isolates the chiefly segments in the first stage and partitions the individual clan blocs in the second stage through the device of direction-reversal. The directional feature of the distributional proceedings is summarized below.

First-stage distributions proceed between succeeding blocs of clan chiefs in a uniform direction (Hagwilnelh's account, in Section 1, reveals a clockwise movement, reckoned in reference to the doorway), but require directional reversals internal to each of the groups. Thus, illustrating from Jenness' tables:

Stage I

\[
\begin{array}{ccc}
\text{Laksamshu Chiefs} & & \\
\text{Gitamtan Chiefs} & & \text{Laksilyu Chiefs} \\
B_1 & A_1 & C_1 \\
B_2 & A_1 & B_1 \\
\text{Host} & & \\
\end{array}
\]
The second stage reverses most elements of the first. Passage from wall-to-wall, phratry-to-phratry, proceeds in counter-clockwise direction, and distributions internal to each clan bloc move in a single uninterrupted direction. However, as I have already emphasized, passage between clan blocs is marked by directional reversals.

Stage II

These procedures, then, posit a series of contrasting blocs of personnel as the units of the spatial and temporal (distributional) structure of the feast. The ceremonially marking of these units is tantamount to denoting or, as it were, naming the categories of ideological Carrier social structure. I wish to show, however, that there are discernible syntagmatic features beyond this which are able to transform this set of linked units from a simple series of names into a rather

9. Here again I am taking Hagwilnelh's account to illustrate reversal of wall-to-wall direction between the first and second stages.
fuller statement. The syntagm emerges out of two salient aspects of the patterning of the bloc units: the first is the pattern of spatio-temporal relations among the bloc units taken as wholes, and the second concerns the internal structure of the units. The semantic analysis of these patterns will consume some considerable space. First, I shall examine the connotations that might be discovered in the spatio-temporal aspects of ritual which mark the opposition between the blocs of clan chiefs and the remaining blocs of ordinary dineezas.

Again, as in Section 1, we encounter an opposition of structural categories (clan chiefs vs. ordinary chiefs) in correspondence with the spatial duality central/lateral. Once again we also find that the semantic content of the Carrier ideologies concerning these categories of social structure imputes to them the contrasting properties of relative endurance/transience. This has the effect of fixing the order of correspondence between the terms of the two polar pairs. Thus, I wish to argue that

clan chief:ordinary chief::central:lateral

is a fixed analogical structure owing to the mutual connotation of the two pairs of terms of the opposition transience/endurance. In order to make this argument I shall have to digress into the complex subject of crests and crest prerogatives.

We have seen that Jenness makes a distinction between two types of crest; namely, clan crests (nettse), and the so-called personal crests (chanka). The distinction is complex and far from clear in some details. For the moment it suffices to note the prerogatives associated with the display of clan crests were—generally speaking—treated as the
privilege of the clan chiefs. Thus, for example, speaking of clan
crests in particular, Jenness (1943: 495) observes: "Such crests were
carved on the clan totem poles, painted or carved on the fronts of the
chiefs' houses, painted on chiefs' grave boxes, represented at times on
the ceremonial hats and blankets the chiefs wore at dances...." In ad-
dition to these usages, clan crests were frequently exhibited at feasts
through the performance by a clan noble of an enactment imitative of
the crest being. Thus, Jenness' (1943: 497-501; 505-12) tables of clan
and personal crests include several instances in which display may be
limited to these dramatizations. 10 There are even more instances in
which the crest is exhibited through a feast drama as well as on a clan
pole or house front. In either instance the following remark seems, by
and large, correct:

Generally only the chief of a clan might dramatize a clan
crest, whether he called it his personal crest or not, but in
at least two instances a noble below the rank of chief has
claimed and been allowed the same privilege...one receives an
impression that any noble might adopt a clan crest as his
personal crest, provided no other member of the clan was using
it and the chief gave his consent (Jenness, 1943: 501).

In fact, Jenness does not enumerate well in connection with this point.

In addition to the dramatization of the crest swan by the nephew of
Flat Rock House chief Widalh-kyet (see ff. 10 ), there are several clan
crests which appear on poles or houses which are also dramatized as the
personal crests of nobles beneath chiefly rank. These include:

1) Clan crest wolf which appears on Grizzly House pole;
and was dramatized by Djolukyet, second ranked title in the
clan (Jenness, 1943: 497, 505).

10. Moose; Owl House clan crest and personal crest of chief Klo'mkan.
Crane; Thin House clan crest and personal crest of Chief Khasbut.
Swan; Flat Rock House clan crest and personal crest of Negupte,
nephew of chief Widalh-kyet. Whale; clan crest dramatized by chief
Smogehlghen, but not classed also as a personal crest.
2) Clan crest raven (detsanco) which appears on the front of the clan chief's house and on a pole situated on the hunting grounds of the conjoint Anskaski-Middle House. It was also dramatized by the bearer of the title of the same name, to which the crest was thus permanently fixed. Jenness (1943: 497, 596, 581) listed the title ninth in rank in the clan.

3) Clan crest frog was painted on the door of Thin House and was dramatized as the personal crest of Kanau who was listed eighth in his clan (Jenness, 1943: 498, 509).

4) Clan crest Mountain Man (Gitamskanese) appeared on the House of Many Eyes' totem pole, and was dramatized by the person who bore the corresponding title, whom Jenness (1943: 499) describes as "the heir of the clan chief."

5) Clan crest otter also appeared on the House of Many Eyes' pole and was dramatized as the personal crest of Malhalhaks, ranked third in his clan.

Thus, there are not two but at least six instances of crests listed as clan crests which are also listed as personal crests of nobles of sub-chiefly rank whose prerogative it therefore was to represent the crest beings at feasts through imitative dramatizations. Of course, there are a number of cases of clan crests dramatized by the clan chiefs themselves. These include the following crests:

1) Clan crest woodpecker which "would be placed on the clan’s totem pole, if one existed,..." (Jenness, 1943: 498). It was also dramatized as the personal crest of the chief Samooh' of Birchbark House (Jenness, 1943: 509).

2) Clan crest beaver appeared on the Laksamshu-Tsayu pole and was the personal crest of chief Kweese (Jenness, 1943: 500, 512).

3) Clan crest whale was not regarded as the personal crest of chief Smogehlghem although he had the privilege, as chief, of portraying it through a feast dramatization. There is no stipulation that this crest would necessarily have appeared on a clan pole had one existed--as is specified of the Sun House crest sa (sun or moon) (Jenness, 1943: 500).
4) Clan crest grouse has two associated feast portrayals. First, as a clan crest it was dramatized by chief Smogehlghem as an integral feature of his display of the crest whale (Jenness, 1943: 500). On occasion he enacted the same crest being differently, and regarded it then as his personal crest (Jenness, 1943: 511).

In addition to the clan crests cited above, there were many others which were displayed on poles, house fronts, or on ceremonial garments (e.g., weasel skin decorated with the neck of mallard duck; see Jenness, 1943: 500), but which had no associated feast dramatization. The crests owl of Owl House, and eagle of Beaver phratry are examples of this type (Jenness, 1943: 500).

It is clear from these data that all crests classed as clan crests, excepting only the crest swan cited below, have at least one and frequently more of their display manifestations associated clearly with the office of clan chief. This nexus is apparent when Jenness speaks of the representation of clan crests specifically on the houses, grave boxes, and ceremonial gear of the chiefs. Totem poles, and hence the clan crests mounted upon them, are thought of virtually as the chief's property. The raising of poles bearing clan crests was the privilege of the clan chiefs. For example:

Both these crests [Beaver and Eagle] were represented on the totem pole of the combined Laksamshu and Beaver phratries in the Hagwilgate Canyon, a pole erected about 1865 by a chief of the Beaver phratry, Kwi's [Kweese], or as he re-named himself, Bini...he named it Fireweed (gila's), after the principal crest of the Gitksan phratry that equated the Laksamshu, caused the figure of an eagle to be carved on its summit, and the image of a beaver to be attached to about mid-height. The Indians removed the beaver after his death and placed it on his grave (Jenness, 1943: 500-1).

My informant, Hagwilnelh, spoke of Tl'eyhtse, the pole belonging to the
House in the Middle of Many, as Gistehwa's pole. It is also noteworthy that this pole is now situated near Gistehwa's home at a distance of some 40 or so miles from Moricetown. It carries the figure of sis (= black bear), which now seems to rank as a House in the Middle of Many crest (Jenness listed it as a Grizzly House personal crest), and the figure of an Indian in feather headdress holding a bow and arrow. The latter figure represents the crest Gistehwa (= bow and arrow man," according to Gistehwa himself) which was listed as a personal crest by Jenness (1943: 507).

Beynon's manuscript concerns ceremonials held in connection with the raising of a number of totem poles representing houses of the Canadda (= frog) and Gisgaast (= fireweed) phratries of the Gitksan Kitsegukla tribe. These poles are referred to throughout as the poles of the representative house chiefs.

In the same vein, all clan crests portrayed through feast dramatizations are either so enacted by the clan chief himself or, if displayed as the personal crest of a lesser noble, are then linked to the clan chief through one of the other modes of manifestation that I have noted. In sum, virtually all crests identified as clan crests are ideologically linked through one or more of its display manifestations with the office of the clan chieftainship.

Certain ones among these various clan crests are counted as more important than others. Jenness refers to these as "principal crests." Although he provides no separate listing of these crests, he makes scattered references to some of them. Thus: "The Grizzly, Sun or Moon, Owl and Beaver Houses derive their names from their principal
crests" (Jenness, 1943: 484). Also, "Kaigyet (a mythical monster)---this is the principal crest portrayed on the clan's totem pole in the Hagwiligate Canyon, and gives its name to the pole" (Jenness, 1943: 498).

We have already seen that the crest raven of the conjoint Anskaski-Middle House (p. 162) clans is designated a principal crest.

The sense of continuity which is predicated to the clan chief's derives most clearly from the imputation of continuity to the principal clan crests with which they are identified. The continuity of principal crests is established in the following statement:

In clans that had several crests, one (or occasionally two) generally ranked very much higher than the rest, because it was more deeply rooted in the local history and traditions. This crest was then as permanent as the clan [my emphasis], and deeply concerned the entire phratry, which felt toward it the same proprietorship as it felt toward the clan (Jenness, 1943: 496).

These principal crests, then, as the leading collective representations of their respective clans, constitute metaphors of clan continuity. The sense of crest continuity is most vividly asserted through the mounting of the crests upon the pole. One of the most important features of the totem pole is its ability to endure beyond the lifetime of its builder and, as such, to mediate the display of the principal crests ideally through a span of several generations. All of the crests specified by Jenness as principal crests are pole crests. Even, as in the cases of sun or moon of Sun House, owl of Owl House, and woodpecker of Birchbark

11. In the early years, figures were carved as masks and subsequently pegged to the bare pole (see Barbeau, 1929: 13).
12. I suspect, as well, that a chief who raises a pole may also be ceded the privilege of mounting upon it any personal crests he is using. This, for example, could well be the case with the appearance of the crest Gistehwa ("bow and arrow man") on the present pole Tl'eyhtse. This may also be one of the ways in which certain of the lesser clan crests have arisen.
House, where the crest did not actually appear on a pole at the time, it was conceived as a pole crest:

Sun or Moon (sa)--if these two clans (Sun House and Twisted House) had erected a totem pole, this is the crest that they would certainly have carved upon it....Owl (misdzi) --This is the crest that would be carved on the clan totem pole, if one existed (Jenness, 1943: 499-500).

While on the subject of pole crests, I suggest that the desire to carve the major crests upon poles or houses arises in part from a wish to clearly contrast the use of the crest-being as a collectivizing clan symbol from the possible use of the same crest-being as a personal crest for feast dramatizations. It seems that virtually any crest-being, including those taken as the principal clan symbols, may be taken as a personal crest either by the chief himself or, with his permission, by one of his nobles. In fact, except where a personal crest coincided (in name) with an honourific name, it could be bought and sold freely within or without clan and phratry. Where title and personal crest coincide, the crest is fixed with the title of its clan (Jenness, 1943: 501).

This is illustrated with the crest grouse which receives two kinds of enactment; one as the Sun House crest, and another as the clan chief's personal crest (Jenness, 1943: 500). In this case, both dramatizations are the prerogative of the same clan. However, the crest grizzly occurs as the personal privilege of Anskaski chief Medeek (= Grizzly Bear in Gitksan), who acted it in his feasts, and as the clan principal crest of Grizzly House (Jenness, 1943: 506). In cases such as these the impact of a clan crest dramatization would be somewhat attenuated where the same being is likewise dramatized as a personal crest. The existence of separate carved representations achieves an important divi-
-sion between the use of crest-beings as clan emblems on the one hand, and as personal prerogatives on the other.

Principal clan crests were therefore regarded as inseparable from their clans. They carried a sense of endurance both in relation to the idea of their long association with their clans and, just as I have argued in relation to the phratry crests, because the great majority are representations of living species (see pp.148-9). This sense of continuity was therefore predicated also upon the office of the clan chieftainship through its special proprietary rights with respect to the clan crests, in particular to the principal clan crests.

The sense of continuity thus projected upon the office of the chief stands in contrast to what the rules of disposition imply concerning most personal crests: "...it ranked as purely personal property and could be sold within or without the clan like a garment or a piece of furniture" (Jenness, 1943: 501). In fact, concerning the minor clan crests, we note a similar attitude: "...the minor crests, being of comparatively slight importance, could conceivably be alienated or even dropped" (Jenness, 1943: 496). It is true that there was some tendency for personal crests to remain bound to a particular clan owing to the fact that they "...tended to become hereditary, like the title, and a man normally adopted the crest of his mother's brother when he inherited that uncle's title" (Jenness, 1943: 502). Nevertheless, this remains a mere "tendency," a contingency counterposed against the rule which permits alienation of such crests from a clan. On the other hand, among principal clan crests there is the reverse tendency that the poles, or houses on which they are mounted, in time will rot and fall and must be
renewed in order to maintain the ideal of perpetuity. So long as these rules of crest disposition are not negated under the strain of these contingencies, they continue to convey to the social categories chief/ordinary chief the complementary connotations, respectively, of continuity/transience vis-à-vis the clans with which they are identified.

It is true that similar remarks could be made concerning one special class of personal crests: "Whenever a man's personal crest coincided with his title it belonged to the permanent structure of the clan and was therefore inalienable;..." (Jenness, 1943: 501). Jenness' lists reveal a sizable number of such crests. Nevertheless, in the case of those crests which are the exclusive prerogative of the clan chiefs, the so-called principal crests, alienation (from the clan) is categorically precluded. The personal crests are, on that score, a mixed bag. In sum, principal clan crests must not, and most personal crests may, be alienated from their clans. The categorically fixed principal clan crests are the prerogatives of the clan chiefs who are therefore set apart from their fellow dineeza as the unique bearers of the most important symbols of clan continuity, the principal clan nettse.

In contrast to the clan crests, the personal crests are in principle freely mobile with respect to rank position. A personal crest may, as it were, shift its rank by moving from title to title within a clan, or via shifts in the status of the title to which the crest is permanently (when crest and title "coincide") or currently affixed. There are instances of apparent rank reversals among Jenness' accounts of the peerage. Thus, for instance, he records that:
The Hagwilnexl who preceded his nephew, the present Hagwilnexl, as chief of the house of Many Eyes and chief of the phratry, lived originally at Trembleur Lake, where he was either a nobleman in the same phratry, or its chief. When he moved to Hagwilgate in the latter half of the nineteenth century he succeeded, on the strength of some marriage connection, in wrestling the title and chieftainship from its proper heir, Kela [which is shown as second in rank in Jenness' table]. (Jenness, 1943: 493).

In spite of the ambiguity of the expression "proper heir," the foregoing statement suggests that de facto shifts in the ranking positions of clan titles was a recognized occurrence. Comparison of the roster of chiefs' titles which I obtained from my informant, Gistehwa, against the ones supplied by Jenness shows two such shifts. The title Khasbhut has been elevated since Jenness' time, when it ranked second among the nobles of the Thin Board House, to the present chieftainship of the clan. And more remarkably, the once lowly title Satsa'n has now been assumed by the Owl House chief in favour of the title Samooh' which was used by the Owl House chief of Jenness' time.

It has been argued that whatever projects a connotation of relative constancy in a diachronic perspective will tend to orient spatially toward a position of centrality. Perhaps it is more precise to say that, in a system of elements, the one which is regarded as most permanently affixed within the frame of reference that defines the system will be taken to establish the central position in a spatial distribution of those elements. This last statement summarizes the meaning represented in the placement of the clan chiefs. That is, the fact that the chiefs enjoy certain exclusive prerogatives in relation to the special class of inalienable clan crests results in an associational transfer

13. Note also the attempts of Gutseut to usurp the seat of Klo'mkan (Jenness, 1943: 494).
upon the office of the clan chieftainship of the same sense of permanence as is carried in the ideological view of the crests themselves. At the same time this connotation of continuity imposes a centripetal force upon the spatial orientation of the clan chiefs in relation to the positioning of the other nobles of their respective clans.

The locus of the clan chiefs in effect stipulates the center of the continuum of dineeza' of the phratry. Gistehwa expressed the spatial code of social rank in specifying that chiefs sit always "in the middle" while, moving away from the clan chiefs, the ranks are "getting lower." The ranking of the nobles, that is, is manifest according to the simple analogy:

**Analogy III.** clan chief:ordinary chief::high:low::central:lateral

The aura of continuity predicated to the office of clan chieftainship—through its special prerogatives with the clan crests—renders improbable any inversion of this analogical structure. This assumes, as before (see above, p. 137, et seq.), that the ordered analogical relationships as follows,

**Analogy IV.** enduring:transient::high:low::central:lateral tend to hold unconsciously, and for reasons bearing upon panhuman perceptual experiences: sunsets; edge vs. center of field of vision.

In contrast to the chiefs, the ordinary dineeza' do not, as a category, bear such inalienable crests. In this respect, then they are not as strikingly marked as are the chiefs by a connotation of permanency vis-à-vis their clans cum permanency of their clans. The fact that the personal crests, to which the ordinary chiefs are limited, are somewhat subject to rank transition stands also in contrast to the principal
clan crests which always mark the top of the rank continuum within the clan, whichever title happens also to be associated with the chieftainship at the time.

In summation, the clan chiefs are set apart through a centripetal tendency imparted to them in virtue of their exclusive association with the clan's principal crests. The centripetal force reflects an aura of duration and stability imputed to the clan crests. This sense of continuity is stressed through contrast with the relative transience imputed to the class of ordinary chiefs in virtue of their confinement to displaying crests which are regarded as dispensible properties (vis-à-vis the clan), which are subject to periodic shifts among the titles and ranks, and which contain a significantly higher admixture of rather contingent representations (i.e., as opposed to the near-universal representation of principal clan crests as living species). These contrasts establish the analogical relationship:

Analogy V. clan chief:ordinary chief::enduring:transient

This analogy is established by analysis of the metaceremonial ideology of Carrier crests. By combining Analogy V with the theoretically-based Analogy IV we create a sort of an analogical syllogism. From this syllogism we may generate Analogy III, which itself is merely a simple summary statement of the explicit ceremonial protocols.

I conclude that similar forces are at work in formalizing the placement of the clan chiefs vs. the ordinary chiefs as were held--in the preceding section--to be operative in the locating of the auxtadinee vis-à-vis the total class of the nobility (including the chiefs). I do not claim that the central positioning of the clan chiefs is consciously
intended—by the ceremonialists—to symbolize a quality of endurance in the clans which are metonymically represented, in their idealized perspective, by the office of the chieftainship. While this is certainly a possibility, the available evidence will allow only the obverse interpretation. Thus, although the ceremonial participants may themselves be quite unable to express its origin—except as an appeal to established tradition—the formalized spatial arrangements of the societal categories which we have witnessed to this point are accorded by the participants a sense of virtue or appropriateness which reflects, in turn, a strain to consistency in the relationships among the semantically-linked categories of space, time and society.

The foregoing explanatory schema of seating protocol has taken more or less at face value several notions which were raised in the course of the analysis. I shall pause here to explore these notions before passing on to further discuss the semantic basis of seating according to blocs of chiefs, and of lesser nobles, by their clan.

First let us consider more closely the concept of the permanence of the principal clan crests. I adopted this notion, it will be recollected, from Jenness' (1943: 495) statement that a clan's principal crest "...generally ranked much higher than the rest, because it was more deeply rooted in the local history and traditions. This crest was as permanent as the clan...." This statement does not warrant the conclusion that the principal crests of the clans are considered to be entirely coeval with the clan itself. At least in the context of origin mythology such is not the case. Carrier mythology accounts for the adoption of crests, clan crests and personal crests, through an encounter between a
human ancestor and a mythical being. Unlike the totemic myths common
elsewhere—notably in Australia—the mythic being which is adopted as
a clan emblem is not itself considered to be the originating ancestor
of the group. In the context of the Carrier mythology, the clans and
phratries which assume the myth beings as their principal crests appear
as already established societal divisions, and none of the myths recorded
by Jenness (or by myself) specify an adventure out of which a clan or
phratry arose. Consider a few illustrations.

The origin of the crest Kaigyet, chief crest of the Laksilyu
clan House of Many Eyes, 14 derives from a legend of the cannibal monster,
Kaigyet, which concludes with the following statement: "The woman whom
Kaigyet killed belonged to the Laksilyu phratry, so a clan in that
phratry made Kaigyet its crest and represented it on a totem-pole at
Hagwilgate" (Jenness, 1934: 222). Similarly, the origin myth of the Sun
House crest Sa ends on the following note: "Skawah had belonged to the
phratry known as Laksamshu, and it was from her marriage with the sky
god (sa: sun or moon) that the Laksamshu phratry adopted Sa as one of
its crests" (Jenness, 1934: 218). Origin myths connected with other
chief crests present the same picture: see, for example, accounts of
the crests whale (Jenness, 1934: 225-9), woodpecker (Jenness, 1934: 236-7),
and owl (Jenness, 1934: 239-40).

These accounts establish the ideological autonomy of the con-
cepts of the societal divisions, clan and phratry, and of the system of
append ed crests. Neither Jenness’ record nor my own information has un-
covered examples of myths purporting to give an accounting of the estab-

14. The house name "Many Eyes" derives from another myth concerning
Kaigyet (Jenness, 1934: 214).
lishment of any clans and phratries. It must be admitted, therefore, that in the mythological context the clan crests and the clans are not precisely coeval. Therefore the principal crests do not fully represent the duration of their clans since the clans are, as it were by default, ascribed an indeterminate historic depth but always precede the acquisition of the crests. I think, nonetheless, that we must take the assertion from Jenness that the Carrier conceived the principal crests to be "more deeply rooted in the local history...." at face value. It is sufficient that we recognize that in Carrier belief the chief clan crests bear a longer history of association with their clans than do other crests, and that because of this they are able—as representations of the clan—to display a sense of the clan's historic depth.

Lest there be any question that the principal crests of the clans must be regarded as the symbols par excellence of the clans, it should be noted that these (Jenness, 1943: 495, speaks specifically of clan crests here) could be "...tattooed on the chest of the clansmen [and], on the wrists of the clanswomen, by close kinsmen of their fathers,..." As apparently there were no restrictions within the clan

15. That is, while there are many legends accounting, as we have shown, for the possession by clans and phratries of their important crests, none of these speak of the beginning of the social divisions as such, or specify any founding ancestors. Morice (1892: 119) makes a similar observation: "...the traditional origin of the gentes received no definite explanation...." Carrier legends are, in this way, in contrast to many coastward traditions involving the adventures of mythic cum historic ancestors who became the founders of their clans: see, e.g., the stories of the ancestors Neegyamks (Frog-Woman) of the Neegyamks clan (Barbeau, 1929: 43) and of the warrior Naegt (Tongue-Licked), founder of the Naegt clan (Barbeau, 1929: 52) among the Gitksan.

On the other hand, Jenness (1934: 240-1) recorded several myths alleging the dispersion of various "tribes" including the Carrier, the Gitksan, the Sekani, etc. from a single place of origin, and the subsequent fusion of the Carrier and Gitksan into local subdivisions. The legends do not give any detailed accounting of the creation of Carrier subdivisions.
according to class, rank, or person in this usage, the clan crests must be considered to constitute truly collective symbols.  

The particular form of this usage is striking. The clan emblem is etched into the skin of its personnel. Clan representation acquires a somatic focus, again, as in the name appropriated to the phratry and clan crests, nettse (if I am correct in my speculation that the word nettse derives from a root morpheme -tse meaning flesh or meat). Thus, in the practice of tattooing, and perhaps in the semantic derivations of the word nettse as well, the concept of clan, yux, is represented as a somatic manifestation. That is to say, these usages appear to contain a symbolic assertion of principles of somatic differentiation and continuity which become articulated in the rules of matrilateral filiation and matrilineal descent that recruit the Carrier clans. The umbilical bond of mother and child is conceived essentially as a transmission of substance; of flesh. The basic Carrier principles of transgenerational continuity are illustrated in their origin legends of the tribes: "The Hagwiligate people are descended from a grizzly that once married a woman; hence they are always killing people. The Babine came from a loon; hence they are foolish. The Sikani...." (Jenness, 1934: 240-1). The descendants of marriages of human women and animals have human form (i.e., their

16. Tattooing is no longer in fashion. Nevertheless, the principal of universal usage persists at least in connection with the crests which I referred to earlier as the panphratric crests. As it has been explained to me, these may be freely used by any phratry member (but not by others) as the motif embroidered upon a jacket or on a bead necklace. In this account, no specific mention was made of clan crests as such. This may reflect what seems to me to be a considerable decline in the significance of the clan since Jenness' day. (The question of clan decline is approached from another perspective in Part II.)

17. A demonstration of this derivation will ultimately require the isolation of a morphemic, net-, which can, according to principles of Carrier grammar, combine with the root noun, -tse.
maternal form), but are characterologically differentiated according to traits derived from their animal fathers.

I have tried to show that the principal clan crests are set apart insofar as certain of their usages are the exclusive prerogative of the clan chiefs. In bearing a special relationship to the most important ritual usages of these otherwise universal (i.e., where used as a body tattoo) clan symbols, the office of the clan chieftainship is itself clearly established as a metonymic symbol of the clan. The metonymic value of these crests, as manifest in their use as tattoos, is transmitted to the chiefs who are ceded unique identifications with the other important display features of these crests.

We may now pass on to an examination of the meanings contained in the arrangements of phratry nobles according to their clan and chiefly blocs.
The Dialectic of Phratry and Clan

The discussion to this point has considered how the protocols of seating, and the order of prestational distribution, express certain manifestations of hierarchy within Carrier social structure. The basic expressed rules of these protocols (apropos the nobles of the outside row) are summarized in the following simple analogy:

**Analogy VI. Basic Seating Rules**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hierarchy</th>
<th>Seating Positions</th>
<th>Distribution Order</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>superior:inferior::</td>
<td>[above:beneath::central:lateral::right:left]::before:after</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As we shall now see, the practical application of these rules is no simple matter. Particular, person-by-person placements must be made in what may aptly be termed a dialectical context. With respect to distributional order in particular, the dilemmas of the practical expression of rank are extremely well summarized in a classical case cited by Phillip Drucker out of Nootkan history. It is a telling illustration, so I shall quote it in extenso:

During the latter half of the last century, apparently about eighty years ago, the Tlupana Arm Tribe, consisting of several local groups who wintered at Nis, moved down to Friendly Cove, joining the Moachat ("Nootka"). The head man of Nis stood first in the tribe; he had married a close kinswoman of the Moachat chief, and because of this relationship the latter offered him and his tribe a place at Friendly Cove. (The Tlupana Arm groups had been seriously reduced in numbers both through wars and the usual historic-period causes.) In addition, the Moachat chief 'shared' his potlatch-seat with his kinsman. For a time, when one potlatched the joint tribe, he had to give simultaneously to the Moachat and Tlupana first chiefs, and by analogy, to both second chiefs, and so on down the line. This was extremely confusing; both names and both gifts had to be called out simultaneously. No one was satisfied. Finally, the Moachat chief in second place gave a potlatch at which he gave to all the Moachat chiefs, from first to last, then began with the Tlupana Arm chiefs. The first chief of the Moachat then tried to establish another order: himself and the Tlupana first chief; the second of Moachat, then the second of Tlupana; the third of Moachat, then the third of Tlupana, etc.
This did not meet with favor; the Moachat second chief was really receiving third, the third fifth, and so on. Nor would the Moachat chiefs approve of a plan to give simultaneously to both first chiefs, then to all the Moachat chiefs and after them the Tlupana men. They insisted on following the lead of the second chief, each giving to his own first chief (Moachat) and his fellows first, then to the Tlupana chiefs. The Moachat chiefs were rich, and did most of the potlatching; whether the Tlupana chiefs desisted because of poverty or from tact I do not know. There came to be considerable feeling over the situation. Finally the first chief of the Tlupana potlatched, announcing that henceforth he would receive after the Moachat chiefs (and of course his subordinates received after him), so everything was settled...

(Drucker, 1939: 57-8).

Thus, the quasi-combination of these Nootkan tribes generated dilemmas concerning the appropriate determination of individual rank relationships and the expression of these in the order of gift distributions. The distinct resolutions entertained in this case offer paradigms of similar dilemmas inherent in the expression of rank (and other social relationships) in the seating patterns established in the Carrier protocols. What basic forms can we extract from the deliberations of the Nootka tribes?

At this point I must note that no consideration at all was given to any form of randomized system of, as it were, "rush-seat" distribution. Such a solution would obviously be unacceptable since it amounts to a complete dismissal of all ceremonial manifestation of the existing elements of Nootkan social structure; including the chieftainship and the ranking of individual nobles as well as a representation of the constituent tribes. Another hypothetical pattern not raised in the Nootkan case will be considered shortly.

For the present, by analyzing the structural principles which underly the various distributional systems considered by the Nootka,
and by then combining these with the basic Carrier seating rules just given, we can generate a number of hypothetical seating patterns. In so doing we may then inquire as to the adequacy of each such pattern as a manifestation of Carrier social structure.

Consider first the arrangement recommended by the Moachat chief whereby the distributional pattern would effect an interdigitation of the personnel of the combining Nootkan tribes. Applying this formula to the seating of the Carrier nobles (arranged below according to the basic seating rules) who compose the constituent clans of a single phratri, produces the following schema:

**Schema I**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>9</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Order</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phratry</td>
<td>B₃</td>
<td>C₂</td>
<td>A₂</td>
<td>B₁</td>
<td>A₁</td>
<td>C₁</td>
<td>B₂</td>
<td>A₃</td>
<td>C₃</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nobles</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Two aspects of this arrangement render it inadequate as a manifestation of Carrier social structure and, in all probability, caused its rejection by the Nootka as well. Most conspicuous, of course, is the fact that this schema entirely dismisses any expression of the clan subdivisions (tribes in the Nootkan case) as discrete and solidary segments of Carrier society. In this schema, I assume that gift distribution order follows precisely the rank order. Thus, whether or not the clan chiefs, A₁, B₁, and C₁ are isolated en bloc from the remaining nobles in the distributions, the distributions among the latter clearly cannot proceed according
to segmented clan blocs of dineeza'.

The second problem with such a seating *cum* distributional pattern was expressed, succinctly, in the above account of the Nootkan deliberations by the following statement (which I repeat): "This did not meet with favor; the Moachat second chief was really receiving third, the third fifth, and so on" (Drucker, 1939: 57). Obviously, the combining of the personnel of the social divisions requires introduction of many additional individual rank differentiations. The pattern of the mingling of divisional personnel established in the particular schema calls for the ranking of each individual, *vis-à-vis* those immediately above and beneath him, as a direct expression of their respective divisional memberships. Criteria normally applied in establishing and/or modifying rank relationships as between individual nobles (when these are co-members of a given social division) are effectively suspended in establishing the relative ranking of nobles who are members of the separate divisions being combined according to this hypothetical pattern. Thus, the rank priority of $A_3$ over $B_3$ ordained by this system is a direct function of the relative rank of their respective divisions and in no way reflects their relative performance as givers of generous and frequent feasts, for example. Nor, of course, does it reflect any rank
relation established in traditions originating in mythic times.¹

This seating pattern waives any attempt to give a clear representation of the discrete subgroups that compose the wider division. Neither does it represent an effective dismissal of the subgroups as salient ideological social divisions; they clearly continue as such as determinants of the ranking relations among the nobles of the combined division. It is an altogether unsatisfactory expression of the prevailing social structure. If applied to the Carrier feast, this seating order would not only suppress full expression to the usual criteria applied to individual ranking when matching personnel of the different clans composing a phratry, it would also fail to render concrete display of the clans as discrete and salient elements of Carrier society.

¹. The basis of the maintenance and modification of the relative rank among the social divisions as well as among the nobles composing them is an exceedingly complex matter. I cannot dwell upon it in this essay. However, it is fair to say as a summary conclusion that, among the Pacific coast peoples who engage in the feast, the feast record associated with the noble titles (the number, grandeur, variety, generosity, etc. of ceremonials sponsored by a noble), often including the record of past as well as current incumbents, is the single most salient determinant of their status. To be sure, other factors, such as successes in wars and general leadership qualities, were significant but no other matter in the content of the lengthy mourning songs delivered at the funeral feasts of the Southern Kwakiutl even approximated their obsession with the feast record of the deceased and his predecessors (for example, see Boas, 1925: 77-87). Similar factors obtain in the determination of the relative ranking among the various social divisions; tribes, clans, etc. Curiously, the actual occurrence of rank reversals among the ranks of both social divisions and of individual nobles did not deter the Kwakiutl from alleging that their order of numaym (an ambilateral descent group) titles had been fixed in the mythic period. Boas (1897: 339) observes: "At all festivals they [the noblemen] sit in the order of their rank, which is therefore called the 'seat' of the person. The legend says that the order of seats was given by the deity at a festival of the tribes, at the time when the animals were still able to speak." Following this statement, Boas appended a lengthy list of noble titles of the Kwakiutl tribe Mamalalégalá in their rank order. He unfortunately provides no data on the corresponding seating pattern. I am aware of no belief among the Carrier that the rank orders were fixed in mythic times.
Any circumstances in which the structural significance of the system of clans becomes so measurably attenuated that it is not ceremonially realized through some mode of bloc seating of the clan personnel would, for the same reason, also undermine the efficacy of clan identity as a determinant of the ranking among the phratry noblemen. In such a situation one would expect to find, rather than Schema I, that the nobles of the phratry—the superordinating division—are conceived to be arranged by rank, as ever, but without any regularized pattern of distribution vis-à-vis their traditional subdivisions, the clans.

As an hypothetical example of such an arrangement, given a ranking order of phratry nobles such as \( A_1 > B_1 > B_2 > A_2 > C_1 > B_3 > B_4 > C_2 > A_3 \ldots \), then the application of the basic seating rules would produce the following pattern:

**Schema II**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank Order</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>9</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Phratry Nobles</td>
<td>( C_2 )</td>
<td>( B_3 )</td>
<td>( A_2 )</td>
<td>( B_1 )</td>
<td>( A_1 )</td>
<td>( B_2 )</td>
<td>( C_1 )</td>
<td>( B_4 )</td>
<td>( A_3 )</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This, incidentally, is the other arrangement which, as I mentioned above (p. 188), was not raised in the Nootkan deliberations. I have presented this schema not only for logical completeness, however. This kind of a modification could come to be imposed upon the traditional seating structure if the system experienced a serious reduction in the number of persons participating as active bearers of titles and crests. Of course, a drastic reduction in the numbers of the participating nobles would threaten the survival of the entire ceremony, but one can envision a
serious reduction, short of that, resulting in the persistence of discretely positioned phratric groups with their reduced membership arranged into a panphratric system of individual ranking, thereby avoiding the humiliating display of its pitifully reduced clan contingents. I do not intend this as a gloomy prophecy. Although I have been told by one or two elders that they fear for the system since the young people do not seem to be interested, that seems to have been the case in Jenness' time as well. He comments, for example, that "so little do most of them regard their old clan and phratric divisions that they no longer insist on phratric exogamy or pay any respect to the clan chiefs and leading nobles" (Jenness, 1943: 513). Nevertheless, these divisions have persisted since that time as salient elements of a still vigourous feast.

Beynon's account of the Kitsegukla feasts provides a listing of the order of prestational distributions among the guests wherein distributions were made in sept blocs, with the Kitwangak nobles receiving first, then the Kitwancool, the Gitanmaax, and lastly the Hagwilget. Within each group, however, distributions were not arranged according to phratry. In other words, after the fashion represented under Schema II, distribution was conceived as following a pansept order of personal ranks without any regular pattern according to phratry, much less to clan (Beynon does not specify clan identity of the nobles). Beynon merely notes the walls and sections of wall to which each sept bloc was assigned without specifying individual seating. In the next section I shall consider some important questions arising out of the record of the Kitsegukla intersept feast.

There remain to be considered three further solutions to the
Nootkan dilemma. One of these, the first one attempted by the Nootka, called for the simultaneous announcement of the names and gifts of the nobles who were the rank counterparts of one another in their respective tribes. We can quickly dispense with this plan. In terms of the practical execution of the plan, it is even more difficult to imagine a way of seating the nobles to establish "shared" seats, than it is to imagine a satisfactory pattern of simultaneous announcement and distribution. Concerning seating arrangement in particular, it is not stated in the Nootkan case whether the rank counterparts of the tribes actually sat adjacent to one another (in which case there would probably arise disputes as to who sits to the right and who to the left) or whether the tribes remained seated in discrete blocs. In any event, the practical difficulties of expressing the idea of a merger of otherwise discrete social divisions through the "simultaneity" of distributional acts and/or through some form of "simultaneity" in actual seating seem insurmountable.

The distributional pattern (and most probably the seating arrangement as well) that was ultimately adopted by the combining Nootkan tribes constitutes a polar solution vis-à-vis the patterns represented in Schemata I and II. Neither of these patterns manifests the clan subdivisions of the various phratries as cohesive spatial blocs. In Schema I, as we have seen (see above, p.189), the clans are given a spatial manifestation inasmuch as the positioning of their personnel is modulated with reference to a pervasive system of interclan rank. In this situation, then, the spatial arrangement permits the manifestation of differentiation among the clans of a phratry without, at the same time, representing their unity (in the sense of internal solidarity) through
an immediate positional closeness among their respective memberships. Schema II, on the other hand, not only fails to manifest any perspective of coherence of the clan, it relinquishes all realization of their differentiation as well. Schemata I and II have in common that neither is able to represent, in any degree whatever, the perspective of the internal cohesion of the clans by means of the closeness of its constituting elements. If the Nootkan solution, represented below as Schema III, were applied to the Carrier feast, it would indeed assert clan unity through an unbroken closeness among the nobles of each clan.

**Schema III**

\[
\begin{array}{ccc}
\text{Nobles of Clan} & \text{Nobles of Clan} & \text{Nobles of Clan} \\
B & A & C
\end{array}
\]

In this situation, adherence to the basic seating principles of the rank superiority of right over left and of central over lateral, reckoning the center of each clan bloc from the locus of its chief, would generate an internal bloc arrangement (actually of secondary importance in the present context) of the following kind, illustrated from the hypothetical case of the nobles of Clan "A":

**Internal Arrangement of Clan "A" Under Schema III**

--- A_4 A_2 A_1 A_3 A_5 ---

This arrangement is not employed in the Carrier feast for the simple reason that it fails to adequately reflect Carrier social structure.
But why do I say this? Schema III clearly differentiates the categories of Carrier society: thus while the phratries are demarcated by their assigned walls, the clans are marked by the gathering of their nobles into blocs within their respective phratic walls. Such a schema fails, however—in contrast to the one recorded by Jenness—to project any expression of the quality of articulation characteristic of the formal relations among the clans which compose a Carrier phratry. In brief, the categoric differentiation of the clans after the manner of Schema III is purchased at a cost to the image of phratic internal cohesion.

Closeness in feast seating not only provides the mechanism for representing categories of structure, it also projects a metaphoric assertion of extra-ceremonial modes of social relationship among persons who compose these categories. As I will show shortly, however, such modes of relationship obtain within the phratries as well as within the clans. The problem of Schema III is just that, in manifesting as it does the special cohesion within the clans—as well as differentiation among them—it removes the nobles from virtually all juxtaposition with their fellow phratrymen of different clans. This seating cum distributional pattern, then, inadequately reflects the state of relationships within the phratry when in fact so many of the most important of the interests, activities, and properties of the clans and their personnel were regarded as equally the legitimate concerns of the entire phratry. Indeed, the phratry commonly is pre-eminent in matters formally of concern to both levels of structure; enough so that Jenness (1943: 483) offers the general conclusion that: "The phratries were the most important units within the subtribe. Though each was divided into two or more clans that had
their own chiefs and distinctive crests, the phratry overruled its clans in many ways."

I will proceed herewith to an examination of ways in which legitimate authority and interest are both allocated to the clan and often extended beyond clan bounds to the phratry, even to the point where the authority of the phratry formally supercedes that of the clan.

In an earlier chapter I have already considered the territorial prerogatives of the clans and phratries, but one point needs review here. Although trapping/hunting grounds were allocated for the exclusive use of clansmen, they were ultimately regarded as segments of phratic property, subject to modification under the authority of the phratry chief in consultation with the clan chiefs. This point is made several times by Jenness (1943: 487):

All the hunting territory of the subtribe was partitioned among the different phratries, and trespassing on the territory of another phratry without the consent of its chief led to quarrels and often bloodshed. Within the phratric territory each clan had its recognized hunting grounds that were theoretically subject to endorsement by the phratric chief and to any limitations and changes he might make in the interests of his phratry, but were practically inviolate as long as the clan was strong enough to resist encroachment.

Again,

The division of the fishing grounds corresponded to the division of the hunting grounds. Each clan had the exclusive fishing rights over the lakes and streams within its hunting territories, subject theoretically to the jurisdiction of the entire phratry, exercised through its chief (Jenness, 1943: 488).

And again,

Fishing places, and portions of the hunting territories, were often sold or given away in payment for certain services ... In all such transactions the phratic chiefs played the leading roles, but they could not act without consultation with their clan chiefs and principal noblemen (Jenness, 1943: 488).
Finally,

Through its chief (who was always a chief of one of its clans) it controlled the division of the hunting territories among its members and acted as a unit in resisting aggression by other phratries (Jenness, 1943: 484).

This last citation raises a second mode in which the phratry acts cohesively, again a mode that I have already made note of; namely, in warfare.

Similarly, where violence arose between persons of different phratries, the matter was not confined to them, to their families, or even to their clans: "Thus, if a man of one phratry murdered a man of another, the two phratric chiefs, supported by their clan chiefs, cooperated to avoid a blood-feud by arranging for satisfactory compensation" (Jenness, 1943: 519).

The principal clan crests, although they were manifestly clan-exclusive prerogatives in display, were nevertheless of great significance to the phratry as a whole: "This crest [the principal clan crests]...deeply concerned the entire phratry, which felt toward it the same proprietorship as it felt toward the clan"² (Jenness, 1943: 495-6).

Titles could pass from clan to clan within, though not (ideally) without the phratry; notably in compensation for generous assistance—in connection with a feast—from other clans within one's phratry (Jenness, 1943: 490).

The proprietorship of the phratry toward its clans and its entire personnel is very clearly evident in connection with the feast itself. Indeed, when feasts are given among the Carrier, it is not only

². I have been told, for example, that any member of the Gilserhyu phratry, and only members of that phratry, may adorn garments or bead pendants with the image of a frog. Frog, consequently, is a panphratric crest (Jenness, recall, does not recognize such a category), as well as the chief crest of the Thin House clan in particular.
the focal persons (e.g., claimants to titles) who are regarded as the hosts of the occasion, but their entire phratry. This is with good reason, of course, since all members of a man's phratry are expected to contribute some goods and/or services in support of him.

All individual contributors, together with a statement of the nature and amounts of their donations, are named to the assembled guests before the prestational distribution begins. On the occasion of the Kitsegukla feasts, the announcement of contributions proceeded first from the focal host and his immediate family to his other clan-men and further collaterally to the remainder of his phratry, and thence, finally, to those whose fathers and spouses belonged to the host's phratry. Thus, contributions are drawn not only from the personnel of one's entire phratry, but even from persons linked with these as children and spouses.

The pattern of Schema III represents very clearly the differentiation of each of the phratries into its discrete clan components. However, it does so only at the rather high cost of relinquishing effective display of the profound sense of intraphratic, cross-clan allegiance. In the round of Carrier social life, the clans which compose a phratry are not merely abutted, they are well and truly blended. In terms of the space-time parameters of feast protocol, a degree of spatial juxtaposition (seating) and of ordinal conjunction (prestational distribution) among the least units (persons) composing distinct structural divisions is considered to manifest a blending of those divisions--beyond their mere abuttment--when it is greater than that involved in the juxtaposition of only the border personnel at the ends of abutted divisional blocs.
The expression "least (structural) unit" warrants a tentative definition. To begin with, least units may be conceived as elements in a system of semantic categories in which the categories are arranged syntactically according to a conception of levels of inclusiveness. A least structural unit is one which may itself be predicated as a member element of a category at any of the levels superordinate to its own in the system to which it belongs. Inversely, whatever may be the elements into which the least structural units are themselves decomposed, these cannot ordinarily (i.e., other than metaphorically), according to the syntactic principles of the language concerned, be predicated as member elements of any categories which transcend the least structural units themselves within their semantic system.

In this instance, I have specified "persons" to be the least units of the domain of Carrier structural categories. It is perhaps more useful to understand the word person in the sense of persona so as to admit, where applicable, that a number of human individuals may, at once or in succession, constitute a single least unit of the structural system. Thus, for example, the aristocratic title (name) with its succession of incumbent individuals represents the least unit from the diachronic perspective. Indeed, occasionally titles are held concurrently by more than one individual.³

It must be noted that, while assuming persons to be the least units of Carrier social structure accords well with aspects of English usage, I cannot claim to have established exact parallels on this point.

³. Such is the case with the title Ghispin which is currently held legitimately by two members of the Gilserhyu phratry among the Babines.
with the Carrier language. In English usage, while we know that Gistehwa's arm is a member, as it were, of Gistehwa, we would not normally say that "Gistehwa's arm is a member of the Gitamtan phratry." On the other hand, certain superficially similar locutions might be quite acceptable. Thus, it might well be acceptable to say "Gistehwa's heart is Gitamtan" with an intention similar to "Tolstoy had a Russian heart." The difference between these statements, therefore, and what makes the latter acceptable while the former is not, is that they have quite different meanings. Thus, the first statement has, unacceptably, predicated infrapersonal categories as member elements (denotata) of social categories, whereas the second statement implies the existence of qualities or properties which are conceived to extend homogeneously to (and may therefore be predicated at) all levels of structure from the phratric level to the plane of infrapersonal categories (e.g., bodily and spiritual facets of persons).

Further, a statement of the kind "Gistehwa's heart is Gitamtan" would imply that it is in virtue of some such homogeneously distributed qualities that the phratries are internally bonded, and in virtue of distinct modes of such qualities that the phratries are externally differentiated. In fact, the suffix -yu which occurs in the names of the phratries and connotes an extraordinary, aidful power source (see below, p. 221, and also Jenness, 1943: 545), suggests a parameter of quality in terms of which the phratries are conceived to be internally bonded and externally differentiated. That is, the phratries are a unique flesh, matrilineally perpetuated, each bearing a special blessing. Unique flesh and special blessings differentiate on the plane of phratries
as they do on the plane of persons (who acquire personal -yu through dreams, guardian spirit visitations, or as elements in their title successions) effecting, thus, the metaphoric rendering of the phratries as macrobeings.

As I have stated, it cannot presently be established that in terms of the syntactic properties of the Carrier language persons represent the least units of Carrier social structure. Nevertheless, as persons can scarcely be physically decomposed while manifest as actors on the feast stage, they can serve well as the least units in the syntax of feast seating. I am in fact inclined to anticipate that the Carrier language, like English, will not ordinarily admit a literal predication of infrapersonal categories as member elements of social-group categories precisely because the person cannot be actually dismembered and his parts redistributed toward the constituting of another as can be done conceptually and has probably been done historically to the phratries (see above, pp. 146-7). On the anatomic plane, the integrity of persons is not subject to such historic contingency. They cannot be assembled from heterogeneous parts contributed by the dismembering of others (not even in the age of the organ transplant!). From the physical perspective, then, the modes of part/whole relationship are quite distinct as between the infrapersonal and suprapersonal (societal) domains. Therefore, it seems to me unlikely that this disjunction will fail to be reflected in Carrier language structure. At the same time, much of the impact of a metaphoric personification of the phratry derives precisely from this difference. The sense of a physical integrity among the parts which compose a person can be metaphorically transposed to the phratry, even
in the face of historic realities that deny it.

The dilemma which the Carrier ceremonialists have successfully solved is how to display the perspective of the discreteness of the clans without, at the same time, compromising expression of the sense of a clan-transcending interdependence which pervaded the entire phratry in connection with many important functions. In the feast seating structure, the juxtaposition among the metonymically specialized clan chiefs of a phratry—who are, correspondingly, separated as a distributional bloc from their fellow phratrymen—clearly asserts the pan-phratic mutuality which prevails in many functions of Carrier life.

We have also seen—notably in connection with the allocation of hunting grounds—that the phratry, through its chief, sometimes formally superceded the authority of its clans. This seems to reflect (as I argued in Chapter 1, Section 2) that the phratries antedated the clans as elements of Carrier society, and that is was to the phratries that the hunting (in fact primarily fur-trapping preserves) territories were first allotted. Generally speaking, the function of the phratry vis-à-vis its clans seems most aptly summarized as redistributive. Thus, in the case of the territories, the phratry distributes usufruct to portions of these among its clans, and retains to itself formal rights of disposition. This redistributive role of the phratry, through its chief, is also indicated in the following observations from Jenness (1943: 518):

Only a chief [of the phratry] could lead a war expedition, because no one else possessed the means to gather the stores of food necessary to feed the warriors from different places who assembled to take part in it;....

...he had to keep open house, as it were, to all members of
his phratry, to relieve the wants of the poor, and to support his people in their relations with other phratries.

Jenness (1943: 518) does not make it clear how the phratric chief was able to defray the cost of these roles except for "receiving with his fellow-chiefs the largest gifts at every potlatch." Beyond this, my informant Gistewha advised that the phratry chief controlled a supply of equipment and other commodities which he distributed among the young hunters, claiming fully one-quarter of their catch in return.

Thus, in terms of the full round of Carrier social life, the clans composing a phratry were well and truly blended through the sharing among their personnel of mutual support, resources and objectives. The separation of the discrete bloc of chiefs renders an effective summary of phratry structure. In the first place, the principle of distribution according to rank results in directional reversal internal to the chiefly bloc, reaffirming the heterogeneous composition of the phratry. This emerges out of contrast against the unidirectional distributions internal to each of the clan blocs of lesser nobles (see above, p. 168 et seq.). In the second place, the close proximity of the clan chiefs asserts the blending of the clans as a mutuality which permeates to the least units of Carrier social structure, i.e., to the plane of persons.

To close this section I shall take up one unfinished problem concerning the directional patterns in the order of prestational distributions. As we have already seen, the seating patterns recorded by Jenness permit the clear demarking of the salient structural components (chiefs, clans) of each phratry in the course of prestational distributions by the simple expedient of the directional reversals which
occur both within the chiefly blocs and between the clan blocs. Of course, these reversals occur as a direct function of the basic rules which dominate the seating plan; i.e., as a function of a seating plan which manifests the hierarchies of persons and societal categories in terms of spatial relations.

Concerning distributions among the chiefs in particular, the Gilserhyu phratry presents the only anomaly to the principle of the marking of the structural categories by directional reversals. Thus, assuming as before that distributions follow rank order directly, the following diagram shows that no direction reversal divides the two Thin House chiefs ($B_1$ and $B_2$) from the chief of the Birchbark House ($C_1$) but that it does so divide the Thin House chiefs:

Distribution Pattern Among Gilserhyu Chiefs

Now, the reversal principle could easily have been made to operate here by simply locating $B_2$ to the right hand side of $B_1$, as follows:

Alternate Pattern

This case illustrates that the structure of Carrier feast seating is strongly dominated throughout by the analogical rule \textit{central}:\textit{lateral}:\textit{superior}:\textit{inferior}. That is, although the latter plan would have effectively marked the differentiation of the clans within the bloc of chiefs,
it would have done so only at the cost of demeaning the status of $B_2$ in relation to $C_1$ by removing him a step further laterally from $A_1$, the phratry epicentrum.

A corollary to the foregoing interpretation is the subordination of the rule of the supremacy of right sidedness over left to the rule of the supremacy of centrality over laterality.
4. The Dialectic of Phratry and Sept

It was noted in the last section that Beynon's Kitsegukla feasts involved a gathering of four Gitksan septs (Kitsegukla hosts, and guests from Kitwangak, Kitwancool, and Gitanmaax) plus a Carrier representation from Hagwilget. Unfortunately, we have no comparable report of the proceedings at intersept feasts involving Carrier hosts. However, Beynon's report reveals striking departures from the overall organization of the intra-sept feasts described by Jenness and witnessed by myself among the Bulkley River Carrier. I shall assume, for the sake of argument, that these differences are primarily as between intrasept and intersept feasts rather than as between Gitksan and Carrier feasts. I do not think that this assumption is very daring, in view of the evidence that the Carrier feast has been largely adopted—along with phratry names, noble titles, and crests—from the Gitksan in the first place.

I have remarked, specifically, that during the Gitksan intersept feasts prestational distributions were made in sept segments. Indeed, we found that the nobles were seated strictly as separate sept blocs, each with its wall or portion of wall, rather than according to phratry as Jenness describes. In fact, nobles were not even arranged by phratry within each sept bloc, much less by clan (see above, p.193).

The present chapter is concerned with the intersept feast. I pose the following questions: why were phratric contingents not displayed as blocs within their respective septs? Perhaps more basic: why are the septs, rather than the phratries, ceremonially manifest as the supreme segments of social structure; i.e., as the widest or most
inclusive units of differentiation? I shall address the initial question first.

One of the factors that may account for the distributional form of not demarcating the phratic groups composing the septs is the fact that the phratries are apparently not formally ranked within their tribes. Jenness (1943: 485) seems clear on this point, in connection with Carrier structure; a formal parity among the Carrier phratries is implied in the following statement: "The chief of the leading clan was the recognized head of the phratry, and the heads of the different phratries were coordinate in rank, though the one who had the largest following might possess more power and influence." I have received similar statements from my own informants. Also, I have already noted that perhaps the premium manifestation of rank resides in the prestational receiving order. Drucker (1939: 57) states: "This order of giving was, from southeast Alaska to the mouth of the Columbia, the most important expression of the concept of rank."

However, we have seen that during the intrasept feast there is no notion of a fixed distributional order as between the phratries. It is my firm impression that the distributional order among the phratries varies according to which one is hosting on the occasion and, possibly, according to other factors such as which one is halsut to the host of the occasion. Only the privilege, ceded to the Laksamshu among the Bulkley and the Babine, of occupying the rear wall when they are not hosting has the appearance of formalized rank.\(^1\) It is clear, however, that no other

\(^1\) This privilege is extended in recognition that Laksamshu was the first phratry established within these septs.
phratry is given a fixed wall assignment. Thus, no order of rank permeates the entire company of phratries in terms of the allocations of walls.

I must stress that this conclusion does not preclude that each feast occasion may establish an order of priorities as a function of the particular relationships being represented on that occasion. Thus, it is possible that a consistent pattern of both wall assignments and distributional order will be discernible—given enough data—as an expression of variables particular to individual occasions such as the identity of the father's phratry and the affinal phratry of the current focal person (e.g., the deceased on the occasion of funeral feasts).

It seems reasonable to hypothesize that the idea of parity among the Carrier phratries reflects a similar ideal among the Gitksan. Given that, and given also that as among the Carrier the Gitksan rules accord superiority of rank to central placement over lateral and to right over left, then an arrangement whereby the constituent phratries of the sept segments are situated as blocs will project connotations that contravene an ideal of phratric parity.

This implication would be theoretically eschewed if occasion-specific factors (e.g., which phratries are halsut, affinal, etc., on the occasion) determined the situating of the phraternity contingents within sept blocs. I do not know why this option is not used except possibly that cross-sept phratry identity may be somewhat weak. Thus, for example, the

---

2. Likewise, although its meaning is not perfectly clear, Boas (1916: 487) makes the following statement about the Coast Tsimshian: "...in most of the myths the four exogamic groups are considered as entirely equivalent."
formal status of halsut may not be extended to the appropriate phratric contingents beyond the sept of the focal host. However, this possibility can only be treated with great hesitancy since, for example, persons of chief Wiseks' phratri but from a different sept did contribute to the expenses of his pole-raising feast. On the other hand, it may be that on these particular occasions the role of halsut is rather too attenuated to call for a special (and spatial) recognition. For the present, the entire matter must remain undecided. Future research should consider, however, whether these arrangements do not reflect, at least in part, a tendency for phratric solidarity to somewhat dissolve at the edge of the sept. But this matter runs into my second question for this section and I have more to say yet on the first.

In terms of Carrier social structure—I am less certain about the corresponding features of Gitksan society—a principle of phratric parity, and the dissolution of the phratries within sept blocs as a possible consequence of this principle, makes a kind of eufunctional sense.

Carrier society did not possess any mechanism of superordinating authority to which otherwise intractable disputes over phratric rank might have been appealed. Jenness (1943: 481) remarks that the Carrier septs recognized "...no ruling chief or established council....like other Carrier subtribes, the Bulkley natives were divided into a number of fraternities or phratries, each intrinsically associated with the others, yet politically independent." Thus, had the principle of ranking been applied among the Carrier phratries, unsettling disputes might have arisen, potentially quite volatile, with no formal mechanism to contain them.

Of course, disputation is of the essence in the continual re-
shaping of ceremonial expressions. Balances must always be struck in resolution of currently stressed oppositions among counterposed structural categories. Assuming that disputes concerning rank, specifically, are resolved by similar mechanisms of authority as obtain in the settlement of other disputes, then there would be a tendency for the focus of any opposition, ultimately involving persons, to rise to the highest plane of social structure within which the initiating persons are allocated. Thus, for example, Jenness (1943: 483) states that the phratry "...took an active interest in all the relations of its members with the members of other phratries, supporting them in their grievances and bearing the responsibility of their misdeeds." The focus of opposition can rise beyond the respective clans of initiating antagonists to their phratries.

If a dispute cannot be settled on the plane of structure\(^3\) at which it has come to be focused (that is, through an assembly of interested contrast units--per their representatives--comprising the focal plane) then it must be referred upward at least to the next ascending structural plane; where possible, to the unit of that plane, specifically,

\(^3\) By the expression "plane of structure" I mean a set of contrast units posited in the social ideology of a culture (e.g., particular clans) which, taken together, are conceived to subtend the entire spectrum of least social units posited by the culture (persons). The contrast units of a given plane are conceived to encompass mutually exclusive segments of the total spectrum of least units comprising the social system. The contrast units of a given plane are conceived to subtend, in mutually exclusive clusters, the various contrast units of the planes intervening between the given plane and the plane of least units, and to be themselves similarly grouped as proper subsets of the various contrast units of higher planes of the structure.
within which the antagonist units are mutually included. This formula is illustrated in the following statements from Jenness (1943: 485):

In such places [Moricetown and Hagwilget] the maintenance of peace and harmony rested on both the clan and the phratry chiefs. Each clan chief normally settled disputes that extended no further than his own little unit; when they involved another clan in the same phratry, the head of the phratry, counseled by his clan chiefs, settled them....

Thus, where disputes were focused at the plane of individuals or clans, they could be readily referred to the chief of the unit subtending the antagonists. However, where disputes come to be focused at the phratric level the mechanism of referring it upward to a more inclusive plane of structure is not available. Thus the following from Jenness: "...and when they [disputes] involved other phratries the heads of the phratries consulted, first with their clan chiefs, then with each other, decided the issues at stake...." (Jenness, 1943: 485). Even where structural units between which contention arises are individually subtended beneath distinct units of the immediately superordinate plane (e.g., conflict between clans of different phratries), an upward shift of the focus of opposition to the superordinating plane offers a mechanism for diffusing somewhat the force of the initiating antagonism by, as it were, diluting it within the wider structural totalities. This mechanism, also, is unavailable in the event of the interphratric dispute.

As is affirmed by the foregoing citation, interphratric conflicts were appealed to a council of phratry chiefs. Beyond that, the only possible direction of further appeal would be through a lateral extension of the council to include the phratry chiefs of neighbouring septs. The emergence of such panphratric (cross-sept) mutual support
could place great strain upon sept solidarity. Here again we confront the dialectic of phratry vs. sept. To what extent do sept boundaries, uncertain as they are in Athapaskan tradition, intercept the ideal cross-sept phratic identity? Conversely, in what measure does cross-sept extension of phratic identity threaten dissolution of sept integrity?

Thus, unless a particular ranking order among the phratries which compose a tribe is considered as at least ideologically uncontestable, the maintenance of a system of phratic ranking in the context of the overall Carrier social structure would tend to induce serious rivalry within the sept without any mechanism for effectively containing its divisive manifestations. The frictions of phratic rivalry are the more hazardous in view of the fact that the phratry is ideally the central warring unit of Carrier society: "...it [the phratry] acted as a unit in resisting aggression by other phratries" (Jenness, 1943: 483).

Thus, contests of rank among the phratries would tend to place the structure of Carrier society under great strain.

At the same time, the distributions among the guest septs at the Kitsegukla feasts were made to the septs en bloc, in a specific and consistent order (see Beynon, 1943). Beynon gives no indication whether the receiving order among the guest septs represents:

1. a widely accepted fixed rank order, or as seems more likely, that
2. it is merely the current standing in a continuing contest waged around criteria concerning the collective (however reckoned) feast

---

4. An assumption of uncontestability might, for example, be supported by a theory of mythic preordination. I have found no evidence of such a mythological sanctioning of the order of titles among Carrier nobles, less still among the phratries.

5. According to accounts appearing in the Coast Tsimshian mythology, their phratries were also warring units (see Boas, 1916: 260; 270).
record of the competing septs, or, again, whether

3. It reflects a form of recognition on the part of the host group, and is therefore subject to highly variable determinants.

In any event, intersept rivalries would seem to impose a less volatile situation. Thus, while it is true that at least among the Bulkley Carrier the phratries "...united at times to repel a common danger" (Jenness, 1943: 481), it is also true that they recognized among them "...no ruling chief or established council to control the actions of the different families and govern their relations with the outside world" (Jenness, 1943: 481). Indeed, "they [the Bulkley phratries] associated at will with foreign peoples even when these might be hostile to others of their countrymen" (Jenness, 1943: 481-2). Thus, while the sept can unite in a consolidated effort of mutual defense (as was argued in Chapter 1, Section 1), it lacks any office of a chieftainship, or an institutionalized tribal council specialized to coordinate such collective efforts. The sept, lacking any such institution—and bear in mind its traditional Athapaskan indefiniteness (Chapter 1, Section 2)—is therefore without an enunciated sense of permanence. Whatever other functions it may perform, the existence of such a formal office, chartered with regulations concerning the succession of its incumbents, clearly predicates an ideal of continuity to the totality which the office

6. George Hunt's information suggests that 13 of the Southern Kwakiutl tribes ranked one another according to principles centering around feast performance, must have varied somewhat according to the judgment of a particular host (who, I will assume, had the formal obligation of making such judgments as well as the need to exercise great tact in rendering them) on a particular occasion. This view of ranking among the Southern Kwakiutl tribes is my own. Helen Codere's interpretations are interesting but are unable, as she recognizes, to resolve certain apparent contradictions in Boas' data (Codere, 1950: Chapter 3 and p. 64 in particular).
represents. It is in contrast with the phratry especially, which for its part possesses a chief's office and which occupies the same plane of structure (see ff. p. 211) as the sept, that the Carrier concept of the sept takes on an air of contingency.

Social structure manifests a gestalt. Where two terms (i.e., two categories of social structure such as sept and phratry) are on the same plane of structure and, other things being equal, one of these carries an aura of greater permanence than the other, then it will be stressed in relation to that other. A culture participant will tend to invest the greater measure of his sense of personal significance, or personal identity, in whichever of the societal categories projects the more forceful image of continuity. This argument implies that, in a hypothetical situation in which a participant's loyalty to his acephalic sept is placed in opposition to his loyalty to his phratry (at least to the intrasept segment of the phratry and perhaps beyond), he will tend to lend his support to the latter. Correspondingly, and nearer to my immediate point, this factor of relative stress may cause a greater evocation among participants of a contest which centers its opposition among social divisions that represent the accented structural term (e.g., among the Carrier phratries) than would occur where opposition centered on divisions representing the unstressed term (e.g., the Carrier septs). In other words, according to the hypothesis, a contest of rank among the Carrier phratries would tend to be more evocative to its participants and hence more liable to produce unsettling disputation than would similar contests among the Carrier septs. The flavour of this relationship of relative accent between phratry and sept is illustrated in the following
statement from Jenness (1943: 483): "The first question asked of a stranger (if it were not apparent from his dress or tattooing), was not 'what clan does he belong to,' or even 'what subtribe [sept] does he belong to,' but 'what is his phratry?"

Having offered this argument on an "other things being equal" basis, I must now pause to recognize one important respect in which they are not. The ideological sense of continuity projected by the phratry is somewhat blunted, among the Carrier, in view of the de facto historic antiquity of the system of septs. Sept identity, therefore, counterposed against the phratry, must carry rather greater force than would otherwise be expected.

An overall ideological stress on the phratry must somewhat impede any tendency toward development of a specialized sept chieftainship. Thus, although the nobles assembled at the intersept feasts were, as we have seen, individually ranked within their septs, the title which was assigned to the highest rank was not therewith conceived to represent the special champion of the entire sept. On the other hand, where there is recognition of a metonymic relationship between a particular status and an entire social division, then there is provided a mechanism for the considerable amplification of the performance level of its incumbent relative, that is, to what he might achieve acting to a greater extent on his own behalf—even as a performer currently of first standing within his group. A chief, acting as the special champion of his group, can claim the right to synchronize and focus the resources of his group in aid of his own feasts in a degree which he could not do acting on his own behalf. At the same time, ambitious nobles become inspired to compete among themselves, through feasts given in their own names, in the wake
of the standards set in the rivalries of the great chiefs. In fact, these were the structural conditions which led to an almost fanatical escalation in the extravagance of feasting among the Southern Kwakiutl tribes. In conclusion, oppositions over rank among social divisions which, like the Carrier phratries, acknowledge chiefs in whom intergroup rivalries could be focused will thereby permit a greater synchronization of the efforts of the membership at large on behalf of their common cause than would be possible in oppositions among social divisions, such as the Carrier septs, which do not recognize an overall chieftainship. A greater synchronization of effort will tend to generate a greater sense of rivalry among the participants. Thus, in the absence of a superordinating mechanism with the acknowledged authority to deliberate disputes over rank among parallel social divisions, the opposing of the septs, as acephalic divisions, would seem less likely to generate uncontainable rivalries (i.e., resulting in withdrawal of participation and/or violence) than would the opposing of the phratries, which become more closely integrated about a recognized metonymizing chieftainship.

Just as the Carrier maintain an ideology of phratric equivalence in terms of rank, so they must avoid any seating arrangement which would connote a rank order among their phratries. Assuming that, on similar occasions of intersept feasting, Carrier hosts would use the same basic format at that which we have observed in the Kitsegukla feasts, a ranking of the phratries is avoided and their rank equivalence asserted by means of the mingling of the personnel of the various phratries within their particular sept blocs. I suggest, then, that this seating pattern and its associated order of prestational distribution may reflect the
intent of the ceremonialists to accommodate the doctrine of phratric equivalence by avoiding confrontations which might otherwise inject serious schisms within the sept to the point, conceivably, of inter-phratric warfare.

We come now to the second question. If it is indeed the case that in the content of Carrier social structure the phratry represents a more heavily accented term than the sept (in the sense discussed earlier, that the phratry is the more important identificational predicate to individuals) should we not expect a reversal of the overall seating arrangement utilized in the intersept feasts? That is, should not the phratries be accented over and against the sept by manifesting the phratries as the supreme spatial and distributional blocs within which the personnel of the different septs are mingled (possibly as sept sub-divisions of the extended cross-sept phratry) rather than vice versa? It will be possible to answer this question only by dwelling awhile on some of the connotations of the concepts of the sept and phratry in Carrier terms. This will warrant some repetition of issues considered earlier (Chapter 1, Sections 1 and 2).

A ceremonial representation of the sept as a spatial cum distributional bloc is given precedence over a bloc representation of the phratry partly, at least, because—in terms of the widest cultural contents—the most definitive attribute of the sept is territorial whereas the most defining aspect of the concept of the phratry transcends its territorial associations. In other words, the sept is represented spatially in the ceremonial context precisely because it is (more so than the phratry) conceived spatially in its metaceremonial settings.
Of course, the Carrier idea of the sept must perforce be conditioned by a wide range of associations. Some of the more obvious of these are indicated, for example, in the following statement from Jenness (1943: 482):

It was only the constant association, the ties of kinship and marriage, the uniform dialect, and the pressure of common interests that counteracted the strong centrifugal tendencies and knitted the phratries into a definite, though headless, unit justifying the name of subtribe.

Nevertheless, the locational dimension is a key to these other associations. Thus, as we have seen, most of the septs are differentiated by Carrier names which expressly signify an assemblage of people in a distinctive physiographic setting. Some of the Carrier sept names appear on a map (p. 476) and are listed in an appendix (pp. 584-86) in Jenness' report on the Bulkley tribe. Morice (1893), Duff (1964), and Hackler (1954) also provide a number of sept names, some the same or similar to those given by Jenness, others quite different. As a result the total picture is somewhat unclear, due in part to the fact that these sept names have been recorded by ethnographers working among informants who are themselves of different septs, probably speaking different dialects. Nevertheless, it will serve our present purpose to merely review some earlier (Chapter 1, Section 1) conclusions concerning some semantic aspects of the sept names.

The first point to note is that the names of the septs bore the suffix rendered -tenne by Morice (1893), -woten by Duff (1964), -otenne by Jenness (1943), and -witenne by myself (see above, p. 16). The suffix bears the simple meaning "inhabitants of..." Thus, for example, the name Taklawitenne (not recorded by the others) connotes "the people of Takla
Lake." Takla, in turn, means "head of the lake," so that fully translated the name means "head of the lake peoples." This raises the second key feature of the sept names noted in Chapter 1, Section 1.

It is striking that most of the root elements of these names turn out, when reducible to their original meanings, to designate—like Takla—some water system or a feature of a water system. We have seen names translated, "peoples of the bottom of Stuart Lake," "confluence of two rivers people," "people of Nulki Lake," "people of the Bulkley River," etc. Taken as a whole, then, sept names designate an assembly of people who reside in association with a distinctive water system.

The concept of the sept is most aptly summarized as the peoples who gather at one or more sites around a common water system for summer and autumn fishing, above all for the runs of Pacific salmon. Thus, the Bulkley sept is the various peoples who gathered at common or adjacent weir sites along the Bulkley River.

Before the landslide occurred on the Bulkley River at Hagwilgate, the best place in the whole district for trapping the migrating salmon was at Moricetown, the common center of the phratries [my emphasis]; and on the dam built there across the river. Most, if not all, of the clans had special stations where they could ply their gaffs or set their traps and baskets. The part of the subtribe that moved to Hagwilgate after the landslide subdivided among its clans, in exactly the same way, the various fishing stands in the Bulkley canyon.... (Jenness, 1943: 488; Fig. 62, 486).

Among the western Carrier, at least, these common sept fishing grounds are distinct from those reserved for the exclusive use of the clans: "Each clan had the exclusive fishing rights over the lakes and streams within its hunting territories...." (Jenness, 1943: 488). Nevertheless,
it is evident that certain water systems, particularly those which carried the migrating salmon, were the common property of all the divisions, clans and phratries, composing a sept.

It is important to recognize that the physiographic connotation of the sept names not only provides a convenient means of differentiating among the divisions of a plane of social structure (sept vs. sept), it also effects a differentiation between the sept plane per se and the other planes of Carrier society, most importantly the very nearly isoplanar domain of the phratries. In terms of Carrier societal taxonomy this differentiation is summarized in the suffixes characteristic of the system of names in the sept and phratri domain, -witenne and -yu respectively. The concept of -yu is extremely difficult to penetrate, especially in its metaphysical ramifications, but may be roughly translated "power." My immediate point is that whatever a full explication of the expression -yu might entail, it would clearly stand in contrast to the locational orientation of the system of sept names. Thus, the systems of sept and phratri nomenclature effect differentiations in two dimensions; within, separating the subcategories which comprise the various societal domains, and without, opposing the domains themselves. The point which these observations on Carrier societal taxonomy are intended to serve may be viewed as a modification of the following conclusion from C. Levi-Strauss (1966: 75):

Now, on the theoretical as well as the practical plane, the existence of differentiating features is of much greater importance than their content. Once in evidence, they form a system which can be employed as a grid is used to decipher a text, whose original unintelligibility gives it the appearance of an uninterrupted flow. The grid makes it possible to introduce divisions and contrasts, in other words
the formal conditions necessary for a significant message to be conveyed.

In fact, it would be more precise to say that the introduction of divisions and contrasts—by means of features selected to mark the domains and categories from whose total semantic content these differentiating features were drawn—does not merely establish the conditions necessary for the conveyance of a meaningful message, but that the specific features in terms of which differentiation is effected have their own meanings and constitute, of themselves, a significant message. In addition to simply marking, as it were passively, the contrast categories, contrast features which appear in a nomenclature system assert something of the content of the contrast. In view of this fact, one expects that as a rule a condition in the selection of features which are to be specialized for the marking of differentiations is that these be in close consonance with the residual content of the contrast which they impute to the categories they name. It is even reasonable to suppose that features which appear in nomenclature systems do so precisely because they render a symbolic reduction of contrasts which stand apart, to the culture participants, as of greater importance to the opposition of categories being thus marked than would be the case with other possible contrasts. In any event, the contrast features used in nomenclatures must surely come to be generally stressed, more so than might otherwise be the case vis-à-vis the residual semantic contents of the opposed categories, simply in virtue of their being thus established in explicit names.

To return to Levi-Strauss, it is useful to do as he has so
often suggested, and to treat contrast features as open variables, "x," "y," etc., which, having marked contrast categories "X," "Y," etc., have thereby served what is an obviously important function. However, we must bear in mind that is is at least as important that we understand what factors constrain and channel the concrete realizations of these variables subject to substitution rules. My task, among other things, is to begin to understand these rules. The Carrier naming system of septs and phratries is a case in point, reflecting as I shall argue the same kinds of symbolic functions as are manifest in the seating arrangements at the intersept feasts.

We have seen that the septs are often distinguished by names which carry a locational reference, tending thus to oppose them to the phratries which bear names without any apparent geographic connotations. At the same time, in spite of the territorial references in sept names, it is not a sept chief--since there is no such office--who administers the allocations of hunting territories: "Through its [i.e., the phratry's] chief (who was always a chief of one of its clans) it controlled the division of the hunting territories among its members...." (Jenness, 1943: 483). But is this not curious? Why would a nomenclature system imply a differentiation of societal planes which is not borne out by the actual social conditions? The phratry as well as the sept has a territorial aspect; indeed, it recognizes a special office for the administration of its territories, whereas the sept does not, although it is the sept which bears names with the locational reference. The sept and phratic nomenclatures appear almost to misrepresent very important aspects of the comparative semantic contents of the categories which they partition.
This would be a far cry from the function which is expected of features that are specialized as taxonomic differentia. That is, it seems a far cry from the function of representing the contrasts which are felt to be most fundamental among the total semantic contents predicated to various opposed societal categories (in the perspective of their full round of sociocultural relationships). To dismiss this seeming contradiction, I shall need to review some aspects of the yearly cycle of Carrier economic activities.

The traditional annual rhythm among the western Carrier manifested two overall societal phases based upon ecologically determined production activities. As winter approached the sept population scattered from its village(s) to the various clan hunting grounds to pass the winter months in pursuit of large game for sustenance; now especially moose, which has replaced the caribou of earlier years, together with some bear, mountain goat, and mountain sheep, and various fur-bearers for sustenance and for cash (beaver, marten, fisher, fox, otter, ermine, rabbit, etc.). After a last, late winter beaver hunt before the bush became swamped in spring runoff, the sept reassembled in its village(s) in proximity to its fishing areas. Throughout the summer months and into early autumn the entire sept population is concentrated upon the catching of the migrating salmon on its common water system.

Thus, it is apparent that, other than ceremonially, the sept is only realized as a de facto social unit when its clans and phratries are concentrated in a de jure common space, acting in parallel to harvest the communal pool of salmon. A measure of recognition is given at this time to the fact of the segmentation of the sept into clan units.
by assigning individual fishing places to them. It may also have been the case that certain tasks concerted the labour of the clan personnel, which would contribute further to sustaining a perspective of segmentation in the context of sept assembly. I must say, however, that there is no clear evidence to this effect in Jenness' accounts, and my own information indicates that once the weirs, traps and smokehouses had been repaired, the actual harvesting and preparation of the salmon was undertaken by individual fishermen and wives who speared, netted or trapped whenever they wished at the site(s) under the control of their clan chief, as long as their use of the site did not conflict with another fisherman of the same clan. (See Chapter 3, Section 2 for further elaboration on the control of access to fishing sites.) Thus, fishing was an individualistic activity which utilized a common resource and was subject to constraints imposed by the clan chiefs. Yet, especially with respect to the Babine weir fishery, there can be little doubt that the yearly repair, and certainly the initial construction, of the large weirs must have required some concerted of the labour of all village personnel.  

7. A Babine informant, while showing me a large basket trap (= k'ondze) that belonged to his family, explained that each man owned his own fish trap, which he set into an opening in the barricade (= sis which also means black bear; a striking metaphor for a salmon trapping system). These baskets were manufactured by the wives of the fishermen from the roots and branches of spruce and jackpine; these materials, gathered by the women, were also important elements in the construction of the weirs themselves. This, and other systems, such as the setting of basket traps by the Moricetown Canyon falls, was forcefully discontinued circa 1904 by officials of the Ministry of Marine and Fisheries. This policy is explained by Mr. A.J. Whitmore, Chief Supervisor of Fisheries, in a letter (dated October 24, 1952) addressed to Mr. G.S. Reade, Supervisor of Fisheries, Prince Rupert Division in the following words: "These weirs were considered destructive to the salmon fishery, not so much on account of the number of salmon taken by Indians, as by the fact that weirs were left by the Indians when the season was over and this interfered with the ascent of fish."
In 1904 an agent of the Department of Fisheries ordered the destruction of the weirs on the Babine River which served Fort Babine. There were two of these, half a mile apart, and at least one was 200 feet wide. Thus, two large weirs served the five phratries and their various clan divisions at Fort Babine. Manifestly, these weirs had to be shared by the clans and phratries which undoubtedly also shared in the labour of their construction and repair.

My present point is just that the occasional task which might have concerted the labour of the personnel of each clan in its discrete space (clan fishing sites) would, in so doing, merely provide an accentuating counterpoint to the concurrent and pre-eminent theme of the salmon season. That theme is the one whereby the spaces and labours of these divisions were incorporated, respectively, within a wider mutual space (common water systems and common weirs) and into a wider framework of pansept interaction (including occasional concerted interaction).

The attitude towards the hunting grounds projects an even sharper sense of the discreteness and autonomy of the clans and phratries than does the partitioning of the salmon trapping areas into individual clan sites. The phratries maintained a strict proprietorship over their hunting grounds: "...trespassing on the territory of another phratry without the consent of its chief led to quarrels and often bloodshed" (Jenness, 1943: 487). As I have noted, this proprietorship is particularly relevant to fur species.

---

8. This information is contained in a report of the aforesaid agent, a Mr. Hans Helgeson, to John T. Turner, the Inspector of Fisheries at Port Essington, B.C.
The salmon season is characterized by a sense of spatial segmentation which marks the structural segments as reciprocating elements of a totality sharing a common substratum; i.e., the common food, salmon, yielded by the common water system. The winter season, on the other hand, disperses the sept to the territories of its various phratry and clan divisions, not only isolating the divisions socially as well as spatially, but removing them ideologically from the summer concept of a more mutual society in a mutual space. Thus, the practice of spatial subdivision of the sept is more heavily stressed in connection with the winter hunting grounds than with the salmon waterways.

On the other hand, while the territorial segmentation of the sept is accentuated during the winter months, this is not accompanied by a corresponding concentration, spatial or interactional, of the personnel of the various structural segments above the level of the family. To the contrary, winter not only disperses the sept, it also widely scatters the personnel of the clans and phratries, albeit within the boundaries of their respective territories.9

Before any snow settled on the ground, however, the sub-tribe broke up and the families dispersed to their hunting territories in search of beaver, caribou, bear, goats, and marmots. Tribal activities then ceased, and for a time the families lived solitary, or else one or two together, eking out a precarious existence by the chase (Jenness, 1943: 531).

The summer months conversely brought enormous intensification of interactional contact among persons within and across all segments of sept substructure above the family. Most of the Carrier modes of personal interaction were, no doubt, concentrated in the season of

9. This spatial cum interactional rarefaction of the clan (and of the phratic) population was undoubtedly maintained in large measure by the vast tracts included within the clan boundaries. (See Map A for an indication of the territorial expanses.)
assembly, and most of these, in turn, were structured by regulations bearing upon the differentiation and articulation of the clans and phratries. The most striking examples of this are the various ritual modes of affinal interaction: betrothal agreements, bridewealth payments, the ceremonial conferment of childhood names and, of course, the complex of events known to anthropology as the potlatch, involving the assumption, transfer and display of a variety of ceremonial prerogatives (titles, crests, poles, spirit songs and dances, etc.) representing the accumulated mythology and history of Carrier culture. These events are associated with important transitions of status in the lives of persons and, invariably, they engage the active participation of a wide circle of the kinsmen of the principal subjects; virtually entire clans and phratries in the case of persons of high rank.

The protocols of these occasions predicate specific ritual functions, not only to persons recognized as the nearest kin of the immediate subjects, but to the structural units as a whole, then clans and phratries, with which the subjects are linked. Thus, on the one hand, certain roles will be assigned to individuals as a function of their unique kin links with the subjects: e.g., a son must always contribute substantially to meeting the expense of his own father's funeral, although the burden of the cost falls upon the father's own clan and phratry as a whole. Or again, once the child-naming ceremony was completed, "the father divided among his family and nearest kinsmen such gifts as her [the child's mother] phratry had contributed for the occasion" (Jenness, 1943: 520). On the other hand, many and perhaps most of the ritual procedures are assigned as the principal responsibility of the
subject-linked clans and phratries as units. In most forms of the feast special recognition is given, as I have often noted, to the father's phratry of the subject (halsut), in payment for the special services performed by it on behalf of the phratry of its child; such as burial (at one time cremation) of the corpse of its deceased child. If these rituals do not always concert the efforts of the entire membership of the subject-linked phratries, the phratries will at least be represented through the allocation of special duties to their chiefs. Child-naming ceremonies, held in the house of the chief of the child's phratry, were conducted by the chief. It was he, holding the child in his arms, who announced its childhood name and related its history (Jenness, 1943: 520).

Ideological categories of social structure are the principal elements in the design of the protocols of Carrier ritual. At present, my data are thin on many points of detail germane to the various rituals of affinal interaction. What I do have, in terms of participant accounts of betrothals, and of certain rituals ancillary to the feast, however, suggests that many of the rituals of Carrier life may best be understood under the general assumption that the subject-linked phratries and clans

10. Jenness provides no clear account of these. However, some of these ancillary rituals which I know to be in current use include the following: 1) preinterment feasts called lidab gek ja'at (= "they eat from the table"); among other things, these events honour the members of the deceased's halsut who have been selected to do the "work" of the funeral such as building or purchasing the casket, digging the burial pit, etc. Hosted by the phratry of the deceased, these events are also attended by dignitaries of the phratries not directly involved. 2) cesbiabetelh; the anger and sorrow of the mourners is pacified by a dance in which the white feathers of peace (ces = feather) are placed on the heads of the mourners. In a later ceremony, the mourners "return the feathers" (= cesendidisqwat).
are articulated into roles which constitute a reiteration of relational norms predicated at the level of persons; notably the intra-familial roles of father, husband, mother, wife and child.

As the birth of a child manifests the metamorphosis of the raw products of the Carrier world—flesh of moose or stream-caught fish, and semen, flesh of man, proffered by the body of man as hunter and husband to the body of woman, transformer of the raw to the cooked—so it is that when a clan raises a pole to represent its perpetuating matriform, it is from the halsut or its chief that the crude log must come. In the course of the preinterment feasts, the halsut of the deceased pose a ritual demand of his phratry: "when will you give us our child?" The ultimate response to this demand comes only through replacement of the deceased by elevation of a successor to his title. However, an interim promise of the rebirth to follow (a successor will usually be announced at this time, and perhaps an approximate date set for the succession feast), the halsut and other guests are feasted upon steamed tail of beaver which, together with the compote of

11. Beaver originated through the transformation of a young woman who camped with her husband alongside a mountain stream. She was pregnant at the time and, while her husband hunted during the day, she amused herself by constructing a dam, pooling the stream waters behind it. Returning each evening, her husband destroyed the dam on three successive occasions, only to find it larger each time. On the second and third occasions, he had also to destroy the beaver lodge which his wife had built in the center of the pool in order to conceal herself from her husband. On the fourth and final occasion the woman had become completely transformed into a beaver, her breech cloth had become its tail, and she had delivered her babies. The rich symbolism of this myth speaks for itself. In the present context, however, I must emphasize the fecundity symbolism associated specifically with the tail of the beaver, where it is presented as a metamorphosis of the loin garment of a pregnant woman. Jenness' (1934: 202-3) version of this myth is incomplete in a number of important details. What I have presented is an outline of a version given me on several occasions by different informants.
berries\textsuperscript{12}, passed among the guests in its ceremonial bowl (= begigay; each phratry has its own), displays the fecundity of the phratry of the deceased in its maternal pose.

Over the preceding paragraphs I have tried to illustrate the notion that occasions of ritual effect a concentration of structural divisions, as ideological units, into modes of interaction which symbolically reiterate aspects of interpersonal role relationships. This parallelism is impressed by metaphor upon the mind of participant and witness. It animates the phratries as macrobeings, now as husband, advancing the crude log to woman's power of metamorphosis, at another time adorned with the tail of beaver as wife and expectant mother, in ever-shifting poses as the occasion focuses upon events in the lives of the individual persons who occupy the center of the current ritual stage.

In summation, although the principal events of ritual interactions are ultimately executed by a central set of individuals, many and perhaps most of these events are assigned by the ritual protocols as the function of the clans and/or the phratries rather than being charged to persons as tokens of kin types. Thus, the allocation of a particular ritual function to the halsut of a subject person means that the function

\textsuperscript{12} The legend, "The Woman Who Married a Grizzly" (Jenness, 1934: 129-37) relates how a young woman at first refuses to pick berries with the others because she is disgusted with the sight of grizzly dung amid the berry patches. Having at last filled her basket, she is abducted to a big house wherein the animals one by one bid to marry her. Ultimately, only "big old man" (= widalh-kyet, title of the chief of the Flat Rock Clan), who is in reality grizzly himself, is judged suitable. These are merely the opening episodes of a lengthy and important legend, but they illustrate nicely how the readiness and desirability of the young woman for marriage, notwithstanding her initial maidenly coyness, are symbolically signalled by the repletion of her berry basket.
is conceived to be the obligation of his father's phratry, writ large, not merely of his particular genitor. But the specific ritual functions so allocated frequently involve features which suggest roles appropriate to individual persons in the context of kin-type relationships. In brief, ritual protocols frequently effect a personification of structural groupings. If the phratry can be as a person, then persons—even those who participate only from the periphery—can the more readily be their phratry.

Seldom, if ever, were the divisions manifest as de facto gatherings of their complete personnel during the winter dispersal. Indeed, apart from the more important of the funereal and succession feasts, few occasions achieved concentration of a major portion of the phratry or, for that matter, of the clan personnel. It is true that the clans may occasionally have been concerted as a task force for the repair of weirs and smokehouses. In general, however, the personnel of the clans and phratries were concentrated to the greatest extent in connection with occasions which articulated the divisions in ritual intercourse. The degree of the de facto concentration of the divisional personnel must, of course, have varied according to the nature of the ritual involved and the rank of its central subjects. However, it is important to recognize that virtually all modes of ritual interaction, even those which do not require the active participation of a major proportion of the personnel of the structural divisions involved, produce a vivification of the clans and phratries through the metaphoric prescriptions of

---

13. It is very probable that child-naming ceremonials and betrothal agreements, for example, called for the inclusion of a narrower range of the collaterals of the principles than did feasts for the succession to adult titles.
Thus, what is most essential to the manifestation of a phratry (or a clan) as a social entity is its ritual engagement with other phratries. This requires a set of central subjects—together with as many collaterals as the occasion demands. Collaterals perform roles predicated in the first instance (in terms of the enunciation of feast rules) to their respective phratries which, in effect, they represent on the occasion. During the winter dispersion it is only the separation of hunting/trapping territories which sustains a sense of the discreteness of the phratry. During the assembly of the salmon season, on the other hand, the divisions are vivified through the continual round of ritual intercourse with a sharpness not possible during the winter's "hibernation." An image of the phratry as a social entity is in greatest relief precisely when its territorial segmentation is least apparent. Trapping territories do not define the phratry, they are merely its appendage. The sept, in contrast, is only realized--ideally as well as concretely--as an association of parts periodically foregathered on a common stage.

In spite of the many dimensions of everyday Carrier life accent the foremost importance of the phratry in personal identity, the sept prevails as the unit to which wall areas are assigned in the inter-sept feast. Whereas the sept unlike the phratry is defined in spatial terms, a place-mark is particularly appropriate to it; and less so comparatively to the phratry.

Also, in spite of the ideal of cross-sept crest identifications, the phratries are, sociologically speaking, largely contained by the
septs. Phratric territories are strictly proper to sept contingents of a phratry. No man of the Bulkley Laksilyu paid a trapping tax to the chief of the Babine Laksilyu, much less military fealty. After all, were not the phratry territories cut out of the (albeit vague) traditional sept hinterlands in the first place? What would be implied by the spatial fusion in the feast hall of intersept phratric contingents?

What would be implied by closer formal bonds among phratric contingents (e.g., fusion of hunting territories) of the various septs? How, in principle, would constraints be maintained upon rights of access to salmon fishing places? Would phratries, the Carrier warring units, become serious rivals for control of salmon sites?

In conclusion, the spatial containment of its phratric contingents by the sept in intersept feasts may represent a symbolic constraint upon the (ideologically) catholic pretensions of the phratry.
5. **Summary Conclusions Regarding the Meaning of the Feast**

The early sections of this essay represented Carrier society in ecological and ethnohistoric perspectives. Three stages were posited in Carrier social history and conveniently labelled the band stage, the sept stage, and the sept/phratry stage. This succession corresponds to, and was at least partly triggered by, two major ecological shifts.

First, the transformation from hypothetical band stage origins to the sept system was envisioned as a consequent of migration from the woodlands of the Yukon or Mackenzie basin to the present setting along the salmon spawning-grounds of headwaters of the Skeena and Fraser Rivers. Ecologically speaking, the original (macrocosmic) woodland bands came to be essentially fish-oriented assemblies. Correspondingly, the relocated bands established themselves first in areas near the most favourable salmon sites (e.g., lake inlets and outlets) along the main salmon conduits. The comparative abundance and reliability of this new resource led to an hypertrophy of the initial settlements, and to a subsequent budding of these in an upstream direction. In this way, satellite village sites were established in the vicinity of last-stage migratory streams interpolated between successive primary sites—punctuating the septs—along the main conduits.

Apparent instances of sept-wide, and even of intercept military allegiance, indicate that the two-to-three level segmentary structure (village, sept, related septs) has more than mere nominal significance in the Carrier world. This segmentarism, in turn, may well represent the perpetuation of patterns of association established first in con-
nection with the settlement sequence described above. Similarly, the stress placed in several contexts of sept/village nomenclature upon downstream village sites (within septs) is a clue not only to the ecological advantages of the downstream sites (relative to upstream sites on terminal conduits) along the main salmon paths, but—owing to these advantages—to the historic settlement pattern out of which the sept segmentary structure emerged. These ideas, which are by no means conclusive, rest on the assumption that social traditions manifest inertial tendencies and, correspondingly, that a social present harbours fossils of its past.

The second great transformation of Carrier society, giving rise to the sept/phratry system, seems to reflect the convergence of two major interdependent forces: growth of the European fur trade and a resultant intensification of coast-interior contact. My analysis of this transformation was guided by these words from Boas:

> It is much easier to prove dissemination than to follow up developments due to inner forces, and the data for such a study are obtained with much greater difficulty. They may, however, be observed in every phenomenon of acculturation in which foreign elements are remodeled to patterns prevalent in their new environment (Boas 1940: 284).

This remodelling by "inner forces" was observed many times in connection with the assimilation of phratries, crests, and territories by the Carrier.

Duff's evidence and present-day practices suggest that the resource territories (i.e., hunting/trapping grounds) were and are predicated at the sept level of extension of the superimposed crest divisions (phratries) among the Carrier rather than upon the infrasept village contingents of the descent groups (clans or houses) as among most coastal
populations including the Coast Tsimshian and Gitksan. That, I submit, probably reflects the fact that on the eve of their assimilation of the phratry and territorial system, it was the sept, and not the village per se, that represented the supreme political and territorial (although territory was only weakly defined at best and merely traditional rather than exclusive) unit of Carrier society. That is, the sept level prevailed as the enclosing frame within which the system of phratries and clans, with their appended territories, arose against two counter tendencies: on the one hand, the crest divisions—as ideological units—cross-cut the septs which constrain them territorially and politically, and, on the other hand, the resource territories are predicated at the village level among the coast tutors of the Carrier. With the support of parallels drawn from Beynon's data on Gitksan pole-raising feasts, it was predicated that in contexts of Carrier intersept pole-raising feasts we would see a suspension of the usual arrangement into phratric blocs in favour of sept blocs. Such a pattern, it was argued, would constitute a ceremonial manifestation of the political and territorial containment of the phratries by the septs, of the new by the old.

Another example of remodelling was the refractoriness of the (preferentially endogamous) Carrier sept structure to assimilation of the exogamic aspect of the coast descent system when the crest divisions were initially linked one-on-one to the septs. Again, inertial tendencies of established traditions prevailed against contradictory innovations until finally, among the northwestern septs, the contradiction was resolved by the folding of multiple phratries into the traditional septs.

Another statement from Boas that has guided this analysis is
the following:

The object of our investigation is to find the processes by which certain stages of culture have developed. The customs and beliefs themselves are not the ultimate objects of research. We desire to learn the reasons why such customs and beliefs exist—in other words we wish to discover the history of their development (Boas 1940: 276).

In producing the models in the early sections, it has been my wish to contribute in a small way to an image of the processes of the continuous creation of culture. With Boas, I have been interested in viewing cultures in terms of "the history of their development," but here only in the sense in which Levi-Strauss understands history:

When, in addition, one completely limits study to the present period in the life of a society, one becomes first of all the victim of an illusion. For everything is history: what was said yesterday is history, what was said a minute ago is history (Levi-Strauss, 1963: 12).

From this viewpoint, then, the aim is to collapse the synchronic and diachronic perspectives upon the same generative principles. Relatively long-range and far reaching social changes—such as those I have been concerned with in Chapter 1 of this essay—involve the same kinds of operations of the selection and modification of new elements (endogenous or borrowed) in a dialectic against established patterns as are involved in the relatively short-term mutual adjustments among the co-existing elements of a system.

Just as salmon was a stimulus of the first Carrier social transformation, the fur trade seems to have been a major factor in the assumption of definitive resource territories and the associated system of crest divisions. The burgeoning of the fur trade stimulated a shift in the economic orientation of the dispersion season to a heavy concentration upon fur-bearing species and encouraged the establishment of
trapping territories. The specification of territories is of no practical use, however, without a parallel definition of admissible personnel. One possibility was a stiffening of the band cum sept traditional place-of-birth citizenship criterion with secondary provisions for selective "naturalization" (notably with marriages into the sept). That, in turn, would imply the appending of specified territories directly to the septs themselves. However, this would call for reversal of the sept traditions of ideally open hunting hinterlands. Selective naturalization would, of course, contradict the relatively easy residential fluidity that characterized relations among neighbouring septs, and would require the establishment of a central screening authority in a context which had always lacked a political centre of any kind.

Cultures tend to resist the admission of innovations insofar as these threaten to fracture semantic associations established in the (conscious or unconscious) collective ideology. That is to say, the adoption and modification of social institutions advances under the impetus of politico-economic or demographic forces along paths which cause least disruption of practiced semantic patterns. Under the economic and political impetus of the fur trade (recall the suggestion, at the end of Chapter 1, Section 3, that a principal connotation of furs was guns), the path had been cleared for assimilation of the coastal system of territory-holding crest groups. The coast concept of crest divisions entailed the specification of a human continuum to which ownership of resource territories was appended; as such, the concept was ready-made for the assumption of a territorial system by the Carrier without directly confronting the ideally anti-territorial traditions of the septs. Similarly, as I have already noted, adopted features are
modified so as to minimize their disruption of established patterns of association. Levi-Strauss summarizes these simple principles in the following remark:

We act and think according to habit, and the extraordinary resistance offered to even minimal departures from custom is due more to inertia than to any conscious desire to maintain usages which have a clear function (Levi-Strauss, 1963: 19).

Patterns of culture, that is, are structures of semantic association. The inertial tendencies of these patterns reflect the reinforcements of repetition—of habit—more often than any conscious orientation to a weighted telos. The repetition that weights cultural inertia, of course, has intersecting dimensions of both trans-personal and trans-temporal depth.

Typically, sentiment guards a largely invisible whole most particularly at those points of its structure which operate, metonymically, as representations of the whole or of segments of it. The sentiment imputed to symbols draws force from the inertia of the unseen semantic totalities and, particularly in contexts of opposition, inspires the repetitions (e.g., ritual as a mechanism for the management of opposition) which feeds inertia. Of course, the inertia of established culture patterns is subject to the counterplay of political, economic and demographic forces arising within and without its social body and altering its composition and vector—as will be seen in Part II of this essay.

The contribution of ritual to the inertia of established social patterns is an anthropological truism. However, the mechanisms of ritual efficacy are extremely complex and have only just begun to be understood. It is more than simply a question of the inertial effect of repetitious, but piecemeal, displays of symbols of the central categories
of social structure. Leach (e.g., 1958, 1961, 1971), Turner (e.g., 1969), and Douglas (e.g., 1966) following Van Gennep (1909) have explored ways in which myth and ritual punctuate the boundary of semantically contiguous categories by the special handling of elements (or their symbols) which occupy a taxonomic lacuna between the categories. Either the no-man's-land becomes subject to tabu (from Leach) and mutatis mutandis serves to mark and guard the margins of adjacent categories; or it is the source of the symbols of category transitions (from Turner), and here again the categories are affirmed. Similarly, ritual tends to propagate the integrity of established structure by the special treatment of elements (including persons) in which (whom) properties are found to coincide that, inasmuch as they are traditional criteria—by established ideology—of categoric social oppositions (e.g., noble/commoner), are supposed not to coincide. So, for example, the ability to command sufficient wealth to give the impressive festivals which fix the ears and eyes of others upon one's claim to a place in history is not supposed, in feast tradition, to occur in persons who (like the man who took the name Satsa'n) are "without genealogical history." That is, a formal linkage to genealogical lines having histories established on the feast stage was ideally regarded as a necessary condition of the possession of sufficient wealth for a place on the feast stage and in the stream of its history. Notwithstanding the relative recency of their class system, the opposition of nobles/commoners appears to have been ideally closed among the Carrier. This was extended also to marriage: "The Indians strongly disown marriage outside the caste" (Jenness, 1943: 528). In spite of these ideals, the first
Carrier Satsa'n acquired wealth as a carver and gambler, and now, no longer a commoner, is given a place of his own—but apart from the rows of established nobles whose purity as a category he would surely sully with the contagion of mixed properties.

Although cases such as Satsa'n's must have been common enough in the early years of the development of the system of classes and titles, the ideal of genealogical and marital class closure was buffered by the use of temporary transition-status markers such as Satsa'n's special place until the title acquired sufficient genealogical depth to be admitted to the ranks of the ideologically pure (recall that the title Satsa'n is now used by the chief of Birchbark House). The closure was also sustained by the economic advantages ceded to the chiefs and their families by dint of their tax privileges vis-a-vis furs trapped on the territories which they "owned". Among the Carrier, then, there was apparently no sudden rush of independently wealthy commoners sufficient to rupture the ideal of a strictly genealogically defined gentry.

This discussion reminds me of the group of Fort Rupert (Kwakiutl) nouveau riche, denominated "Eagles," and described by Drucker (1955: 128-9) as "men of intermediate or even common status who through industry and clever trading amassed great quantities of material wealth." These persons acquired the special privilege of receiving feast gifts ahead of the highest chiefs. In this case, the emergence of the nouveau riche resulted from a profound change in economic orientations which made sources of new wealth universally accessible on an individual basis (e.g., commercial fishing, lumbering, fish canneries, domestic service, prostitution, etc.) and independently of traditional resource-producing corporate kin units (the numayma). The rallying of such independently
wealthy persons around a discrete category name represented a dramatic legitimation and crystallization of their materially derived ideological challenge to the traditional chiefs. Thus, the name "Eagles" now connoted a category which inverted the traditional stress placed on established genealogy (vs. wealth) as a necessary condition of access to current prominence on the feast floor in favour of the criterion of current personally acquired wealth as a sufficient condition of such prominence.

The second chapter of the essay demonstrates some of the ritual mechanisms contained in the feast protocols for the symbolic iteration of the structure of synchronic and diachronic relations among categories of Carrier society. In particular, it was argued that the space/time (seating/distributional order) syntax of feast protocol is motivated by a convergence (unconscious to participants) of the temporal connotations connected with ideologic and historic aspects of salient societal categories and corresponding temporal transformations of spatial concepts. Analogical formulas were given as summaries of both the explicit seating and distributional protocols, on the one hand, and of the temporal connotations of various societal categories ceremonially represented on the other (chiefs vs. nobles, nobles vs. commoners, phratries vs. clans). These analogical patterns represent "surface" manifestations, and the feast protocols in particular were "deduced" by means of what we termed an analogical syllogism. This syllogism combined, as premises, the analogies summarizing the temporal connotations of social categories with certain other analogies which were theoretically predicated to Carrier actors as "deep" level (unconscious) cognitive configurations and which posit specific transformation patterns as between various
spatial/temporal concepts.

With regard to these "deep" transforms—such as [central: lateral::above:beneath::enduring:transient]—it was suggested that we might seek their motivation in certain givens of the perceptual universe of any subject. In the case of this particular analogy, for example, I noted that the patterns expressed in the analogy are manifest, on the level of public perception, in the movements of heavenly bodies (I spoke of the sun, but the same is true of other luminaries). On the level of private perception I noted the instability of peripheral as opposed to the stability of central images on the visual field. I do not wish, however, to claim that such perpetual cum biological givens are ineluctable forces which can never be inverted by cultural factors.

In general, I believe that this analysis of feast protocol has contributed to the explication of some of the cognitive mechanisms underlying the well-established anthropological view of the cybernetic relationship of ritual and social structure. I have shown, on the one hand, how the spatio-temporal management of salient structural categories is motivated by basic aspects of their epi-ceremonial ideological and historic meanings. At the same time, however, the protocollary patterns infuse these aspects of structural relations with a sense of special virtue. Thus, for example, not only are the chiefs placed centrally vis-a-vis the lesser nobles and commoners because their office conveys a sense of deeper and more stable continuity; but, conversely, the spatial display of itself transfers back upon the epi-ceremonial relations of these social categories a connotation of relative endurance/transience respectively, which derives independently (ex hypothesi out of perceptual experience) as a transform of the central/lateral and above/beneath
oppositions. That is, the sense of appropriacy, derived from perceptual experience, which attaches to the specific arrangement of terms in the transform central:lateral::above:beneath::enduring:transient is transferred upon the corresponding temporal aspects of the ideologies proper to the societal categories involved in the feast. In this way, the Carrier feast contributes to the inertia of established social structure by imputing to definitive aspects of its particular form a sense of virtue drawn from "deep" sources external to the structure of society itself: as Levi-Strauss might say, from the "structure of the mind."

To conclude Part I, we have seen that the efficacy of ritual is dependent upon the ability of its symbols to concentrate and appropriately articulate a wide spectrum of epi-ceremonial dimensions of social structure. This function of concentration seems to express the same urge to holism that is perhaps the fundamental principle of Levi-Strauss' "original logic" (see Chapter 1, Section 3). Given that symbolic condensation is a key function of ritual, we must conclude that the syntax of spatial and temporal relations must always provide a fundamental entree to the analysis of ritual if only because—since all concrete events have, perforce, discernable space/time coordinates—they represent the most powerful of all means of symbolic condensation.

In Part II, I shall turn to an examination of Hwitsowitenne property relations and laws through the examination of specific cases, as well as study the counterplay of political, economic and demographic forces alluded to above. This will be done with a view to exploring the question: What is the relevance of the contemporary feast with respect to the current context of Hwitsowitenne social-economic existence? The
discussion will be limited to the Bulkley River Carrier, the Hvitsowitenne, with whom I have had the most direct experience.
PART II: THE CHANGING CONTEXT OF CARRIER LIFE
AND THE CONTEMPORARY RELEVANCE OF THE FEAST

Chapter 3: POWER, LAW AND ECONOMY

1. Carrier Conceptions of Power and Chieftainship

At this point I wish to allude to parts of Chapter 2, inasmuch as they referred to the concept of chief (dineeza') in pre-contact and immediate post-contact Carrier society. While touching upon earlier points, the following discussion will examine the dineeza' in rather a different light, namely as beings in a particular ideological/religious framework. This is an appropriate starting point in an attempt to understand the changing nature of Carrier "political" life, in particular, as well as other aspects of Carrier social organization such as territoriality, and production and distribution.

The primary underlying theme in this part of the essay is change—change from the so-called traditional social system which is manifested, as described, in the feast hall today to the rather sorry condition of a group of people caught at the awkward end of the wider capitalist system in which they have become involved. The focus for this study of change and the comparison between Hwitsowitenne society within and without the feast hall is that which the Carrier now refer to in English as their "laws." 1 The laws which are of prime concern in

1. I have been unable to find a Carrier term which corresponds to "law" to the satisfaction of the majority of my informants. For purposes of this essay, the concept "law" is characterized by three main elements discussed by Hoebel (1979), namely the following: (i) a normative element, (ii) a recognized authority carrying the privilege of making judgements and exercising sanction through force, if deemed appropriate, (iii) regularity in application.
This essay are associated generally with the relationship between Man and Nature, as will be discussed below. As one might expect, aside from issues of bodily and personal property harm, these laws deal primarily with inheritance, production, and necessarily with the integrally related phenomena of distribution and territoriality. It will be seen that Carrier "traditional" ideology clearly forms the philosophical basis of a conservation oriented society. The body of laws identified for me by the elders is consistent with this.

This examination of Hwitsowitenne laws and the condition of those laws in the context of political and economic imposition from the wider society is intended to then allow the drawing of some conclusions regarding the extent and nature of the relevance of the contemporary feast to Hwitsowitenne life. For while laws are adhered to or broken in daily life outside the feast hall, it is at the feast that the process of law is ideally manifested. Indeed, chiefs and elders often refer to the feast hall as their "courthouse" and their "land registry office." The extent to which this courthouse is effective will be considered throughout the remainder of this essay, while examining some of the reasons for the discrepancies in the legal process between the feast hall and daily life.

In order to adequately describe Carrier ideology prior to and soon after European contact, and the place of the dineeza' in that context, we require some understanding of how the Carrier traditionally viewed their environment. Rappaport refers to the "cognized model" of the environment, that is, "the model of the environment conceived by the people who act in it" (Rappaport, 1968: 238). No human society can
survive if its members take the physical environment totally for
accepted; hence, over time, attempts to comprehend observed properties
and processes in nature lead to a systematized body of knowledge which
is shared. Thought of as a model of reality, it is seen by Rappaport
and others as a critical adaptive mechanism by functioning as a guide
for action. I should note here that while this guide serves to main-
tain social relations of production, it is not the case that ideology
determines relations of production (including power as an aspect of
those relations). Thus Tanner's assessment of the Cree of northern
Quebec is unacceptable for the present work inasmuch as Tanner states
the following:

At the ideological level the Cree hunting group is oriented
towards subsistence hunting and fishing. Rituals and myths
are based on an assumption of the primacy of hunting, and
within the hunting group religious ideology acts to a large
degree to determine the social relations of production within
the group (Tanner, 1979: 12; my emphasis).

A preferable way of looking at the relationship between the
cognized model and relations of production is to view (with Godelier,
1978) the former functioning as the latter; that is, ideology is the
"dominant sphere" because it functions as a relation of production in
addition to "its own ostensible purpose and its explicit function"
(1978: 765). A primary "explicit function" of the Carrier cognized mo-
del of the environment is the regulation of relations between hunters
and animals and between fishermen and fish. This has important implica-
tions for the maintenance of social relations of production which will
be discussed at greater length below. For now, however, it should be
noted that in terms of Godelier's (1978) notion of "determination in the
last instance," religious ideology was the "dominant sphere" within
pre-contact and immediate post-contact Carrier hunting and fishing relationships precisely because it served to maintain social relations of production. But it was not a determining factor.

There is another point that needs making here; namely, that religious ideology can vary through time in its significance as a dominant sphere. Thus while I do not accept religious ideology as determining economic behaviour, I see the likelihood of its changing role as time passes. The historical frame of reference is critical (Goldman, 1975: 24).

In non-industrial societies, cognized models tend not to be of Nature per se, but rather of Man in relation to Nature. Further, the underlying assumptions are typically religious which means that the models are moral as well as pragmatic in orientation. Finally, Nature usually is not differentiated from other realms of human experience, or seen as subject to special laws; instead, it is viewed as part of a cosmos and governed by universal principles.

As a religious ideology the traditional Carrier model of Man in Nature requires an analytic distinction that can account for its moral and pragmatic orientations. The most useful appears to be the distinction between "sacred" and "profane." As Eliade (1959: 14) states, these are "...two modes of being in the world, two existential situations assumed by man in the course of his history." As modes of being, sacred and profane can be compared on a number of dimensions, the primary one of which for the Carrier is that of power. Sacred being involves the possession of supernatural powers; profane being the absence of them. The Carrier viewed themselves as living in a
sacralized universe which they shared with other beings. According to Jenness, before European contact the Carrier

had looked mainly to powers in the animal world for explanations of life's phenomena and for assistance in life's journey. They thought that animals possessed warmth, mind, and shadows equally with men; that they differed from man only in their corporeal forms, in possessing certain powers that man lacked, and in lacking other powers that man enjoyed (1943: 539-540).

Men, animals and spirits were thought to exist in separate, yet interrelated realms. For each realm power was an important aspect of both internal and external interactions, and as such can be considered as fundamental to universal order. As discussed at some length in Chapter 2, the Carrier distinguished among three major status levels in human society, namely chiefs or "real people" (dineeza') who were sacred beings with powers, commoners or "ordinary people" (auxtadinee) who were profane beings without powers, and slaves (elnee). These status distinctions were paralleled in the spirit and animal realms. Although dineeza' differed in degree of power among themselves, the relationships between them tended to be symmetrical and based on mutual respect, while, in contrast, those between dineeza' and auxtadinee were asymmetrical, the former providing for the latter out of obligation or pity, and the latter being expected to support the former and to follow orders.

It was the acquisition of powers by certain individuals which determined the form of human existence. By receiving powers, some people (men or women) became "real" in a cosmological sense, respected by other "real" beings. Since powers must have come from outside the human realm, typically as gifts from supernatural beings, one can posit a cosmic equation:

(Supernatural:Human)::(Chiefs:Commoners)

With the receipt of powers came a special relationship between the non-
human source and the human recipient which was expressed by the human taking on the donor's identity as an additional part of self. In a sense, "real" people transcended the human condition as given in "ordinary" status; they retained their humanity but at the same time became something more. From the viewpoint of commoners, their chiefs were simultaneously: (i) representatives of mankind, (ii) other beings, and (iii) mediators between men and those beings.

Carrier religious thought was ultimately an assertion of "real" status, that is, men were equal to other beings with powers. While this equality implies the denial that man existed out of pity or as property within the natural universe, considerable respect was commanded by the animal world (including fish) since, as myths indicate, man originally acquired much of his knowledge from the animals and depended on them for his daily existence. Further, the animals were aware of every word spoken and every act performed in village, camp or bush (Jenness, 1943: 540). If the animal world was not given its due respect, animals were likely to apply their power of sanction against the offender, whether an individual or an entire village.

This theme recurs throughout the corpus of Carrier myths compiled by Jenness (1934) and was often repeated to me by elders. It represents one level of the reciprocal nature of relations between man and animals: knowledge and daily subsistence were exchanged for respect. Myths make constant reference to the need to demonstrate respect for animals and the ways in which this is best done (for example, through the crest system or the rite of honouring the first salmon taken each spring). Given this role, it seems reasonable that as one manifestation of the cognized model of the natural universe, myths can be viewed as
a systematized guide for action (see Cove and Laughlin, 1976), or perhaps simply as "sound advice."

Paralleling the distinction between sacred and profane being was that between sacred and profane time. Opposed to profane time, sacred time is "...reversible...indefinitely recoverable, indefinitely repeatable" (Eliade, 1959: 68-69). The Carrier lived in both. Prior to the period of commercial fur harvesting, at least, sacred time was associated with the winter season, profane with summer. Winter was the time when sacred being and sacred relations were emphasized and powers acquired while summer was oriented more to profane being and productive activities. Both were deemed necessary to human existence.

It was during the winter season that the Carrier engaged in ceremonial activities, primarily feasts and secret society rituals. As discussed at some length in Part I, the traditional feast can be thought of as reflecting the social order in that individuals interacted as members of a phratry and a clan. In this context crests were used extensively and legitimately and the myths of the clans were evoked to legitimize possession of crests, thereby affirming how they were acquired from the supernatural realm. Similarly, feasts were the context in which succession to names, territories, possessions and responsibilities was validated. The succeeding dineeza' indicated his support of his clan and his worthiness to hold the name being bestowed; in return he received public recognition and legitimation and his "real" status was acknowledged by other "real" people through a display of mutual respect. The food and wealth items given out at feasts symbolized that the donor had powers, since ultimately it was only the supernatural beings who could provide and, further, it was a statement that a dineeza' could support everyone
in his clan, that he was necessary to the larger collective.

The use of myths in feasting emphasized the notion of sacred time. In essence, the original encounters with supernatural beings were brought forward to the present, lived through ritual re-enactment. Men were able symbolically to re-enter sacred time when the order to the human realm was established, thereby asserting its continuity. Implicitly, there was also a re-affirmation of Man's relation to the supernatural donors and the permanence of that linkage.

The relationships between men and spirits during sacred time were mirrored and elaborated by those between men and animals in profane time. Again, in Carrier thought the principle underlying subsistence activities was reciprocity, thus "ordinary" animals did not exist for people to take, but rather were seen as gifts which paralleled those received at feasts in recognition of the status and powers of a dineeza'. The presentation of animals for food was made by animal chiefs, recognizing and perpetuating their human counterparts. Carrier mythology suggests that giving and receiving with respect is necessary to the existence of both men and animals and that without it, there would be a constant struggle--men and animals hunting each other and using powers to destroy instead of aid. With reference to the Kwakiutl, Goldman refers to the "logic of the hunter," stating the following:

The logic of the hunter is brutally concise; life demands deaths. From this binary opposition rooted in the nature of all organic life and understood by all mankind, the Kwakiutl have drawn a variety of logical extensions. For them as hunters the issue of life reemerging from death has a special urgency, the urgency of meeting obligations of reciprocity. Between human beings reciprocity need be little more than a simple action of mutual respect. Between men and animals they hunt, reciprocity expands into cosmic proportions. At the cosmic level, reciprocity is the reply to the logical possibility of entropy. What is given must be returned. The life yielded is the life returned, and the species are never exhausted (1975: 3).
There may first appear to be a major inconsistency with the notion of reciprocity between men and animals. For animal chiefs to give "ordinary" members of their Houses to human dineez[i] seems to violate obligations between chiefs and commoners—an assertion that relations between chiefs override those of clan. To treat someone as a gift implies that person is a slave, that is, property with no rights. Although such treatment was within the powers of the dineez[i], it was only proper if the "ordinary" individual had defined himself outside the sphere of obligation by refusing to support his dineez[i].

What made reciprocity possible was the Carrier conception of body and soul: all living things had both a mortal body and an immortal soul. At death the soul was thought to go to the realm of the dead for a period of time, then enter another body. That body was supplied by one's lineage and ideally the soul of an individual was reincarnated in a direct descendant, usually a grandchild.

The gift of "ordinary" animals for human use refers to their bodies, not their souls; it is the body which is property, the soul which is "ordinary". Just as an auxtadinee provided material support to his dineez[i] who used it to feast other dineez[i], so did an "ordinary" animal give up its body as part of an exchange between his chief and human chiefs.

Reciprocity implies that men also give to animals. What they give is best seen in the case of salmon, which enter human territory to spawn and die. Without access to spawning grounds, the souls of dead salmon would have no bodies to re-enter and as a consequence, the House (clan) of salmon could not continue to exist, nor could human
clans which use salmon as food. Reciprocity between animal and human chiefs was of mutual benefit, not only to themselves but also to "ordinary" individuals subordinate to them. Similarly, it can be argued that reciprocity was the basis of human and spirit interactions inasmuch as many powers were given to men because they helped spirits, often providing them food or shelter when they were in animal or human form. In more general terms, men provide powers with physical existence in the world; they give bodies so that the powers might live in this realm.

In summary, it can be said that in cosmic terms there was an overall system of exchange involving powers, souls and bodies, and that Man's relations to Nature was one part of that system. Man received both powers and food from the natural realm, and in return ensured the continuity of natural entities. This exchange was considered to be "sacred" in nature and involved the act of reciprocation between "sacred" beings, that is, the chiefs of the human and animal realms. Thus it was incumbent on the dineeza to ensure that the reciprocation was carried on according to the highest standards aiming at mutual benefit. To that end, there exists a body of what have come to be idealized laws. Ideally, also, responsibility for the implementation of the laws through judgement and application of sanctions lies with the dineeza', which, as will be seen, is an ideal that has been eroded, especially during the last forty years. The point to be made now is that this ideal locus of responsibility corresponds to the relations between human and animal chiefs, where each group is responsible for the well-being of its own realm and, necessarily, the other realm as well. There is no doubt, based on Jenness (1934; 1943) and my own discussions with elders and
attendance at feasts, that the ideal continues to be held high among the chiefs and elders; however, the impacts of involvement in the wider society are continuing to have a serious negative effect. This process is going to be examined in following sections.

One final point must be reiterated in this section. The pragmatics of subsistence were once understood entirely through the morality of religious precepts; that is, religious ideology acted as the dominant sphere in the organization of power relationships and of production. As Carrier mythology suggests through its accounts of Man in conflict with Nature, however, the fit between ideology and social organization was not perfect; but no model is, whether religious or scientific.

Certainly, the shift in power identified in this Chapter and the next has resulted in a structure that lends support to the notion of inherent imperfection in certain organizational models.
2. Property Relations and the Supporting Legal System

As discussed in Part I of this essay, the fur trade had a significant effect on the territorial organization of the Carrier. With the need to regulate access to non-migratory fur bearing species such as beaver, marten and lynx, there developed a system of territory-owning crest groups, namely phratries and clans. These social divisions formed concomitantly with an appropriate authority structure based on the inter-generational continuity of the dineeza'. This system of territoriality and authority coincides with the model designed by Dyson-Hudson and Smith (1978) which views territoriality as an adaptive strategy associated with certain environmental conditions. Their model employs a cost-benefit analysis, with a specific territorial system expected when "the costs of exclusive use and defense of an area are outweighed by the benefits gained from this pattern of resource utilization" (Dyson-Hudson and Smith, 1978: 23). As might be expected, this state of affairs tends to occur when the resources being exploited are relatively high in density and predictability, such as is the case with fur bearing species like beaver. Of course, salmon also falls into this category and, as explained in Chapter 1, likely enabled the development of a stable village organization as the Carrier moved southward from the regions of migratory game animals.

Prior to the 1950's, during which period critical changes occurred in the Moricetown and Hagwilget fisheries as will be discussed below, the so-called traditional organization of property relations was in place. Again, this is examined with a view to assessing the Carrier "laws" and the locus of power inasmuch as power is used to regulate social relations with respect to land and resources.
The suggestion that there exists a number of delimited territories within a society implies the need to view land as property. Smith (1974: 2) proposes that the institution of property requires the following:

(i) a community;
(ii) a quantity of scarce resources;
(iii) rules regulating acquisition of, access to, and use of those resources;
(iv) a set of pronouns whereby this relationship can be expressed;
(v) a set of rules protecting that property relation.

I intend to concentrate on points (iii) and (v), namely the existence of a set of well-defined rules or "laws" governing the property relation and its various components.

Without belabouring points (i), (ii) and (iv), it can be said that they apply to the Carrier situation. The existence of scarce resources deemed valuable for subsistence can be assumed from the earlier discussion of territoriality as an adaptive mechanism. As well, and as will be pointed out below, resources were not in such abundance as to preclude scarcity and competition. Similarly, the existence of communities is non-problematic: historical (refer to Chapter 1) and archaeological evidence show Carrier occupation of a number of villages, including Hagwilget and Moricetown. That these were "communities" is taken as self-evident, particularly in light of the discussion in Part I. Finally, regarding point (iv), there does exist a set of pronouns for stating property relations. This is most clearly manifested in the correspondence of phratry names to blocks of hunting territories which are further delimited and named according to the various clan chief's who hold managerial responsibility for
the territories under the aegis of the phratries (see Map A). The possessive pronouns wheni ch'oh (= our) and deedu ch'oh (= their) are used in everyday conversation as well as at the feast with reference to territory. Note that the plural form is consistent with group (i.e., phratic) ownership and that non-use of the singular form further indicates phratic rather than chiefly territorial ownership.

The basic unit with territorial jurisdiction in the Carrier fishing economy was, until the 1950's at least, the clan. As explained in Chapter 1, however, unlike the Tsimshian and the Gitksan, the basic unit of Carrier ownership was not the clan but the phratry (see also Jenness, 1943: 483). It was suggested that this was consistent with the movement from the band stage of social organization oriented to the communal hunting of migratory species, to the sept stage oriented to local fishing, to the sept-phratry stage which developed as an adaptive response to a new focus of exploitation, namely the relatively abundant, non-migratory fur bearing species.

Thus ownership of fishing sites and hunting/trapping territories (not the registered traplines) rests with the phratries; management and control at the level of production, however, rest with the various clans. It is at this point that the distinctions between auxtadinee and dineeza', and among the status levels of dineeza' become crucial. The laws regarding inheritance, territoriality, production and distribution are manifested in a well-delineated system that is reflected both on site (i.e., at the fishing sites and on the hunting/trapping territories) and in the feast hall. Relative power, based on religious ideology as the dominant sphere in the organization of production is a key to the effective operation of this system.
At this point I would ask the reader to bear in mind that I am now articulating a system which existed in more-or-less pristine form until about 1950. Since that time, the political and economic relations between the Hwitsowitenne (as a distinct group) and the wider society have led to significant changes. I shall lead into the period of radical change as this Chapter and the next unfold.

A. Fishing on the Bulkley River

For the Hwitsowitenne, salmon was the single most important food source until the 1950's. Based on conversations with elders, correspondence and transcripts of meetings between members of the Moricetown Band and the federal Department of Fisheries in 1951-52 and between members of the Hagwilget Band and the Department of Fisheries in 1958-59 (material on file in the Document Resource Centre, Gitksan-Carrier Tribal Council), and based as well on Hewes (1973), a conservative estimate would be that salmon accounted for fifty percent of the Hwitsowitenne diet. Assuming a more-or-less constant population of approximately 520 individuals (cf. Morice, 1893: 27; 1904: 196) and a caloric requirement that demanded approximately 550 pounds of fresh fish per capita per year (Hewes, 1973: 136-137), then approximately 286,000 pounds of fresh salmon were needed annually for the Hwitsowitenne as a whole.

Hwitsowitenne fishing was concentrated in the Hagwilget and Moricetown Canyons on the Bulkley River and in the case of Moricetown it still is. The two villages are located at these canyons, approximately 25 miles apart. A canyon on a salmon river represents an excellent fishing location since the fish must converge in a relatively narrow channel in order to continue upriver on their spawning migration. Traditionally,
this enabled the fishermen to employ uncomplicated, yet productive techniques utilizing basket traps, dip nets and spears, rather than the more complicated technology of river-spanning weirs as did the Gitksan. Another advantage of canyon fishing is that the fishermen and their families must carry the fish only a short distance up the canyon banks to the clan-owned smokehouses and only slightly farther to their places of residence (i.e., for residents of that particular village; residents of the other village, whether Hagwilget or Moricetown, had to travel.)

The territorial delimitation of Hwitsowitene fishing sites is unique in the region because fishing does occur in the canyons. While other tribal groups such as the Gitksan and other Carrier septs such as the Babine have fishing sites spread along many miles of river, the Hwitsowitene sites are concentrated in a distance of about 100 yards at Moricetown and 200 yards at Hagwilget. The result is a grouping of sites in some cases separated by only a few feet. It should be noted that the entire lengths of the canyons are not suitable as fishing sites: in some cases the steep rock walls are too treacherous even for the placement of hanging wooden platforms as was often done at Hagwilget; at other spots in the canyons the fish simply do not pass. Thus there is a limited number of possible fishing sites at both canyons, and these tend to be grouped in a rather concentrated area.

This concentration of sites appears on Map 2 and Map 3 bound into this Section. On Map 2, indicating the types of sites, phratic ownership and clan chief control at Moricetown, the reader will see that there were twenty traditionally delimited sites at the canyon.

As has been indicated, there are thirteen clan chiefs, each
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of whom controls at least one gaff site (formerly a spear or dip
net site.) ¹ Two chiefs, Whoss and Kweese, each control two gaff sites at
Moricetown, the reason for which is not perfectly clear; however, my
enquiries of the various elders who knew the canyon well when the
territorial delimitations were in full effect lead me to believe that
the answer is strictly a functional one, namely that the two gaff
sites held by Whoss and the two held by Kweese are equivalent in pro-
ductivity to one of the gaff sites held by the other chiefs. It ap-
ppears then that there is a concern for equality of opportunity at work
here.

I might speculate, though, that an advantage to controlling
two gaff sites, even if not as productive as other sites, is that it
would enable more than one fisherman from that particular clan (i.e.,
the clans of Whoss and Kweese) to fish at the same time at one canyon.
For according to Carrier law, it was the clan chief who fished first and
at his discretion until his obligations could be met, at which time he
stipulated the order (in consultation with his "subchiefs") in which
the other nobles in his clan and then the "commoner" family heads could
fish at the site. With two sites at one canyon, more than one fisherman
could be provisioning the clan at one time from the one canyon. On the
other hand, of course, each clan controlled sites at both Hagwilget and
Moricetown Canyons (that is, since 1820). When both canyon fisheries
were in full operation before 1951, the clan chief would usually fish at
his village of residence while other members of his clan could fish
simultaneously at the other village, though this usually was not done.

¹. A gaff is a 20-foot pole with a large, steel hook attached at the
end. Spears and dip nets were banned by the federal Department of
Fisheries in the 1930's in favour of gaff poles. Ironically, more
damage is done to fish by using gaff hooks than spears or dip nets.
The upshot of these observations is that while more than one gaff site at one canyon might in some ways be advantageous, it is generally the case that before the 1950's the clans and the families composing the clans usually were able to meet their needs. The primary example of critical shortage involved a slide which partially blocked the Bulkley River, and hence the migrating salmon, downstream from Moricetown in 1820. Until the slide debris had washed away sufficiently after several years to allow the completely free passage of fish once again, times were rather more difficult for the Hwitsowitenne. However, it was during this crisis that a number of the clans moved downstream past the slide to establish the village of Tse-kya (now Hagwilget) at the Hagwilget canyon. In so doing, stress was removed from the temporarily meagre salmon run at Moricetown. Further, the territorial delimitations newly established at the Hagwilget Canyon included the clan chiefs who had remained at Moricetown, so that the Moricetown chiefs were provided with alternate and relatively abundant fishing sites in any case.

It will be noted that in addition to the gaff sites at the Moricetown Canyon there were four trap sites. A fish trap is a device that is set in a particularly narrow channel between rocks so that the live, entrapped fish can be selected according to any harvesting criteria desired. At the Moricetown canyon each phratry owns one trap site. Again, the functional explanation for this correspondence is that there were only four possible trap sites at the canyon; hence, a fortunate correspondence between the number of suitable sites and the number of phratries. My informants do not query this correspondence;
however, they do note consistently that it is the phratry chief who ideally controls access to and use of his phratry's trap site.

The fact that fish traps have been illegal since the 1930's and that dip net sites have since that time become gaff sites will be discussed below.

The other fishing technique represented on Map 2 is dip netting, denoted as "net site." Prior to the 1930's all of the gaff sites indicated were, in fact, dip net or spearing sites. The dip netting technique again allows the live capture and thus the selective harvesting of fish. The one remaining net site at the Moricetown Canyon is indicated in this way because the elders with whom I spoke referred to it as such. It is a site that belongs to the Gitamtan phratry under the direct managerial authority of Gistehwa (as chief of the House in the Middle of Many.) It is no longer used, however, even as a gaff site, due partly to the fact that it is at an extremely treacherous place in the canyon and apparently also because Gistehwa, who now resides in Hagwilget, chooses not to exercise his right to fish the site.

Regarding the Hagwilget Canyon (Map 3), my information is not so complete, partly due to the fact that this canyon has not been fished at all since 1959, thus rendering precise recall difficult for those informants who once knew the canyon well. In addition, engineering modifications by the Department of Fisheries in 1959 altered the structure and appearance of the canyon, again inhibiting the elders' ability to envision the old sites.

I have managed, however, to piece together a picture of the site locations which is accepted as valid by the elders. As well, the
fishing techniques at Hagwilget make the picture somewhat simpler inasmuch as traps were never set. Spears and dip nets (more latterly, only gaffs) were used interchangeably at all Hagwilget sites. As the map indicates, there were fifteen sites at Hagwilget: one for each clan with two clan chiefs having responsible control (as at Moricetown) for two additional sites. Only one of the chiefs controlling two sites have I been able to identify conclusively, namely Gistehwa. The identity of four clan chiefs in control of four other sites is questionable, as indicated by a question mark (?) after the name on the map.

I wish now to give some consideration to the question of the organization of property relations, bearing in mind the ideological basis of the power differentials in Carrier society which are here viewed as regulating social relations with respect to land and resources by determining certain rights and obligations, namely access, use, control (through sanctions), indirect economic gain and transfer. As I have suggested, it is the phratry that is considered to "own" specific territories, whether for fishing, hunting or trapping. Yet the clan chief is in direct management control of the territories under his name and for the use of members of his clan. This is the case regardless of whether the clan chief is also a phratry chief.

Aside from the historical explanation for the phratry-ownership/clan-management model described in Chapter 1 and alluded to in this Section, above, the ideal is manifested clearly in two arenas: first, at the feast; second, until the 1950's at least, at the fishing or hunting site itself. Put briefly, phratric ownership is indicated at the feast by the required and unquestioned participation of all
dineez' within a particular phratry in deciding upon inheritance of territorial responsibility and any transfer of ownership of that phratry's territories. In other words, if there is a possibility either that the control of territory should change hands within the phratry or that ownership should go to another phratry, the dineez' of the phratry owning the territory must make the critical decisions through consultation. These decisions concern questions such as who should inherit managerial control of the territory, in the case of intraphratric change, and in the case of the allocation of territory to another phratry, the following questions:

(i) to which phratry should a transfer be made?
(ii) for what reason should a transfer be made (e.g., as compensation for a crime committed against another phratry)?
(iii) what territory (and how much) should be transferred?
(iv) should the transfer be permanent and, if not, how long should it be effective?
(v) what conditions, if any, should be put on the transfer (e.g., should the transferring phratry retain any privileges of access or use)?

Such decisions generally are not made at the feast, of course, but are made through consultation prior to and then announced at a feast being hosted by the phratry owning the territory (see below). Specifically, matters of control or ownership transfer were traditionally settled at either funeral, memorial or settlement (for damage) feasts; currently, only funeral and memorial feasts are held.

I have not witnessed the process of decision-making regarding the inheritance of territorial responsibility or the transfer of ownership; it has, however, been described to me by a number of dineez'.

It is preferred upon the death of a dineez' to transfer as soon as possible that chief's responsibilities for territory as well as for other social matters, together with the title (name) and ritual
regalia. Typically this is done at the "smoke feast" (= kha'ta ray khill tsuk) which is held in the home of a close relation in the same clan as the deceased within a day of the death. This is a small gathering to which the nobles of the deceased person's phratry as well as certain members of his/her father's clan (halsut) are expected to come. Tobacco (hence, "smoke feast") and light refreshments are provided. The purposes of the smoke feast are, first, to provide the dineez'a of the bereaved phratry with the opportunity to discuss inheritance (that is, the individual to whom the responsibilities should now go) and, second, to arrange with members of the halsut to fulfill their duties with respect to preparing the body and digging the grave. As well, if a transfer of ownership from one phratry to another is to be made for any reason, it is usually done at a funeral feast. The smoke feast provides the forum for discussion of such matters among the dineez'a in one phratry with respect to intraphratry inheritance of territorial responsibilities and to the transfer of ownership of territory to another phratry. Management and control of the territories (including fishing sites) and resources rests, on the other hand, with the individual clan chiefs to whom specific territories have been assigned. Generally, when an individual inherits a chiefly name, the assignation of the territories does not change; specific names tend to remain associated with specific territories.

At this point I wish to examine more closely the body of Hwitso-witenne laws governing property relations, bearing in mind the phratry-ownership/clan-management model mentioned above. The categories for examination include access and conditions on access, use and conditions
on use, and transfer. I will deal first with fishing sites at the Moricetown and Hagwilget Canyons. Again, I would ask the reader to recall that I am presenting a system which is essentially no longer in effect at the level of real production. Current realities are to be discussed later.

(i) Fishing Sites: Access, Use and Transfer

While each clan chief held the putative power to determine access by others to the fishing sites he controlled, he was obliged by normative practice to consult with the lesser chiefs in his clan, particularly when disputes arose over access. To do otherwise was to deny the wisdom of the so-called subchiefs in their roles as sacred beings. The result was a consultative decision-making process, the final responsibility resting with the clan chief. In cases of conflict between subchiefs in the same clan, the clan chief acted as arbiter without necessarily consulting the subchiefs.

As was suggested above, the clan chief was expected to fish the sites at his discretion until his subsistence, distributional and ceremonial needs were met. By subsistence needs, I mean the requirements of his immediate family for fresh salmon and salmon to be preserved by smoking for consumption throughout the year until the next fishing season. Distributional needs of the clan chief included obligations that were more extensive than those of his subchiefs or the lower ranking family heads in his clan. Specifically, the clan chief was not only responsible to provide for his own immediate family (including children still living in his House) but also for elders in his clan whose families, for one reason or another, could not fill their needs. Simi-
larly, the chief was expected to supply fish to families in his clan who were without male family members capable of fishing, whether permanently or temporarily. Currently, however, certain chiefs exercise distributional responsibilities beyond the membership of their own clans to include a variety of kin and non-kin relations not prescribed in the traditional network of distribution. More will be said on this below.

Ceremonial obligations represented a significant production quota for the clan chief. As chief of the clan calling a feast he could expect material support in the form of food and other goods for distribution from the other clans in his phratry; however, the major responsibility for supplying the feast rested with the calling chief. Typically, a feast would involve the distribution of considerable quantities of various kinds of food, including fresh salmon if the ceremony were held in fishing season and cured salmon if it were not. Game meat such as bear and moose as well as beaver were also distributed among the guests either in fresh or preserved form. These foods, along with preserved berries and perhaps delicacies such as eulachen grease, herring roe and seaweed acquired from the coast through trade, were consumed at the feast and taken home by the guests.

At this point I must digress somewhat and make the point that competition per se, leading to the need to borrow and repay with interest as a means to amassing goods for distribution at the feast, was not the case among the Carrier (at least as far as I can determine from elders' accounts of earlier feasts.) The inflationary nature of the potlatch as posited by Codere for the Kwakiutl was based, at least in post-contact
times, "in the context of a fantastic surplus economy" (Codere, 1950: 63). I have found no indication that the Carrier ever lived in such a context. Further, following Boas (1897: 341), Codere sees the inflationary cycle of the Kwakiutl potlatch as an effect of the chiefs’ obligations to repay the receipt of feast gifts with substantially increased gifts. She writes as follows:

The property received by a man in a potlatch was no free and wanton gift. He was not at liberty to refuse it, even though accepting it obligated him to make a return at another potlatch not only of the original amount but of twice as much, if this return was made, as was usual, in a period of about a year. This gave potlatching its forced loan and investment aspects, since a man was alternately debtor and creditor for amounts that were increasing at a geometric rate (Codere, 1950: 68-69).

Certainly, ecological theorists such as Suttles (1968), Vayda (1961) and Piddocke (1965) deny the assumption of a constant "fantastic surplus economy" upon which the inflationary potlatch was supposedly based. Hwitsowitenne chiefs explain to me that a chief calling a feast must repay goods, services and privileges "with interest" at the feast; but this refers to goods, services and privileges which are transacted outside the feast hall, not gifts given at a previous feast. For example, if a clan chief, whether of the calling clan chief's phratry or not, has permitted the calling chief or a member of his clan to use his fishing site or hunting territory, then that privilege is repaid at the feast with a gift considered equivalent in value to the privilege together with an arbitrary amount of "interest." In the use of disposable material such as ammunition given by one chief to another, the recipient will repay the same amount of ammunition together with interest (often a hand tool or a blanket) at the next feast hosted by his phratry.
In summary, the concept of repayment with interest at the feast refers not to the repayment of feast prestations but to the completion of transactions that began outside the feast hall, usually in the context of productive activities. Thus there was no geometric rate of increase as suggested by Codere for the Kwakiutl, rather the completion of economic transactions in a forum (i.e., the feast hall) that enabled the completion of the transaction to be witnessed publicly and that acknowledged the honour of both participants in the exchange.

To return to my earlier discussion, each clan chief was obliged to meet certain production quotas dictated by the subsistence, distributional and ceremonial needs he faced. His was the first right to fish at the sites under his control in order that his quota was maintained over the May to October fishing season (this assumes healthy migratory salmon stocks). This is not to suggest that the chief's sites were reserved solely for him on a 24 hour per day basis, nor every day during the fishing season. Canyon fishing requires concentrated effort, the degree of productivity more directly related to effort expended than in the weir or net fishery practised by other groups, including the Gitksan. This is due, of course, to the fact that fish are caught only so long as the fisherman is actively engaged in spearing, dip netting or gaffing. (The four traps at Moricetown represented a more passive type of fishing.) Thus, an individual fisherman generally could meet his needs by fishing from two to four hours per day for perhaps up to fifteen days during each of the three major salmon runs. This allowed ample time for the usual eight or nine clan fishermen besides the chief to meet their needs, all at one site. As I have pointed
out, every clan controlled at least two sites—one at Hagwilget and one at Moricetown; however, the more distant site generally was not preferred because of the time and effort involved in travelling. As well, I am told by one elderly gentleman, Muh'nuh'lehts who was a subchief in the 1940's, that the chiefs did not encourage their clan members to fish at the sites away from home because the distance prevented the chiefs from supervising the users in terms of the numbers of fish being taken. Thus, the greatest demands were placed on the "home site(s)."

The allocation of fishing time to the clan’s fisherman favoured first, after the clan chief, the subchief of second ranking status, and so on down to the youngest commoner who was a family head. Muh'nuh'lehts also advised me that not every commoner who expected to fish was given the opportunity to do so every day. Again, the allocation of fishing times depended on the strength of the run and thus the ability of the higher ranking clan members to meet their needs. It was pointed out to me in this connection, however, than one of the clan chief’s major responsibilities was to ensure, as far as possible, that no family suffered a total lack of fish. Ideally, at least, in times of relative shortage of migrating salmon adjustments were made in the effort and catch of all clan fisherman, including the chief.

The question is a critical one as to whether or not clan chiefs actually exercised their authority to limit the number of fish taken by individual clan fishermen and by the clan as a whole, particularly in years when one or more migratory runs were weak. If such were the case, it would be a strong indication (a) that the clan chiefs,
at least, were able to assess with some confidence the strength of individual runs, and (b) that there existed an institutionalized resource management scheme, at least with respect to salmon. The earlier literature on the Carrier is of no help on this question; however, the place to start perhaps is to recall Godelier's (1978) notion that religious ideology may be viewed as the dominant sphere of production. In that regard Goldman's explanation of "the logic of the hunter" cited above (p. 254), sums up well the ideal approach by the Hwitsowitenne to fishing and hunting, namely that men are in a reciprocal relationship with animals and that it is essential to continued production that this exchange be an equitable one based on the interests of both men and animals. Specifically, the exchange involves respect and care from the human side in return for food and clothing from the animal side. As it is the chiefs of either realm in their capacities as mediators who are responsible for ensuring the fair exchange, it is the human chiefs who have the direct responsibility to control the number of fish taken from the river. Indeed, this logic corresponds well both to Hwitsowitenne myths and to the elders' and chiefs' general explanations of the way things should work. That is to say, there was never any doubt expressed in my discussions with elders and chiefs that chiefs had the authority and the obligation to control fishing effort and catch according to the strength of the salmon run.

The difficulty arises in finding concrete examples of this. Again, examples are most likely to have occurred prior to the 1950's, during which time major changes affected the Hwitsowitenne productive organization. Fortunately, it has been possible to identify three
different years in relatively recent memory when the run of one species or another was poor. An advantage of these examples is that they involve the entire Bulkley River stock of the species concerned so that both Hagwilget and Moricetown, further upriver, were affected.

In 1941 the spring (chinook) run was particularly slow in starting and continued very weakly. The cause is unknown although possibilities include a low point in the natural cycle of the species, the effects of disease or the commercial fishery at the coast. I have been told by seven elders, each from a different clan, four from Moricetown and three from Hagwilget, that in 1941 a limit on effort and catch was imposed by the clan chiefs on the Bulkley River. The chiefs, who generally tended to keep a sharp eye on the activity at their fishing site(s) even during healthy runs, evidently spent most of each day and night at the site(s) located in their village of residence during the weak run. Although my informants' reports differ slightly, it appears that allowable catch during the period of limitation varied between two and five fish per day of fishing per fisherman, the variation due in part to the status of the individual. This range of allowable catch was considerably lower than during normal runs when five to ten salmon were caught per fishing day (again depending on the fisherman's rank).

My informants recall no incidents requiring the application of chiefly sanction in the 1941 case. In 1946, however, it seems that during a particularly weak sockeye run one young commoner who happened to be a family head was found fishing at dusk at his clan chief's site after he had received explicit instructions not to do so for two days. The chief, Gistehwa, verbally reprimanded the young man. The next day the commoner was again discovered fishing at Gistehwa's other Hagwilget
Canyon site. At this point the young man's fishing gear, consisting of dip net, spear and carrying baskets were confiscated by the chief and orders given that the offender was not to fish at all for the remainder of the season; instead, he and his family would have to rely upon his hunting and trapping skills and the goodwill of the other members of his clan in order to survive the winter. It was universally acknowledged by my informants that a third offence by the same individual would almost unquestionably have resulted in his being cast out of the clan, although his wife and children would likely have been given the option to remain.

Ostracism from one's clan was potentially a serious fate for an individual, inasmuch as mutual support within the traditional clan was crucial for survival. Ostracism would have been announced at a feast by the chief of the clan in question, thus making public the offender's crime and rendering unlikely his adoption into another clan. While I was told by elders that such cases had occurred in their lifetimes, I was not able to collect adequate information on any specific case to present it substantively here.

The third example of a weak migratory run concerns the coho stock in 1952. Perhaps not coincidentally, this was the year after major engineering modifications in the form of fish ladders were made in the Moricetown Canyon. Coho is the last species to run each year and as such is especially important as a fish to be preserved for the winter and spring months. As will be explained later in this Chapter, by 1952 the Moricetown system of property relations was breaking down, although that at Hagwilget was continuing to function well. In that
year the clan chiefs of Hagwilget, based on assessment and consultation, decided to impose very severe restrictions on the coho fishery, hoping that the resulting food shortage would be compensated by a good moose hunting season in the fall. The case to be described is an interesting example of the management control exercised by clan chiefs, not because it involves an offence by any individual of the clans whose chiefs imposed the restrictions but because it involves the "trespassing" on one of the Hagwilget sites by two members of another phratry (in this case from Moricetown). This leads us to consider another level of the laws concerning access and use, namely interphratric control.

Again, it was one of the sites controlled by Gistehwa at Hagwilget that was used illegally, on this occasion very early in the morning before anyone from Hagwilget was fishing at the canyon. By chance, Gistehwa (mother's brother of the present Gistehwa) discovered the offenders spearing coho at the site. Now, in Carrier legal terms this offence is perhaps the most serious, next only to personal bodily harm and severe property damage done willfully. I have been told repeatedly by chiefs and elders that in such a situation the clan chief whose fishing site was being violated had the unquestioned right to shoot the offender on sight. For obvious reasons in 1952 Gistehwa refrained from the ultimate sanction and resorted instead to a series of actions that were effective yet acceptable by western standards (certainly by 1952 northern British Columbia standards). While the Moricetown men were still fishing, unaware they had been observed, Gistehwa summoned three other clan chiefs, each from a different phratry, including Laksilyu, the phratry of the offenders (recall that Gistehwa is Gitamtan). The chiefs were called to witness the offence. At this point, Gistehwa
accosted the offenders and at gunpoint ordered them away from his fishing site at which time he employed a practice known as *yunaxstlax* in the presence of the offenders and the other chiefs present. *Yunaxstlax* is translated into English as "whipping;" that is, the names of the offenders are called out, scorned and the nature of the offence is stated. This is the first step in the act of "calling down a name" at the Gitksan refer to it, and takes place before a feast, preferably at the time of the offence and with witnesses. Gistehwa’s next step in the process of shaming the pair was to execute *yuneexstlax*, the formal "whipping" at the next feast being held by any phratry except his own. *Yuneexstlax* is essentially an elaboration of *yunaxstlax* but occurs only in the feast hall and is intended to shame the offender before the entire community of nobles.

The results of the shaming process are potentially rather serious for the law breaker. Typically, as happened to the offenders in the case just described, loss of status and privileges results. Several elders recalled for me with some glee Gistehwa’s excellent *yuneexstlax* at the feast following the described offence and the resulting shame for the two law breakers. In this case both men were high ranking nobles in one of the Laksilyu clans, one a subchief immediately below the clan chief in rank and the other a noble about fourth rank from the clan chief. Once the *yuneexstlax* had been executed and the illegal act verified by the original witnessing chiefs, it then remained for the chief of the offenders’ clan to "pronounce sentence" and to state that compensation would be announced at the next feast. (The time lapse until the announcement of compensation enabled the clan chief to consult with his sub chiefs and, more importantly, with the other clan chiefs in his phratry.
as to the substance of the compensation. Since the transfer of territory, albeit usually temporarily, was likely to be involved, the decision had to be made at the phratric level.) The "sentence" in this case was typical for such an offence: fishing privileges were severely restricted for an indefinite period (usually one season) at the discretion of the sentencing clan chief; as well, the guilty subchief permanently lost his privileged position of advisor to his chief and was permanently forbidden to speak on his chief's behalf at the feast. This disruption of the clan's ranking order necessitated, of course, a realignment of personnel, responsibilities and privileges within the clan. Such reorganization was done internally and not at the feast.

Retribution made to the offended phratry was typical as well in this case: Gistehwa was granted free access to and use of the fishing site at Hagwilget normally controlled by the chief of the offending Laksilyu clan. This was to remain in effect as long as the current (in 1952) Gistehwa remained alive; at the time of his death access and use would revert entirely to the Laksilyu clan in question and the reversion would be announced by the Laksilyu clan chief at Gistehwa's funeral feast. This in fact occurred upon Gistehwa's death in 1965.

This example of interphratric control with respect to property relations is not an isolated case, although it is the case which was described to me most consistently and in greatest detail by the elders. The point to be made is that there existed a set of laws governing access to territory and use of resources. Two men were found guilty of breaking a property law and were punished accordingly. While their actions might well have been born of necessity or desperation (given the poor coho run in 1952), or of the breaking down of property relations at Morice-town, thus inducing them to try an illegal act at Hagwilget, they were
not excused in the eyes of Hwitsowitenne law. Further, fair compensation was made to the offended phratry in such a manner as not to alter the interphratric property relation permanently. Finally, the entire case was handled according to normative practise by the proper authorities at the proper forum, namely the feast. This was the Hwitsowitenne legal system in operation, supporting that society's structure of property relations. Again, those relations were set in the context of religious ideology as the dominant sphere, recalling the "logic of the hunter" which demands that a state of fair reciprocity be maintained by the chiefs of human and animal realms. Property relations and their supporting laws and sanctions form an operational system which assists the human realm, particularly its chiefs, to manage that reciprocal relationship. Thus, I might conclude that prior to the period of radical change in the 1950's there existed an institutionalized resource management system, at least with respect to salmon.

(ii) Radical Change in the Fishery

The first external impact on the Bulkley River fishery resulted from commercial fishing and the fish canning industry at the mouth of the Skeena River (the Bulkley is a tributary of the Skeena) in the 1860's. As Lane (1978) points out, the uncontrolled waste of fish by the canneries was so great by the early 1900's that the cannery operators expected to be limited in their processing activities at any time. In order to escape the blame for the diminishing salmon runs that in fact resulted from commercial overfishing to supply the canneries, the cannery operators mounted a political campaign in 1904 against the Indian fishery (Lane, 1978: 4). Specifically, they demanded that Indian fishing gear
such as weirs, basket traps and dip nets be banned\textsuperscript{2} and that only gill nets and gaffs be allowed. As far as Hagwilget and Moricetown were concerned, the campaign was effective by about 1930 at which time federal fisheries officers pressured Hwitsowitenne fishermen, under threat of fine and imprisonment, to forego the use of their basket traps (at Moricetown) and the traditional spears and dip nets. Instead, they were to adopt the gaff pole, the only realistic alternative in the canyon fishery.

Thus the initial impacts on the Bulkley River fishery from external sources took two forms: first, reduced stocks due to commercial overfishing at the coast; and second, the enforced change from effective, conservation oriented gear to unfamiliar gear that was considerably less effective and more damaging to the fish. It is reasonable to assume that as a result, increased time expenditures were required by the Hwitsowitenne fishermen in order to meet their needs, and further that this affected daily life to some degree.

The most critical impacts on Hwitsowitenne fishing, however, came in 1951 at Moricetown and 1959 at Hagwilget. I shall examine the Moricetown case first.

Based on their assessment of the declining Bulkley River salmon stocks, the federal Department of Fisheries concluded in 1950 that a large part of the problem was due to the migrating salmon having difficulty negotiating the waterfall at the Moricetown Canyon. It can be assumed also from Lane's (1978) work and transcripts of meetings

\textsuperscript{2} The cannery operators focused their campaign on weirs, which were actually illegal anyway according to the Fisheries Act. According to Lane (1978: 5), the packers threatened to withdraw political support from the ruling federal Liberal Party if weirs were not banned. By about 1930 the threat had also extended effectively to prohibit other forms of gear such as basket traps, dip nets and spears.
between the Hwitsowitenne and the Department of Fisheries in 1950-51 that the Department was continuing to look towards the Indian fishery as a major cause of declining stocks, this view probably still the result of political pressure from the commercial fishery and processing interests. At any rate, the Department determined to construct two fishways (i.e., fish ladders) around the waterfall at Moricetown. Despite the protests of the Moricetown people, in particular, engineers' dynamite blasted considerable sections of the rock outcroppings which formed the places in the canyon where the fishermen stood while using their gaff poles. The fish ladders, which are basically concrete "tunnels" measuring approximately five feet square at each end, were built one on either side of the canyon around the waterfall.

This construction had three immediate effects. First, the blasting simply removed certain sections of rock which formed natural fishing "holes" and upon which the fishermen could stand for effective access to the migrating fish. Second, where the river bottom in the canyon had originally been relatively smooth and thus amenable to the use of a gaff pole, the blasting deposited large quantities of rubble that interfered with the sensitivity required in the gaff pole. Third, where the fish once swam past rock outcroppings and were thus accessible, many now swam through the enclosed fish ladder past the most productive section of the canyon. Further, the Fisheries Act makes it illegal for anyone to fish by any means at either end of a fish ladder. Since the time the ladders were constructed fisheries officers have kept a keen eye on them, thereby ensuring that the potential Indian harvest is substantially reduced inasmuch as a great many fish are protected by the ladders.
What was the cumulative impact of these immediate effects on the Moricetown fishery? Essentially, it was that the configuration of the terrain and the distribution of the resource on that terrain were radically altered. The result was a severe strain placed on the territorial organization at the Moricetown Canyon. The reader will appreciate in examining Map 2 that the productive quality of most sites has deteriorated seriously. It is understandable, therefore, that the clan chiefs faced a serious problem in terms of meeting their subsistence, distributional and ceremonial needs; other family heads faced the problem of meeting subsistence requirements. Additional stress was placed on the territorial organization due to the fact that the decline in productive quality of sites was not spread equally among all clans; that is, certain clans were less affected by the physical changes than others.

An important point arises here. The Hwitsowitenne organization of productive and property relations normally would have been able to accommodate considerable stress without interphratry or interclan conflict arising. As has been demonstrated, the clan chiefs in their capacity as controlling managers of specific fishing sites had the authority to determine access to and restrictions on the sites they controlled. Besides being able to keep members of other clans away from "his" site(s), a chief was able to allow members of another clan to use the site(s) under his control if there were a particular difficulty with the productivity of the other clan's site. Thus, the organization of property relations had built into it a provision for the equitable distribution of access to fish. In 1951 at Moricetown, however, conflict ensued.

The conflict, I am told, arose directly as the result of
several commoners and a few low ranking nobles, whose fishing sites had become particularly unproductive, moving onto the sites controlled by other clans without acquiring permission to do so from the appropriate clan chief. Physical conflict resulted a number of times at the sites between the authorized users of the site and the "trespassers." Again, the examples of control I cited earlier suggest that this would not have been tolerated by the clan chiefs or the society as a whole under normal conditions. There were, however, two new factors which contributed to the breakdown of the effective control of the clan chiefs and the operation of the legal process. First, a number of Moricetown people became involved in the wage economy that was building rapidly in the area. And second, the development of a new Reserve government in the form of an elected Band Council (initiated by the Department of Indian Affairs through the Indian Act) resulted in a shift in authority and in the approach to property relations. This second factor will be discussed in more detail in the Section to follow. Suffice it to say here, however, that with the new democratic system in operation many of the younger men, in particular, began to seriously question the hereditary authority of the clan chiefs. Further, the Band Council favoured what it saw as an egalitarian policy of free access by all family heads to any fishing site, regardless of phratric ownership and especially of clan chief control, as long as physical conflict did not occur. "The people can work things out" the elected chief councillor is reported to have said in 1951.

The question of the involvement of clan chiefs in the wage economy is critical. After World War II the federal and provincial governments together with large industrial interests jointly instituted a resource development policy for the northern areas of British Columbia,
primarily in the development of the timber resource. The resultant influx of capital to the northcentral and northwestern regions of the province was manifested in a burgeoning logging and timber processing industry that employed many people, native and white, in the bush and the mills. Men from Moricetown were drawn to mills at Smithers, about fifteen miles south, and to South Hazelton, about twenty-five miles to the north. Band records (Moricetown Band, 1953) indicate that in 1952 there were 68 male "family heads"; of these, 27 (39.7%) were employed in the forest industry. It is difficult to estimate how many of these men worked full-time or for the entire year as the Band has no such record nor records of personal income for the early 1950's. For our purposes here, however, it is safe to assume that most were employed from June to October, that is, during the season of considerable activity and the salmon fishing season. The immediate result of this involvement in the forest industry was that fishing suddenly lost some importance as a subsistence activity in the case of commoners and as a means of meeting the ceremonial, distributional and subsistence needs of some of the chiefs. (Of the seven clan chiefs residing at Morice-town, four were employed in the forest industry in 1952.)

At this point, before elaborating on the implications of the imposed changes at Moricetown, I shall discuss the Hagwilget situation. In contrast to Moricetown, events at Hagwilget in 1959 were straightforward—straightforward in the sense that as the result of one simple engineering project the entire Hagwilget fishery was shut down permanently. Again it was the Department of Fisheries that identified declining spawning runs as traceable to a physical problem on a reserve.

In the centre of the Hagwilget Canyon there existed a large
rock formation around which the salmon had to swim in order to proceed upriver. The passable spaces between the centre rock and the sides of the canyon were quite narrow, enabling fishermen operating from an impressive array of platforms attached to the rock walls to fish most effectively with spears and dip nets and, latterly, with gaffs. For reasons which are still unclear (correspondence between Hagwilget Band and Department of Fisheries, on file with the Gitksan-Carrier Tribal Council), technicians with the Department of Fisheries determined that the large rock was inhibiting the migration of salmon. The resulting action involved destruction of the rock with dynamite. The immediate physical effect was to clear the centre channel in the canyon, thus allowing the fish to swim there. The important species, namely, spring, sockeye and coho, naturally prefer the central channel and thus were able to avoid the sides of the canyon. Consequently, the fishermen were left with no access to the fish as the canyon is too wide to reach to the centre and the current is too swift to allow the setting of nets or other passive gear. In 1959 fishing at Hagwilget ceased and is not likely to ever begin again.

As an aside, I might note that the Hagwilget elders view the large rock as having been beneficial to the salmon, as well as to themselves as fishermen. They maintain that the salmon used to rest in the relative calm of the downriver side of the rock before resuming their arduous swim through the canyon; the destruction of the rock thus removed a natural advantage to the salmon. It is significant that there was no increase in salmon stocks after the blasting as was promised by the Department of Fisheries. Whether the Department's purpose was to remove a
physical barrier to the fish or to curtail the Indian fishery, both were achieved but neither had the effect of improving the salmon run (Gitksan-Carrier Tribal Council, Fish Management Study, unpublished documentation).

Before attempting to place the above events in analytical perspective I shall examine Hwitsowitenne hunting and trapping, first in terms of the unique Carrier organization of property relations and the laws governing those, and then in terms of the stresses placed on the relations and laws by involvement with the wider system.

B. Hwitsowitenne Hunting and Trapping

It is not by chance that I discussed the property relations and laws of fishing prior to those of hunting and trapping. For as far as can be determined, fishing was the single most important productive activity among the Carrier of Hagwilget and Moricetown (see p.261); further, the canyon fishery provides a microcosm of territoriality which can now be extended to hunting and trapping. I should point out that much of the rationale underlying the laws governing access, use and transfer with respect to hunting and trapping is the same that applies to fishing. In particular, I would refer the reader back to the beginning of this Section where I explained that the ownership of hunting territories rests with the phratries while management and control at the level of production rest with the various clans. Also, as in the case of fishing territoriality, it is the clan chiefs in their capacity as special beings holding power who make decisions and enforce laws regarding access, use and transfer. Similarly, the consultative decision process with respect to interphratric transfer of territorial rights holds for hunting territories as it does for fishing sites, and the feast is used
as the ultimate forum for legitimating any action concerning hunting territorial access, use and transfer as it is for fishing.

Again, I would remind the reader that at this point I am discussing the more pristine system as it existed on site and in the feast hall prior to the 1950's.

(i) Hunting Territories: Access, Use and Transfer

Moose, and secondarily bear, were and continue to be the large game species most hunted by the Hwitsowitenne. Rabbit, grouse and other small game were hunted for subsistence during the course of a hunting trek aimed at getting large game. Trapping, which flourished after 1820 with the entry into the area of the Hudson's Bay Company, was primarily for beaver, marten and lynx. Until the institution of the provincial government's system of registered traplines in 1946, trapping was not distinguished from large game hunting in terms of territoriality; that is, the same territories were used by the same approved individuals under the authority of the same clan chiefs.

Hunting and trapping were fall and winter activities, during which periods entire families would leave their villages for the territories of their clan chiefs. There they would stay in cabins from October while the men hunted and trapped, returning to the villages about once every six to eight weeks to attend a round of feasts. In April the families would return to the villages to prepare for the spring fishing season; before fishing began, however, the men alone would return to the hunting territories for about one month in late April and May to trap beaver, finally to return to the villages in late May. Examination of Map A, appended to this thesis, will give the reader some indication of the distances travelled by the Hwitsowitenne in their yearly cycle:
while families were able to travel by train (after the 1860's) for part of their journey from Moricetown and Hagwilget, several still had to walk as far as 120 miles to reach their hunting cabins.

Map A indicates the total extent of Hwitsowitenne hunting/trapping territories as well as phratic ownership and the management areas under the control of the thirteen clan chiefs. Each phratic territory has its own history explaining its location and boundaries, as well as its subdivision among the phratri's component clans. Unfortunately, these histories have mostly been forgotten. This fact is significant inasmuch as the histories were regularly repeated at funeral feasts when a new chief was assuming his inherited name and territories, as well as at the pole-raising feast one year later when the new chief raised his totem pole, thus making a clear statement as to the phratri territory under his control. However, a state of flux, or perhaps uncertainty, has arisen within the feast hall concomitantly with the stresses placed on traditional property relations as a result of the imposed system of registered traplines. Trapline registration will be discussed below; at this point it is important to note that most of the specific histories of individual territories (though not their locations) have been forgotten.

There are, however, four apparently anomalous cases on Map A which can be explained historically to some extent. The most obvious case is that of Widak-kwats, a clan chief of the Laksilyu phratri. The territory under the control of Widak-kwats is divided into three relatively small sections, all adjoining a larger territory controlled by Smogehlghem, phratri chief of the combined Laksamshu-Tsayu phratries. The obvious question is: why is the Widak-kwats territory divided the way it is?
The first point is that the more westerly two sections have been separated beyond the memory of anyone living now; thus, the history is lacking here. The easterly section, however, was evidently transferred in perpetuity from the Laksamshu-Tsayu phratry to Laksilyu in about the 1840's. A number of elders, including at least one from each phratry advised me that the Smogehlghem at the time mistook the identity of a subchief immediately under Widak-kwats and shot him as a trespasser hunting on the Laksamshu-Tsayu land; in fact, the victim did have explicit permission from Smogehlghem to cross the latter's territory, hunting on the way if necessary, in order to reach the other portion of the territory controlled by Widak-kwats. In light of this grave mistake the Laksamshu-Tsayu chiefs made the decision to transfer the perpetual ownership of a section of the territory controlled by Smogehlghem to the Laksilyu phratry. (Recall that in cases of interphratric transfer of territory, the decision had to be made together by the clan chiefs of the transferring phratry.) The Laksilyu chiefs accepted the retribution together with considerable other material at an elaborate settlement feast and allocated control of their new piece of territory to Widak-kwats; hence, the easterly portion of the territory labelled Widak-kwats on Map A.

Another apparent anomaly when looking at Map A is the smaller, more southerly territory of the two areas under the control of Smogehlghem. The history behind this division is rather less clear than for the previous case; however, the present Smogehlghem advises me that sometime around the turn of the century the decision was made by the clan chiefs of Laksamshu-Tsayu to transfer the control of part of the territory under Klo'mkan to Smogehlghem for an indefinite period. The reason for the transfer concerned a question of population ratio vis-a-vis size of
territory and resource abundance. I am told that the population of Klo'mkan's clan dropped sharply in the late 1800's, the cause of which is now unknown; at the same time, Smogehlgem's clan size was increasing. The decision was taken, therefore, to even out the population:resource ratio by transferring the control and rights to resource use of the territory in question from Klo'mkan to Smogehlgem. This history has been verified for me by Gistehwa (the Gitamtn phratry chief who controls an adjoining territory) with one variation from Smogehlgem's version; namely, that the decision to make the transfer of control was not made by consensus among the Laksamshu-Tsayu chiefs but was made unilaterally by the Smogehlgem at the time, who happened to be a particularly forceful individual and who was willing to extend his right to veto power as phratry chief to include this decision. According to Gistehwa, the earlier Smogehlgem's action caused some dissent within the Laksamshu-Tsayu phratry but not enough to prevent the transfer or to reverse it later.

The most significant aspect of this case is that an alteration in territorial control (and hence resource allocation) could be made in order to match the changing size of the resource using units (i.e., the clans). Thus it appears that there existed an ability to adjust the man:land ratio as needed, in this case with respect to hunting territories. Earlier it was indicated that access to salmon could also be controlled according to the needs of the various clans as well as to the availability of the resource at any particular time.

Another territory which immediately raises a question is the smaller, more northerly section under the control of Khasbut, especially as Khasbut's southern territory is quite large. Unfortunately, I was
unable to acquire concrete evidence on this case from the elders. It was generally felt, however, that because of the topographical delimitation of the small territory in question it had likely belonged at one time to the Laksilyu phratry under the control of Hagwilnelh. Further, the elders, including the current Khasbut and Hagwilnelh, surmised for me that the land was transferred as retribution for some now forgotten reason.

The fourth case of immediate interest on Map A is that of the two parcels of Gitamtan territory controlled by Medeek. Why are there two parcels, particularly in light of the existence of a natural boundary, namely the Suskwa River, which would seem to be a logical connector to join the two parcels into a single larger one? The explanation in this case is quite clear and raises another interesting aspect of property relations; that is, the "international" (i.e., intertribal) level relations. The history of this case has been confirmed for me by Gistehwa and Medeek, as well as by various Gitksan elders. Evidently, at some point in the 1880's a commoner belonging to Medeek's clan crossed into the hunting territory of the Gitksan clan chief Lutk'utsiiwis of the Laxse'el (Frog) phratry. The commoner was hunting moose and in crossing his clan's boundary, particularly into Gitksan land, he was clearly "trespassing" and intending to "steal" moose as well. While on Gitksan land he shot a moose and was discovered by a subchief under Lutk'utsiiwis while dressing the carcass. When accosted by the Gitksan subchief the Hwitsowitenne trespasser shot and killed the other.

In view of the severity of the crime a special meeting of all Gitksan and Hwitsowitenne phratry chiefs was convened, at which time the commoner's guilt was clearly established. It then remained for the
Gitamtan clan chiefs to decide upon the retribution to be made to the Gitksan Laxse'el phratry and to host a settlement feast in honour of all the Gitksan phratries and for the primary purpose of announcing the retribution. A feast was held immediately and settlement was made to the satisfaction of the offended Laxse'el. As well as a variety of material goods such as rifles, ammunition, blankets, fishing gear, snowshoes, traps and food distributed among the Gitksan chiefs, and to Lutk'utsiiwis in particular, a valuable piece of Medeek's territory was transferred in perpetuity to Lutk'utsiiwis. (Recall my belief expressed in Chapter 1 that among the Gitksan, unlike the Carrier, territories were owned by the clan chiefs rather than by the phratries; hence the transfer of ownership to Lutk'utsiiwis as the offended clan chief.) The events in this case are particularly well recalled because of the international aspect. It remains for the Gitksan and the Hwitsowitenne an example of the good relations between the two groups. For the purposes of this essay it also indicates the well defined system of property relations and concomitant legal and ritual mechanisms that existed in the area, in earlier times at least.

The four cases just presented are obvious ones because of their irregularity as manifested on the territorial map. There are, however, other less obvious cases that can be used to indicate the operation of the property relations and legal system. Fortunately, several such cases are within the living memory of some Hwitsowitenne elders and I have chosen to concentrate on certain of these in the hopes of greater accuracy of detail.

The hunting of moose and bear presented interesting problems in terms of property relations and the exercise of laws. Compared to salmon,
large game animals are, relatively speaking, less evenly distributed in their habitat, a fact which can present problems in terms of relative abundance of game on the various hunting territories. It is thus conceivable that while one clan's territory can support adequate numbers of moose for that clan, another territory might be lacking. Mechanisms therefore existed whereby uneven distribution of resources would not lead to "trespassing" and perhaps conflict, as has been shown in the two cases above involving the transfers of territorial control and ownership to Smogehlghem and Lutk'utsiiwis, respectively. A further complication of large game is that the animals exhibit no willingness to observe the territorial boundaries set arbitrarily by men. Problems may thus arise for a hunter who is stalking an animal when that animal crosses the boundary into another territorial jurisdiction; however, laws have been established to govern this situation. The laws relating to hunting territoriality (including trapping) can be categorized into three broad headings: first, transfer of territory; second, access to territory and resources; and third, distribution of produce. (It must be noted that the second and third categories are closely related.) The first category has been exemplified in the case of Smogehlghem, above. Let us now examine cases in the second and third categories.

The first example occurred during my stay in the area. The territory of the Laksamshu-Tsayu clan chief Kweese has been seriously damaged for hunting and particularly trapping by intensive logging. Kweese's sister's son, however, has been most interested in trapping and, as a result of recent unemployment, has made the decision to live in the bush as a trapper. Significantly, he lives and traps not on Kweese's territory but rather on the adjacent territory of another Laksamshu-Tsayu clan chief, Sa'bek. The obvious question arises: Does this man have a
right to live and trap on the territory controlled by a clan chief other than his own? And secondarily, what are the conditions, if any, on this right to territorial access and resource use? These questions were answered unequivocally for me by Sa'bek, Khasbut (Gilserhyu chief) and Gistehwa (Gitamten chief). Evidently, a man has the right to almost guaranteed access and resource use on a temporary basis to any other territory within his phratry if for some reason he is having a problem getting game on the territory of his own clan chief or if he needs food from the other territory for immediate survival purposes. Such access and use are more-or-less guaranteed if the following conditions are met: (a) that the clan chief who controls the needed resources is first approached and gives permission for access and resource use (permission may be general enough to allow access to any part of the territory and the taking of any game, or it may focus on specific areas and animals, or any combination thereof); (b) that the visitor's stay on the territory is temporary (about one week is acceptable); (c) that the hosting chief is presented with some portion of the visitor's catch, perhaps a bear skin, a moose quarter, or a couple of beaver. (This presentation is to be immediate and not at the feast; however, an appropriate gift must be made to the hosting clan chief by the visitor's clan at the next feast put on by their common phratry.)

The rules just described concern temporary access and use. Access is more-or-less guaranteed if the above conditions can be met and if host and visitor are of the same phratry. In the specific example I cited of a member of Kweese's clan living and trapping on Sa'bek's territory, the stay was to be more than temporary, which brings into question the assuredness of permission being granted. It is, however, entirely up to the discretion of the potential host chief to determine who can have access to his/her territory and resources and under what conditions this
may occur. In other words, because of the prolonged nature of the requested access and use, Sa'bek would have been quite in line to refuse permission; however, as manager of that territory, Sa'bek used chiefly discretion in favour of the petitioner. I should note, as well, that the visitor has made payment to Sa'bek in the form of beaver and, at the feast, with blankets and a rifle.  

Another case concerning access, use and distribution of produce was related to me by Gistehwa (Gitamtan). This example involves the previous Gistehwa who was tracking a bear on his own territory. Before he caught up to the animal it crossed into the adjoining Laksamshu-Tsayu territory controlled by Klo'mkan. Under Hwitsowitenne law Gistehwa had the right to continue tracking the bear and to kill it, providing he fulfilled certain obligations required by the fact that the animal was now in the territory of another phratry. Specifically, Gistehwa had to stand at the boundary (in this case conveniently formed by a bluff) where the bear had crossed and shout to the chief of the adjoining territory (who, obviously, was unlikely to be within earshot) that Gistehwa was going to follow the bear onto Klo'mkan's land in order to kill it for use by Gistehwa's clan. Secondly, Gistehwa was obliged to return the skin of the bear to Klo'mkan as soon as possible and to repay Klo'mkan for his generosity at the next feast hosted by the Gitamtan phratry. I am told by the present Gistehwa, who witnessed the entire process, that the skin was returned to Klo'mkan and that an appropriate gift of two beaver traps was made at the feast.

In a similar case circa 1953, the subchief immediately under

3. This case is especially significant because it involved a chief and a younger person, the trapper, observing Hwitsowitenne laws and etiquette within the last two years—most encouraging to those who are anxious to revitalize the indigenous system of property relations.
Nedibish (Gilserhyu phratry) tracked a moose from his clan's territory into that of Gistehwa, shot the animal and packed the meat back to his legitimate territory. He did not observe the code regarding territorial access and resource use in this instance. By chance, a commoner in Gistehwa's clan observed the event and, because of the status difference, did not confront the offender but immediately informed Gistehwa who was also hunting in the territory. It was a simple matter to demonstrate conclusively to witnesses that the Gilserhyu subchief had committed the crime by observing the fresh remains of the dressing process (where the animal was shot) and tracing the meat to that subchief. At that point Gistehwa did his yunaxstlax which, the reader will recall, is the first public step in the "whipping" process (see p. 278 above). He subsequently executed the yuneexstlax, the "formal whipping," at a feast soon thereafter to ensure that the offense was recognized publicly. Retribution was made at the next feast in the form of granting Gistehwa access to Nedibish's territory for the purpose of hunting moose for the period of one year; as well, Gistehwa was bestowed with a number of gifts which, as far as my informants can recall, included a rifle and a pair of snowshoes presented by Nedibish on behalf of his clan. The guilty individual lost his status as first subchief but in this case was not penalized by restrictions on his hunting.

In the preceding pages I have presented cases regarding the exercise of Hwitsowitenne laws governing property relations, regarding both fishing and hunting/trapping. Hopefully, the reader will have a reasonably clear idea as to the system as it operated prior to the period of radical change in the 1950's. It is a system based on the clear delineation of a number of components, as follows:
(a) that land is defined as property (Smith, 1974: 2), owned by the phratries and managed by the clan chiefs;
(b) that the laws governing the property relations are characterized by the following (from Hoebel, 1979):
   (i) a normative element,
   (ii) a recognized authority (i.e., the chiefs) carrying the privilege of making judgements and exercising sanction through force, if deemed appropriate,
   (iii) regularity in application;
(c) that there exists a clear structure of authority that is maintained through time.

It should be stressed, particularly bearing in mind the power of the chiefs as rationalized in Section 1 of this Chapter, that the chiefs held considerable discretionary privileges in terms of ensuring that the system of property relations was upheld and that the management of land and resources operated effectively for the Hwitsowitzenne as for the animal realm. Laws were well defined and universally understood but at the same time allowed for a degree of flexibility according to the judgements of chiefs.

There have been pressures, however, placed on this system as a result of involvement with the external system of authority and management. In fact, I have been able to collect few cases demonstrating the serious application of the traditional laws in terms of either fishing or hunting since the late 1950's. I shall now consider those pressures on the hunting territorial system imposed by the provincial government through its system of trapline registration.
(ii) Changes in Hunting/Trapping Territoriality

During the period 1945 to 1947, the Government of British Columbia introduced to the Hwitsowitenne area its scheme for dividing land into parcels for the purpose of commercial trapping. Map B, appended to this thesis, indicates the result in terms of geographical delimitation and the right to trap according to group membership (i.e., Hwitsowitenne, other Carrier, Gitksan, non-Indian). Map B covers the same area covered by Map A, namely the Hwitsowitenne territories owned by the four phratries; comparison of the two maps indicates significant differences. The government's division of the area into parcels reserved for trapping was done according to technical assessment of the carrying capacity of the land and animal population distribution, not according to the phratric boundaries. Once delimited, the trapping areas were offered publicly for use, based on approval of one's application and the yearly payment of a registration fee.

There are a total of 85 registered trapline parcels covering the Hwitsowitenne territory. (Some of these cross the external Hwitsowitenne boundary, although these overlaps are not indicated as such on Map B.) Table 1 indicates the 1982 breakdown of groups holding registered traplines.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Registered Trapline Holding by Group, 1982</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No. parcels held (% of total in brackets)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hwitsowitenne</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Carrier (e.g., Babine sept)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gitksan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Indian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>open traplines</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Thus, Hwitsowitenne individuals hold only 40 percent of the registered traplines in Hwitsowitenne territory; significantly, non-Indians hold 34.1 percent of the lines.

Perhaps even more significant is the fact that of the twenty-one Hwitsowitenne nobles discussed in Chapter 2, Section 2, only six have traplines registered in their names. Of those twenty-one nobles, thirteen are clan chiefs of whom only four hold registered traplines. Of the four phratry chiefs, only one—Hagwilnelh—holds a registered trapline. In table form, this can be shown as on the following page.

Thus, of the thirty-four Hwitsowitenne traplines, only 17.6 percent are held by nobles and, further, only 11.7 percent are held by clan chiefs—clearly, a different framework than the indigenous system in which 100 percent of clan chiefs control 100 percent of the territory.

The approximate 82.4 percent of Hwitsowitenne registered traplines held by commoners is open to speculation in terms of its drastic break with the traditional property relations. I would suggest that in offering restricted areas to individuals, regardless of social rank, for the purpose of trapping, the government presented commoners with their first opportunity to break away from the authority of the chiefs. Changing attitudes, a concomitant of the increasing involvement in the wage economy as well as of the new political system (see Section 3 of this Chapter), may well have contributed to the desire of younger people, especially, to apply for their own "territories" (though not ownership in any real sense). On the other hand, I suspect a reluctance on the part of the nobles, and particularly the chiefs, to acknowledge any territorial system other than the one of which they formed the base.

The laws governing the Hwitsowitenne property relations are
# TABLE 2

**Nobles Holding Registered Traplines**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phratry</th>
<th>Noble</th>
<th>English Name</th>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Registered Trapline?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Laksamshu-Tsayu</td>
<td>Smogehlghem</td>
<td>Leonard George</td>
<td>chief, Sun House &amp; chief of combined L-T phratries</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sa'bek</td>
<td>Jim George</td>
<td>chief, Twisted House</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Klo'ncan</td>
<td>Johnny Mack</td>
<td>chief, Owl House</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kweese</td>
<td>Florence Hall</td>
<td>chief, Beaver House</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Namox</td>
<td>Lucy Holland</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Muht</td>
<td>Joshua Holland</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laksilyu</td>
<td>Hagwilnelh</td>
<td>Sylvester William</td>
<td>chief, House of Many Eyes &amp; phratry chief</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Widalhkyet</td>
<td>Henry Alfred</td>
<td>chief, House on Top of Flat Rock</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Widakkwats</td>
<td>John Namox</td>
<td>chief, House Beside the Fire</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Khikh</td>
<td>Ester Holland</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Widziyh</td>
<td>Lawrence Michell</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gitamtan</td>
<td>Gistehwa</td>
<td>Alfred Joseph</td>
<td>chief, House in Middle of Many &amp; phratry chief</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Whoss</td>
<td>Roy Morris</td>
<td>chief, Grizzly House</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Medeek</td>
<td>George Naziel</td>
<td>chief, Anskaski House</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Djolukyet</td>
<td>Gordon Hall</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yuk'kulakh</td>
<td>Margaret Austin</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sawees</td>
<td>Mathias Michell</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gilserhyu</td>
<td>Nedibish</td>
<td>Sarah Leighton</td>
<td>chief, Dark House &amp; chief of phratry</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Khasbut</td>
<td>Stanley Morris</td>
<td>chief, Thin House</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Satsa'n</td>
<td>David Dennis</td>
<td>chief, Birchbark House</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gukhlet</td>
<td>Lucy Namox</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
divorced from the registered trapline system; in that context, judgement and the application of sanctions are the direct responsibility of the courts and the police. In 1979, for example, a Moricetown resident of high status was trapping on the territory under the traditional control of his mother's brother, Satsa'n. The trapper was arrested for trapping in an area not registered in his name and was convicted and fined. (The trapline in question was registered in the name of a non-Indian.) To add to the difficulties faced by the adherents to the traditional system, Band Councils, which are the elected local bodies operating under the aegis of the federal government, are obliged to be supportive of the new regime. Thus the clan chiefs get little support for their claims to rights of control of access to and use of the phratric territories. Yet paradoxically, perhaps, in the feast hall every clan chief is recognized as a dineez'a' holding a particular hunting territory, regardless of the registered traplines superimposed on his hunting territory. I shall elaborate on this recognition in Chapter 4 as well as offer some observations on the apparent contradiction within and without the feast hall. First, however, it is necessary to examine further the involvement of the Hwitsowitenne in the wider system and the pressures to change that have led to the contradiction.

C. The Development of a Dependency Relationship

At this point I might speculate on the coincidental events that have contributed to the decline of the Hwitsowitenne system in the

---

4. In January, 1982 Satsa'n appealed the division of his traditional territory into two registered traplines, partly on the basis of aboriginal right, to the provincial government. He lost his case at the first stage, the public hearing; he will, however, likely appeal that decision. This is the first case of a Hwitsowitenne chief challenging the trapline registration scheme.
following areas:

(a) the property relations and economic significance of the Moricetown fishery;

(b) the destruction of the Hagwilget fishery;

(c) the property relations of hunting and trapping.

As will be explained in Section 3 of this Chapter, the federal government represented primarily by the Department of Indian Affairs has long assumed a policy of assimilation (Ponting and Gibbins, 1980). The prime approach to this end has been to establish a relationship of dependency of Indian people on the wider society in general and on the federal government in particular. The relationship has been effectively established along four related lines: the undermining of so-called traditional productive activities such as hunting, trapping and fishing; the involvement of Indians in the wage economy with its associated access to consumer goods; developing a reliance on transfer payments, especially during periods of decline in the wage economy; and the weakening of the indigenous authority structure. (The last point, in particular, is discussed in the next Section.)

The turning point for Hwitsowitenne society came in the 1950's. It was during this period that there occurred changes in economic activity and in the authority structure at least inasmuch as it related to the exercise of laws governing property relations. I shall present data to indicate that there now exists a dependency relationship between the Hwitsowitenne and the wider society along the four lines listed above. I must, however, make some assumptions concerning the economic make-up of Hwitsowitenne society prior to the 1950's; in fact, until native colleagues and I worked on the Gitkaan-Carrier Tribal Council Census in 1979-80 and
follow-up work more recently, the information on social and economic activity had been very sparse. Data produced by the local office of the Department of Indian Affairs are incomplete and the Band Councils have had neither the funds nor the time to adequately survey their Band members. I have had to assume that prior to the damage sustained by the Moricetown fishery in 1951 and the destruction of the Hagwilget fishery in 1959, salmon fishing was undertaken by virtually all households. Further, it can be assumed that salmon accounted for 50 percent of the Hwitsowitenne diet (see p. 261 above). As well, hunting and trapping formed significant parts of the yearly economic cycle and were undertaken by at least one representative of virtually every household. I base these assumptions on discussions with elders and on correspondence and minutes of meetings between government representatives and Hwitsowitenne leaders in the 1950's.

I would first remind the reader of the village population sizes (G-CTC Census, 1979):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Village Populations 1979-80</th>
<th>No. of Households</th>
<th>No. of Individuals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hagwilget</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>133</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moricetown</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>383</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>98</td>
<td>516</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These figures have remained more-or-less unchanged since the late 1800's.

In terms of subsistence activities, we can examine the numbers
of households that engaged in fishing and hunting during 1979-80. (I have included trapping in the following table as a reference for the discussion to follow.)

TABLE 4

Households Engaging in Hunting, Fishing, Trapping 1979-80

(\% in brackets)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Hunting</th>
<th>Fishing</th>
<th>Trapping</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hagwilget (n = 27)</td>
<td>14 (51.8%)</td>
<td>2 (7.4%)</td>
<td>5 (18.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moricetown (n = 71)</td>
<td>38 (53.5%)</td>
<td>43 (60.5%)</td>
<td>13 (18.3%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Two points should be noted regarding these figures. First, the two Hagwilget households engaged in fishing were not fishing at the Hagwilget Canyon, rather at Gitksan sites to which they had access through marriage. Second, while it would be useful to present data concerning the actual quantities of meat and fish produced at the subsistence level, I am presently constrained from doing so by agreement with the Gitksan-Carrier Tribal Council. For present purposes, however, it is adequate to demonstrate the relative decline in subsistence activity \textit{per se} from an assumed level of universality prior to the 1950's to the much reduced numbers of households presently engaging \textit{at all} in hunting and fishing, as indicated in Table 4.

\textit{5.} Such data are considered strategic and critical to the upcoming series of court cases, public hearings and negotiations in which the Tribal Council will shortly be involved as part of its land claim process. As a condition to writing this thesis, I have agreed not to divulge certain data.
In terms of commercial trapping, the comparison is somewhat better defined thanks to Hudson's Bay Company records (on file in the G-CTC Document Resource Centre). Taking 1949 as a point of reference, we see that 73 individuals from Hagwilget and Moricetown sold furs to the Company agent in Hazelton. In 1979-80, however, only 18 Hwitsowitenne individuals actually trapped and sold furs, despite the fact that 34 registered traplines are held by Hwitsowitenne (G-CTC Census, 1979). The reasons for this decline are various, although two stand out. First, many traplines have been seriously damaged by the intensive clear-cut logging that has occurred in the area since the commencement of industrial activity in the 1950's. Second, many people who might otherwise have continued trapping have become involved in the wage economy, specifically the logging and milling industry. Several individuals who eschewed their trapping in favour of wage labour informed me that even when the logging and milling industry entered a slump in its cycle, the depressed fur market simply did not make returning to trapping desirable, even as a temporary measure. It had become more convenient to draw unemployment insurance payments and, if needed, welfare than to return to life in the bush. The same attitude prevailed among those who had given up hunting and fishing as a means of providing food, even in difficult economic times. At least until the current disastrous bust in the forest products industry (as a result of the 1981-82 decline in lumber sales due to a slump in the U.S. housing construction industry) the assumption has been made by workers that the industry will revive before households cease managing. Until now this assumption has generally proved correct.

In summary, there has been a significant decline in the so-called traditional economy of the Hwitsowitenne; that is, in hunting, fishing
and trapping. While data are not available on a yearly basis until 1979-80, it is clear that subsistence production and trapping declined sharply in the 1950's, the period during which governmental and industrial activities were manifested in a variety of ways, including damaging the resource bases (i.e., the river canyons and traplines).

The traditional economy has also been undermined by the involvement of Indians in the wage economy, as has been suggested above. Knight (1978) points out the high degree of involvement by British Columbia Indians in the wage economy earlier in this century, although he refers primarily to coastal groups rather than to interior groups like the Hwitsowitenne. Elders advise me that prior to the 1950's Hwitsowitenne men occasionally worked on a seasonal basis in the local pole camps (producing telegraph poles) or for the railway in construction and/or maintenance. It appears, however, that wage labour was not extensive in the area before the 1950's as industry did not arrive in any significant form until that time. The point to be made here is that the Hwitsowitenne have come to rely to a high degree on the wage economy and the related system of transfer payments in the form of unemployment insurance and welfare. Again, I see this as contributing to the dependency relationship that has developed between the Hwitsowitenne and the wider society. Examination of the period from 1979 to 1982 indicates this situation. In 1979 the forest products industry was operating at close to full capacity. At that time 28 of the 62 employable Hagwilget adults, or 45.2 percent were employed and 54.8 percent were unemployed.

6. "Employable adults" here refers to all individuals between the ages of 16 and 65 years, inclusive, who are capable physically and mentally of working in the wage economy. Unlike the unemployment rates published by the federal government, the rates presented here include people who are not actively seeking work.
Of these 28 employed people, 15 were employed by Rim Forest Products either in the bush as loggers or at the mill about ten miles away. The Hagwilget Band Council employed 9 people in a variety of capacities (see the discussion regarding Band employment in the following Section). Four people were employed elsewhere.7

A similar examination of Moricetown in 1979 indicates that of 157 employable adults, 56 individuals, or 35.6 percent were employed and 64.4 percent were unemployed. (I should point out that while these rates of unemployment sound extremely high, they are typical of rural Indian reserves in Canada even during relatively stable economic times.) Twenty-eight people were employed as loggers or in various mills accessible to Moricetown residents, primarily in the Smithers area several miles distant. The Moricetown Band Council employed 17 individuals and 11 people were employed elsewhere. These data are indicated in table form below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Employable adults</th>
<th>62</th>
<th>157</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No. adults employed</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rate of unemployment</td>
<td>45.2%</td>
<td>35.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: G-CTC Census, 1979

7. Employment here refers to both full-time and part-time employment.
The above figures represent the employment situation in 1979, a relatively stable economic year for British Columbia generally and for the forest products industry. However, with the major slump in that industry in 1981 (continuing into 1982 with no sign of recovery), the mill near Hagwilget has shut down operations completely, thus also stopping the logging operation required to supply the mill, and the mills at which Moricetown residents usually work have either closed or slowed production considerably. The result has been that the 15 jobs held by Hagwilget people in the forest products industry have been eliminated and 21 of the 28 similar jobs for Moricetown residents are gone. The Hagwilget Band has managed to continue employing 9 people and of the 4 jobs in other areas, only 2 now remain. At Moricetown, the Band now employs 15 rather than 17 people (due to federal funding cutbacks) and of the 11 jobs in other categories in 1979, only 8 exist now. As a result, the unemployment rate among employable adults between 1979 and 1982 has increased in Hagwilget from 45.2% to 81.7% and in Moricetown from 35.6% to 80.6% (see Table 7).

TABLE 6

Employment by Type of Employer, 1979

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Employer (of total employed in brackets)</th>
<th>Hagwilget</th>
<th>Moricetown</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Forest products industry</td>
<td>15 (53.5%)</td>
<td>28 (50%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Band Council</td>
<td>9 (32.1%)</td>
<td>17 (30.3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>4 (14.2%)</td>
<td>11 (19.6%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TABLE 7

Employment by Type of Employer and Unemployment Rates, 1982

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Employable Adults</th>
<th>Hagwilget</th>
<th>Moricetown</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Employed Adults</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>154</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forest products industry</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Band Council</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Employed Adults</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rate of Unemployment</td>
<td>81.7%</td>
<td>80.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It is interesting to note that the numbers of employable adults have not decreased very much since 1979: from 62 to 60 in Hagwilget and from 157 to 154 in Moricetown. One might expect an out-migration when the number of jobs declines as drastically as it has in the past three years. I suspect, however, that people are remaining in the villages for a number of reasons, although I have no conclusive evidence to support this suspicion. First, people are aware that Vancouver, the city to which people have tended to move for work in the past, offers little employment opportunity these days. Second, most unemployed people at least receive unemployment insurance payments and, in many other cases, welfare payments. These factors, together with familial support, likely induce unemployed people to remain in their villages. I think this is especially significant in the case of younger individuals with no families to support as they are the people who might be expected to leave first. Finally, it has been indicated to me by a number of young, unemployed Hvitsowitenne that they intend to begin fishing, hunting and trapping in earnest as a mode of survival. While this has not yet happened to any significant degree, the
potential exists, especially given the unlikelihood of the forest products industry recovering in the near future.

The rise in unemployment rates in Hagwilget and Moricetown as a result of the slump in the forest products industry is an indication of the degree of dependence of the Hwitsowitenne on the wage economy. A concomitant effect and one which further indicates the dependency relationship is that the number of people relying on transfer payments has increased substantially since 1979. Specifically, these take the form of unemployment insurance and welfare payments. Table 8 indicates the increase in households receiving transfer payments between 1979 and 1982, an increase which is clearly related to the decline in the local wage economy. (Note, however, that the reliance on these forms of income even in 1979 is very high.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1979</th>
<th>1982</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hagwilget (n = 27)</td>
<td>8 (29.6%)</td>
<td>4 (14.8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moricetown (n = 71)</td>
<td>17 (23.9%)</td>
<td>8 (11.2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub-total</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>37</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: U.I. (Unemployment Insurance) payments are not received concurrently with welfare payments; the latter may begin only when the former cease after one year.
I see these data as clearly indicating the existence of an economic dependency relationship between the Hwitsowitenne and the wider society represented by industry and the federal and provincial governments. (The federal government supplies unemployment insurance payments while the province covers welfare payments.) I have suggested that this dependency has been developed to a high degree since the 1950's and I have argued that it has been established along four related lines. First, the so-called traditional productive activities such as hunting, fishing and trapping have been undermined through various means, most significantly the serious alterations forced upon the Moricetown fishery, the destruction of the Hagwilget fishery, the effects of logging on trapping grounds and the impositions on the indigenous property relations with respect to hunting. Second, the Hwitsowitenne have been led to a reliance on wage labour, which is erratic at best. Third, a serious reliance on transfer payments has developed. And fourth, as will be discussed in the next section, the indigenous authority structure has been significantly weakened.

As I have pointed out in this section, the Hwitsowitenne system of property relations and the laws that support those relations have suffered greatly through the process of a dependency relationship being developed. Let me now continue by examining the process by which the locus of authority has shifted from the hereditary chiefs to the federal government and its local representatives, the Band Councils.
3. The New Authority Structure

For the purposes of this essay, power is seen in terms of its use in regulating social relations with respect to land and resources by determining rights and obligations of specific kinds; namely, access, use, control (through sanctions), indirect economic gain and transfer. These rights and obligations are considered to be delineated in a set of laws, whether uniquely Carrier as described in the previous section or British common law.

The question of the shifting locus of power from the hereditary chiefs to representatives of the Canadian federal system is a critical one in the attempt to understand present Carrier territoriality and the feast. For it is the holding of real power (as delimited above) within the community that provides what is perhaps the most striking anachronism when comparing the structure and organization represented within the feast hall (as elaborated in Part I) with the political and economic situation outside the feast hall. That there has been a shift in power in terms of the regulation of social relations with respect to land and resources is assumed at this point; indeed, the result of the shift has been discussed in the previous Section of this Chapter. At this point, however, it is necessary to give some explanation for the shift in the locus of power and the power relationships that tend to exist currently within the Hwitsowitenne community. This will contribute to the clarification of the apparent contradiction between events within and without the contemporary feast hall, to be elaborated in Chapter 4.

The first part of the discussion to follow is a general historical perspective on the question of shifting power; the Carrier ex-
-perience should be seen in the larger context of Anglo-Canadian policy regarding native peoples, particularly with respect to the control of land and resources. Secondly, I will examine the recent (since 1951) Carrier history of imposed control by the federal system under the authority of the Indian Act. These observations will then be related to the questions of territorial control as discussed in Section 2 of this Chapter and of the feast itself.

A. The General Historical Perspective

The history of Canadian native-white relations has taken on a sharper focus in recent years thanks to the land claims issue, wherein many native groups have examined closely the historical relationship in order to make a claim to title. The James Bay and Mackenzie Valley resource development projects emphasized for native peoples the need to clarify their titles and rights in order to provide them with a degree of self-protection. Development schemes of this kind not only had potentially negative effects on the environment, but also on the maintenance of traditional ways of life based on hunting, fishing, and trapping. After World War II native peoples had become increasingly aware of their economic and social marginality as measured in terms of life expectancy, health, housing, crime rates, and employment (Canada, 1974). In part that marginality was due to physical location in hinterland areas lacking economic alternatives and provision of services. As Berger (1977: 115-116) suggests, large-scale development projects not only undermine native economies, but do not provide significant long-term wage labour alternatives. Native marginality was therefore likely to be increased by economic development; and at the same time threaten the survival of native cultures by destroying their economic bases, requiring resettlement, and creating
needs for more government assistance.

These threats to cultural survival were not exclusive to economic development: since the middle of the nineteenth century the government's policy had been focused on assimilation of native peoples into the wider society. The 1969 White Paper recommended amendment of the BNA Act, repeal of the Indian Act, and a phasing out of the Department of Indian Affairs as a means to achieve that end (Daniel, 1980: 153-154). Although these changes directly affected only 290,000 individuals legally defined as Indians, they also had consequences for an additional 800,000 with claims to native status. Existing rights, including those related to land, were seen as inadequate for cultural preservation and for changing the native's marginal position in Canadian society; on the other hand, assimilation, with loss of those minimal rights, would reduce native peoples to ethnic groups with no legal, political or economic grounds for changing their conditions.

Viewed in general terms, land claims were one means of modifying relations between native peoples and the wider society as represented by the federal government. The fact that both parties were interested in changing that relationship is suggestive. If one aspect of that relationship was problematic to native peoples and the government, it was the characteristic of dependency. The government's long term solution of total assimilation represented a desire to deny special responsibility for natives, while the native answer was to argue for increased political and economic autonomy, which implied fixing and increasing the nature and scope of their rights.

1. The 800,000 people with claims to native status are generally referred to as non-status Indians or Metis. This estimate was provided by Victor Valentine and based on unpublished statistics from the Native Council of Canada.
The central question to emerge from the above discussion is the nature of that dependency relationship and its causes. This question will be examined historically using the general framework of dependency theory. Although this theory was designed to account for economic underdevelopment in hinterland areas (Frank, 1966; 1967) it is potentially relevant to native dependency and its causes. This theory argues that hinterland areas are underdeveloped not because of internal factors but rather due to their relationship to metropolitan centres, which are loci of economic and political control. The relationship is essentially exploitative, maintaining and increasing the development of the metropolis at the expense of the hinterlands attached to them.

The history of colonial/dominion relations to indigenous peoples tends to fit the dependency theory framework. Expansion of the colonies and later of the nation was predicated largely on economic development. Certain forms of resource exploitation required the acquisition of lands which were under native sovereignty; the resulting land surrenders and the movement of the frontier westward and northward resulted in indigenous societies becoming enclosed within the Anglo-Canadian system. As Davis (1971: 12) and Carstens (1971: 138) state, the result was native marginality and dependency which is multi-dimensional: economic, political, legal, social, cultural and psychological. In the following discussion, the historical evolution of the dependency relationship will be surveyed, with emphasis on land as a critical basis of that relationship.

Given the focus on land relations as a cause of dependency for native peoples, it will be necessary to briefly discuss the problem
of title: following Smith (1974) that concept is treated in terms of property institutions, as was discussed in Section 2 of this Chapter. Title in its broadest sense is the recognition that a property relation exists with specific rights and obligations under a set of rules. So conceived it is not unique to Western law, but can be found in all human societies. In respect to land, intra-societal titles are a direct consequence of rules designed, in part, to govern the exploitation of scarce natural resources and although universal, the actual rights and obligations, the relevant social categories and conditions for assignment vary cross-culturally. This variation can also be understood ecologically as due to differences in resource characteristics, environment, technology, population, and social organization (Crocombe, 1974: 2-4; Dyson-Hudson and Smith, 1978).

Title may similarly exist within inter-societal property institutions. When societies co-exist in the same geographic area, boundary conflicts frequently lead to the creation of such institutions whereby they mutually recognize each others' sovereignty over specific territories. Under conditions of societal expansion these agreements may also include rules governing legitimate acquisitions of additional territory, even in respect to third parties not part of that property institution. In effect, recognition of another's sovereignty is a tacit acceptance of its internal property relations; this can become problematic, however, if one of those societies becomes politically dominant over the other. The critical question then becomes the form of recognition the dominant society will give within its own institutions to the property relations of the subordinate society (Smith, 1974: 9).
The evaluation of the general pattern of recognition given to indigenous titles throughout Canadian history will require a qualification to be made at the outset. Following the assumptions of dependency theory, the immediate historical analysis will concentrate on Anglo-Canadian-native relations rather than on the internal characteristics of Carrier property institutions per se. The latter have been discussed at some length in the earlier parts of this essay and will be placed into the general political context later in this Section and again in the final Chapter.

(i) The Accommodation Phase (1600-1815)

An important factor in the pattern of recognition given to Indian sovereignty by Britain was the existence of inter-societal property institutions among European nations which had rules governing the acquisition of new territories. In respect to the New World the first documented consideration of native title occurred in sixteenth century Spain (Cohen, 1942). A theologian named Francisco Vitoria argued that Spain was morally obligated to recognize aboriginal title in spite of a Papal grant over the New World. He held that land acquisitions through discovery only applied to unoccupied territories. This position was formalized in 1537 by the Papal Bull Sublimis Deus which had the status of international law.

In pragmatic as well as moral terms, Justice Marshall stated in 1832 that European inter-societal property institutions were created:

To avoid bloody conflicts, which might terminate disastrously to all, it was necessary for the nations of Europe to establish some principle which all would acknowledge and which should decide their respective rights as between themselves '...that discovery gave title to the government by whose subjects, or by
whose authority, it was made, against all other European governments...' This principle, acknowledged by all Europeans, because it was in the interest of all to acknowledge it, gave to the nation making the discovery, as an inevitable consequence, the sole right of acquiring the soil and of making settlements on it...' but could not affect the rights of those already in possession; either as aboriginal occupants, or as occupants by virtue of discovery made before the memory of man. It gave the exclusive rights to purchase, but did not found that right on a denial of the right of the possessor to sell. (Cumming and Mickenberg, 1972: 17).

The size of North America, however, generated multiple discoveries and consequently conflict over the limits of European rights. Ultimately, maintenance of those boundaries was by direct and indirect military control. Since there was no unoccupied land, recognition of native sovereignties was strategically important. It was used as a means of insuring native neutrality, gaining allies, and creating buffer zones between hostile European colonies (Brown and Maguire, 1979: 10-11; Nash, 1967).

Similarly, acquisition of lands by purchase was for pragmatic reasons; not only would conquest have been difficult in the initial period of colonization, at later times the costs would have been too high given the distances involved, the size and distribution of native populations, and differences in native and European technologies and concepts of warfare. More importantly, it can be argued that land surrenders were not central to achievement of early colonial objectives. The fur trade, on which British and French discoveries and expansions were largely based did not require title to land. Rather it needed rights of indirect economic gain through exclusive access to furs, which in turn depended on native skills and labour.

The first British-Indian treaties had the objective of securing
peace and friendship, not only for military-political purposes but also for trade relations (Brown and Maguire, 1979: 10). Two components of those treaties which would have significance later were recognition of native rights to hunt and fish, and Crown jurisdiction over disputes between natives and colonists (Cumming and Mickenberg, 1972: 95).

Although the fur trade did create some tensions between the British and aboriginal societies, more problems were caused by agricultural settlement. Farming is mutually exclusive to hunting and gathering, and acquisition of land for that purpose was disruptive to native modes of adaptation. Neither treaties nor legislations were able to resolve this conflict, and British colonial survival was threatened by French-Indian alliances in the Seven Years War and by Indian uprisings such as the Pontiac Rebellion. These contributed to the issuing of the Proclamation of 1763 which stated in part:

And whereas Great Frauds and Abuses have been committed in purchasing Lands of the Indians, to the Great Prejudice of our interests, and to the Great Dissatisfaction of said Indians; In order, therefore, to prevent such Irregularities for the future, and to the End that the Indians may be convinced of our Justice and determined Resolution to remove all reasonable Cause of Discontent, We do, with the advise of our Privy Council strictly enjoin and require, that no private Person do presume to make any Purchase from said Indians, within those parts of our Colonies where, We have thought proper to allow Settlement; but that, if at any Time any of said Indians should be inclined to dispose of said lands, the same shall be Purchased only for Us, and in our Name...(Cumming and Mickenberg, 1972: 291).

This Proclamation was an attempt by the British government to resolve what had become two contradictory needs--Indian allies and Indian lands. For the next fifty years the first would dominate, only to become replaced by a growing need for land. The initial step in that transformation was the elimination of French colonial presence in
North America by the Treaty of Paris; however, that source of conflict was replaced by increasing tensions between Britain and its colonies. In 1775 instructions were issued to Governor Carleton to strengthen the implementation of the 1763 Proclamation policies in order to insure Indian friendship and alliance (Canada, 1978b: 8-9). With the end of the Revolutionary War and the signing of the Treaty of Versailles in 1783, the size of British North America was reduced and its southern boundaries defined in respect to the United States. The War of 1812-15 was to be the last major boundary conflict, with the Convention of 1818 establishing it at the forty-ninth parallel to the Rockies. With no further conflict over sovereignty in respect to other European nations, the need for allies ceased and land surrenders became the principle focus of British-native relations.

The long-term consequences of the accommodation period were two-fold: politically it established the role of the Crown as protector of native peoples vis-a-vis the wider society, which role slowly evolved into a guardianship as the colonial system expanded and incorporated native societies within it. The second was economic and came from the fur trade inasmuch as that trade required natives as simple commodity producers (Cox, 1980). Although trapping was generally consistent with indigenous modes of adaptation, it gradually began to replace them in economic importance. It created a reliance on European technology and goods, a type of economic dependency.

The fur trade, like hunting and gathering, was incompatible with other kinds of land use, making trapping viable only on the frontiers. As the fur trade was displaced by western and northern settlement it left behind native peoples who were no longer needed as labour or commodity producers. Even in hinterland areas where displacement did
not occur, that commodity production was vulnerable to fluctuations in external market demands. In the 1950s that market collapsed and without economic alternatives many native trappers were transformed from independent producers to welfare recipients, dependent on the government for support and services and increasingly under its control (Berger, 1977: 87).

(ii) The Assimilation Phase (1816-1969)

One of the major side effects of the Revolutionary War and the War of 1812 was the large influx of settlers into British North America. By the second decade of the nineteenth century the white population in the eastern colonies was almost double that of indigenous peoples in all of what is now Canada, which reduced their relative strength militarily. A more significant change resulting from that immigration was to shift economic dominance from the fur trade to agriculture as homesteads had been promised to those loyal to, or fighting for, the Crown. Between the years 1784 and 1812, fifteen treaties were signed with Indian groups to acquire the needed lands. In return for those surrenders the native signators received once-and-for-all compensations of money and goods, and later annuities. In 1850 the Robinson Huron and Superior Treaties were signed and became models for all future extinguishments of native title (Cumming and Mickenberg, 1972: 115-116). In addition to compensations, these treaties specified the creation of reserves and denied natives the rights to sell or lease reserve lands without the consent of the Crown. The eleven so-called numbered treaties covering the Prairies followed this model, with varying clauses concerning Crown responsibilities for education, medical care, and protection from outside influences such
as alcohol (Brown and Maguire, 1979: xv).

In retrospect, treaties created as many problems as they solved. Not only were land acquisition treaties different from the earlier ones of "peace and friendship", they were not uniform in either content or application; being discontinued for land acquisition in most of British Columbia, the Yukon, and the Northwest Territories.  

Treaties of land surrender initially involved two sets of rights held by two parties. Native rights to reserve lands depended upon how those lands were acquired (Cumming and Mickenberg, 1972: 228-229). If created from lands which were part of original territories, native signators retained all rights except freedom to dispose of lands to other than the Crown. When reserves were based on lands acquired by other means, native rights were more restricted. In relation to resources on reserve lands, only the Robinson Superior and Huron Treaties specified Indian control. On ceded lands, Indian rights were also varied. In general, hunting and fishing rights were granted by treaties with the qualification of alternate uses of that land superseding them. In some cases, however, those rights were not mentioned; and in others were subject to federal regulations or consent of the provincial government (Brown and Maguire, 1979: xv).

These difficulties with respect to reserve lands became compounded with Confederation. According to the BNA Act, Crown lands became the property of the provinces which meant lands ceded by native groups within the boundaries of those provinces. At the same time, the federal government retained jurisdiction over all Indians and their reserves.

---

2. By the end of the nineteenth century, British and Canadian political dominance was fully established and involuntary land acquisitions were deemed acceptable. It was argued that a sovereign power could extinguish native title in any way it saw fit, and hence legislated transfers were equivalent to treaties. (Cumming and Mickenberg, 1972: 192).
In 1888 the decision in the case of St. Catherines Milling and Lumber versus the Queen determined that the provinces held proprietary rights to reserve lands as well (Cumming and Mickenberg, 1972: 228). To resolve federal-provincial relations in terms of reserves, the federal government entered into individual agreements with the provinces concerning their respective rights vis-a-vis reserve lands, agreements which vary in content.

Reserves also became administrative units after Confederation, hence objects of special policies and legislations. Being under the jurisdiction of the Dominion, they have a semi-autonomous status in respect to local and provincial authority (Carstens, 1971: 132-137; Sutton, 1975: 150). Initially designed to provide protection against the consequences of white encroachment, reserves slowly became economically, politically, socially and culturally marginal.

Given the hunting and gathering mode of adaptation of most native societies, man-land ratios ranged from one person per one-half square mile to one person per one hundred square miles. The numbered treaties specified reserve lands ranging from one square mile for a family of five down to one hundred acres per family. In British Columbia where treaties were not signed, the amount of land reserved was ten acres per family (Brown and Maguire, 1979: xv; Cumming and Mickenberg, 1972: 182).

Economic survival of native groups on reserves, engaged in a "traditional" mode of production, was only possible given continued use of ceded lands; however, as these lands were required by whites for other purposes through sale or lease by the Crown, this alternative became undermined. The Crown and later the Dominion as self-defined guardians of native welfare were obliged to intrude increasingly into reserve life.\(^3\)

---

3. The Riel Rebellion of 1868-69 was also grounds for imposing greater political control and cultural intrusion.
The primary policy solution was to change Indians into farmers, with provision of education and technology intended as the main inducements. Later, attempts were made to indirectly transform indigenous property institutions into those more compatible with farming. The Land Act of 1868 was designed to create a relationship between individual natives and the land similar to that of white homesteaders, granting "tickets" for specific pieces of land to which a native could acquire title by improving it (Canada, 1978b: 53-54).

Intrusions were also made into native culture and social organization. Christian missionaries often were, in effect, extensions of government policy, equally concerned with "civilizing" as with converting (Usher, 1974). For example, legislation was passed prohibiting the potlatch (Canada, 1978b: 81) on the grounds that it was an obstacle to native acceptance of Christianity and of Western attitudes towards property.

The granting of specific rights, immunities, and annuities by treaties and legislations brought about a need to formally define Indian status under law. A comparison of the various definitions over time suggests that the government was attempting to reduce the number of native people under its jurisdiction. In 1850, an Indian was defined as anyone of Indian blood, or married to an Indian and residing with them, offspring of either category, and anyone adopted by Indians as infants and living with them (Daniel, 1979: 14). The Land and Enfranchisement Acts of 1868-69 required a minimum of one-quarter Indian ancestry, and did not recognize the legal status of Indian women marrying white men or of their offspring (Canada, 1978b: 54). These restrictions on the legal definition of Indianness had a number of negative consequences. First, they established criteria which were different from cultural definitions of membership. For example, many native groups had matrilineal descent as
opposed to the patrilineal bias of legislations. This not only involun-
tarily removed individuals from benefits stemming from Indian status, it
physically separated them from those cultures which were based on reserves.
Finally, it created quasi-legal categories of natives such as non-status
Indians and Metis.

The Enfranchisement Act reflected the government's long term
solution to Indian related problems, namely their assimilation. The ob-
jective was to encourage Indians to become self-sufficient as farmers,
and then to take their place as ordinary members of the wider society.
Reserves were seen as temporary measures, isolating native groups during
their enculturation. This protective concept of reserves and government
policies of assimilation became problematic by the second decade of the
twentieth century. Voluntary enfranchisements were occurring at a slow
rate, the costs of "guardianship" were increasing, and reserve lands were
seen as obstacles to further settlement and economic growth by many whites.
Approximately one million settlers had moved into the prairie provinces,
and the overall population of Canada increased by one-third in the first
ten years of this century (Canada, 1978b: 105). However, reserves closed
off needed lands and resources from development so that the reserves with
industrial appeal often remained unused. As a consequence, amendments
to the Indian Act of 1876 were introduced permitting leasing and expro-
priation of reserve lands, selling resources on reserves to help pay for
their support, and expanding involuntary enfranchisement (Canada, 1978b:
106-121).

The period of the Depression and World War II presented no
radical changes in government-native relations, principally due to the
lack of economic expansion. Government policy reflected the mixed ob-
jectives of protection and assimilation, albeit with a growing recognition that new comprehensive legislation was needed. After World War II, Parliament began to consider formal revisions of the Indian Act with the goal of bringing in an Act "acceptable to both Indians and the Government" (Canada, 1978b: 133) and for the first time natives participated in the process by making submissions to hearings of government committees. The resultant Indian Act of 1951 (Canada 1951; 1970), however, did not represent a major change from previous Acts, with the exception of reducing the powers of the Department of Indian Affairs to a more advisory role, and the granting of voting rights to natives by a later amendment (Canada, 1978b: 150-152).

The Indian Act continues to have serious implications for Indian life. It gives sweeping powers to what is now the federal Department of Indian Affairs and Northern Development (DINA), specifically to the Minister of that Department. In general terms, the Minister is responsible for a number of major areas concerning natives, including administration, welfare, economic development, reserves and trusts, the operation of the various DINA agencies across the country, education, engineering and construction, and enfranchisement (Canada, 1961: 279 passim). The authority of the Minister is superseded only in criminal matters which are handled by the Royal Canadian Mounted Police in most reserve communities and by the courts.

In the late 1970s in a programme of bureaucratic decentralization the locus of responsibility shifted from Ottawa to nine regional Directors General in cities across the country. Thus, in the case of

4. The fact that the Department of Indian Affairs controls finances means that their "advice" still contains considerable power.
British Columbia Indians, much of the federal government's policy implementation is directed from Vancouver. Since 1867, however, there have been local representatives of the Department of Indian Affairs residing in or fairly near most of the native communities in Canada. These officials were at one time known as Indian Agents, and while that term has since been replaced by a series of rather more innocuous titles, it is still used somewhat derisively by Indians to refer to any local representative of DINA. Currently the Indian Agent who has responsibility for the Hwitsowitenne is located in Hazelton; the Hagwilget and Moricetown Bands, together with six Gitksan Bands, now compose the Gitksan-Carrier Agency of DINA (formerly the Babine Agency).

The historical role of the Indian Agent, at least in Hwitsowitenne territory, could in itself provide the basis of a revealing study of Indian-white relations. In the earlier years of the agency system and until the late 1940s, the various Indian Agents were given considerable authority and discretion by Ottawa to deal with the Indian people. I might cite one example to indicate this. In the 1920s the Department of Indian Affairs began a campaign to bring Indians into the reserve communities from their hunting-trapping territories on which they lived during the winter and spring. One reason for this was easier administration (Loring, 1922) and another, though unstated, was to free the land for the influx of white settlers arriving in northcentral British Columbia to engage in farming and logging. During this period Johnny David (Muh'nuh'lehts), a Hwitsowitenne elder now in his 90's and living in Moricetown, was living with his mother in a cabin on their clan's territory east of Moricetown. A representative of Indian Agent Loring arrived one day from Hazelton with a legal document which Johnny David was to
sign and by which he would give up any claim he had to that territory in return for title to an area of 160 acres of his choice near the village of Hagwilget. Although Mr. David was illiterate, he accepted the agent's explanation of the offer but declined for a number of weeks during which period Loring's envoy repeatedly pressured Mr. David and his mother to accept. On the advice of his mother, Mr. David finally agreed to the terms and immediately staked out his chosen 160 acres near Hagwilget. When he visited Indian Agent Loring in Hazelton to acquire his title to the land, however, Loring refused to see him. Repeated visits over a number of months resulted in not one meeting with Loring and, hence, no legal claim to the land he had been promised. In the meantime, however, Mr. David had abrogated any rights he might have had to use of the land he and his mother had been living on. An attempt to return to the territory resulted in Mr. David's arrest by an R.C.M.P. officer and a three month jail term. Mr. David then settled in Moricetown, trapping and hunting only occasionally on the territory of another clan chief in his phratry.

This example of the power of the local Indian Agent and the police is not an isolated one; there are numerous cases wherein Indians were more-or-less forcibly removed from the land into the villages, particularly in areas desired by White settlers for farming or logging. This case is, however, perhaps the most completely documented (Loring, 1927; Agreement on file in Gitksan-Carrier Tribal Council Document Resource Centre); as well, Mr. David is still living and is willing to recount the details of the event.

This type of policy and action, namely forcing Indians off their land into the villages, is consistent with the long standing federal policy to build a dependency relationship between itself and the Indian
people. For once in the reserve villages on a year-round basis, their productive activities as hunters and trappers would be seriously curtailed and families would have only the salmon runs to rely upon for subsistence. Inevitably this dislocation, along with the imposed system of registered traplines, led to the necessary reliance upon the Department of Indian Affairs for social assistance as well as to the need to become involved in the wage economy to make up for lost subsistence production in the form of game and simple commodity production in the form of fur trapping. While hunting and trapping were not ruled out for all Hwitsowitenne, the system of territorial access and resource use suffered enough damage at the hands of Indian agents to weaken it considerably and to create a serious dependence on the federal system and the wage labour sector of the Canadian economy.

B. The Hwitsowitenne Experience Since 1951

In 1951 Hagwilget and Moricetown became "Bands" under the authority of the Indian Act. The local Indian Agent is now the direct link between the Band administrations and the regional Director General of DINA in Vancouver who, in turn, deals with DINA in Ottawa. It should be said at the outset of this discussion that the Band Councils are part of the dependent relationship between Indians and the federal government and that the structure of authority of which elected Band officials are a part does not necessarily bear any correspondence to the hereditary structure of authority discussed earlier in this essay (this point is elaborated below).

Band Councils are elected by Band members every two years. The Hagwilget Band is represented by one Chief Councillor and two Councillors; the Moricetown Band, with its greater Band membership, by one
Chief Councillor and three Councillors. The title "Chief Councillor" is not meant to imply any connection to hereditary chieftainship, but rather was an attempt by the Department of Indian Affairs to lend greater legitimacy to the elected positions when they were first established. Band membership comprises all registered Indians who choose to be enrolled in each particular Band and who meet one of the following requirements: males descended in the male line (note the emphasis on patrilineal descent) from persons entitled to use Indian lands in May 1874, the legitimate children of such persons, illegitimate children of women so descended, and wives and widows of members. Band members retain their legal status as Indians and their Band membership even though they may reside permanently away from the reserve, except in the case of women who marry non-Indians and thus lose their Indian status (again, the patrilineal bias) (Canada, 1970: Indian Act, Sections 11, 12).

Certain administrative responsibilities are vested in the Band Councils and while these are limited in relation to the higher levels in the DINA authority structure, they are sufficient, as will be discussed, to contribute to the shift in power away from the hereditary chiefs to the DINA representatives (which include Band councillors). While it is the Minister's responsibility to control each Band's capital and revenue funds, the Band Council must consent to his expenditure of its funds for purposes specified in the Indian Act. The areas covered in this joint management scheme include the allocation and building of new housing on the reserve, the disposition of reserve resources such as timber and gravel, the development of health care facilities, and the construction and maintenance of public works on the reserve. As well,
the Band Council has authority in the areas of Band membership, the allotment of reserve land to members, the transfer of reserve land, the regulation of traffic, water supplies, public amusement and peddlars, and the designation of building codes and zoning on the reserve. Even in these areas the Band Council has no judicial authority and the Council's decisions are always subject to final approval by the Minister; however, it is safe to say that the administrative activities of the Hagwilget and Moricetown Bands have rarely been disapproved by higher authorities, so that the Councils are left to be fairly autonomous within their areas of jurisdiction.

Another serious responsibility of the Councils, though not stipulated as such in the Indian Act, is that they are expected to apply for federal and provincial economic development funds on behalf of their Bands. Thus, for example, in the 1950's the Moricetown Council applied to the federal government for grants to establish a sawmill on the reserve. In an area suffering from chronic high unemployment, projects such as this are extremely important; it is crucial to note as well, however, that in terms of the power of the Band Councils within the communities such projects take on considerable significance. For once the project funds have been granted, the project's development and continued operation, including the hiring and paying of workers, is controlled by the Band Council. Similarly, in terms of public works projects such as the installation and maintenance of roads and water lines on the reserve, it is the Band Council that hires and pays workers. Clearly, in a community where productive activities have undergone an imposed shift from subsistence and simple commodity production to a reliance on wage labour, the Band Council wields considerable influence, particularly in
difficult economic times. This reliance on the Council for economic opportunity further denigrates the perceived and actual authority of the hereditary chiefs in economic matters.

Along the same lines, the responsibility of Band Councils for the allocation and building of new reserve houses for use by Band members gives the Councils considerable status within the community, given that funds are inadequate to provide satisfactory housing for all Band members. Again, housing was a responsibility traditionally held by the clan chiefs for members of their clans, a responsibility that began to be eroded in the 1880's when the longhouses were replaced by single family dwellings under pressure from the missionaries.

The question of the relative degrees of authority held by the Band Councils, on the one hand, and the hereditary chiefs, on the other, is most relevant here. Significantly, among the Hwitsowitenne as among their Gitksan neighbours, there has been surprisingly little overlap between the two structures. An examination of the numbers of years during which Hwitsowitenne clan chiefs have held elected office is indicative. Table 9 shows that of a total of 224 years (i.e., 7 Council positions x 32 years) of elected office since 1951, clan chiefs held office for a total of 52 years (23.2 percent).

---

5. In response to a general question in the Gitksan-Carrier Tribal Council Census (1979) concerning the adequacy of individual households' living quarters, 83.1 percent of Moricetown household heads and 78.2 percent of Hagwilget household heads responded that the household's living quarters were inadequate in terms of living space and physical condition.
### TABLE 9

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number Years Clan Chiefs Holding Elected Office Since 1951</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Moricetown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>As Chief Councillor (yrs.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>As Councillor (yrs.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total (a)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total yrs. elected office since 1951 (b)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clan chiefs yrs. office (a) as percentage of total yrs. elected office (b)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It is significant to note also that the greatest proportion of those 52 years were during the first three terms of office for the Band Councils (i.e., 1951-57); in fact, during the first term all but one Councillor position was held by a hereditary chief. That tendency, however, quickly declined, perhaps because the authority of the hereditary chiefs had already been undermined in various ways.

This overlap between the clan chiefs and elected offices in the Band Councils is especially low when compared to the Nishga case. McNeary (1976: 199) points out that "(t)here is no split between modern elected leaders and traditional chiefs" among the Nishga. His explanation for this correspondence lies first in his perception of the Anglican Church and the Salvation Army as having been supportive of the hereditary authority structure, thus avoiding factionalism within the communities. Secondly, McNeary observes that Nishga hereditary chiefs have maintained their high status due to their continued well-being in relative economic terms. He says, "In many cases, chiefs have retained their status as wealthy men, despite the fact that they no longer control essential
resources. Not every man with a high title is wealthy, but I think it is fair to say that all conspicuously well-to-do people are of high rank" (McNeary, 1976: 199). This, he implies, helps the chiefs to be elected to Band Council offices.

With respect to McNeary's last point, among the Hwitsowitenne, at least, there is not a tendency for hereditary chiefs to be any more wealthy than the "ordinary" people. On the contrary, the average yearly gross income among the present thirteen clan chiefs is approximately $9,500, while the average yearly gross income for all other adult males (over seventeen years of age) is $10,400 (Gitksan-Carrier Tribal Council Census, 1979). This difference may be caused in part by the fact that the average age of the present thirteen clan chiefs is fifty-seven years—considerably higher than the average twenty-nine years of adult males living on the reserves. The connection between the age difference and the income difference between the two groups lies in the fact that in a wage economy (when it is operational) based on physical labour, younger men are clearly favoured; secondly, the younger men tend as a group to have more children at home needing support so that when the inevitable employment lay-offs occur and the unemployment insurance payments cease, their family welfare payments tend to be higher than for older household heads. Thus, McNeary's first situation, that greater wealth leads to the clan chiefs being put into elected office, does not hold for the Hwitsowitenne.

Similarly, the Nishga experience of Churches supportive of the hereditary authority structure does not apply to the Hwitsowitenne. As Jenness states, the Catholic "teachers and missionaries condemn the old principality and demand undivided allegiance to the new" (Jenness, 1943:
The disregard of the priests for the authority of the hereditary chiefs has left many Hwitsowitenne elders bitter about the Church. An example of this disregard was cited in Chapter 1 (p. 56) where I described how among the Babine people local priests had identified one chief above all others in each of the Babine communities who would be given special standing in return for exercising authority on behalf of the Church. Other examples abound of local priests in Hagwilget and Moricetown condemning the feast, particularly the funeral feast, as heathenistic. Such manoeuvres and condemnations by the priests, some of which continue to the present, fly in the face of the hereditary authority structure. Thus, again the Hwitsowitenne situation does not parallel that of the Nishga.

Another factor that has contributed to the decline of the authority of clan chiefs has been the general attitude towards the traditional system held by the elected Band officers from the commoner ranks. This group tends to have a deep mistrust of the hereditary authority structure (though not necessarily of the individual clan chiefs) because it is seen as undemocratic and its operation does not follow modern processes of information collection, decision making, policy formation and action. While I do not mean to imply a causal relationship, it is interesting to note that over the last ten years the average age of elected officials of commoner status has been 31 years. As well, the educational level attained by these people has tended to be considerably higher than among the rest of the population inasmuch as most have finished high school and several, over the years, have attended college; and almost without exception this group has either attended school or worked in an urban area for at least two years.
As was suggested in the previous Section, the elected Band Councils tend not to be supportive of the traditional authority system nor of its concomitant organization of territories and laws. On the other hand, the clan chiefs have little good to say about the elected Band Councils.

In summary, I would point out that the Band Councils to a great extent have superseded the status and real authority of the clan chiefs in Hagwilget and Moricetown. This arises from a variety of factors. First, the traditional territorial organization has been dealt a number of blows by the federal and provincial governments, the effects of which have been to undermine the chiefs' control of resources and thus their economic power in the communities. Further, the Band Councils have been obliged to be passive, if not supportive, with respect to government actions since it is their federal masters they must satisfy in order to continue operating. Second, fishing, hunting and trapping have declined in economic significance as the first priority in terms of productive activity has shifted to the economy of wages and welfare. Thus a different dimension has been added to the economic life of the Hwitsowitenne since the 1950's, a dimension that largely precludes the authority of the clan chiefs.

Third, the Band Councils control both community funds and the decisions that matter to people on a daily basis; for example, housing, the provision of services such as water, and the hiring and paying of workers in the various Band development projects and in the Band Office itself. The provision of the daily living requirements of commoners that was once under the organizational control of the clan chiefs has shifted to the arena of the dependency structure. This structure is
formed by the elected Band Councils operating under the paternal direction of the Department of Indian and Northern Affairs in the context of the general capitalist economy. Recalling for a moment the discussion at the beginning of this Section, it should be stressed that this relationship of dependency implies that the Indian world is unfolding as it should—

from the federal perspective, that is.

And finally, as will be discussed in the next Chapter, the younger people who are in line to assume the names, rank and putative responsibilities of clan chiefs are finding it increasingly difficult to justify the expense and time required to achieve those hereditary positions. Again, the new political and economic context with its new demands is beginning to take a toll on the system of chiefly succession.
Chapter 4: CONCLUSION: CONTEMPORARY CHIEFTAINSHIP AND THE FEAST

In light of what I have written concerning the "meaning" of the feast within the feast hall (Chapters 1 and 2) and the recently changing context of Hwitsowitenne social, economic, political life particularly with respect to property relations and authority outside the feast hall (Chapter 3), I shall now consider the relationship between the feast and current daily life. Once again this will focus on the authority of the hereditary chiefs and the Hwitsowitenne system of property relations. In Part I I suggested, following Levi-Strauss, that there is a tendency to inertia in any culture such that changes are made in the existing structure ideally with minimal disruption to the order designated by the collective ideology (pp. 239-42). I submitted, as well, that the feast as ritual contributed to the inertia of established social patterns. However, I believe that certain pressures arising from without Hwitsowitenne society particularly since 1950 have seriously limited the ability of any social mechanism, including the feast, to minimize disruption in the social order.

I shall now elaborate on this inasmuch as changes in the political-economic context of Hwitsowitenne life are reflected in certain stresses within the feast hall. Thus, I am suggesting that while the feast continues to support traditional social patterns (in terms of hereditary authority and property relations) to some degree, the direction of influence has been reversed to the extent that the feast is now undergoing stressful changes induced from without.

The immediate questions concern feast types, frequency and attendance. Presently feasts are held on the occasion of the death of
either a noble, including chiefs, or a commoner (the funeral feast) and again one year later to commemorate the placing of the permanent headstone in the cemetery (the memorial feast). There were at one time several other types of feasts, all concerning specific events requiring legitimation; there were, for example, as recently as the 1940's feasts to commemorate births and weddings, and feasts as specialized as that required to be organized by a chief who had sustained an injury in order to "wipe away the blood" (that is, to wipe away the shame). Among the Gitksan there were thirty-two specific types of feasts that have been identified (Polly Sargent et al, 1982), although I have not discovered so many for the Carrier. It is safe to say, however, that the funeral feast and the memorial feast (originally the totem pole raising feast) have always been the most significant; for it is at the former that the critical questions of inheritance and other transfers and allocations of rights and ownership are addressed and at the latter that the new chief himself traditionally asserted his territorial control through the act of raising a pole.

In two years during which I worked in the Hwitsowitenne community (August 1980 to August 1982) there were a total of thirty-three feasts, of which seventeen were funeral feasts and sixteen were memorial feasts. (For purposes of feasting, there is no distinction made by the Hwitsowitenne between Hagwilget and Moricetown.) Virtually every feast is attended by each of the thirteen clan chiefs. During the two-year period mentioned, only four clan chiefs missed feasts: two chiefs were absent at two feasts, one chief missed three and one other chief missed one. In every case in which a clan chief was absent it was due to personal or immediate family illness. The attendance rate among the people
who are nominally identified as sub-chiefs (and hence nobles) by the high names they have been assigned is somewhat lower than among the clan chiefs. Of the twenty-six nominal sub-chiefs (i.e., two per clan), only thirteen attended all thirty-three feasts in the two-year period. Together the rest missed a total of one hundred and four feasts (i.e., an average of eight missed feasts among the thirteen sub-chiefs who missed at all). The reasons for absenteeism among the sub-chiefs are somewhat more diverse than among the clan chiefs, and in the clan chiefs' eyes unacceptable in several instances. I might speculate that this reflects a lower degree of direct interest and therefore of commitment to the contemporary feast among the sub-chiefs, a situation which, if real, may not bode well for the continuation of the inherited lines of authority or for the feast itself. On the other hand, I am advised by clan chiefs that the attendance rate of sub-chiefs has been lower than that of clan chiefs for at least forty years, and that the rates of attendance have remained more-or-less constant during that time. In summary, then, during two years of fieldwork I observed a rate of feast attendance among the clan chiefs of 98.6 percent and among the sub-chiefs of 87.8 percent.

Attendance by commoners is another matter in that during the same two-year period I found their attendance to be quite erratic. Based on a random sample of thirty percent of adult Hwitsowitenne commoners I found the following with respect to feast attendance during the year 1980-81 (a total of fifteen feasts held that year):
TABLE 10
Feast Attendance by Commoners, 1980-81

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feasts attended (n = 15)</th>
<th>% commoners attending</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 - 5</td>
<td>41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 - 10</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 - 15</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In terms of age distribution, there is a distinct tendency for older commoners to attend more feasts; in fact, of the ten percent of the sample attending between eleven and fifteen feasts in 1980-81, all were over forty-five years of age.

Regarding the respondents' reasons for attending or not attending feasts, the summary response among those who did not feast at all was that they had neither the time nor the interest in the traditional system to bother. Among those commoners attending between one and ten feasts, it was apparent that they did so generally when the feast concerned the death or placement of the headstone for a member of their immediate or extended family; that is, people in this category tended to have a more-or-less direct interest in the particular feasts they attended. The people attending between eleven and fifteen feasts were generally more committed to supporting the so-called traditional Hwitsowitenne social system. Again, however, while this picture might not appear particularly encouraging for the feast as a strong institution, I have had slight indications that attendance may be on the verge of a recovery. I have attained the impression by talking to several young Hwitsowitenne between fifteen and twenty-five years of age that interest in the indigenous social system, including the feast, is reviving. While this tendency is indicated only through conversation and not yet in
actual feast attendance figures, it is an impression that has been corroborated for me by some elders and chiefs. Re-examination of the situation in two or three years would be revealing.

In the meantime, however, there are causes for concern in the feast hall. I suggested above that there is a tendency for younger adults to be disinterested in the feast and I would submit further that this disinterest stems at least partly from a disdain of the hereditary authority structure, as was discussed in Section 3 of Chapter 3. The democratic nature of the Band Councils holds appeal, especially for those who have been to school and have lived in the city; that is, primarily the younger people. As well, it is generally perceived by younger adults that the Band Councils now hold the real power in the communities since it is they who manage the government support funding, make decisions regarding housing and other desired services on the reserve, and hold a degree of potential to hire workers either in the Band Office or on development projects. In this light, the real power of the dineezas' and thus the relevance of the feast are questions affecting attendance by the younger commoners.

Yet there is another problem which may be of greater significance; namely, the high cost of moving upward in the hereditary authority structure. An individual who is in line as a possible candidate to take the name of a sub-chief or clan chief (i.e., the son or daughter of a chief's sister) must demonstrate his/her ability to provide at the community level by contributing increasing quantities of cash at feasts over a period of several years. The Hwitsowitenne refer to this as "paying for the name." Graph 1 indicates the typical scenario for an individual aspiring to clan chieftainship. At about age twenty-five the
GRAPH 1
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first adult name of any real significance might be bestowed. Until the individual is approximately forty, however, he/she remains a commoner and is expected to contribute a sum usually amounting to about ten dollars at each feast. At about age forty the ascent begins, after several years of grooming by the chief whose name is to be inherited. At this point the donations increase to about fifty dollars per feast by the time the individual is fifty years old. The next five years require a more impressive increase in size of contributions to about one hundred dollars per feast by age fifty-five. It is then that the status, name, territorial control, regalia, history and responsibilities of the previous chief are bestowed—assuming, of course, that approval is given by the other chiefs of the phratry. The chief who is being succeeded may either have died or have retired voluntarily. If we assume an average of sixteen feasts per year, the investment required to attain a chief's position is high; typically about fifty-six hundred dollars between the ages of forty and fifty, and sixty-four hundred dollars between ages fifty and fifty-five for a fifteen year total of approximately twelve thousand dollars. Once the rank of clan chief is achieved, the feast contribution by the new chief drops fairly sharply until it levels out in another ten years or so to a typical rate of about sixty dollars per feast.

Contributions in the form of food must also be made, though only at feasts sponsored by one’s own phratry. The increasing rate of quantities of food donated by an individual climbing to the rank of chief correspond over the years to the increasing rate of cash contributions. While a commoner might, for example, donate two loaves of bread for distribution to the guests, a person approaching the apex of the contribution cycle might supply a case of bread (i.e., twenty-four loaves) and
two large boxes of apples. Again, the ability of the dineeza' to provide must be publicly demonstrated.

Of course, while the contributions to the feast by an individual on the rise are quite substantial, the returns to that individual compensate to a degree. Returns in cash and food are gathered when one is a guest at a feast (that is, at approximately three of every four feasts). Graph 1 indicates the approximate rate of cash returns to an individual aspiring to clan chieftainship. It will be noted that the degrees of increase in rate of cash returns do not equal the rate of increase of contributions. Further, it is not until the clan chief has attained a steady rate of contribution about ten years after achieving his new status that his cash returns at each feast surpass his donations—and then only by about five dollars per feast. As well, while the individual is expected to donate cash at every feast he attends, regardless of the hosting phratry, he receives a cash return only at those feasts at which he is a guest. Regarding returns in the form of food, one fares somewhat better inasmuch as returns are gathered at feasts one attends as a guest (i.e., at three of every four feasts) yet food is donated on only one of every four occasions. The point to be made here is that while the costs incurred by an individual on his rise to chieftainship are mitigated to a certain extent by the returns gathered at the feast, the individual most definitely pays for his name. That is to say, he pays to exercise his right to have the acquisition of his chiefly status witnessed and validated.

Additionally, prospective and established clan chiefs are expected according to their customary responsibilities to provide for members of their clans who are unable to meet subsistence requirements
either by themselves or with the help of immediate family. Currently those most often in this situation are the elderly, the ill or the infirm living alone, or single parents caring for children. Salmon is the primary good distributed, although game meat, berries, firewood and other essentials such as flour and tea are given to those in need. Again, this is an activity which is at the same time the responsibility of the clan chiefs and their potential successors and a demonstration of their worthiness as dineeza'. These distributions are considered to be part of the process of "paying for the name." However, in comparison to feast contributions which are widely witnessed and accountable in that public forum, distribution by aspiring and established clan chiefs outside the feast hall is not dealt with as officiously. I was only able to identify three individuals being groomed for clan chieftainship who made any extra-feast distributions, and those of only a minimal and irregular nature. (The reasons for this might lie in the discussion regarding high costs to follow.) With respect to established clan chiefs, five of the thirteen made little or no attempt to distribute goods beyond their immediate families, a fact which might well be attributable to their own difficulties in making ends meet. On the other hand, I observed eight clan chiefs to go beyond the requirements of their distributional responsibilities by regularly giving needed subsistence goods to people both within and without their own clans. While I was unable to identify perfectly clearly the rationale underlying this degree of generosity, it was intimated to me by two of these chiefs as well as by two commoner elders that in light of the vacuum left by "irresponsible" clan chiefs, others felt obliged to make additional efforts. If this is the rationale (and I have no reason to believe otherwise), then these eight chiefs are further
demonstrating their worthiness as dineeza'.

Under ideal conditions, the benefits gained from the acquisition of a chief's status and power would be considered to be worth the cost. However, under current conditions, which are far from ideal for Hwitso-witenne social structure and organization, the benefits are dubious in that the prestige and real power of the chiefs have been undermined. As well, there are increasingly fewer people in the age bracket appropriate for moving toward chieftainship who can afford the investment demanded. As living costs have risen along with the unemployment rate, supporting a family has become a task close to impossible for the younger Hwitso-witenne. An investment of several thousand dollars (and this allowing for the returns) over a fifteen year period is not an inviting, nor in many cases even a possible prospect. This is so especially when the end results are perceived to be intangible at best.

An indication of the extent of this problem can be seen in the number of clan chiefs and sub-chiefs who presently have no one ready to be groomed and to make the investment required to take over their positions. Of the thirteen clan chiefs, two are in this position; among the twenty-six sub-chiefs there are five who presently are without heirs apparent. In none of these cases does the reason for the problem lie in a lack of sisters' sons of acceptable calibre. The reason, I am told, is traceable to a lack of interest and/or financial ability to make the sacrifice demanded to become a chief. Again, this does not bode well for the system of hereditary authority, although the chiefs tell me that they have hope for a general economic recovery which would make the contributions somewhat more possible.

The question might arise as to why the cash investment demands, and thus also the returns, are not decreased or the form of currency
altered altogether. Gistehwa, who happens to earn a reasonable wage, told me that even he now finds it difficult to meet his cash input requirements. He suggested that for many people, especially those aspiring to chieftainship, the investments could be met much more easily by dealing in the more traditional currency, that is, meat, fish and furs, rather than in cash. Upon reflection, though, he qualified this idea by pointing out that it was plausible inasmuch as many younger people now had plenty of time on their hands for traditional economic pursuits. However, given the decline in the resource base since the 1950's and the chaos that would likely result from a substantial increase in numbers of resource users in the context of an uncertain territorial system, he concluded that such a change might not be possible. This dilemma indicates the impact of the external society on the feast itself; that is, current practice is becoming ever more difficult and yet a seemingly attractive alternative is unfeasible as well.

The question as to why levels of investment and return are not lowered to correspond more equitably to the financial capabilities of the people is more difficult to answer. Suffice it to say that until now the cash investment demands have been met successfully by enough individuals such that no chief's name has been left open. On the other hand, this might soon occur in the case of at least two clan chiefs' positions if current economic conditions continue to severely pressure the younger people. The actual process by which investment and return rates might be lowered is an interesting question that is open to speculation at this time.

I wish now to address another critical development facing the
Hwitsowitenne system of property relations and which is currently being manifested as problematic at feasts. The issue concerns inheritance. Specifically, it relates to the fact that in four recent cases--two involving clan chiefs and two concerning sub-chiefs--an attempt has been made to have a registered trapline territory inherited not by a sister's son but by the individual registrant's own son. According to Hwitsowitenne customary law, such patrilineal and interphratric inheritance is absolutely unacceptable. However, to the extent that the sons concerned are now trapping on the lines registered by their fathers and that this form of continuation of use is sanctioned by the provincial government, these moves have been successful. On the other hand, the cases have caused consternation in the feast hall and perhaps have placed before the chiefs their greatest single challenge with respect to pressures arising from the changing political-economic context of Hwitsowitenne life.

Table 2 (p. 301) indicates that of twenty-one chiefs and nobles listed, registered traplines are held by four clan chiefs and two nobles (who, in this case, happen to be sub-chiefs). At the time of the original applications for registered traplines it was natural for individuals to apply for traplines in the areas with which they were most familiar; hence, the registered trapline areas held by clan chiefs cover a portion of the chiefs' traditional hunting territories (albeit, a relatively small portion as indicated by comparing Maps A and B). The two sub-chiefs applied for and were granted registrations for traplines covering parts of the hunting territories of their clan chiefs.

The real problem arises from the organization of the trapline
scheme instituted by the provincial government. Specifically, the government has allowed applicants to register traplines as a "company," such that the primary applicant may register the trapline thus: "John Doe and Company." In each of the four cases under consideration here, the rest of the "Company" comprises the prime applicant's son or sons. As part of this arrangement, the government allows the registration to continue in the name of the company after the death of the primary registrant or whenever the primary registrant chooses to withdraw from the agreement.

At the time of application renewals each year, preferential consideration is given to the incumbent registration holders—to the extent that renewal is essentially a sure thing. Thus, according to the system of trapline control established by the provincial government, individuals who register lines as part of a company are more-or-less assured of being able to pass on control of the trapline to whomever they choose to be in their company. In the four cases under consideration here, this control is being passed on to sons. Clearly, this represents a challenge to the feast hall. In the cases of the two offending clan chiefs there is a serious failure to uphold a basic social institution, namely matrilineal inheritance of territorial control. The threat presented by the sub-chiefs has a somewhat different but related focus; this is, they are effectively passing on a form of control of territory over which they have no direct authority under the Hwitsowitenne code of property relations. A sub-chief may have rights of access and use which can be inherited matrilineally, but he is not in the position either to control territory (except in special instances)
or to pass on any permanent territorial rights to his own son.

It might be argued that in these four cases there are mitigating circumstances; namely, that the provincial government's system of territoriality is separate from the Hwitsowitenne system, and therefore dealings in the former are not subject to the laws of the latter. The five clan chiefs with whom I spoke about this matter, however, were emphatic in their belief that while the difference existed, the externally imposed system was a clear threat to Hwitsowitenne society and that the only defence, indeed hope for their system lay in the strict application of Hwitsowitenne law. They saw no compatibility between the two sets of property relations.

The feast hall is the one forum in which the offenders can be formally and publicly castigated. To this point, it appears that the other clan chiefs have attempted to deal with the problem by making statements at each feast which allude, in a general way, to the severity of the offence of interphratric transfer of territorial control. The people in question are not named; however, the provincial government and its system of trapline registration are invariably criticized. This has been happening for the benefit of one or more of the offenders since early in 1980. I am told by two of my most consistent contacts that outside the feast hall the four have been "getting the cold shoulder" from the other chiefs. Apparently this is especially true for the two subchiefs in that their clan chiefs regularly demonstrate verbal hostility toward them. These clan chiefs feel particularly offended because their rights to territorial control are being usurped by subordinates within their own clans.
It is difficult at this time to gauge the effectiveness of the campaign by the chiefs who are attempting to ensure that their laws are not broken. The offending chiefs have shown no obvious intention to transfer their trapline registrations to anyone but their sons; and yet they continue to endure obvious censure at feasts. The two sub-chiefs, on the other hand, also apparently intend to continue with their transfer plans but increasingly within the last year have avoided the feast hall. This could be an indication that they are opting out of the organizational system that is represented at the feast. If this is the case, then the problem is a critical one. As sub-chiefs they are obliged to carry out certain responsibilities within their clans and by the same token are granted certain rights such as territorial access and use. However, I am told that if they were to reject the Hwitsowitenne system of property relations by the combination of breaking the inheritance law and avoiding the feast, they would seriously jeopardize their positions in their respective clans. Given that the negation of one's clan membership was, until recently at least, one of the most serious sanctions in Hwitsowitenne society, these possible cases of voluntary abrogation of clan membership may indicate the weakening of the sanction and, by extension, the weakening of the clan as an organizational unit. This possibility is consistent with the decline in the effective exercise of authority by clan chiefs that I explained earlier in Part II. Again, the next two years or so should provide something more than conjecture in these cases. In that period we should have a better indication as to the success or failure of the chiefs' campaign on the issue and if, in fact, these four cases are the last of their kind or only the beginning.

It is clear to me that the Hwitsowitenne feast and the system it manifests are currently facing their greatest challenge. The federal
government's attempt to destroy the feast with the "Potlatch Laws" of the 1920's held relatively little threat because the "Laws" attacked only the forum at which the indigenous system was represented. At that time the feast simply "went underground," maintaining its support by Indian people. Since about 1950, however, external pressures have concentrated not on the feast itself but rather on the more basic organization of property relations, production, exchange and authority. As part of this process, alternatives have been created for Indians generally, including the Carrier. As in the cases just described, for example, there are now ways to acquire some degree of territorial control other than by the strict rank-oriented, expensive, and often slow process of matrilineal inheritance. Similarly, I have explained how the wage economy, though tenuous, has attracted many away from so-called traditional economic activities and has further contributed to the decline of the chiefly authority structure. As well, the institution of elected Band Councils with their wider political and economic powers has tended to shift the locus of authority in the villages away from the clan chiefs. Unlike the "Potlatch Laws," the process I have just outlined poses a serious threat to Hwitsowitenne social organization, not through a direct challenge to the feast per se but by inducing the alienation of many people, especially the young, from the indigenous economy and authority structure.

In this light, it might seem that the only way in which the feast could maintain its structural integrity as described in Part I would be by insulating itself from current realities. Indeed, the strength of the entire organizational system which is manifested at the feast and which has received considerable attention here appears in doubt.
Perhaps the unique Hwitsowitenne social system has reached its point of maximum stress and has started an irrevocable transformation into just another sector of Canadian society whose major characteristic (after its high number of Indians) is its economic marginality. Perhaps the cultural "inertia" to which Levi-Strauss (1963: 19) refers has been jolted in the case of the Hwitsowitenne to the extent that radical changes in social structure suddenly proceed relatively quickly and, indeed, may be sought actively by some.

At the risk of submitting to a bias in favour of the continuation of the feast, however, I think the problem can be seen in a positive light as well. While I place considerable weight on the observable effects of pressures arising from relations with the wider society, the explanation presented in Part I, the structuralist explanation, should be recalled at this point. I concluded in light of that analysis that the feast "contributes to the inertia of established social structure by imputing to definitive aspects of its particular form a sense of virtue drawn from 'deep' sources external to the structure of society itself: as Levi-Strauss might say, from the 'structure of the mind'" (p. 245, above). I have little doubt that this is true. The feast is presently the single, most clearly articulated repository of Carrier society and culture and as such it contributes to the inertia of established Carrier social structure. Although its functional relevance to life outside the feast hall has declined, it has not only slowed the drift toward assimilation, but it also holds potential, for the time being at least, to be once again the forum for the expression of a healthy Carrier social structure.
While this potential presently exists, its continuation and full realization depend upon conditions outside the feast hall. The feast cannot maintain its integrity indefinitely within a vacuum, that is, within an inappropriate social and economic context. This then becomes the critical question regarding the future of the feast: Will the current trend toward dependence and assimilation continue for Carrier society, or will control be re-established according to the unique Carrier organization of property relations, production, exchange and authority?

In the second part of this essay I focussed on property relations and supporting laws as a demonstration of the way in which Hwitsowitenne society is changing and of the resulting stresses within the feast hall. I submit that in order for the potential of the feast to be realized, it will need assistance through the reversal of those kinds of changes. At this point in Carrier history, that task can only be attempted by leaders who can operate both within the feast hall and at the negotiating table across from representatives of government and industry. To this end, representatives of the Gitksan-Carrier Tribal Council are working primarily on their land claim, the goal of which is to regain control of Gitksan and Carrier resources and social futures. The task is extremely difficult and time is running out; however, this may be the only viable approach to re-establishing a social context appropriate to the feast so that it again may assume its fullest meaning.
The following is a schematic representation of the various Carrier social divisions and corresponding chiefly levels discussed particularly in Part I. While the diagram is of the Bulkley River sept, note that the Babine and Stuart Lake septs are represented by the same phratric divisions (but by different clan divisions).
* represents the clan in each phratry whose clan chief is the highest ranking in that particular phratry; hence, the phratry chief.

1. Septs are referred to by Duff as "subtribes," where "the Carrier" represent "the tribe."
2. Phratries are referred to by other authors as "tribes" or "clans."
3. Clans are sometimes referred to as "houses."
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