

**"The Bloody Moose Got Up and Took Off": Talking Carefully
about Food Animals in a Northern Athabaskan Village**

THOMAS MCILWRAITH

Douglas College

Abstract. At Iskut Village, British Columbia, moose hunting is frequently spoken about in the form of conversational narratives. Upon analysis, these narratives are full of conventions aimed at valorizing the slain moose even while speakers talk about hunting success indirectly. Here, I present four short moose pursuit stories, along with additional evidence from the speech of Iskut hunters, to show that care is always required when talking about food animals. By extension, such care is indicative of ideal social relations between people.

1. Introduction. At Iskut Village, British Columbia, moose hunting is the central activity of life. Tasks associated with hunting, like camping, snowmobiling, cutting and drying meat, and feasting, are undertaken with passion and vigor. Men and women hunt when they can, often on weekends and throughout the summer when school is out. Hunting is part of day trips by truck around the area to "see the country" and get out of the village for a few hours. To the chagrin of many, seasonal and full-time wage work, whether in the Band Office, on highway construction crews, or in a local mine, keeps Iskut people away from hunting more than they would like.

The importance and pervasiveness of hunting at Iskut is not always easy for outsiders to see. Hunting usually occurs along back roads that visitors rarely travel. Meat is distributed quickly without much fanfare. Moreover, the study of hunting at Iskut is challenging because hunting activities, hunting rules, and information about food animals are rarely discussed in expansive or explicit discourse. Hunting knowledge is, instead, frequently presented artistically in the form of short, barely elaborated narratives during conversations between friends and relatives. Sharing memories of pursuing moose, reporting recent animal kills, and describing the follies of selfish hunters—examples of each of these kinds of hunting talk are provided in the present article—usually includes the deft application of ellipsis, indirection, metaphor, and allegory. The analysis of the use of these rhetorical devices makes it clear that hunting talk is rich in allusions to older notions of respect for food animals. Respecting animals is associated with values such as not boasting about oneself in front of others or, indeed, animals, and not wasting food. By analyzing examples of hunting-related talk, particularly by men talking with each other in everyday situations, I show that hunting talk contributes to a system of ideas and behaviors, values and traditions. In turn, talk of this sort shows that hunters and their families

are not simply trying to subsist by hunting. Rather, Iskut culture itself is being sustained by hunting activities today.

Iskut Village is a small community of aboriginal people in northwestern British Columbia, Canada. It is home to roughly 375 people who claim affiliation with one of two matrilineal clans, Wolf or Crow. Clan affiliations are important when funeral feasts are organized and marriages are considered; in other social settings, clan membership fades in importance. While the Tahltan language (Athabaskan) is spoken with some frequency by the oldest community members, English is the language of everyday talk for people of all ages. Organized politically as the Iskut First Nation, Iskut is one of three communities that make up the broader political entity of "The Tahltan Nation." Along with the other two communities, Telegraph Creek and Dease Lake, Iskut is located along a lightly traveled driving route to the Alaska Highway a few hours south of the Yukon border. It sits in the upper reaches of the Stikine and Iskut Rivers, significant salmon rivers that flow out to the Pacific Ocean near Wrangell, Alaska. The salmon cannot reach Iskut, however, due to blockages along those routes. As a result, moose are the focus of local foraging. The preference for hunting over fishing is a reminder of the orientation of these Athabaskans towards the interior of British Columbia, particularly when compared to their salmon-fishing relatives at Telegraph Creek on the lower Stikine River (see Jenness 1932:379).

2. Stories of pursuing moose. Stories about pursuing moose are common in Iskut hunting talk. The stories are memories of amazing events in the careers of hunters. Embedded within these stories are expressions of respect for animals and deference to them. Also in evidence is the humor characteristic of Iskut people. Pursuit stories are examples of the way in which hunters tell each other indirectly of their own hunting skill and experience while implicitly valorizing the moose. They illustrate cultural themes such as the social relationships that exist between people and animals, the idea that animals control the outcome of hunts, and the principle that Iskut people should share food with each other. In addition, these stories offer insights into the ways in which hunters organize and comment on social relationships within their own families.

Here, I present four moose pursuit stories. They are told in rapid succession and together they form part of a larger conversation between two first cousins, John Edwards and Colin Duncan.¹ John and Colin are in their sixties. They have spent their lives living in and around Iskut Village and Telegraph Creek, British Columbia. Their hunting activities have taken place on the Spatsizi Plateau² and in the Klappan River watershed in a region known locally as *Tl'abāne* 'open grass flats'.³ John's hunting punctuates a busy life of caring for grandchildren and working at a full-time job in the village. The region around Iskut is dotted with the numerous cabins and camps he built and maintains. The camps are the physical evidence of John's hunting prowess and his commitment to gathering

food for himself, his family, and his community. Colin lives in Terrace, British Columbia, but he spent many years living in Iskut.

I had been living in Iskut for five months conducting dissertation research about traditional land uses and resource management when I recorded these stories. My dissertation study was motivated, in part, by my frustration with the traditional land use studies I had once helped to conduct at Iskut. Upon reflection, I felt that those bureaucratic studies relegated the knowledge and narratives of Iskut people to dots, lines, and circles on topographical maps (see also Cruikshank 1998; Nadasdy 2003). I went to Iskut to try to personalize traditional use information and, to that end, I initially sought information about freshwater fishing practices. I slowly realized, however, that hunting was the prestigious activity in Iskut. As the middle of August arrived, the hunting of moose and caribou was in full swing. Naïve about camp life, I drove out to John's hunting camp to see the action. John's camp is located high in the headwaters of the Little Klappan River on the eastern flank of *Dzetzsedle* 'Klappan Mountain' (lit., 'little mountain'). John had moved there about a week prior to my arrival. Each summer he returns to this comfortable camp early in August to hunt for the moose and caribou that feed his extended family throughout the fall and winter. On these occasions, he also teaches his teenaged grandsons how to hunt, clean their game, and care for each other while they travel around the remote location on their all-terrain vehicles. John welcomed me as member of his camp and he proceeded to teach me about camping and hunting, too. As a result, much of my understanding of camping at Iskut, and of these stories, comes from interactions with senior men within the context of the instruction of younger men and boys.⁴

A few days after my arrival, Colin Duncan arrived in the camp with his two teenaged grandsons. Once John and Colin were together, the tenor of conversations within the camp changed. Stories about hunting, past and present, became more frequent, presumably because John had a peer with whom he could speak. On the surface, the stories sounded like memories of the good old days shared easily between two men who had spent a lifetime hunting together. But after a couple of days of listening to these memories-as-stories, I began to consider that the conversations between John and Colin were not simply small talk; the tone seemed serious and the tellings sounded intentional.

Coupland (2003) says that small talk is designed to build rapport or credibility between speakers, but in this case rapport already exists. I contend now that these stories represent a form of small talk that I call "serious chatter" or chatter with serious intent. Serious chatter is like "idle chatter" or "shooting the breeze" in that it functions, in large part, to pass the time (see Mears 2002). But, when allusions to myth-time are included, and humor is used to call attention to it, serious chatter carries more weight than other forms of small talk. In the case examined in the present article, the serious chatter revolves around hunters discussing hunting and reinforcing bonds of friendship and family. As a form of

small talk, serious chatter is different than, say, Frankfurt's "bullshitting" (Frankfurt 1986; also cited in Mears 2002) or Goffman's "fabrication" (Goffman 1986:83), both of which imply that deception on the part of the teller is intended with the telling of the story. These moose pursuit stories include only temporary deception, as each story implies that the moose has been killed before it is revealed that the moose has escaped. And this deception points to my interest in these stories: the Tahltan values that they convey.⁵

The more I listened to John and Colin's hunting stories, the more central to camp life they seemed to be. The boys in the camp could not help but hear the stories, too. The accounts were thin on details, though. They sounded plausible, but when did they occur? Who was there? I started to wonder if they were designed to deflect attention away from the violence of hunting. The stories sounded consistent with the observations of other Subarctic anthropologists that hunters must kill the animals they also revere (e.g., Tanner 1979; Brightman 1993; Preston 2002; Nadasdy 2005). How did talk about killing moose show respect to the animals? And what about the observation that these stories were replete with details of hunting prowess?

3. The text. These moose pursuit stories are a subset of the general hunting talk in John Edwards's hunting camp. They were captured while a tape recorder recorded all conversations between John and Colin over the course of an hour on 13 August 2002. For most of that time, the two men sat under John's kitchen tarp near the camp's central cooking fire. The stories are short—no longer than a minute—and each is told in barely extended conversational turns in English.⁶ They describe the failure of John or Colin to kill a moose seen while traveling in the bush near Iskut. My presence may have affected the tone or content of the talk, particularly because John was aware that I wanted to record stories of the old days. I may have been a catalyst for these discussions in much the same way that the Oblate priest Father Mouchet described himself as a sounding board for discussions of hunting and history while traveling the trails with Iskut men in the 1950s (Mouchet 2002:55). Still, I did not ask for these stories to be told, and the large number of stories I heard in this setting and in others suggests to me that Colin and John would have told these stories whether I was there or not.

The transcript (transcript 1) is divided into six segments. The first segment (A) is the conversation leading to the stories. It provides readers with a sense of the abrupt beginning to the exchange of stories between John and Colin. The next segments (B, C, D, and E) are the four stories. Colin initiates the exchanges in segment B and the storytellers alternate turns thereafter. There are no significant pauses between stories. Segment F is the last stretch of talk, triggered when Bobby Weeks, one of John's grandsons, interrupts the exchange of stories to ask if he can go hunting.

I follow Robert E. Moore's transcription style (Moore 1993). Moore sets transcripts into columns. Text lined up to the left represents the narrative frame

used by the storyteller to talk directly to the audience. Speech in the second column from the left represents third-person narration of the actions of characters or participants in the stories. The third column from the left contains directly quoted speech of story participants (see Moore 1993:219–20). Following Palmer (2005), line breaks are prompted by pauses in speech. Each line represents, in effect, a single utterance (also see Brown and Yule 1983). No dialogue is eliminated from any part of the transcript.

Transcript 1. Moose Hunting Stories

[Speakers: John Edwards, 61 years old (JE); Colin Duncan, 60–65 years old (CD); Bobby Weeks, 15 years old (BW); James William, 15 years old (JW).]

[Scene: John and Colin are sitting under a kitchen tarp in a hunting camp. Colin sits at the kitchen table and John sits on a stool about three feet away. I am seated next to the fire, three feet from both men. Two teenaged boys move in and out of the scene as they get their gear ready to go hunting for *dediye* 'groundhogs'.⁷]

[A. Lead-in (lines 1–15)]

- 1 CD Who's got his [John's father's] gun? [0:00:00]
 JE I got it at home.
 CD Oh.
 BW What kind?
 5 CD .303.
 JE Frank⁸ wanted it,
 but he told me to keep his gun.
 "I just wanna raise you kids,"
 he say.
 10 BW .303?
 JE Yah.
 CD Good shootin' gun.
 JE I shot quite a bit moose with it.
 "You keep it
 15 so you kill moose with it." [0:24:54]

[B. Colin Duncan story #1 (lines 16–51)]

- CD We travel here. [0:25:48]
 Go get that moose.
 Way I go.
 Too much,
 20 I wanna make one shot with it,
 his gun.
 His gun is so good.
 One time I got burnt there, eh.
 Come along to that moose and
 25 "boom."
 Here I musta shoot through the [pause] weather bone, eh. [laughs]
 JE weather bone. [laughs]⁹
 CD I snowshoe around him.
 And we keep agoin'.

- 30 And I think I'll get it up on top
and it'll come.
Big valley on other side
and he'll come on through.
Then I went back,
35 and uncle,
we had camp down below.
He [the uncle] make everybody look.
"Hey Scotty,¹⁰
look at that."
40 Here that moose get up and run.
Way he go down the hill.
I didn't know that, you know.
He came out
and look at my moose.
45 It's gone.
I look right out.
It's running away.
[laughter with JE]
Then I coulda shot him again.
50 I just thought,
"ah that's good enough." [1:10:55]
- [C. John Edwards story #1 (lines 52-83)]
JE That's what I did, [1:12:20]
son of a gun.
I had 30-30
55 and I shot moose.
"Bikū."¹¹ [gestures, see below]
"Bikū."
Down he went.
He kick around, eh.
60 And he quit.
I thought he died.
I made trail back to my dog team.
All the way to the dogs,
back and forth.
65 So I got two.
That first bull.
I tip it over.
I started to skin it.
I finished skinning it.
70 I thought
"I should get my dogs,
go to that cow."
No,
I went over to that cow.
75 Here it ditch up that hill.
CD [laughs]
JE Gee,
I run up behind it
I come out.

- 80 I see it
but I miss.
CD It happened to me twice. [1:57:26]
JE Break trail for nothing. [1:59:57]
[D. Colin Duncan story #2 (lines 84-99)]
CD Happened to me top of Stikine. [2:01:55]
85 Wife and I come out around that long stretch.
See this cow moose run off, eh,
in the timber.
He stop.
"Bang."
90 Down he went.
I went back to the truck.
Drove my truck up there.
Got my packboard.
Put on my snowshoes.
95 Went back there.
The bloody moose got up
and took off.
JE [Laughs]. [2:19:80]
CD Twice I got burned like that. [2:23:80]
[E. John Edwards story #2 (lines 100-134)]
100 JE I did same thing [2:26:40]
other end, outlet of *Mo'uchōhe*.¹²
I shot one dead.
The other one I shot.
Big cow too.
105 I shot and he drop.
I keep it on.
He quit so far.
Thought I got two moose.
I walk over to the first one.
110 He's dead.
I went over to the other one.
There he got up.
I look.
Here he's in a poplar. [with disbelief]
115 Oh, how I shoot.
I miss it
and I chase it.
He fall down three times, eh.
From there he's gone.
120 I hit him right there with it.
I went back to skin the other one.
I was going to make skin toboggan.
I walk right across the lake.
My ski-doo over there.
125 Bring it,
go down.
Whole moose,
I drag out to the highway.
I bury it.

- 130 And I walk down to Monty Able
 where they call Cready Cabin,
 It's about a mile and a half.
 He help me out.
 He haul that meat for me. [3:28.00]
- [F. Conversation after the stories]
- 135 BW What time gramps? [3:31.75]
 JE Ten to two.
 BW Think there'd be groundhogs comin' out.
 CD Comin' out,
 yah,
 140 if sun come out.
 They'll come out.
 JW OK. Let's go.
 BW Let's go up.
 You'll take your .22 then. [3:47.00]

4. The structure of pursuit stories. Most of the dialogue in the transcript is overtly directed at the other person. There is almost no reported speech. The action in the stories revolves around the interaction of narrator and moose. Colin interacts with one moose in each of his stories; John kills one moose and misses another in his stories. What is truly noteworthy about these stories is their careful structure. Each story is organized into seven units and revolves around a narrative turn in which the storyteller announces that the hunted moose has escaped or that the shot missed the target.

The seven units are as follows:

1. Introductory Frame
2. Setup for the Rifle Shot
3. The Shot
4. Result of the Shot
5. Activity after the Shot
6. The Narrative Turn
7. Ending: Giving Up and Moving On

Colin Duncan starts off (unit 1, line 16). He departs from the preceding conversation about a family rifle. The rifle provokes his story, albeit indirectly; rifles and their use are common features of hunting talk. John takes his turn quickly after Colin finishes his first narrative. John states: "That's what I did / son of a gun" (lines 52-53). Colin takes the turn back with "Happened to me top of Stikine" (line 84). John's second story starts with "I did same thing" (line 100).

Once the conversational turn is seized, each man offers basic information about the moose and minor details about the broader context of the hunt (unit 2). This information includes details concerning the type of rifle used, first appearance of the moose itself, sex of the moose, or where the storyteller was positioned when the moose was seen. At the start of his second story, Colin says:

"Wife and I come around that long stretch. / See this cow moose run off, eh, / in the timber. / He stop" (lines 85-88). In both of his stories, John mixes the descriptions of killing one moose and missing another. In the first (segment C), John says that he shot two moose (line 65), although Colin and I soon learn that only one moose is dead. In his second story (segment E), John also complicates the setup by saying that he shot two moose, although only one is said to be dead (lines 102-3).

At this point, John and Colin have provided nothing more than descriptions of the hunt. For both men, the claims of personal experience are established in the opening lines of each story. The narrator's experience is authenticated. The stories are serious in tone and give no hint that anything more than a successful hunt is going to be described. There is no laughter through this part of the story, nor are there interruptions from the audience. By letting the listeners assume that a moose has been killed, the storytellers leave open the possibility of an unexpected turn later in the narrative. This section establishes the truthful nature of the story prior to a dramatic climax with the shot and a surprising turn of events with the unanticipated fleeing of the moose.

A rifle shot is a central feature of each story (unit 3). The storyteller identifies the shot audibly and, in one case, visually with hand gestures. Colin uses the words "boom" (line 25) in his first story and "bang" (line 89) in his second. John is somewhat more dramatic in his first story, repeating the onomatopoeic word "*bikū*" twice (lines 56-57). This word is accompanied by a shooting gesture with the arms, where both arms are held loosely in the position in which a shooter holds a rifle. In John's case, the right arm is bent and his right hand is near his cheek. His left arm is extended, with a slight bend in the elbow. His head is turned so that he can look down the length of his extended left arm as if he was looking down the barrel of a rifle. From this position, John brings together the fingers and thumbs on both hands, opening the fingers abruptly in the instant that "*bikū*" is said.¹³ John describes his second rifle shot less dramatically. He says: "I shot and he drop" (line 105). "Bang," "boom," and "*bikū*" are narrative devices that move each story towards revelations about success and failure. It is possible that they are devices derived from traditional Tahltan storytelling practices. I am left wondering if "bang" and "boom" are translated into English from the Tahltan *bikū*. Further research is needed, ideally with a Tahltan-language narrative at hand.

In both of John's stories, the basic sequence of events gets a little jumbled because he tells of successful and unsuccessful kills. In segment C, John uses two different expressions to signal early in the story that he was successful in killing only one of the moose. For the successful kill, John combines the reference to the shot with a definitive statement of the result: "I shot one dead" (line 102). John continues, describing the second shot in terms that make it sound successful, but without using the word "dead." John says simply, "The other one I shot" (line 103). In segment E, something similar happens to John. Here, we

learn that the first moose is dead (line 110), but when John goes over to check the second moose, it has gotten up and left (lines 112–14).

The result of the shot is always announced immediately after the shot is sounded (unit 4). In segment C, John says simply "Down he went" (line 58). He then uses a second gesture, a dropping forearm motion, to represent the animal's fall as he says this line. In segment D, Colin tells John and me the same thing: "Down he went" (line 90). The result of Colin's first shot (segment B) is somewhat more complicated. Colin states, "Here I musta shoot through the weather bone" (line 26). John and Colin both complete the sentence, saying "weather bone" simultaneously (lines 26 and 27). Laughter results. A shot through the weather bone is not always deadly to a moose and John's ability to complete Colin's sentence may imply that this has happened to John in the past. John's laughter contributes to this impression and suggests that he interpreted Colin's description of the wounded animal as the climax or narrative turn of the story. Colin was, in fact, able to maintain control of the conversational turn, build anticipation and suspense in the narrated events up even higher to reveal a more substantial unexpected moment later in the story. Conarration and collaboration in the production of these stories is evident in this part of Colin's story (e.g., Ochs and Taylor 1995). I am left with the impression, once again, that John has heard Colin's stories, or similar stories of others, and can essentially complete the story for Colin. As such, these stories build rapport and reinforce social relationships far more than they convey unknown information between speakers.

After shooting at the moose, both hunters describe the activities which lead to the revelation that the moose survived the rifle shot (unit 5). In the narrated events, these activities include speculating that the moose is dead and preparing to retrieve it. The descriptions build suspense and delay the onset of the climax by creating narrative distance between the shot and the revelation that the moose has survived. John says, "I thought he died. / Made trail back to my dog team. / All the way to the dogs, / back and forth" (lines 61–64). Later, he says, "Thought I got two moose . . . I went over to the other one. / There he got up" (lines 108–12). In his first story, Colin has already hinted that he had not killed the moose (line 26). Still, he develops his story by describing his efforts to track the fleeing animal. He mentions snowshoeing after the moose and then adds a side sequence about returning to camp and telling his cousin and uncle about the moose (lines 34–40).¹⁴ In his second story, he delays his announcement of the escaping moose by describing a return to his truck to get his pack board and snowshoes (lines 91–95). These extra details delay the expected climax and maintain the possibility that Colin's hunt is ultimately successful. It is unclear to me if the delay in contacting the moose amounts to anything more than rhetorical flourish. The potential danger associated with approaching a dying moose may be a practical explanation for the delay, but in my experience observing successful hunters, there is no hesitation in approaching a fallen animal. Indeed, if the moose is suffering, hunters try to dispatch the

animal as quickly as possible. A hunter is generally expected to minimize an animal's suffering.

The actual results of the hunts are revealed just before the end of each story (unit 6). In each case, the moose has left and the narrators remain behind. Laughter follows in three cases (lines 48, 76, and 98). At the turning point in John's second story, however, no laughter is heard and instead, John reveals the failure through intonation signaling disbelief. John asks, "Oh, how I shoot" (line 115). There is no rising intonation at the end of this sentence, but the effect is one of expressing audibly his misfire as a marksman and his disbelief that the moose is alive and standing in a grove of poplar trees (line 114). John's self-deprecating presentation increases the dramatic fall of the storyline and identifies his missed shot as a spectacular failure. Perhaps it is the great drama that John tells in this last story that signals to Colin that the story exchange does not need to continue. At best, the amusing moments in these stories are indeed funny to the audience. They may, however, reflect more accurately the level of discomfort that the storyteller feels in revealing his failure. Even so, the grandchildren sitting within earshot of the two men did not react to the stories at all, preferring, in my estimation, to tolerate the talk of their grandfathers.¹⁵

The moose got the better of hunter on these days (unit 7). For John, the attempt at a kill had been a waste of time. It is as if the moose was never going to be killed. In his first story, the disgust is audible. John describes running behind the fleeing moose and ultimately deciding that he had broken trail "for nothing" (line 83). In his second story, John relates that again he ran after the moose, which, even though wounded, still got away (lines 116–19). Colin, too, is resigned to the failure of the hunt. In his first story he says, "I coulda shot him again. / I just thought, / ah, that's good enough" (lines 49–51). And, at the end of his second story, Colin seems both annoyed and amused by his failure, saying, "Twice I got burned like that" (line 99). These final sequences in each story offer both a denouement to the story and a cue to the other person that the story has ended.

The storytelling frame is broken in line 135 when Bobby interrupts his grandfather to ask the time. A broader discussion ensues around the kitchen table about whether or not it is a good time of day to hunt groundhogs. Bobby was not continuously present in the kitchen during the narration of the four stories. He has just returned, anxious to get his question in between stories. It is possible, however, that Bobby knew that the story was finished and that he could take the turn without interrupting his grandfather. It is noteworthy that the elapsed time between John's last words and Bobby's interruption was almost four full seconds, a longer pause than between any of the other stories. This suggests that Colin was not anxious to seize the turn back from John and had, perhaps, run out of corresponding narratives to share. The extended break also opened up the conversation to other participants.

5. Creating distance from animals by indirection and allusion. The structure of moose pursuit stories is widely known in Iskut, suggesting that stories like these are told repeatedly (see Valentine 1995:168). I heard children as young as seven tell stories with this structure and documented one example of such talk (McIlwraith 2007).¹⁶ Moreover, each presentation adds serious commentary about the treatment of animals to general talk of the hunt. They draw on elements of Tahltan mythology, including the requirement that hunters act properly toward the animals provided to them. Teit's recording of the Tahltan myth-time story "Meat-Mother and the Caribou and Moose" lays this rule out clearly.

The Meat-Mother watches her children the game, and also the people. When people do not follow the taboos, and do not treat animals rightly, the latter tell their mother; and she punishes the people by taking the game away for a while, or by making it wild, and then the people starve. . . . The Moose children are the most apt to tell their mother of any disrespect shown them: therefore people have to be very careful as to how they treat moose. [Teit 1919:231–32]

John and Colin's stories are mythlike, containing serious themes about the proper treatment of animals and presenting them within an obvious and regular structure.¹⁷

The stories are, thus, commentaries on the continuing importance of social relationships between humans and animals. Because the stories only appear to be about spectacular failures, I believe they are best understood as indirect commentaries on hunting success and its importance to family sustenance. They tell why failed shots are both moments of intense disappointment and incidents of little overall importance in a hunter's long career. They show that life goes on after failures and that it is easy to laugh at one's mistakes. They index the self-sacrifice of food animals and the control these animals have over their own life and death by pointing to powerful moose that decide the outcome of hunts (see Brightman 1993; Hubert and Mauss 1964). Notably, the moose in these stories do not give themselves up to the hunter. The sacrificial exchange is underway as the stories progress, but it is unfinished when the moose decide to leave each narrated scene. This begs the question of what John or Colin did to discourage each moose from giving itself up. Were they disrespectful in some way? Did they speak badly about moose? The answers to these questions are not forthcoming.

The stories give Jim and Colin an outlet for discussing respectfully, albeit covertly, the ability of moose to stymie a hunting event. The men use a humorous narrative turn to reveal their own inferiority and, indirectly, to describe their frustrations about a moose's behavior.¹⁸ To talk about moose otherwise might be deemed disrespectful and result in punishment by Meat Mother. The stories also permit extended discussion about past hunts that do not show up the other hunter through self-aggrandizement. A focus on the failure creates rhetorical distance from both the moose and the hunter's own prowess. It masks bravado.

Iskut people often, if unintentionally, assign sentience to moose in less dramatic ways. They say that moose and caribou are aware of the intentions of the people they encounter. Moose are, for example, more likely to reveal themselves to people who do not have rifles with them. When spotting a moose someone inevitably says, "We saw that because we did not have a rifle," or, "We would not have seen that moose if we had a rifle with us." As in the preceding stories, a rifle rhetorically mediates relations between hunters and hunted in these passing remarks. Interestingly, moose and caribou may know the difference between cameras and rifles. They often posed for my camera despite the fact that stopping a truck and taking a photograph requires a hasty routine and stance similar to firing a rifle. Moose may know, for that matter, the difference between anthropologists and hunters.

The analysis of hunter-prey relationships in moose pursuit stories, and indeed in the general rules for treating food animals, can be extended to social relationships between people in Iskut Village. The stretch of speech documented in transcript 1 begins with Colin Duncan asking John Edwards who has John's father's rifle now (line 1). John responds that he has the gun at home (line 2). John elaborates, however, indicating that his younger brother Frank had some interest in keeping the rifle (line 6). John then reports the speech of his father saying that he "just wanna raise you kids" (line 8). John's father is, presumably, referring to Frank, John, and their other siblings. John's father's voice appears to enter the conversation again soon after. John tells Colin that his father wanted John to keep the rifle and to kill a lot of moose with it (lines 14–15). In this short stretch of talk, John and Colin evoke their parents' generation with reference to a family rifle. The rifle is symbolic of hunting itself—the power to take an animal's life, as John himself says. Yet around the symbol of the rifle develop family relations, the lessons that fathers teach sons, and the rivalry of brothers. The stories depart from there.

The stories continue to revolve around families. Colin's story includes direct reference to uncles and nephews (lines 35–37). With that short comment, Colin draws a larger family into his otherwise solitary pursuit of the moose. Colin's failure is, in fact, noticed first by other people in the camp, implying that they have an interest in Colin's activities. John's story does not include such material, but his account points to another aspect of the discussion of social relationships in these storytelling sessions. John and Colin provide an audience for each other and each of them clearly plays off of the other's stories. Since they are cousins who both lived in Iskut in the 1950s, contextual details are unnecessary. Likewise, the children in the camp are an indirect audience for the accounts. Just as the transcript departs from connections between a father and his children, the storytelling itself continues a tradition of sharing news and history between generations. Stories of this sort are usually constructed collaboratively between hunting partners like John and Colin or between mentors and apprentices like John and his grandsons. The stories signal the instructional

and mentoring relationships older hunters share with younger boys. The immediate importance of hunting returns in the final segment in the transcript when Bobby Weeks interrupts his grandfathers to ask if he and his brother and their cousins can go hunting. A rifle is central to that talk, too. The stories remind listeners, including me, that senior men have obligations to teach hunting practice and how to care for animals. Doing so might be more important than actually killing a moose.

6. "Don't talk bad about it": talking and acting respectfully about animals in other situations. Hunting and speaking about hunting shape connections between people and between people and animals at Iskut Village. Managing those relationships is always a challenge. Contradictions exist. Although John and Colin offer a careful exchange that avoids direct talk about the demise of moose, this is not always the case. Here, I present other examples of talking about moose that reflect rhetorical conventions, such as limited elaboration or expressions of indirect respect for animals similar to those found in pursuit stories.

The reporting of moose kills can, for example, evoke pride and provoke amusement. In the following conversation (transcript 2), male hunters are not the speakers. Instead, two women comment on the successful moose hunt of one of their husbands.

Transcript 2. Reporting a Successful Moose Hunt

[Scene: Janice and Ginny, sisters-in-law, talk about the hunting activities of Janice's husband. The conversation occurs in the lobby of the Iskut First Nation Band Office.]

- | | | |
|---|--------|---|
| 1 | Janice | Dennis [Janice's husband] got a moose yesterday. |
| 2 | Ginny | I heard. He called Gord [Ginny's husband] at lunch. |
| 3 | Janice | He was funny about it. |
| 4 | | He came in and said he got skunked again. |
| 5 | | Long time since we didn't get one. |
| 6 | | We been almost out of meat. |

(19 January 2003)

The feigned failure might have had serious consequences for Janice's family. Janice admits that they have not had fresh meat in quite some time (lines 5–6). Janice's comment that Dennis acted "funny" (line 3) reminds me of the enjoyment Iskut people get from holding back information or reporting falsehoods simply to evoke an emotional response. Notably, Janice did not feel any reluctance in telling this story—and in effect telling of a successful hunt—to Ginny. Presumably, Dennis reported the successful kill as a failure to tease his wife. Such teasing is part of good-natured relationships between spouses and between siblings that I witnessed time and again. This sort of teasing also has the effect of playing down the success of the hunter and, perhaps, valorizing the moose. It

represents an indirect way of getting at the fact that the moose was killed. In most cases, boasting about one's accomplishments is bad form.

More generally, beliefs about respect for, and the proper treatment of, animals are delivered in straightforward statements while camping or collecting food. As in the preceding moose pursuit stories, these statements are expressed matter-of-factly and rarely with additional explanation. They come up, for example, within the context of teaching children or anthropologists how best to behave in order to secure food successfully. For example, while I was cutting wood with Peter Rivers and his grandchildren, one of the teenaged boys told me that whistling at rabbits makes them stop running from you. On another occasion, a young man in his early twenties revealed to me that the elders taught him that an animal can be caught or shot only when it agrees to give itself to you. I learned that birds can lead you to a moose. While sitting on a stool in his camp, John Edwards was pleased to share a story about a "camp robber," the Steller's jay (*Cyanocitta stelleri*), that led him to moose. John elaborated only slightly, suggesting that his hunting success that day was a result of his connection with the camp robber. In all of these cases, personal associations or interactions with some animals help with successful hunting.

Young people, more so than elders, were quick to remind me that once an animal appears in front of a hunter it must be taken. I encountered this rule, and a violation of it, while traveling with Iskut friends near the village. A moose appeared in front of my truck. After slowing to look at it, I was instructed to drive on. We had a rifle with us and I was uncertain about why the moose was not shot. The owner of the rifle hinted, however, that he was unwilling to butcher and clean the moose that day. It was too much work, he said. I wondered if he was referring to my presence and the fact that he would have to teach me what to do. Back in Iskut, Michael Roe chastised the hunter emphatically, saying directly to him *ensuge dintsel* 'you will eat your fart'.¹⁹ Without meat, implied Michael, we were left with only our stomach gases to sustain us.

People of all ages know these injunctions and enforce them through direct and indirect discourse or actions. Adult hunters, for example, tell their children directly not to talk badly about animals, tease them, or play with them (also Sheppard 1983; Nadasdy 2003:88–91). Children enact these rules explicitly. I watched one evening in August 2004 as active, middle-aged hunters Laura Rivers and Cliff Rivers butchered a caribou in front of five young teenagers on the side of *Dzeltse* 'Klappan Mountain'. As Laura began to open the belly of the caribou with her knife, one boy exclaimed "nasty" in response to the warm air and smell that came from the caribou's body. Immediately and in unison, the other four kids chided their cousin, "Don't say that. Don't talk bad about it." The boy was embarrassed. The direct and indirect criticism of the actions of others keeps these rules in play (Nadasdy 2005:306–7).

Less direct ways of controlling behavior include passing references to being "stingy." "Acting stingy" is a particularly serious label meant to call attention to

a person who does not share what they have (see Sheppard 1983a:538; Smith 2002; Braroe 1975:150–56).²⁰ To be sure, stinginess is only addressed indirectly in John and Colin's moose hunting stories; the moose in those stories survive the hunt. Being stingy is frowned upon because it indicates that people are in violation of ideal social relations between people. The Tahltan language word for 'stingy' is *eghādetsen*. This word has nothing to do with meat, according to one elder, despite the fact that the second half of the word appears to contain the Tahltan word *etsen* 'meat'. A mountain southeast of Telegraph Creek and visible from there is called *Tsēghādetsen* 'Stingy Mountain'. The name comes from hunters who report frequent sightings of goats on the mountain. When they arrive at the spot where the goats were spotted, however, there are never any there. In this case, the land itself acts in a stingy way and withholds food from hunters.

In times past, the phrase "acting stingy" referred to people who did not share food. During food shortages, hoarding had the potential to put others at risk of starvation. Smith notes that among the Chipewyan, stinginess stands in contrast to animals that give themselves up to hunters selflessly. He elaborates, saying that between people "stinginess can be as reprehensible as murder, and . . . it sometimes was tantamount to murder" (Smith 2002:65). Avoiding stinginess behavior implies that its opposite, generosity, is preferred behavior (Sheppard 1983:563). Elder Martha James, referring to her granddaughter, who had eaten by herself a half bag of *etsen gane* 'dry [moose] meat', said to me, "How stingy," as a commentary on the girl's selfishness. I was often told that it was the arrival of freezers in the village that made people stingy because freezers allow families to store meat without sharing it.²¹ Just as stingy land is avoided by hunters, stingy people are vilified.

The term "stingy" has acquired meanings outside of its original hunting and meat sharing contexts. The word is heard frequently around the card table. One evening, while playing a card game called "Thirty-one," Martha James and I sat side-by-side in an arrangement that required that I pass cards to her. Within the rules of the game, Martha sees a selection of cards I might pass to her, and on several occasions I chose to pass poor cards to her instead of cards that would help her hand; I was keeping the good cards for myself. Money was at stake, after all. After one such pass, Martha feigned anger and said in English, "You Stingy Mountain," and then laughed aloud. By invoking the name of this mountain, Martha criticized my play. She hoped to influence me the next time I faced a similar card passing choice. It worked!

Elder and hunter Peter Rivers, a man in his seventies, spoke frequently of the importance of being able to procure and secure food when the opportunity presents itself. The first time he took me ice fishing at *Luwechōn* 'Kluachon Lake',²² I failed to catch anything. As we packed up our gear, Peter turned to me without a grin and said, "I'm not going to starve in this country, but you will." I took his comment as a light-hearted tease. I learned later that this was a

common refrain used by older adults to call attention to the laziness or lack of hunting knowledge of children. It is a comment about the ability of a good fisherman to feed himself and the potential to go hungry if he fails. Then, Peter gave me two of the *deghai* 'rainbow trout' (*Oncorhynchus mykiss*) he had caught. The fish had not been cleaned and I moved to cut its head off before Peter thought the fish was dead. He said, "You gotta kill it before you gut it, or they'll punish you." Taken aback, I whacked the fish in the back of the head with my knife as I had seen Peter do. I then asked Peter about the punishment and to whom he was referring. He responded, "How would you like to be gutted if you were still alive?" He never elaborated upon who "they" were or what the punishment would be. Iskut people rarely explain such things. By making me feel much like an Iskut child, the message hit home and thereafter I made sure I clubbed any fish I caught hard enough to ensure that it was dead. Now, I see Peter's message as a reminder that once a fish offers itself to you, killing it is the proper thing to do. Otherwise, punishment comes in the form of starvation. Meat Mother may be involved.

Elder Martha James says that the punishment of hunters by animals does not occur today. For Martha, such talk is a vestige of the past. Martha admits, however, that interdiction such as "you're gonna starve" may be used to scare children who are wasteful with their food. Elder Peg James also shrugs off talk of traditions like thanking animals for their sacrifice as simply a behavior from the past. "People used to thank everything," she says. These traditions have changed, to be sure, particularly in light of Christian teachings about prayer, God as a creator, and that animals are put on earth to serve people rather than the other way around. Some elders admitted to me, however, that they believe *Tsesk'iye Chō* 'Raven',²³ who created the world and the animals, is the Christian God. Two systems of belief about animals appear to blend into one for some people.

Nonnative hunters are not exempt from punishment by animals. These people are held up by Iskut people as examples of what may result when proper relations between animals and people are violated. A nonnative trapper named Terry MacMillan (not a pseudonym) froze to death on a back road several hours from Iskut in 1993.²⁴ This sad episode is interpreted as an example of both MacMillan's poor planning and his mistreatment of a grizzly bear. MacMillan lived in a trailer in the headwaters of the Skeena River. By all accounts he was a decent trapper and was well known to Iskut hunters. He was in the habit, however, of not preparing himself properly for trips out in the cold of winter. In December 1993, MacMillan was starving and cold, and he left his cabin for Iskut Village, a walk of almost one hundred miles. He was found dead by a party of Iskut men who had set out on snowmobiles to see how he was managing in the unusually cold weather.

The details of MacMillan's story are revealed sporadically when driving near the place where his body had been found. Frank Edwards points out to his

children and grandchildren where certain events in MacMillan's last hours occurred, for example, where he made a small fire. Like hunting stories, I hear these accounts as reminders of the importance of being properly prepared for anything that one does. Iskut hunters blame MacMillan's death on his lack of preparedness for living in the bush during the winter. He lacked sufficient supplies to last the winter and he was foolish to try and do so.

Descriptions of MacMillan's fate also reveal the concern Iskut people have for treating animals properly. MacMillan was known to have hurt *khoh* 'grizzly bear' (*Ursus horribilis*) by attaching to the side of his trailer a plywood board with nails sticking outwards. This spiked instrument was designed to protect the trailer from the aggressive bears wanting to get inside. MacMillan's life, and particularly the episode at the end of his life, are commemorated by a large wooden cross erected just off the roadway where he was found. The memorial cross is frequently mauled by grizzly bears; large scratches are visible on the wood. Peter Rivers explained to me that this continuing and endless mauling was MacMillan's punishment for hurting grizzlies. MacMillan represents an antisocial individual living (at least partly) in an Iskut world where hunting and trapping are social pursuits that exemplify relations between people and between people and animals. MacMillan's actions—and the stories about them—contrast with the pursuit stories of John Edwards and Colin Duncan, where family relationships are close to the surface. MacMillan's story exemplifies how poor social relationships between people are replicated in the wider world. MacMillan treated animals badly. He lived alone and did not share what he had. Punishment, in the form of starvation, was his fate.

7. Concluding remarks. Stories of pursuing moose, accounts of successful moose kills, and descriptions of the mistakes of unprepared hunters make up some of the repertoire of hunting-related narratives of Iskut hunters. In each case, these anecdotes, conveyed seriously in everyday situations, leave outsiders like me wondering about the details of the stories and, often, the point. But close analysis indicates that these stories are rich in the symbolism of Subarctic hunting groups. The stories often act as guides for the way in which people should treat animals. Indeed, they are allegories that explain proper relations between people, particularly where the relations between moose and hunters are symbolic of interpersonal relations between family members or friends. The stories and hunting rules here imply simply that the social relationships between people are complicated. They indicate that the obligations to exchange food with one another are just as important as moose exchanging their lives for respect. Just as some moose get away, however, the sharing of food between people does not always occur. The stories instruct audiences, then, not to be stingy, while also showing that stinginess is a part of life. As with people everywhere, friendships and familial relations include disappointments that are usually rectified during future interactions. Successful hunts follow failures, too.

Notes

Acknowledgments. *Medū* ('thank you') to the members of the Iskut Community. They have welcomed me and tolerated my questions for more than ten years. I am particularly thankful for the help and interest of the village elders, who have an impressive commitment to the documentation of their traditional culture. Also, the Council of the Iskut First Nation has repeatedly granted me permission to conduct research in the village. This article emerges from a chapter of my doctoral dissertation, completed at the University of New Mexico. My advisory committee of David Dinwoodie, Keith Basso, Sylvia Rodriguez, and Robert Brightman provided extensive commentary about this work over the course of my studies. I presented an early draft of this article at the American Anthropological Association meeting in Chicago, Illinois, in November 2003. The current article has benefited from editorial review by M. Jill Ahlberg-Yohe and Tim Paterson. John Alderete reviewed my Tahltan language material and provided helpful corrections in that regard. I am grateful to Patrick Moore for extensive comments and suggestions. And I am thankful to Richard J. Preston for his interest. All errors, misinterpretations, and oversights are completely my own.

Transcription. The phonemes of Tahltan as spoken at Iskut Village in 2002 are comparable to those found in other Athabaskan languages. There are five vowel sounds *a*, *e*, *i*, *o*, *u*. Each of these vowels can be pronounced short or long. In the practical orthography used here, long vowels are marked by macrons. Following Carter, Carlick, and Carlick (1994), *a* in the practical orthography is pronounced like English *u* in *cup*; *ā* is pronounced like English *au* in *caught*; *e* and *ē* are pronounced like English *e* in *ten*; *i* and *ī* are pronounced like English *ee* in *sleep*; *o* and *ō* are pronounced like English *oa* in *goat*; *u* and *ū* are pronounced like English *oo* in *boot*. Tahltan includes thirty-seven consonant phonemes. Of note are a glottal stop ('), a voiceless alveopalatal fricative *sh*, a voiceless lateral fricative *l*, a voiceless velar fricative *kh*, and a voiced velar fricative *gh*. For the most part, the Tahltan practical orthography renders Tahltan phonemes according to their underlying phonemic values. Due to variation in pronunciation and use, Leer proposed using *ʒ* to represent /θ/ (like English *th* in *thin*) or /s/ (like English *s* in *sin*), and *z* to represent /ð/ (like English *th* in *then*) (Leer 1985). Thus the word *sa'e* 'long time ago' is pronounced by some as *sa'e* and others as *θa'e*. The letter *ʒ* allows the writing system to identify different pronunciations where the meaning of a word does not change (essentially allophonic variation). Similar variation exists for *tʒ*, *tʒ'*, and *z*. For a full description of the development of the practical orthography, see Leer (1985). Tahltan phonology is described by Nater (1989). The Tahltan children's dictionary (Carter, Carlick, and Carlick 1994) gives a basic guide to the entire system.

1. All personal names are pseudonyms. Due to remarriages, John and Colin have a common grandmother but they do not share a grandfather.

2. "Spatsizi" is an Anglicized contraction of the Tahltan words *isbā* 'goat' and *detsidzi* 'red'. It refers to the penchant of the white-colored goats to turn red after rolling in red, mineralized soil common to the area.

3. Tahltan language words in this article are written in the Tahltan practical orthography (Leer 1985; Carter, Carlick, and Carlick 1994); see the description under Transcription above. Moreover, the spellings of Tahltan words herein are consistent with those given in the *Tahltan Children's Illustrated Dictionary* (Carter, Carlick, and Carlick 1994). My decision to write Tahltan words in the form given in the local dictionary stems from a general agreement with members of the Iskut community to support the use of the practical orthography and dictionary conventions in my writing and research.

4. Throughout the period of my dissertation research, I learned about Iskut hunting as a man, from men. This is the overwhelming bias in my research and I recognize the

need to spend more time with women and with younger adults, both men and women, in future research. Indeed, the information in this article could contribute to a study about gender roles within a hunting culture. The issues and realities of male anthropologists studying men's hunting in Athabaskan cultures have been noted by Brody (2000:5).

5. In the course of preparing and sharing this article, I have had support for the notion of "serious chatter" from some Athabaskanists. Others have questioned its significance to Iskut people, and wondered if there was a better, locally meaningful, phrase to use. "Serious chatter" is my attempt to characterize what I hear happening in these stories. To date, I have not identified a suitable Tahltan word or phrase for this kind of conversation-as-story about hunting.

6. I do not have any recordings of similar stories in Tahltan.

7. Although called "groundhogs" in English at Iskut, the animals are marmots (*Marmota monax petrensis* or *Marmota caligata*).

8. Frank Edwards, John's younger brother.

9. The withers are the hump on the back of the moose to which muscles are attached. Iskut hunters pronounce this feature as "the weathers" or call it the "weather bone." The Tahltan word for the withers is *eghane*. The words "weather bone" at lines 26 and 27 are said at the same time.

10. Scotty Edwards, John's older brother.

11. I have written this word in the conventions of the Tahltan practical orthography in the hopes of replicating the sound John uses when mimicking the firing of a rifle. The letter *i* is pronounced as in the English word *bit* (IPA symbol [i]); *ū* is pronounced like the vowel sound in the English word *boot*.

12. The lake is located about fifteen kilometers north of Iskut Village. It is spelled "Morchuea" on government-issued topographical maps.

13. Honigmann describes the same shooting motion during Kaska storytelling sessions as a socially patterned gesture meant to aid communication. "Shooting of a gun is illustrated by holding the left hand close to the speaker's face, the fingers close together touching the thumb. The other arm is outstretched, the fingers held in the same position and directly in line with the left hand. When the speaker mentions the gun being fired, he spreads out the fingers of both hands in a quick, flaring, movement" (Honigmann 1949:138-39).

14. Three of the four stories include "side sequences" (Goffman 1981:7) in which contextual or activity details are provided. In both of John's stories, for example, John uses side sequences to describe skinning or butchering the successfully killed moose, perhaps in lieu of the turn that characterizes stories of failed shots.

15. Iskut children call great-aunts and great-uncles "gramma" and "grampa."

16. The child presented a story of shooting at a grouse to friends in a classroom. His story had the same structure except that units 6 and 7 were missing. There was no failure to reveal. The boy's shot had hit its mark and the grouse was killed.

17. Meat Mother in Tahltan is *Etsen' Ma'* (lit., 'meat mother'). She is also known as Game Mother by some Tahltans. The Meat Mother story is told in other parts of northern Canada, such as southwestern Yukon (e.g., Cruikshank 1990; McClellan 1975). Teit published his collection of Tahltan stories in three issues of the *Journal of American Folklore* (Teit 1919, 1921a, 1921b). Discussions of respect for animals among northern Athabaskans are also common in the Subarctic literature. See, for example, Nadasy (2003), Tanner (1979), and Ridington (1990).

18. The use of humor to deflect criticism and to level social differences is visible in many situations at Iskut. Teasing and joking behaviors mark, for example, sibling and cousin relationships during competitive card-playing activities or stick-gambling games. Among card players, teasing occurs over misplays, poor shuffling, and feigned attempts at cheating. During stick-gambling matches, the skilled teams are able to win using

distraction techniques, including loud singing, boisterous dancing, and shaming.

19. The word *ensuge* is literally 'your fart'; *en* is a second person pronoun and *suge* is 'fart'. The word *dintget* is 'you will eat'. As I do not have a recording of this phrase, both of these words are subject to revision.

20. On a visit to Vancouver, I heard Susan Folke say "I act stingy to myself" in reference to cutting short her own shopping spree. A variation on "acting stingy" is "acting hoggy" (from "hog," as in "to hog something"). I heard this expression infrequently.

21. Although the arrival of freezers has certainly made it possible for people to be stingy, owning a freezer means simply that people do not need to hunt as frequently before food spoils. I suspect that the freezer allows some people to hunt more, store more food, and to share food widely at community feasts. The freezer has essentially extended winter, or at least the preservation of food that cold weather provides, for those who are able to continue hunting.

22. Literally, 'big fish'; *tuwe* is 'fish' and *chō(n)* is 'big'.

23. Literally, 'Big Crow' (*tsesk'iye* 'crow', *chō* 'big'), a transformer and trickster.

24. This story was told to me on several occasions by different men including Frank Edwards, John Edwards, and Peter Rivers. There is a plaque and photograph commemorating MacMillan's life in the Iskut First Nation office. The picture shows MacMillan with a load of furs.

References

- Braroe, Neils W.
1975 Indian and White: Self-Image and Interaction in a Canadian Plains Community. Stanford, Calif.: Stanford University Press.
- Brightman, Robert A.
1993 Grateful Prey: Rock Cree Human-Animal Relationships. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Brody, Hugh
2000 The Other Side of Eden: Hunters, Farmers, and the Shaping of the World. New York: North Point Press.
- Brown, Gillian, and George Yule
1983 Discourse Analysis. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Carter, Colin, Patrick Carlick, and Edith Carlick
1994 Tahltan Children's Illustrated Dictionary. [British Columbia]: Tahltan Tribal Council.
- Coupland, Justine
2003 Small Talk: Social Functions. Research on Language and Social Interaction 36:1-6.
- Cruikshank, Julie
1990 Life Lived like a Story: Life Stories of Three Yukon Elders. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press.
1998 The Social Life of Stories: Narrative and Knowledge in the Yukon Territory. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press.
- Frankfurt, Harry
1986 On Bullshit. Raritan 6:81-100.
- Goffman, Erving
1981 Forms of Talk. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.
1986 Frame Analysis: An Essay on the Organization of Experience. Boston: Northeastern University Press.

- Honigmann, John J.
1949 *Culture and Ethos of Kaska Society*. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Hubert, Henri, and Marcel Mauss
1964 *Sacrifice: Its Nature and Function*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Jenness, Diamond
1932 *The Indians of Canada*. Ottawa: Department of Mines, National Museums of Canada.
- Leer, Jeff
1985 *A Recommendation for the Tahltan Practical Orthography*. MS, Alaska Native Language Center, University of Alaska.
- McClellan, Catharine
1975 *My Old People Say: An Ethnographic Survey of Southern Yukon Territory*. 2 vols. Ottawa: National Museum of Man.
- McIlwraith, Thomas
2007 *But We Are Still Native People: Speaking of Hunting and History in a Northern Athapaskan Village*. Ph.D. diss., University of New Mexico.
- Mears, Daniel P.
2002 The Ubiquity, Functions, and Contexts of Bullshitting. *Journal of Mundane Research* 3(2).
- Moore, Robert E.
1993 Performance Form and the Voices of Characters in Five Versions of the Wasco Coyote Cycle. In *Reflexive Language: Reported Speech and Metapragmatics*, edited by John A. Lucy, 213-40. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Mouchet, Jean-Marie
2002 *Men and Women of the Tundra: At Second Glance, Telegraph Creek, British Columbia and Old Crow, Yukon Territory*. Whitehorse, Yukon: Arctic Raven Publishing.
- Nadasdy, Paul
2003 *Hunters and Bureaucrats: Power, Knowledge, and Aboriginal-State Relations in the Southwest Yukon*. Vancouver: UBC Press.
2005 Transcending the Debate over the Ecologically Noble Indian: Indigenous People and Environmentalism. *Ethnohistory* 52:291-331.
- Nater, Hank F.
1989 Some Comments on the Phonology of Tahltan. *International Journal of American Linguistics* 55:25-42.
- Ochs, Elinor, and Carolyn Taylor
1995 The "Father Knows Best" Dynamic in Dinnertime Narratives. In *Gender Articulated: Language and the Socially Constructed Self*, edited by Kira Hall and Mary Bucholtz, 97-120. New York: Routledge.
- Palmer, Andie
2005 *Maps of Experience: The Anchoring of Land to Story in Secwepemc Discourse*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.
- Preston, Richard J.
2002 *Cree Narrative: Expressing the Personal Meanings of Events*. Montreal: McGill-Queen's University Press.
- Ridington, Robin
1990 *Little Bit Know Something: Stories in a Language of Anthropology*. Iowa

- Smith, David M.
2002 *The Flesh and the Word: Stories and Other Gifts of the Animals in Chipe-
wyan Cosmology*. *Anthropology and Humanism* 27:60-79.
- Tanner, Adrian
1979 *Bringing Home Animals: Religious Ideology and Mode of Production of the
Mistassani Cree Hunters*. London: C. Hurst.
- Teit, James A.
1919 Tahltan Tales. *Journal of American Folklore* 32(124):198-250.
1921a Tahltan Tales. *Journal of American Folklore* 34(133):223-53.
1921b Tahltan Tales. *Journal of American Folklore* 34(134):335-56.
- Valentine, Lisa P.
1995 *Making It Their Own: Severn Ojibwe Communicative Practices*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.