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Abstract

The naming of places, be they landforms, villages or cities, is a cultural phenomenon dating back to the earliest of times. Naming to identify and differentiate places seems to be as basic a need as assigning names to the persons and objects that make up one’s world. In the Tl’azt’en culture, where oral transmission was the means of passing down knowledge, people developed particular strategies for recalling information. Routes to hunting grounds or fishing holes, for instance, were memorized with the aid of place-names and through the narratives that illumined the named places. This study examines the potential of Dakelh place-names as a tool for educating Tl’azt’en children and youth about the Tl’azt’en ancestral past, the Dakelh language and places on the land that have sustained Tl’azt’enne for generations. The processes of colonization, resistance and cultural reclamation as observed in the naming and re-naming of places provides a theoretical framework from which to explore the potential of indigenous place-names to address issues of cultural revitalization and identity-strengthening. Such theory enables understanding of the importance of indigenous language and places on the land in sustaining cultural identity and forming the basis for appreciating oral tradition. Nine of the eleven toponyms selected by Tl’azt’en Nation were used in this thesis research for analysis; interviews with Tl’azt’en cultural experts and secondary source material were used to assemble and verify the place-names information (their accuracy in terms of location, spelling and meaning), their geographical referents as well as the topographic, biotic and cultural use descriptions for the places they mark. This thesis shows that there is a considerable wealth of Traditional Ecological Knowledge contained in Dakelh place-names, namely knowledge linked to travel and subsistence, and information pertaining to spirituality and the ancestral past. Five guidelines for teaching
about Tl’azt’en history, language and territory through Dakelh place-names are identified in this thesis and illustrated with suggestions for implementation in the Tl’azt’en Nation outdoor science camp programme, *Yunk’ut Whe Ts’o Dul’eh (We Learn from Our Land)*.
Acknowledgements

I would like to express my gratitude to the many people who have generously given their time to commenting on drafts of this thesis and who have helped in other substantial ways in this project. Special thanks are due to my thesis supervisor, Professor Gail Fondahl, whose mentorship and supervision have been of great help in bettering the research design and analyses of the study. I am also grateful to the other members of my supervisory committee—Dr. Erin Sherry, Professor Angèle Smith and Professor Catherine Nolin—for their constructive appraisal of my work which served to improve the original manuscript.

I am especially grateful to my Tl’azt’en partners, who have been a source of support and assistance throughout my research. I would like to extend my sincere thanks to Beverly Bird, Beverly Leon, Morris Joseph, Deborah Page, Mona Anatole, Renel Mitchell, and Veronica Campbell who took the time and trouble to orientate me in the Dakelh language and culture, to provide feedback on the manuscript, and who also went out of their way to assist me with the logistical portion of the research.

Several other people deserve to be acknowledged for their assistance: Susan Grainger and Dexter Hodder of the John Prince Research Forest for their help with maps and information; Dr. William Poser for taking the time to correspond with me about Dakelh place-names; Michelle Lockhead of the Takla Development Corporation for providing me with a Tl’azt’en Territory Dakelh place-names map and related information; Marlene Erickson of the Yinka Dene Language Institute for providing me with a copy of Nak’albun/Dzinghubun Whut’en Bughuni; Christopher Harvey (“the Language Geek”) of the Indigenous Language Institute for help with the Morice Phonetic and Carrier Linguistic Committee lettering in the thesis; and Kathleen Duncan and Nancy Black of the University of Northern British Columbia library, and Valerie Tomlinson of the Aurora Research Institute library for graciously responding to requests for documents.

I owe a particular debt to the Tl’azt’enne who contributed, through interviews and verification sessions, to the place-names content of this thesis. My sincere thanks are due to Catherine Coldwell, Betsy Leon, Pierre John, Walter Joseph Sr., Robert Hanson, Stanley Tom, Alexander Tom, Margaret Mattess, Pauline Joseph, Helen Johnnie, Mildred Martin, Sophie Monk, Frank Duncan, Louise Alexis and Elsie Alexis, who were willing to participate in the research and who offered me the chance to learn about the Tl’azt’en people and territory through Dakelh place-names.

Finally, I thank my family for their faith in me, and in particular, my husband, Dr. Jari Heikkila, whose mind, character and loving support offered solace and hope—our conversations were a constant source of discernment which kept me inspired as the thesis gradually took form.

This project was funded in part by a Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council Community-University Research Alliance grant, and by the Aurora Research Institute.
# TABLE OF CONTENTS

Abstract………………………i  
Acknowledgements…………..iii  
List of Figures………………vii  
List of Interviews…………..viii  
Notes…………………………ix  

**INTRODUCTION**  

Chapter One: INDIGENOUS PLACE-NAMES: A CONTEXT FOR UNDERSTANDING CONQUEST, CHANGE AND LIBERATIVE ACTION THROUGH EDUCATIONAL PROGRAMMES  
Introduction  
Understanding Colonization Through Place-Names  
  Imperial Benevolence and Representations of “Other” in the Landscape  
  The Totalizing Gaze and the Writing of Power  
  Place-Names as Text and Clues to Culture  
The Meaning of Place and Place-Names to Indigenous People  
  Locations of Indigenous Identity  
  Toponymy as an Articulation of Indigenous Memoryscape  
Perpetuating Indigenousness through Re-Knowing the Land  
The Role of Place-Names in Educating about Indigenous Knowledge  
  Place-Names and Traditional Ecological Knowledge  
“Indigenizing” Science Education: Advantages and Obstacles  
“Indigenizing” Science Education via On-The-Land or Culture-Based Camp Programmes  
Conclusion  

Chapter Two: THE TL’AZT’EN LANDSCAPE: AN OVERVIEW OF THE LAND, LANGUAGE, CULTURE AND HISTORY OF TL’AZT’ENNE  
Introduction  
The Geography of Tl’azt’en Territory  
  The John Prince Research Forest  
People  
  Athapaskan Origins, Coastal Borrowings  
The Significance of Places to Tl’azt’enne as Relayed through Dakelh Place-Names  
  Dakelh Place-Names in Father Morice’s Writings  
  Dakelh Place-Names in the Works of Steward, Kobrinsky, and Akriigg and Akriigg
Chapter Three: RESEARCH WITH TL’AZT’EN NATION: A COLLABORATION IN PLACE-NAMES RESEARCH
Introduction 63
The Research Process 64
  Collaborative Research with Tl’azt’en Nation 64
  Selection of Dakelh Toponyms to Research 65
  Extant Sources of Dakelh Toponymic Information 67
  Participant Selection 70
  Interviews 72
Data Management, Analysis and Verification 77
  Content Analysis 77
  Guidelines for the Incorporation of Dakelh Toponymy into Yunk’ut Whe Ts’o Dul’eh 80
Conclusion 82

Chapter Four: THE LAND IN LANGUAGE: DAKELH GEOGRAPHICAL NOMENCLATURE AND PLACE-NAMES
Introduction 84
Dakelh Geographical Nomenclature 84
  Geographical Terms Associated with Dakelh Toponyms Researched 89
    Tizdli (lake outlet) 91
    Took’eche (river mouth) 92
    Tl’at (no English equivalent) 93
    ’Ukoh (river) 94
    Bunghun (lake) 95
    Noo (island) 95
    Dzulh (mountain) 96
Profiles of Dakelh Toponyms Researched 97
  Chuzzghun 100
  Chuz tizdli 104
  K’uz koh 105
  Hadoopatelah koh 108
  Chuzzghun koh 110
  Tesgha 111
  Bin tizdli 116
  Bintl’at noo 117
  K’azyus 118
Conclusion 121
Chapter Five: USING DAKELH TOPONYMIC KNOWLEDGE IN YUNK’UT WHE TS’O DUL’EH CULTURE-BASED SCIENCE CAMP PROGRAMME

Introduction 122

Categories of Dakelh Toponymic Knowledge 123
   Place-Names as Indicators of Dakelh Geographical and Historical Knowledge 123
      Place-Names as Navigational Aids 123
      Place-Names Containing Environmental Information 124
      Place-Names Offering Clues to the Dakelh Subsistence Round 126
   Place-Names Commemorative of the Ancestral Past 127
      Place-Names Alluding to People and Events in the Past 127
      Place-Names Associated with Narratives 129
   The Role of Place-Names in Educating About Land and Language 131
      Patterns of Land Use and Occupancy as Revealed through Place-Names 131
         Toponymic Clusters 131
         Toponymic Chains 132
      The Functionality and Lyricism of Keyoh Place-Names 133
      Place-Names as Symbols of Authority and Knowledge 134
      Place-Names Illustrative of the Intricacies of the Dakelh Language 135
   The Role of Place-Names in Educating about Conquest and Re-Conquest 138
      An Altered Landscape, An Altered Lifestyle, An Eroded Toponymy 138
      Place-Names as Identifiers of Belonging 140

Guidelines for Incorporating Dakelh Toponymy into the Yunk’ut Whe Ts’o Dul’eh Based Culture-Science Camp Programme 142

Conclusion 154

REFERENCES 157

APPENDICES
APPENDIX A: Memorandum of Research Ethics Board Review 169
APPENDIX B: Interview Guide 170
## List of Figures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Figure</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Figure 2.1</td>
<td>Tl’azt’en Villages</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Figure 2.2</td>
<td>Location of JPRF</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Figure 4.1</td>
<td>A Sample of Dakelh Geographical Terms</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Figure 4.2</td>
<td>Dakelh Toponyms Examined in this Research</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Figure 4.3</td>
<td>Dakelh Place-Names in the JPRF area</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Figure 5.1</td>
<td>Guidelines for Incorporating Dakelh Toponomy in the <em>Yunk’ut Whe Ts’o Dul’eh</em> Culture-Based Science Camp Programme</td>
<td>144</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Figure 5.2</td>
<td>Sample Lesson Ideas for Incorporating Toponymy into the <em>Yunk’ut Whe Ts’o Dul’eh</em> Culture-Based Science Camp Programme</td>
<td>146</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
List of Interviews*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DATE</th>
<th>PARTICIPANTS</th>
<th>TYPE OF INTERVIEW</th>
<th>INTERVIEWERS/ FACILITATORS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>31 March, 2004</td>
<td>Catherine Coldwell (Bird) &amp; Betsy Leon</td>
<td>Information session (Video-recorded; English &amp; Dakelh spoken)</td>
<td>Beverly Bird</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17 May, 2004</td>
<td>Theresa Austin</td>
<td>Pre-test interview (Audio-recorded; only English spoken)</td>
<td>Karen Heikkila &amp; Morris Joseph</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 May, 2004</td>
<td>Morris Joseph</td>
<td>Information session (Not recorded; only English spoken)</td>
<td>Karen Heikkila</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19 May, 2004</td>
<td>Margaret Mattess &amp; Pauline Joseph</td>
<td>Information session (Audio-recorded; only English spoken)</td>
<td>Karen Heikkila</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 June, 2004</td>
<td>Pierre John &amp; Walter Joseph</td>
<td>Interview (Audio-recorded; only English spoken)</td>
<td>Karen Heikkila</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 June, 2004</td>
<td>Robert Hanson &amp; Sophie Monk</td>
<td>Interview (Audio-recorded; English &amp; Dakelh spoken)</td>
<td>Karen Heikkila &amp; Morris Joseph</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 June, 2004</td>
<td>Robert Hanson (cont. from 03/06/04)</td>
<td>Interview (Audio-recorded; English &amp; Dakelh spoken)</td>
<td>Karen Heikkila &amp; Morris Joseph</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23 June, 2004</td>
<td>Frank Duncan (Anatole)</td>
<td>Interview (Video-recorded; English &amp; Dakelh spoken)</td>
<td>Morris Joseph &amp; Karen Heikkila</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24 June, 2004</td>
<td>Louise Alexis &amp; Elsie Alexis</td>
<td>Interview (Video-recorded; only English spoken)</td>
<td>Karen Heikkila</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 June, 2004</td>
<td>Catherine Coldwell (Bird)</td>
<td>Interview (Audio-recorded; only English spoken)</td>
<td>Karen Heikkila</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 December, 2004</td>
<td>Alexander Tom &amp; Stanley Tom</td>
<td>Interview (Audio-recorded; only English spoken)</td>
<td>Beverly Leon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27 &amp; 28 April, 2005</td>
<td>Tl’azt’en Place-Names Committee</td>
<td>Verification session (Video-recorded; English &amp; Dakelh spoken)</td>
<td>Beverly Leon &amp; Deborah Page</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 December, 2005</td>
<td>Tl’azt’en Place-Names Committee</td>
<td>Verification session (Audio-recorded; English &amp; Dakelh spoken)</td>
<td>Deborah Page</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 January, 2006</td>
<td>Tl’azt’en Place-Names Committee</td>
<td>Verification session (Audio-recorded; English &amp; Dakelh spoken)</td>
<td>Deborah Page &amp; Karen Heikkila</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Audio- and video-recordings as well as transcripts of interviews have been deposited at the Tl’azt’en Nation Natural Resource Office in Tache.
Notes

Note on Orthography

The Tl’azt’en language is known as Dakelh. It is a language spoken across Central British Columbia, northwards to the Stuart-Trembleur watershed, and southwards to the Fraser-Nechako River and Blackwater River areas. In this thesis, Dakelh place-names are spelled using the orthography developed in the 1960s by the Carrier Linguistic Committee (CLC). While the CLC writing system is today the most widely used orthography to transcribe the Dakelh language, other systems for communicating the language in writing are still in use, namely, Déné Syllabics, the Morice Phonetic and the International Phonetic Alphabet. The former two systems were developed by Father Adrien-Gabriel Morice, and were available to Dakelhne (Dakelh speakers) through works like the Carrier Reading Book and the Carrier Prayer Book (third edition); however, it should be mentioned that the second system was used mainly in Morice’s scholarly works. Unofficially, there also exist other systems for recording Dakelh in writing— I have heard accounts through my experience working with Tl’azt’enne (the people of Tl’azt’en Nation) of individuals who have their own romanized systems for writing Dakelh. I have elected to use the CLC orthography for the reason that it is regarded by many Tl’azt’enne, particularly teachers of Dakelh and those who have been involved in Dakelh language research, as the standardized writing system for Dakelh. This Dakelh spelling convention is used throughout the thesis to spell Dakelh place-names (unless otherwise indicated) and geographical terms, and to transliterate, for instance, place-names given in Morice Phonetic. Transliterations appear as CLC notation in brackets, followed by the proper or modern CLC spellings of the place-names. For further information on the CLC writing system and Central Carrier grammar, see Poser (1998) and Antoine et al. (1974).

Acronyms

CLC – Carrier Linguistic Committee
CPNI – CURA Place-Names Interview
CPNIS – CURA Place-Names Information Session
CPNVS – CURA Place-Names Verification Session
CSTC – Carrier-Sekani Tribal Council
CURA – Community University Research Alliance
JPRF – John Prince Research Forest
TEK – Traditional Ecological Knowledge
YDLI – Yinka Dene Language Institute
My interest in indigenous issues exists within the context of what education can offer in effecting personal and social empowerment. From several years’ experience working as an educator in cross-cultural environments, I have witnessed firsthand the potential education has in bringing about social change and equity, and it was through this experience that I began to appreciate the importance of culturally-appropriate curriculum. Consequently, the opportunity to conduct cultural research with Tl’azt’en Nation, with the eventual aim of applying the findings of the research in education, was an appealing prospect to me. When I first began post-graduate studies, I spent a considerable amount of time working on the idea of Traditional Ecological Knowledge (TEK) and the implications of incorporating such a body of knowledge into school curriculum. Over time, my focus reformed when I learned that the Tl’azt’en community’s interests were proceeding in the direction of recording, mapping and learning traditional place-names. The subject of toponymy arose when my thesis supervisor, Dr. Gail Fondahl, and I met with Ms. Beverly Bird of Tl’azt’en Nation to discuss possible topics of a geographic nature related to TEK that might interest, or complement the needs of, Tl’azt’enne. At the time, the University of Northern British Columbia (UNBC) was in the process of establishing a conjoint project with Tl’azt’en Nation, and was in the midst of preparing a Community-University Research Alliance (CURA) funding proposal. As traditional place-names were an important research consideration to the Tl’azt’en community, I was invited to work on toponymy in that it offered opportunities to link TEK and science education. Rather than having to abandon altogether my initial research questions, I soon discovered that they, in fact, were illumined
by the inclusion of toponymy in my investigations into the value of TEK in making education meaningful to indigenous learners. The allure of place-names to many indigenous peoples can be understood in how indigenous toponymy performs far more than merely a designative function—indigenous place-names contain clues to the identity of a people through their role as depositories of information that link land, language and oral history. Through a consideration of indigenous toponymy in my work, my research questions came to be aimed specifically at the TEK of place and the importance of indigenous geographical knowledge in locating not only places of ecological significance but the ethics, modes of land care and conceptualizations of land that underlie the meanings of place-names. Accordingly, the research questions that have guided this thesis are:

- What are the types of TEK that are reflected in Tl’azt’en toponymy?
- What can Tl’azt’en toponymic information reveal about the natural and social history of places?
- From this information, what deductions can be made about Tl’azt’en methods of landscape management (revealing perhaps ecologically-sustainable concepts or an environmental ethic)?
- In what ways can Tl’azt’en toponymic information contribute to making the learning of western science culturally-appropriate?

In my reflections of the significance of indigenous place-names to Tl’azt’enne, I began to contemplate the significance of learning traditional place-names, that is, place-names fashioned in the Tl’azt’en language, Dakelh. Several ideas occurred to me, informed by discussions with community members, including the need for present-day Tl’azt’enne to revive the Dakelh language and culture which was displaced due to colonization, the political
will of Tl’azt’en Nation in asserting its aboriginal rights and title through demonstrating that its members have had a deep relationship with the land since time immemorial, and the urgency of transmitting the Dakelh culture, language and worldview to the younger generation of Tl’azt’enne who are steadily becoming estranged from their indigenous roots. Therefore, it is the aim of this thesis to explore the meaning of place and belonging to Tl’azt’enne through a study of the Dakelh place-names found in the Tl’azt’en traditional territory, specifically those in the co-managed area known as the John Prince Research Forest. While the toponyms often describe physiography or the fecundity of places in the context of the Dakelh seasonal subsistence round, they ultimately point to the interdependence between people and places, illustrating how places on the land are nodes of emplacement in the Tl’azt’en psyche, connecting events in the lives of people to specific locations on the land. In this way, toponymy has the potential to enrich understandings of local environments, history and sense of place, and thereby, has an important role to perform in the creation of culturally-appropriate curriculum.

Chapter One provides an overview of the ideas concerning the relationship between learning traditional place-names and regaining the land in a political as well as in a spiritual sense. While much can be said about the connection between the revival of indigenous place-names and the assertion of aboriginal title to land, this chapter demonstrates how places on the land, and the names that represent them, have a significant role in promoting cultural continuity and individual well-being. Commencing with a discussion on place-naming, mapping and the production of knowledge, this chapter proceeds to explain how indigenous people were systematically dispossessed of their lands through colonization. Place-naming, here, stands as a trope for both colonization and re-colonization as observed in the displacement of indigenous place-names by European or anglicized indigenous names, and
the reinstatement of indigenous place-names as part of reclaiming and re-knowing the land by indigenous people. Through the idea of “getting back the land” via educational projects that explore the significance of places on the land, it becomes evident how toponymy can enhance the learning of TEK associated with such places. In constructing a framework to appreciate the importance of toponymy in indigenous ideologies and the benefits of applying toponymic knowledge in learning, the second component of this chapter examines the literature on indigenous place-names as well as the educational projects undertaken by several indigenous communities in creating education that is culturally-relevant for children and youth. The review presents the necessary context to grasp the importance of traditional place-names in helping modern-day indigenous children and youth in understanding the value of the land in terms of not only being introduced to the body of knowledge used by their ancestors to survive on the land but in understanding how places on the land continue to define and sustain them as a unique people.

Chapter Two describes the Tl’azt’en as a people. The geography of Tl’azt’en territory is discussed as is Tl’azt’en history, language and worldview. As land and language are intricately woven in the make-up of traditional place-names, the meaning of place to Tl’azt’enenne will be explored in this chapter through a review of literature that specifically addresses Dakelh place-names. The information on the Tl’azt’en past and the importance of land in Tl’azt’en social life will serve as a point of reference in understanding Tl’azt’enenne in contemporary times. I discuss the community’s efforts towards self-determination, as observed in the educational, and language and cultural revival programmes that Tl’azt’en Nation members have been involved in over the last decade. This discussion pays particular attention to Tl’azt’en Nation’s development and implementation of Yunk’ut Whe Ts’o Dul’eh
We Learn From Our Land, the Tl’azt’en cultural science camp aimed at providing children and youth with the opportunity of learning about the land.

Chapter Three outlines the methodology employed in this thesis research. The ideas of cross-cultural and collaborative research methodologies will be examined from the perspective of my fieldwork experience with the Tl’azt’en community. This chapter covers what I learned from the community having an active role in directing the research, namely, from determining the place-names to be researched to commenting on the wording of interview questions to selecting the people to be interviewed to verifying the place-names information collected and analyzed. Other aspects of my research are also dealt with in this chapter such as an explanation of the archival sources of information used in assembling Dakelh toponymic knowledge based on nine place-names, the content-analysis methodology employed to analyze interview data, the themes that emerged from the content-analysis stage of the research, and the process of developing these themes into guidelines for incorporating Dakelh toponymy into the Yunk’ut Whe Ts’o Dul’eh curriculum.

Chapters Four and Five present and explain the findings of the research. Each of the Dakelh place-names studied will be described in terms of how it linguistically represents the physical particulars, and indicates the resource, symbolic or spiritual value of the place it marks. Narratives attached to these toponyms will also be presented and discussed in light of their role in transforming places that exist as part of the physical landscape to places that feed and instruct the moral imagination. To explain the significance of the toponymic information profiled in Chapter Four, Chapter Five will concentrate on the four themes that arose from the content-analysis portion of the research. The themes reflect a distillation and systematization of interview data, allowing for an interpretation of the data of what constitutes Dakelh toponymic knowledge. In this way, the themes serve as a useful tool in the
drafting of guidelines to incorporate toponymic information into *Yunk’ut Whe Ts’o Dul’eh*. The themes are concerned with several important issues that are applicable in the lives of Tl’azt’en children and youth, and are therefore, greatly needed in enhancing the curricular content of the science camp programme. These issues, which include Dakelh environmental knowledge, sense of place, colonization, cultural survival and self-determination, revolve around the importance of the land in the Dakelh worldview, and are requisite in creating learning that is inclusive, culturally-appropriate and just. Hence, the five guidelines found at the end of the chapter resonate deeply with these issues, and offer the opportunity of extending the limits of knowing about our natural surroundings, primarily based on conventional scientific understandings, through learning about the land from an indigenous perspective.
Chapter One:
INDIGENOUS PLACE- NAMES: A CONTEXT FOR
UNDERSTANDING CONQUEST, CHANGE AND
LIBERATIVE ACTION THROUGH EDUCATIONAL
PROGRAMMES

INTRODUCTION

This chapter provides a discussion of the ideas that have guided and shaped this research. To understand the potential indigenous toponymy has in enriching knowledge of language, history and the environment, it is necessary to explore what places on the land mean to indigenous people. Part of accomplishing this task is to consider the processes of colonization, resistance and cultural reclamation as played out through the act of naming and re-naming places. Hence, the chapter begins by situating the process of naming places within a framework of power and the contested identity politics of people and place. This discussion then proceeds to an exploration of the ways in which indigenous toponymy can be employed as a counter-hegemonic discourse in asserting and maintaining indigenousness, particularly in terms of how learning and using the indigenous place-names of one’s ancestral lands can be an expression of indigenous rights. A survey of literature on indigenous toponymy will be given to situate the significance of place-names as a tool for learning about indigenous language, history and territory. Included in this discussion, is an assessment of how formal schooling has been an agent of indigenous alienation and suppression, and how the inclusion of TEK in curricular initiatives can be a redemptive and empowering move towards acknowledging the merits of indigenous ways of knowing. The chapter concludes with a reflection of how indigenous toponymy can perform a significant role in the construction of
culturally-sensitive curriculum, in the sense that place-names as containers of TEK\(^1\) can be utilized to educate about the land, indigenous language and oral history. The worth of indigenous toponymy in “indigenizing” or making educational programmes relevant to the lived realities of indigenous learners will be assessed through a consideration of the ideas and debates that have shaped aboriginal education over the years.

**UNDERSTANDING COLONIZATION THROUGH PLACE-NAMES**

The process of naming places is inextricably bound to relations of power and the contested identity politics of people and place (Berg and Kearns 1996). The mapping and inscription of names to places in the landscape can be read as a trope for the enfranchisement and legitimization of spaces, physical as well as ideographic (Brealey 1995), and the sanctioning of certain ways of perceiving the landscape, which in turn has led to the production of particular forms of knowledge about the land and its original inhabitants. Hence, naming, mapping and the attendant production of knowledge, rather than being ontological givens, are ideological weapons produced through complex power tactics (Berg and Kearns 1996). Since the naming of places involves both a “politics of space and a spatialized politics” (Berg and Kearns 1996: 111), naming is an act of controlling space and infusing it with particular

---

\(^1\) Three terms used in Canada to refer to aboriginal peoples’ knowledge systems are: Traditional Ecological Knowledge (TEK), Indigenous Knowledge (IK), and Traditional Knowledge (TK). There is no absolute definition for these terms (see McGregor 2000; Berkes 1993) other than they all indicate the knowledge held by a particular aboriginal community of its local environment that has been transmitted through time and that assumes an emotional and spiritual connection with the local landscape. At times, the usage of IK and TK is observed in contexts where there is a need to distinguish knowledge specific to indigenous communities from knowledge stemming from the western scientific tradition, while TEK, on the other hand, is used to refer more specifically to indigenous peoples’ knowledge of their local environments, including their values concerning sustainable and responsible use of natural resources (see Grenier 1999). To some, IK is more relevant than TEK in describing the knowledge of aboriginal peoples; IK encompasses the spiritual as well as the physical, thereby describing the knowledge that aboriginal peoples hold as a way of life rather than only a body of knowledge about the environment (see McGregor 2000). TEK is the term that Tl’az’ten Nation has chosen to use to identify the knowledge of its people (see Tl’azt’en Nation n.d. a; Tl’azt’en Nation&UNBC CURA 2005); hence, out of deference to this choice, TEK is used in this thesis when discussing aboriginal knowledge, including the knowledge shared by Tl’az’t’enne.
values and belief-systems. Thus, the politics of those in power are legitimized through the
control and strategic use of space as a platform for their views. The “writing in” of one set of
norms ultimately means the displacement of another.

Colonial toponymy and related cartography—precursors, in a sense, of the
reservation and residential school systems—speak of how the land was divested of
indigenous people, indicate how indigenous traditions and ways of life were vilified, and
symbolize the loss of indigenous language and cultural knowledge. An example of the long-
reaching effects of colonial toponymy and related cartography is observed in how indigenous
territoriality, or the manner in which people envision, comprehend and interact among
themselves in relation to the land they occupy, has been dislocated due to the commodified
and oftentimes destructive ways the land has been managed, used and re-fashioned by
colonial powers. Such changes to the land have resulted in places of significant subsistence,
spiritual and historic import being lost or drastically altered.

While the twenty-first century seems far removed from the era of colonialism that
characterized the first five decades of the previous century, forms of conquest still exist,
observed in the seeming tolerance for difference and otherness in settler civil societies. This
outward display of tolerance disguises a palimpsest², defined by Herman (1997) as the “anti-
conquest” or “neo-colonialism”, that is present as part of the societal subconscious of settler
nations. Herman (1999:78) writes, “unlike most forms of colonialism, anti-conquest is never
a conscious process…colonizers usually perceive it as paying genuine respect to the local
culture, and would take offence if one were to confront them by suggesting their ‘gracious
acts’ were in fact modes of power.” Whether it has been the seeming benevolence of early

² This suggests that the landscape is a text to be read, albeit cluttered, as a result of writings superimposed on
cultural landscapes by a series of occupations, leading to the erasure or concealment of original or earlier
writings (see Duncan and Ley 1993).
anthropologists and geographers in mapping and preserving indigenous place-names before they were thought to be lost for good or the appropriation of indigenous toponymy by nation-states in naming public places in the context of forging a “unique” sense of place and local identity for non-natives (as in the case of Hawaiian place-names; Herman 1999), a form of imperialism is evident in how space has been represented.

**Imperial Benevolence and Representations of “Other” in the Landscape**

At the start of the twentieth century, investigations on North American indigenous toponymy featured significantly in anthropological studies (Thornton 1997a; Basso 1996). It was assumed that through place-names, links between human thought, language and the landscape could be made known. As a consequence, indigenous toponymy was of great interest to early anthropologists and linguists such as Franz Boas, Edward Sapir, Alfred Kroeber, J.P. Harrington and Thomas Waterman. Boas found in indigenous place-names the geographical knowledge of a people and their cosmography (Thornton 1997a:3). Sapir studied the relationship between language and the environment, and argued that geographical nomenclature provided vital clues to the way the natural world is perceived and factored into social life through language (Thornton 1997a:4; Basso 1996:43). Kroeber discovered that place-names were valuable in “identifying cultural sites, migrations, and land use patterns, and distinguishing between the centers and peripheries of culture areas” (Thornton 1997a:5). Like Kroeber, Harrington’s interest in ethnotoponymy centred on the correlation between social group boundaries and place-name densities, and the way land was administered (Thornton 1997a:6). Waterman’s study of native place-names led him to develop cognitive theories based on the semantic referents in toponymy (e.g., myths, plants, animals and human
anatomy) that connect the natural environment to aspects of culture, which were instrumental in his development of a typology or taxonomy of Puget Sound Indian toponymy (Thornton 1997a).

While much was accomplished in terms of the documentation of indigenous languages and cultures, the investigative work undertaken on indigenous groups, as discussed in the above paragraph is, according to Layton (1997:213), “ethnography…written by the dominant about the weak [whereby] the practice of translation confers power”. The collection, classification and cataloguing of place-names undertaken by early anthropologists and linguists, as part of their examining indigenous place-naming traditions, can be likened to an urgent attempt to salvage for posterity remnants of supposed dying or already extinct cultures and languages, and is thus akin to relic-hunting. The collection and recording of indigenous place-names in this era can be said to symbolize a production of indigenous culture, history and knowledge by outsiders, and can be read as an imposition of the colonial mode of representing space. Indigenous place-names, to pioneer anthropologists and linguists, were fascinating as they were thought to be the gateway to primitivism or a romanticized indigenous past, a time believed to be free of “the degenerative influences of modernism”. Consequently, these studies very likely abetted, through their treatment of indigenous peoples as “constants” (i.e., unchanging or remaining forever the same), depictions of indigenous powerlessness that must have been rampant at the time. The

---

3 Kroeber and Waterman (in Thornton 1997a:6), for instance, were very much against what they termed “folk etymologies” or explanations of indigenous toponyms and the “legends” they contained by white settlers. Waterman, for instance, called these explanations “deceptive” although he contended that there was a “psychological factor” motivating these (supposed) embellishments. His comments on achieving an authentic American character through the use of indigenous toponymy are also interesting: “The way we have of ignoring Indian place-names and plastering the map with such atrocities as Brownsville…and silly names like Cloverdale and Vista…is to be deplored. Such a way of naming places is certainly unsystematic and meaningless, indicating to the outside world merely that we have no ideas and certainly no place names of our own. The primitive names of every region always mean something, and there are countless of them. Primitive geography is precisely characterized by a wealth, a redundancy of names”.

---
implications of a “depoliticized” ethnography, like that practiced by the early scholars, lie in precluding the agency of indigenous peoples to interact, perceive, envision, organize and transform the landscape. Willems-Braun (1997) describes this as the naturalizing of social relations and the erasure of power, in that culture was fixed and made to seem unvarying, bounded and uniform, and incapable of resilience. In this way, the “facts” produced in early indigenous toponymic work have played a part in “fixing” indigenous cultures, suggesting that the very identities of these cultures were manufactured, controlled and explained in a discourse of unbending “primordiality”.

**The Totalizing Gaze and the Writing of Power**

Similar to the expeditionary mapping of the Americas, the particularistic approaches employed in early toponymic traditions typify the “phallic order” of the colonial system. Duncan and Ley (1993) contend that the goal of European geography, as the Americas were being “discovered”, was to produce a mimetic and taxonomic representation of the land so that the landscape could be fathomed in its entirety. Hence, indigenous ephemeral representations in the sand (Fossett 1996) or straight-line mapping (Binnema 2001) were dismissed by early cartographers as “crude” or “childlike” as the illustrations lacked scale and directionality. The importance of place-names in tracing travel routes amongst aboriginal communities baffled the Europeans, in whose own “place-naming customs a mere list of

---

4 Herman (1999) uses the Lacanian concept of “phallus” to refer to the authority of deciding and establishing knowledge found in modes of subjugation, such as imperialism. When this knowledge is written, systematized and pronounced, it assumes the power of creating meaning and order. As Herman (1999:78) argues, “the Age of Exploration can be understood as a phallic project to cover the globe with order, to subject other lands and peoples to names and categories, hierarchies and schema of European design.”

5 An instance of this method of mapping was observed in how the Alaskan Inuit produced a map for the voyager Thomas Beechey in 1826. They drew “the shoreline with a stick in the sand, then piled pebbles and sand at appropriate areas to represent islands, hills, mountains, and river beds” (Fossett 1996:75).
names would [have been] inadequate as a traveller’s guide” (Fossett 1996: 86). Fossett (1996: 85-86, emphasis in original) argues that in a convention where symbols had no role to play in “the oral transmission of travel instructions, … the memorized legend was the map [and] people placed more value on the ability to remember place-names in the correct order than they did on drawing skills”.

The mapping agendas of the two cultures, European and indigenous, were fundamentally different—one was to exert control over lands and resources through the “hyper-knowledge” gained from a graphic representation of terrain, and the other, albeit with “distortions of scale and distance, [was to reflect] a view of the physical environment as a complex of relative conditions important only insofar as they affected human activity” (Fossett 1996:83). Therefore, implicit in the map adhering to European cartographic standards is “a symbolic and technical language of space” (Jacobs 1993: 100) premised upon a spatial logic that supports a totalizing process of homogenizing and levelling the Other (Jacobs 1993).

Likewise, early attempts at collecting and cataloguing indigenous place-names were by nature “phallocentric” (see Herman 1999), culminating in the assertion of a foreign authority over the landscape, as place-names were “systematically” dislocated from their places and histories. Appraised and assessed according to a European episteme, the place-

---

6 Most explorers discounted the oral instructions that accompanied indigenous maps, thinking that an excessive amount of talk was taking place at the expense of detail that could be instead drawn (Fossett 1996). The indigenous maps were, in fact, of no use without the verbal directions.
names were divested of their original meanings and reduced to mere husks, valued for their “quaintness”, for the relics they were perceived to be. Indigenous place-names and their associated narratives were mapped into a “concocted antiquity” (Brealey 1995:154).

**Place-Names as Text and Clues to Culture**

The descriptive and explanatory authority in Anthropology and Geography eventually broadened to include a diverse set of concepts to facilitate the investigation of a range of issues dealing with “the ways in which humans use landscapes to structure identity along with accounts of the symbolic qualities of landscape” (Norton 2000:270). The work taken up in the 1970s, therefore, emphasized “the ongoing cultural construction, representation and interpretation of landscape, place and space…[leading to] humanistic interests in place and in human experience” (Norton 2000:270). Eventually, following from developments in British social geography in the 1980s, issues of identity, difference and inequality further informed this debate on identity in landscape (Norton 2000).

Toponymic inquiry within Anthropology and Geography was also influenced by these theoretical transformations in that place-names were now studied as a human endeavour and for their symbolic meanings or iconography. In taking on this strategy, landscapes were regarded as being “laden with meaning, reflecting the attitudes, beliefs and values of occupying cultures” (Norton 2000:290). This approach was indeed a dramatic change from

---

7 Particularly with regard to studying place-names as indicators of cultural differences through the naming of sites in human settlements as well as the “natural” and “artificial” features of their habitats so as to gain “retrospective knowledge” for reconstructions of culture areas and movements. As with Waterman’s distrust of “folk” etymologies (see Thornton 1997a), many anthropologists and geographers had hitherto displayed similar suspicions of place-name investigations undertaken by “amateurs”; however, this gap between “professional” and “amateur” would be narrowed severely in the coming decades when Anthropology and Geography employed the approach of studying the psychology behind the naming of places, which included studying the affective ties that bind people to place, as well as the contested nature of space and place. Perhaps most importantly, there was recognition of the localization of meaning and the relativism in human stories that make “ordinary” people worthy counterparts in the discussion of lives lived in semiotic spaces.
focusing on references of place–names to solely the physical qualities of landscape or language (i.e., landforms or lexico-grammatical components) to considering how cultures express themselves ideologically in the landscapes that they create through the act of place-naming. The particular context of place-naming came to be understood as a basic human undertaking to signify social or cultural meaning in experiences of the world, and place-names came to be appreciated as matrices of language and the various cultural elements (including landscape) which compose a society’s way of life (Nash 1993; Robinson 1996). Accordingly, toponymy was recognized as a means of observing how people enter into a discourse with the landscape through the act of place-naming, and how through the naming of places, human knowledge of and behaviour towards the environment is developed as people interact with places on the land. This perspective went beyond understanding place-names as revelatory of clues to the human past to appreciating that place-names have a living or progressive role in investing human meaning in the landscape and in influencing human thought and action with regards to the landscape.

THE MEANING OF PLACE AND PLACE-NAMES TO INDIGENOUS PEOPLE

Place-names are significant in discourse surrounding identity to place, having the potential “to transform the sheerly physical and geographical into something that is historically and socially experienced” (Tilley 1994: 18). Because place-names are “texts and texture of a people and their place” (Fair 1997: 478), their use can serve as a means of relaying ideological meaning about place, and can therefore play a role in the process of place-making itself. Equally important, given the ongoing reciprocity between people and the places they inhabit, is the idea that place is more than a material entity—it is a process, constitutive of
identity. This quality of place is reflected in the naming of places, through which cultures express themselves in the landscape. Place-names, cultural artefacts in that they are culturally negotiated, gain significance in the ongoing exchanges between people based on their perceptions of themselves in relation to the landscape. In this way, toponyms hold the clues to the human meaning that is invested in the landscape.

The role of place is inestimable to people who have had a long and intimate relationship with the landscape. Indigenous groups, for instance, have a deep attachment to places that can be traced to their worldviews. Rather than merely “a backdrop for human action” (Tilley 1994: 22), the landscape assumes a conscious form that takes an active part in establishing and maintaining individual and social identity (Tilley 1994). This idea is captured in indigenous toponyms via the narratives and events that surround them, which reflect culturally-defined notions of physical space and beliefs about the material and social significance of environmental features (Deur 1996). Place-based stories “have the function of founding and articulating spaces—the narratives concern actions organizing more or less extensive social cultural areas” (de Certeau 1984: 123). Through the conveyance of their related narratives, place-names participate in a situation, and become symbols of “meaning-making”, converting space into “a practice of a particular place” (de Certeau 1984: 116). Stories situated in the tangible aspects of places in the landscape are summoned, explored and visited through toponyms. It is this cogitative attribute of place-names that makes them significant in understanding their importance in the living use and organization of space by indigenous peoples.

It could be argued that place-names function simultaneously as both “tours” and “maps” (de Certeau 1984). As “tours”, toponyms enable subjectivity, movement and the production of geographies of action. Promoting experience of the world through movement
and action, place-names also condition “maps”. Through place-name narratives, travellers make meaning through the practices they engage in as they negotiate the landscape. Place-name narratives orientate and focus these journeys (de Certeau 1984:116), making place-names also function as “maps”, through which they speak of “being”, “thereness” (Tilley 1994: 13-14) or “dwelling” (Tilley 1994: 13, drawing on Heidegger), and convey emplacement. In validating who people are, and what they are in relation to where they are (or where they are not) in space and time, emplacement informs identity.

A means of understanding belonging in places is through examining indigenous place-names, which embody the myths and experiences of places (Cruikshank 1990, 1981; Basso 1996). Through memory of sensory information, belonging is formed out of an intimate knowledge of places reflected in place-name narratives via the personification of natural elements and features, and the frequency of references to the landscape in the vernacular (Cajete 1999; Fair 1997; Basso 1996; Rosenberg and Nabhan 1997; Salmon 2000). The importance of the land in the make-up of the indigenous worldview is articulated in the ecosystem-like concepts (see Berkes et al. 1998) that form the core of people’s involvements with the land, such that the relationship between the land and some groups of indigenous peoples can be said to be “kincentric” (see Salmon 2000) or familial. This idea may explain the concept of mental maps (Brody 1981; Ridington 1990), and may have a strong influence on indigenous land tenure systems, which generally can be regarded as holistic in the sense that the land is perceived to be simultaneously a physical, spiritual and genealogical entity.

The naming of geographical locations is not just a means of revealing use and occupancy of land or a way of organizing living space or territory. Place-names also aid in making the landscape available to indigenous people on both a material and symbolic level—
“people think and act with the landscape as well as about and upon it” (Momaday in Basso 1996:75). Likewise, people project themselves in the landscape through the act of naming locations that are significant to them. Of equal significance are the narratives that accompany toponyms. Stories reveal the contiguous bond between people and the places they inhabit, a relationship forged through use of land for social organization, subsistence, story-telling, and ritual. Stories in places have the effect of linking the contemporary to the ancestral (Basso 1996, Cruikshank 1990) through their enactment in people’s interactions with the landscape. The named landscape is a container of oral history, reminding indigenous people of how the land and its inhabitants came to be (Cruikshank 1981), and how cultural continuity in places can be maintained (Müller-Wille 1985). Knowledge of places is central to survival and embraces the philosophies and skills linked to the resource-harvesting as well as the careful husbandry of natural resources, and on a symbolic level, this knowledge spans morality and knowledge of self (Basso 1996; Cruikshank 1990). Through knowing the land intimately, and using the “symbolic resources of language and land…to promote standards of behaviour” (Cruikshank 1990: 54), people become one with the land, with rapport established between the self and a sentient landscape (see Anderson 1998). Therefore, place-names are at once material and metaphorical, substantive and symbolic (Nash 1999), and serve as repositories of cultural identity through the stories they contain.

**Locations of Indigenous Identity**

Identification of place and self as one is described by Sack (in Osborne 2001:42) as stemming from “…the use of landscape as part of memory in an oral society that must remember everything about itself and its practices…[therefore] place, of necessity, must be
more intimately a part of its culture.” Perhaps the idea of oneness between place and self can be seen also as a covenant with the land, concretized through the treatment of it as a “sentient being” (Anderson 1998) — in other words, the land will act benevolently and provide, as long as there is heedful use of its resources. From this perspective, the earth itself narrates indigenous experience and worldview through the human act of place-naming. Myths associated with toponyms refer to themes of travelling through or being within the land, as opposed to merely existing on it.

Basso (1996) in *Wisdom Sits in Places* recounts how the Apache invoke their terrain. Toponyms, although their precise origins may be lost, serve as cautionary or moralizing devices through the myths with which they are associated. The Apache, in Basso’s (1996:39) words, are “stalked by stories” — landscape features of mythico-historical importance serve a mnemonic function in their role of warning against or promoting certain social behaviours. For instance, when the name of a particular site is evoked to provide advice, the place-name projects in the listener’s mind the image of the actual place, which “activates” its charter myth and the moral of the tale. Basso, following Heidegger, forwards a phenomenological analysis of the complex array of symbolic relationships with physical surroundings that are found among the Apache in their perceptions of the environment. He writes that it is “[these] ideational resources with which [the Apache] constitute their surroundings and invest them with value and significance” (1996:66). The connection between place-names, oral history and daily life is intricate, a reminder that indigenous accounts of history are reckoned in largely spatial terms, divergent from the western linear and temporal organization of past events (Cruikshank 1994). As containers of oral history, place-names contribute to an individual’s sense of place and belonging. Basso (1996:34) proposes that, “knowledge of places is …closely linked to knowledge of the self, to grasping one’s position in the larger
scheme of things, including one’s own community, and to securing a confident sense of who one is as a person”.

### Toponymy as an Articulation of Indigenous Memoryscape

Indigenous place-names serve to connect people to the land, maintaining “rapport” with a sentient ecology. For example, the Tlingit (a people who have traditionally occupied the temperate rainforest of the area extending from Alaska’s southern border with British Columbia to the Gulf of Alaska) utilize two geographies, physical and social, to organize subsistence production and social structure (Thornton 1997b). These geographies are linked to the deployment of place-names in rituals and other commemorative interactions. Tlingit social identity, itself, relies on placement within “a particular sociogeographic web of relations indexed by geographic names”, of which there are six major levels. At each level ties between the social and physical landscapes are expressed through place-names, so that “every time the clan name is spoken, the geographic associations are invoked in a way that merges the social group with the place” (Thornton 1997b: 2-3). Members of a clan are able to affirm their emplacement or belonging on the land through situating themselves amongst the ancestors by learning their wisdom present in place-narratives. For instance, *Yaaw Teiyi* or Herring Rock, a fishing spot still in use today, is regarded as a “geographical and moral center of the [salmon] harvest” because it evokes a tale cautioning against over-exploitation of the resource (Thornton 1997b: 5). On the other hand, desecrated (through deforestation

---

8 A term coined by Nuttall (1992) to refer to the fusion of time and space in the grounded memories of place where contemporary, historical or mythical events that take place at certain points in the local landscape become an integral part of understanding and knowing those places. This idea parallels Bakhtin’s (1981) “chronotope” as points in the geography of a people where time and space intersect to produce a “fluid” and “personified” landscape for human meditation.

9 Tlingit social organization can be structured from “broadest to narrowest” as follows: nation, moiety, *kwaan* (translates as “to dwell”), clan, house group, personal name/title (Thornton 1997b:2).
and mining) and abandoned sites like *Kaawagaani Hit* and *Kax’noowu* are also commemorated and honoured as powerful icons with important social goals to achieve:

…in potlatches and other ceremonies in northern Tlingit land, *Kaagwaantaan* orators often use the phrase *Ch’a Tleix’ Kox’nuwkweidi* (We who are still on People of the Grouse Fort) to achieve at least three ends: 1) to promote solidarity and communitas among the now-dispersed *Kax’noowe* clans; 2) to reiterate their inextricable ties to this historic, collective dwelling place; and 3) to metaphorically transport the listeners to this sacred landscape so that they may be reunited with their ancestors who likewise maybe summoned by name [Thornton 1997b:4].

In this sense, the place-names marking these sites serve as a monument symbolizing the collective memory of a group of people, where “neither time nor space can be understood without reference to the other” (Thornton 1997b:4). This provides people with “symbolic reference points for the moral imagination and its practical bearing on the actualities of their lives [so that]…the landscape in which people dwell can be said to dwell in them” (Basso 1996:111).

Cruikshank (1990:54) also comes to similar conclusions regarding the internalization of the landscape by people. From interviews conducted in the late 1970s with Athapaskan speakers in the Yukon, Cruikshank notes that attention to context is of utmost necessity in appreciating the role of place-names in instructing about people and places. All her informants recalled a story or song when a toponym was mentioned—remarkably, toponyms could not be discussed without “speaking with names” (see Basso 1996) via tales. The stories revolved around personal incidents that happened at a particular place, and occasionally a story from mythological time. From this observation, Cruikshank not only learns from her informants that an individual’s sense of self and her or his history is deeply immersed in the landscape but discovers that there is a correlation between understanding the names and the stories, living as responsible human beings, and knowing the land as aboriginals.
The idea of knowing the land as indigenous people is addressed in Jett’s (1997) study on Canyon de Chelly Navajo place-names. The toponymic information gathered and analyzed in this study indicates a logic and way of life that discloses the mindset of this group of people. Interestingly, only places carrying personal names in the Canyon de Chelly area were found to be relatively “modern” places like farmsteads, “possessable [sic] via usufruct, and …named for their users”. All natural features, with the exception of three trails named for supernatural beings, carried literally descriptive names like Didsé Sikaad Nástlah, which translates directly as “chokecherry [-bush]- is-standing-spread- out cove” (Jett 1997: 487). Jett draws two interesting conclusions about the Canyon de Chelly Navajo worldview from their toponymy. Firstly, on the basis of the general absence of commemorative or personal names in toponyms, Jett (1997: 486) writes, “Navajos normally do not name anything after a person unless it belongs to him…to the Navajo, a store can be owned but not the land or any part thereof”. Secondly, he remarks that “translatability seems to be a general Athapaskan characteristic” (1997: 486), so that the clarity of referents, owing to the paucity of the abstract or metaphorical in place-names, suggests that this “high degree of literality no doubt reflects, at least in part, the well-known Navajo (and general Athapaskan) pragmatism” (1997: 491). To mobile peoples, as Athapaskan groups have been in the past (Jett 1997; Basso 1996; Cruikshank 1990), travel was facilitated through toponyms, serving as mnemonic devices and vividly encapsulating the most significant of details. The stories situated in the tangible aspects of places in the landscape were summoned, explored and visited through toponyms. In this way, the landscape has served as more than a part of a people’s mental geography; it has also served to memorialize them as a distinct people (see Basso 1996).
PERPETUATING INDIGENOUNESS THROUGH RE-KNOWING THE LAND

Land and the persistence of an indigenous identity constitute two of the most fundamental and intertwined issues that underlie cultural survival. The “search and restoration of place lost” (Jacobs 1993: 104) marks the reclamation of rights that is couched within the geographical in both its physical and semiotic manifestations. The common experience of having their indigenous autonomy suppressed and their lands and resources confiscated or appropriated by nation-states and corporate interests has brought about an indigenous sense of political consciousness that involves the reclamation of indigenous languages, customs (including TEK), and rights and title to land by indigenous groups. As Müller-Wille (2000: 150-151) argues, “If language remains an element of cultural identity and distinction, the use and application of all known [place] names within the traditional territory will contribute to the appropriate and proper representation of culture and identity of the people, thus supporting symbols that strengthen cultural and political self-determination.” In this light, toponymy acts as a counter-hegemonic discourse to assert and maintain aboriginality, and, thus, is an expression of cultural sovereignty and aboriginal rights when the indigenous place-names of one’s traditional territory are learned and used.

As markers of language and locality, place-names perform an immediate, applicative role when the names and meanings of places are learned. This enables a more complete understanding of indigenous languages and histories in the context of the land. For peoples who have been denied their language and culture for generations, place-names offer a “compact” encounter with language, culture and land, establishing an understanding that is indigenous and entwined with place. In this sense, indigenous place-names herald the “re-
conquest” (Herman 1999) because the land can once again be known and claimed through the inheritance of stories that establish rights to the land.

The use of powerful images from nature in the vernacular for didactic purposes shows how familiar landscape features become cultural symbols, allowing people a “living” association with their past or history, and the deepest values and aspirations it contains (Cruikshank 1994). Stories, spatially grounded through their connection with specific sites, become imbued with historically-constructed cultural meanings. When a site is named, it embodies symbolic value and becomes a marker of place-based stories, fixing meaning to events through its functioning as a repository of place-memories (Basso 1996). Oral narratives thus commemorated in place-memories, and embedded in toponyms, engender powerful feelings that bind people to place, and provide a “template for identities” (Osborne 2001:44). It follows, therefore, that storied landscapes, the aide-memoire of a culture’s knowledge and understanding of its history and future, are monuments to a people’s identity (Osborne 2001).

The call for enculturation through the re-naming of places on traditional lands and learning those place-names is evidently based on a counter-hegemonic discourse tied to claims of social justice and land rights. As a significant part of enculturation lies in the demonstration of resilience and permanence of TEK about place (Cruikshank and Argounova 2000), reconnecting with the indigenous ancestral past becomes an exercise for defining the present. Given the harrowing effects of rapid modernization seen in the loss of culture and homeland, there is an urgent need to remember and transmit the core values that have hitherto defined the indigenous identity and lifestyle. Such memory-making creates the scaffolding necessary for building a place-world, which is visualized from past events and presented through new possibilities that not only revive the historical but revise them, as well
(Cruikshank and Argounova 2000; Basso 1996). By way of exploring how past happenings might differ from conventional understandings of history, historical knowledge is placed in the everyday world of people, a world of places and place-worlds that act in concert to build personal and social identities (Basso 1996).

THE ROLE OF PLACE-NAMES IN EDUCATING ABOUT TRADITIONAL ECOLOGICAL KNOWLEDGE

Ethnographic studies of how children acquire knowledge have shown that there can, in fact, be multiple literacy and numeracy practices (Baker, Clay, and Fox 1996). With indigenous groups, in particular, knowledge seems to be based on the socio-cultural as well as the ecological, and is internalized, practised and transmitted in a “habitus”\(^{10}\) governed by the subsistence way of life (Sarangapani 2003: 203). Throughout the world, indigenous groups face the unremitting problem of schooling their children. Like the development and modernization schemes in areas of the world with surviving indigenous populations, formal education has played a part in the marginalization of these peoples. As an agent of “social control, containment and assimilation”, formal education has perpetuated the idea that indigenous peoples, their knowledge and way of life have no place in the present (Urion 1993:98). Unfortunately, this idea has gained momentum through the degradation of indigenous homelands and the ensuing loss of traditional occupations, which seem to appear to greater society as an inevitable process of change. Given this general attitude, it is perhaps unsurprising that indigenous experiences and ways of knowing are under-represented and seldom heard, written or taught. In the microcosm of the classroom, an example of such negation is the way indigenous groups are portrayed in textbooks. Aboriginal people have

\(^{10}\) Borrowed from Pierre Bourdieu (1991) to mean a framework for the objects of knowledge consisting of a society’s social, historical and political structures, perpetuated through performance.
been reduced to “a footnote in the history of the European settlement of this land” (Restoule 2000:39) with their knowledge and beliefs, in some cases, inaccurately described in the past tense (Ninnes 2000). Such depiction has had the effect of impressing upon readers that indigenous cultures ended with the coming of whites. Such thinking makes it difficult to appreciate the unceasing importance of land and language to indigenous groups as symbols of identity and repositories of culture and knowledge. Consequently, there is much ignorance surrounding the idea that indigenous people have their own science and notions of environmental sustainability that continue to have relevance in their lives.

The dearth of indigenous representation in the curriculum compounded by the problem of younger aboriginals growing up with hardly any knowledge of oral tradition or life in the bush (Rosenberg and Nabhan 1997) makes the need for including aboriginal ways of knowing in education a pressing priority. A means of achieving this is through using indigenous toponymy to introduce the concept of TEK. Through place-names, TEK can be learned in context to place, where environmental knowledge, language and oral history can be grasped as part of learning about the significance of places to people. As toponyms “represent a complex body of knowledge…accumulated over long periods of being part of specific natural environments and ecosystems” (Müller-Wille 2000: 146), and “…constitute a detailed encyclopaedic knowledge of the environment, [telling] much about how native people perceive, communicate about, and make use of their surroundings” (Afable and Beeler 1996: 185)—they have a role in communicating TEK. Other than their capacity for relaying environmental information, place-names possess the potential to be employed in a post-colonial exploration and reclamation of identity (Nash 1999). Such a quality contributes significantly to the construction of culturally-sensitive curriculum. When places are referred to by their indigenous names, the social work of memory operates to anchor indigenous
identity to place, replacing histories of dispossession, and erasure of indigenous language, culture and systems of knowledge with accounts grounded in precise locations that re-establish meanings locally (Cruikshank and Argounova 2000). This is when the symbolic resources of toponymy and oral history play an important role in cultural self-determination, shifting the emphasis from retaining culture for reasons of posterity to “developing mechanisms for its continued transmission: school curriculum projects, local museums, usable orthographies and training for Native people who want to work with and develop those materials” (Cruikshank 1981:86).

**Place-Names and Traditional Ecological Knowledge**

Indigenous toponymy, rarely commemorative or honorific of humans, has a practical role in tracing landscape changes, locating food resources, and defining material culture and resource harvesting and preparation techniques. In this way, it serves as a repository of TEK. Language, through the customary use of toponyms, makes tangible the knowledge essential for survival (Hallowell in Thornton 1997a). Toponyms, therefore, identify the knowledge of past generations of places that have given (see Saxon et al. 2002), and assure people of who they are and the importance of detailed knowledge and skills. Brody (1976) observes that knowing the place-names of the land’s features directs people’s movements in locating significant resource areas. Beardsall (1988) remarks on the pride felt amongst indigenous people on their ability to spot and interpret landmarks, and in using their knowledge of place-names to travel with confidence through the land in finding their way home. Through these observations, it is evident that TEK functions not only as a science but also as a way of life.
Place-names also offer information on the way the land is managed, cared for and identified with. In some indigenous communities, the landscape is organized into clusters of recurring names, each reflecting in name, a prominent or central natural feature (Saxon et al. 2002; Fair 1997; Afable and Beeler 1996; Rankama 1993; Müller-Wille 1985; Brody 1976). These place-name systems signal geographic concepts and perceptions, reflect focal points in cultures and, determine topography, fauna and flora to ease travel, hunting, fishing and gathering. Individual toponyms gain in meaning when they are regarded as part of a place-name system because then understanding of place-names in context is possible. Saxon et al.’s research on Dogrib caribou place-names supports the idea of looking at names within their toponymic systems. For example, although few Dogrib toponyms literally have the term “caribou” in their composition, there are quite a number of names that intimate “caribou” through references to other food sources that could be relied upon in case caribou arrival in an area was overdue, points in the landscape where caribou are known to habitually cross, and caribou forage (Saxon et al. 2002: 57-58). These “indirect” place-names, as argued by Saxon et al., are potentially more informative than names that denote only “caribou”, as they contain descriptions of bio-geographical surroundings. In turn, it might be argued that such toponyms illustrate how TEK operates through place-name systems.

Cruikshank (1990, 1984, 1981) and Saxon et al. (2002) argue that toponymic information can be used to complement scientific understandings of certain natural phenomena. Because place-names often correlate to geology, fauna, flora and material culture, they represent a means for not only verifying but also illuminating the scientific record with indigenous understandings of nature and natural processes. *Naludi’*, the Southern Tutchone name for the Lowell Glacier in Yukon, is an example of a toponym that provides confirmation of scientific accounts of phenomena recorded in the area it marks (Cruikshank
1990:63; 1981:87). *Naludi’—“fish stop”— tells of the curse put on a boy and his village, as a result of his making fun of a shaman who was balding. The shaman’s curse caused a glacier to surge across the riverbed and damn the river, stopping salmon from ascending the river. So today, while sea salmon are not found in the Alsek River, there are landlocked salmon further upstream. This local account complements the scientific account of the surging of the Lowell glacier and subsequent damming of the Alsek River in 1852.

Another toponym, *Mezdih E’ol*, also known as Carcross (a contraction of “caribou” and “crossing”), illustrates how place-name information supplements scientific knowledge (Cruikshank 1984:31; 1981:63). Although biologists are still trying to understand why the Porcupine caribou herd stopped coming to the Southern Yukon at the start of the twentieth century, they can nonetheless, reconstruct the herd’s migration routes with the aid of names like *Mezdih E’ol*. The name translates as “place where caribou swim (across) in groups” (Cruikshank 1984:31) and marks the point on Nares Lake where the herd used to cross when they still migrated across Southern Yukon at the start of last century.

**“INDIGENIZING” SCIENCE EDUCATION: ADVANTAGES AND OBSTACLES**

The literature on aboriginal education in Canada cites mathematics and science as curricular areas requiring considerable reform to help indigenous students succeed. Aikenhead (1997) and MacIvor (1995) point to the importance of increasing the number of indigenous youth in science and science-related programmes in view of the impending post-treaty era, when there will be an urgent need for scientific and technical skills in aboriginal communities to execute local governance, and management of lands and resources. It appears that low rates of enrolment in senior secondary-level mathematics and science amongst indigenous students is
correlated with insufficient exposure to and experience in these subject areas during elementary-level schooling (MacIvor 1995). This disparity in acquiring basic skills in science and mathematics is due to the placement of indigenous students in remedial programmes, “where ‘basics’ are stressed [and] science instruction is limited (MacIvor 1995: 84, emphasis in original). A weak foundation in science is also due to a lack of proper facilities and equipment (particularly in rural schools), few indigenous role models in the field of science, and the mistrust many parents have towards institutionalized education that limits family support for science learning (MacIvor 1995: 84). Battiste (2000), Cajete (2000), and Mackay and Miles (1995) attribute low attainment in mathematics and science to insufficient representations of indigenous lifeways in the curriculum.

As discussed, indigenous toponymy is a means of offering an understanding of the world encoded in logic different from that of western science. Therefore, as a means of educating about TEK in the context of particular places, the introduction of toponymy in education can prove to be beneficial for indigenous children and youth, in light of making learning more culturally appropriate. Snively and Corsiglia (2000) and Aikenhead (1997) stress the need to include TEK in science education to bring about a more critical and liberative approach to the teaching and learning of school science subjects. Scientific literacy as taught in schools is largely representative of western science, where science is conceptualized and conveyed as European, current, objective, value-free and precise; whereas, as Snively and Corsiglia (2000) and Aikenhead (1997) argue, it is really one of many sciences, in that every culture has its own science, its own ways of exploring, rationalizing and comprehending phenomena. While allowances are made in the curriculum for the teaching and learning of indigenous languages and culture, indigenous perspectives as such are largely absent from core subjects like science and mathematics. Battiste and
Henderson (2000:253) state that language learning without integrating “the indispensable role of the land as the classroom in which the heritage of each Indigenous people has traditionally been taught,” reduces language learning to a superficial study of words and concepts that fail to capture the essence of TEK. Hence, it is imperative that learners be able to make the connections between the learning that takes place in language lessons to other areas of the curriculum. Any aspect of TEK that is dealt with within the educational system must be woven into and across the traditional school subjects of language, geography, history, science and mathematics. This results in a global or interdisciplinary approach to teaching and learning that not only helps students grasp “the big picture” of the natural and cultural history of their traditional lands but instils in them an appreciation for the intellectual traditions of their own people (Snively and Corsiglia 2000; MacIvor 1995; Snively 1995). Through such an approach, TEK could be included in the curriculum more effectively, becoming the unifying and underlying concept of all things studied at school (Aikenhead 1997).

The reality of reforming the curriculum through the inclusion of TEK is problematic. Given the newly emergent status of cross-cultural education, and its concordant low priority in curriculum development schemes, the incorporation of TEK in the curriculum is often treated as tangential to standard curricular mandates. While the Canadian school system is not without indigenous representation in its curricula, such inclusion is cosmetic and negligible in practice. For instance, the British Columbia Teachers Federation’s (BCTF) Policy Related to First Nations/Aboriginal Education outlines the importance of Headstart or early intervention programmes in introducing schooling as a positive aspect of life and the recognition of indigenous role-models within the formal school setting. The treatment of aboriginal culture as an integral part of the curriculum is “proven” in the manner First
Nations curricular links are a part of, as opposed to just marginal appendices to, the provincial educational standards and guidelines, known as the *Integrated Resource Packages*. It is interesting to note, however, that one of the BCTF’s policies is to increase “Aboriginal history and culture content …in all subjects, with special emphasis on social studies…” [BCTF (n.d.)]. This policy statement can be interpreted in two ways. Seeing that the overall population of First Nations people in British Columbia is relatively small\(^{11}\), such a policy could be understood as a move by the BCTF to include TEK and indigenous values in the curriculum, in offering an alternative and even a more equitable account of history. On the other hand, the policy reflects a failure in including TEK and indigenous wisdom as an integral part of the co-construction of knowledge in subject areas like science and mathematics. This trend is also evident in the 1998 Ministry of Education guidelines aimed at integrating aboriginal content into the different subject areas. *Shared Learnings: Integrating B.C. Aboriginal Content K-10*, while a step in the direction of encouraging inclusion of indigenous content with its subject-specific guidelines, sample lesson plans and (largely Canadian) First Nations recommended reading and multimedia lists is unfortunately still not much more than a tenuous attempt at political correctness as it fails to render a thorough treatment of TEK as a science. These guidelines focus primarily on introducing non-indigenous students to aboriginal art, customs and storytelling, and do not address in any concerted or meaningful manner the concept of TEK as a “tried and tested” system of acquiring and validating information about the world. Retaining the canonical nature of subjects such as science and mathematics only serves to reinforce the deeply-lodged popular belief that they are fundamental to human progress, thereby influencing what is taught and

\(^{11}\) 4.4% (all ages) of the overall British Columbia population (2001 Census of Population, Statistics Canada).
learned universally (Baker, Clay and Fox 1996) to the detriment of other understandings and interpretations of the world. Consequently, even if TEK seems to be part of the curriculum, it is highly likely curtailed to indigenous language classes, the learning of traditional stories as part of Language Arts activities or to segregated hunting, fishing, trapping and gathering trips that entail a break from school (Aikenhead and Huntley 1999; Aikenhead 1997; McCaskill 1987).

**“INDIGENIZING” SCIENCE EDUCATION VIA ON-THE-LAND OR CULTURE-BASED CAMP PROGRAMMES**

Barnhardt and Kawagley (2004: 63) describe an effective indigenous school curriculum as one that is place-based, engages learners in “studies associated with the surrounding physical and cultural environment” and involves increased contact time with “elders, parents and local experts” (Barnhardt and Kawagley 2004: 63). From this perspective, indigenous cultural content is regarded as being complementary, rather than an appendage, to core subjects like science and mathematics (Barnhardt and Kawagley 2004: 59, 61), entailing a shift of focus from “teaching about culture to teaching through culture” (Barnhardt and Kawagley 2004: 62, emphasis added).

Barnhardt and Kawagley (2004: 63) describe five themes that are necessary in reforming the curriculum: 1) documentation and validation of TEK; 2) defining and building upon indigenous pedagogy; 3) defining and setting in motion a culturally-sound standards-based curriculum; 4) teacher support systems; and 5) determination of culturally-sound assessment practices. While the implementation of these themes suggests a drawn out process with a number of extensive reforms to the curriculum, including changing the school culture by revamping the formal standards-based curricula to reflect local cultural values (Barnhardt
and Kawagley 2004: 62), they can be effected on a small-scale level, in community-led educational initiatives such as on-the-land learning programmes. Such initiatives offer the opportunity for local empowerment where culture-based education can be instated without participation in the bureaucracy and red-tape associated with reforming the formal school curriculum. From a broader perspective, community-led educational initiatives symbolize the reclamation of education, an institution historically linked to paternalism, racism and cultural dispossession, as a means to transmit cultural knowledge and values.

Several indigenous communities across Canada have initiated their own on-the-land or culture-based camp programmes. These programmes while ranging in content and form (i.e., some stress a balanced academic/cultural curriculum while others place greater emphasis on the learning of culture), take the notion of counter-mapping to new levels. Information from indigenous-commissioned studies, once used to challenge state policies on lands, resources and basic human rights, are now being employed towards educating children about their birthright— their people’s culture, knowledge and place. The mapping of indigenousness, as seen in cultural revival and continuity efforts, “allow[s] the emphasis to shift from de- to reconstruction, from map-breaking to map-making” (Nash 1993:54).

On-the-land or culture-based camp programmes provide a much-needed space for experimentation into ways in which to introduce TEK to children and youth, and can be

---

12 Other examples of on-the-land programmes, besides Tl’atz’en Nation’s Yunk’ut Whe Ts’o Duleh (We Learn From Our Land) programme in British Columbia, include: the Rediscovery summer camps held in several parts of Canada, the Reconnecting with the Land programme in Manitoba, the Big Trout Lake land-based programme in Ontario, the Nutchimiu-Attuseun Training Centre on-the-land programme in Quebec, the Avataq Cultural Institute Innujuaq and Kuujjuaq summer camp programmes in Nunavik, the Mi’kmaq and Wuastukwiuk (Maliseet) cultural-enrichment summer camp in New Brunswick (INAC 2006). These programmes deliver traditional land-based skills and environmental and cultural education to children and youth of aboriginal ancestry, and include the participation of community elders as instructors. It should also be mentioned that on-the-land programmes are in some instances initiated by schools— in the Northwest Territories, for example, schools like Sir Alexander Mackenzie School (Inuvik), Chief Julius School (Fort McPherson), and Paul William Kaeser School (Fort Smith) organize outdoor experiential camps as part of their curricula to teach students bush survival skills, environmental awareness and Traditional Knowledge.
understood as a transition\textsuperscript{13} step to revamping the formal curriculum followed in community or band schools. Culture-based programmes could be also called laboratories of learning, as the successes and failures experienced through the running of such programmes can prove to be important lessons for informing how a culturally-appropriate education should be modelled. Additionally, on-the-land or culture-based camp programmes provide a natural venue for increased community and parental involvement, where teaching takes place in an unofficial atmosphere, carried out by individuals other than trained or certified instructors or teachers. This way of teaching is representative of traditional ways of imparting knowledge, harmonizing student-teacher-elder-parental relationships (Yamamura et al. 2003), and enabling direct interaction with the land and learning about the environment that is mediated by the cultural cognitive map (Kawagley 1999).

\textbf{CONCLUSION}

When indigenous communities play a part in the development of their own curriculum projects and teach in a manner they determine, they increase their chances for cultural advancement and continuity (Dean 2004; Enkiwe-Abayao 2004). On-the-land or culture-based camp programmes symbolize, through their non-formal and extra-curricular nature, a space for enrichment and supplemental educational opportunities, providing hands-on science and conservation activities that also include enhancement of indigenous lifeways and language skills. It also signifies a space where power changes hands, highlighting shifts from mere appropriation and appreciation of indigenous content in the curriculum to

\textsuperscript{13}When the Department of Indian Affairs and Northern Development (DIAND) relinquished control of Indian education to individual bands, a preparatory period or transition step was not provided to aboriginal communities, so that bands were faced with this herculean task overnight (York 1990). To this day, DIAND or INAC still legally controls education through the Indian Act, which maintains that the Minister has exclusive powers over decision-making and jurisdiction in all aspects of Indian life, including educational programmes (Charters-Voght 1999).
accommodation of localized knowledge within the context of the land. The introduction of
indigenous toponymy in on-the-land or culture-based programmes is itself a stalwart
proclamation of the cultural in teaching science. Place-names lend an interdisciplinary
flavour to scientific knowledge linking it to language, history, culture and politics, thus
placing western science in the context of one way of understanding the world. This increases
the holism of science education, making it less abstract and obscure to students who have a
non-western background. As complexes of language, oral history and the land, place-names
hint at the power that underlies understanding specific meanings that are attached to places so
that they can be known and claimed from an indigenous perspective.

In the following pages, a more detailed discussion of the role of indigenous place-
names in enhancing on-the-land or culture-based programmes will be given based on my
research with Tl’azt’en Nation. In providing a framework for appreciating the important role
land plays in defining Tl’ażt’en identity and worldview, Chapter Two will commence with an
introduction to the Tl’azt’en socio-cultural and historical make-up, including descriptions of
territory, language, and the balhats and keyoh systems. Within this context, the potential of
place-names to address issues of cultural revitalization become apparent in the way language
and land represent and sustain cultural identity, forming the basis for understanding the
continuing importance of places in knowing and claiming the land as Tl’ażt’enne. Of
particular significance in this chapter is a look at Tl’ażt’en Nation’s efforts in reviving the
Dakelh language, culture and ways of knowing among its children and youth, as seen through
the creation of the culture-based science camp programme, Yunk’ut Whe Ts’o Dul’eh (We
Learn From Our Land).
Chapter Two:
THE TL’AZT’EN LANDSCAPE: AN OVERVIEW OF THE LAND, LANGUAGE, CULTURE AND HISTORY OF TL’AZT’ENNE

INTRODUCTION

The purpose of this chapter is to introduce the Tl’azt’en, a Dakelh-speaking people of the northern portion of Stuart Lake, British Columbia, and to describe their territory, language, culture and history focusing on the enduring importance of the land in Tl’azt’en life. Drawing on written accounts I hope to demonstrate the role of places on the land in providing subsistence, in defining territoriality, in maintaining language and culture, and in the Tl’azt’en assertion of its aboriginal rights to land, resources and self-government, including the right to educate Tl’azt’en children and youth in the language, culture and knowledge of their ancestors.

THE GEOGRAPHY OF TL’AZT’EN TERRITORY

The Tl’azt’en community or Tl’azt’enne are the Dakelh or Carrier-speaking people of the Stuart-Trembleur Lakes watershed concentrated in four villages: Tache, Binche, Kuzche (Grand Rapids) and Dzitl’ainli (Middle River) (see Figure 2.1). Located on the Nechako Plateau of central interior British Columbia, the region was heavily glaciated, resulting in a landscape punctuated by multitudinous narrow stream valleys, lake basins, wetlands, rolling hills and sharply rising mountains (Hudson 1983; Carlson 1997). Two major river systems, the Skeena and the Fraser drain into the Pacific, and serve as migration routes and spawning habitat for a number of anadromous and freshwater fish species, including salmon, sturgeon, rainbow trout, whitefish and char (Carlson 1997). The third river system, the Peace-
Mackenzie, drains into the Arctic Ocean. The region experiences a typical continental climate, and a short growing season. In the spring, migrating waterfowl descend upon the region’s lakes to nest, which in the late summer become places of refuge for birds such as swans, geese and ducks when they moult in preparation for migration southward (Moric 1897; Nak’azdli First Nation 2000; Hall 1990). Lakes, ponds, rivulets and rivers are also home to beavers and muskrats, prized for fur and flesh.

Lying between the Subalpine and Montane regions, Tl’azt’en territory is blanketed by hybrid white and Englemann spruce, and Douglas fir (Hudson 1983). In areas that have been cleared, lodgepole pine, trembling aspen and paper birch are found. Along alluvial systems, black cottonwood and willow prevail. Besides providing habitat for game such as moose, mule deer and black bear, and fur-bearing animals like the marten, fisher and lynx, the forest is also a source of plant products such as sap, berries and roots, materials for medicines, and traditional implements like nets, baskets and canoes (Hudson 1983; Hall 1990).
The John Prince Research Forest

Tl’azt’en Nation traditional territory includes an area of over 6,500 square kilometres to the north of Fort St. James. In 1999, roughly 13,000 hectares of this territory were allotted to the establishment of the John Prince Research Forest (JPRF), a co-management venture involving Tl’azt’en Nation and the University of Northern British Columbia (UNBC) (see Figures 2.2 & 2.3). The nine place-names of the present study lie in and around the research forest, which encompasses three keyohs or traditional management units used by the Tom, Monk and Pierre families.

Among the JPRF’s research priorities is investigating and enacting the “role of cultural values in education” (UNBC Press Release, n.d. a), which is in keeping with the
vision of John Prince, in whose memory the research forest was named and who was “a
strong advocate for the teaching of traditional language, culture and land values to younger
generations” (UNBC n.d. b). Accordingly, a goal of the research forest’s education and
training programmes is to develop capabilities among children and youth to pursue natural
resource and other science-related careers in the future. Part of this goal is being achieved
through JPRF programmes such as the Yunk’ut Whe Ts’o Dul’eh culture-based science camp
programme (described below), and through research such as the present study that provides
ideas into how to integrate Tl’azt’en cultural content into creating vital foundational
knowledge for children and youth to learn in order to have a sound understanding of their
own traditions while mastering the conventional knowledge necessary to succeed in today’s
world.
Figure 2.2
Location of JPRF. SOURCE: JRPF archives, 2006.
Culturally, Tl’azt’enne are considered central Carriers along with people from Nak’azdlı́, Yekooche, Lheidli T’enneh, Saik’uz, Takla Lake, Nadleh, Stellat’en, Cheslatta and Broman Lake (Furniss 1986). The term Carrier, a translation from the French *porteur*, in turn a translation of the Sekani *aghelhne* or the “ones who pack”\(^1\), did not suggest socio-political or cultural-linguistic unity until the arrival of the first Europeans in Carrier country. Rather people thought of themselves (as they do today) as belonging to a regional social arrangement or band, comprising of closely related families who shared the resources of a specific region (Furniss 1986). Accordingly, the names of bands were patterned on the name of a place with the suffix *–whuten*, meaning “people of” (Kobrinsky 1977; Furniss 1986). However, the bands were not isolated by any means; instead, they were closely linked through a network of trade, kinship, language and culture created and reinforced through travel, intermarriage and reciprocal obligations (Furniss 1986). Terms like “Carrier”, were in actuality generalized labels used by fur traders, missionaries and linguists for grouping together people who seemingly sounded, behaved and lived alike.

---

\(^1\) This designation is believed to have been derived from an old Dakelh practice of widows carrying their husbands’ cremated remains in a pouch on their backs (Poser 1998; Hall 1992; Furniss 1986).
The establishment of new social categories was not of European making alone; given the presence of outsiders in their territory, the Carrier created new ways of identifying themselves to others, using the term, *dakelh* (corrupted into “Tacully”) or the contraction of *‘uda ukelh* (i.e., “people who travel by water in the morning”) to distinguish aboriginals from whites (Furniss 1986).²

*Athapaskan Origins, Coastal Borrowings* ³

Archaeological, ethnographic and linguistic evidence suggest that the origins of Dakelhne trace to parts of Alaska, Yukon and the Northwest Territories, where Northern Athapaskan traditions and languages still prevail. Athapaskan expansion from northwestern North America took place throughout the subarctic forests, the Pacific Coast and the southwestern portion of the United States. There are no definitive interpretations about Athapaskan arrival in central British Columbia (Tobey 1981). Some theories suggest that the migration took place in the Holocene some 9-5,000 years ago following the retreat of the glaciers (Carlson 1997). Others propose that Athapaskans arrived in the British Columbia plateau approximately 600-850 years ago (Donahue 1977). Early Athapaskans were likely foragers and hunter-gatherers, who led a generally mobile way of life and whose social organization was that of patrilocal hunting bands (Morice 1895; Jenness 1943; Donahue 1977; Hudson 1983; Fiske 1987).

² Furniss (1986) states that the modern usage of “Carrier” implies kinship and cultural cohesiveness for people who think of themselves as belonging to a greater Carrier nation. Among Tl’azt’en, “Dakelhne” suggests pan-Carrier rather than pan-indigenous connotations, and has come to replace “Carrier” as the term to describe other peoples in Central British Columbia who share the same linguistic and cultural traits as themselves (see Carrier-Sekani Tribal Council (CSTC) n.d., and Poser 1998). Yinka Dene or Yinka Whut’en is another term that is used as a cover term by Dakelhne for the Athapaskan-speaking people of Central and Northern British Columbia, including peoples like the Sekani and Tahltan (see Poser 1998).

³ It should be acknowledged that this section gives a reconstruction of Dakelh pre-history based on outsiders’ rather than Tl’azt’en perspectives. Therefore, the material presented here should be regarded as a “working” history, to be enriched by Tl’azt’en origin and migration accounts.
Dakelhne relied on thorough understandings of their surroundings in order to survive. Knowledge of the land and its resources were valued over material accumulation, mirrored in Athapaskan subsistence technology, which “depended on artifice rather than artifact” (Ridington 1990:12). When travelling, having the know-how in order to hunt, fish and trap and to construct dwellings, weaponry and tools in unpredictable circumstances and severe conditions was indispensable to survival. Knowledge was regarded as stemming from two systems, *yun* and *dune* (Deborah Page, Tl’azt’en Youth Meeting, 27/02/04), which centred on the learning of utilitarian skills as well as appropriate ceremonial and customary conduct. Children gained this knowledge through fulfilling gender-specified tasks: girls were taught to cook and preserve foods, basketry and other skills to maintain a household; boys learned hunting and fishing techniques and housing, tool and weapon construction (Jenness 1943). Besides the day-to-day survival skills, children were also taught stories and became familiar with their motifs and morals (Jenness 1943). Children learned to connect their present reality to myth time through the medium of the story, as well as through guardian spirit or vision quests and dreams (Furniss 1986; Ridington 1990). In general, these elements formed the rites of passage to adulthood, helping the person to navigate the important aspects of life in a hunting society: understanding the habits of game, adhering to the proper methods of harvesting, observing rituals and taboos, and following etiquette befitting social relations (Jenness 1943). In other words, stories, spirit or vision quests and dreams “drove home [the lessons]” (Jenness 1943:522) and helped individuals to place themselves within the community, and within the physical environment that sustained the community.

---

4 Jenness (1943) following the Bulkley River Carrier dialect, gives *geretn’e* and *gidet’e* as the systems of secular and religious knowledge.
Coastal enculturation took place at some point to reflect a blend of Athapaskan and Northwest coastal customs in social organization (Ives 1990). In the case of the central Dakelhne, coastal enculturation is thought to have come about as an appendage to, rather than a replacement of, the basic paternal group structure of the bands. The matrilineal system, a vestige of coastal influence that still plays a role in Tl’azt’en culture, is said to “function solely in the area comparable to a social welfare system, i.e., the potlatch system” (Walker 1974: 380), without significant alteration to the basic Athapaskan identity of Tl’azt’enne.

Over time, the ancestors of present-day Tl’azt’enne, typical of central and northern Dakelhne bands, became gradually less mobile, established permanent villages at lake outlets and led an increasingly sedentary lifestyle due to the steady availability of salmon (Carlson 1997; Furniss 1986). With a dependable food source came an increase in population, which encouraged clusters of villages along the salmon-rich drainages (Kobrinsky 1977). Villages located at the furthermost downstream locations had the largest number of inhabitants and an abundant supply of salmon because these locations marked the entryway for spawning salmon. People congregated in the villages from late-summer to mid-fall to harvest salmon and participate in potlatches and other clan ceremonies (Furniss 1986).

The Dakelhne also subsisted on large and small game, berries, roots and other plants, which were harvested after the salmon-fishing season was over. Each family had its own hunting and gathering territory known as the keyoh (Morris 1999; Fiske 1987; Furniss 1986; Hudson 1983). The right to hunt and fish in keyohs could extend to individuals unrelated to members of the families who “owned” the territories. Two social institutions, the balhats (potlatch) and clan systems, regulated rights to resources within the keyoh. Permission had to be sought of keyoh-owning families to hunt and trap within these territories; it was considered a serious infringement if this arrangement was disregarded (Morris 1999). The
balhats was carried out in order to affirm property rights and resource use in the keyoh, in essence acting as a system of balancing credit and debt that renewed alliances between people (Furniss 1986; Morris 1999).

**THE SIGNIFICANCE OF PLACES TO T'I'AZ'T'ENNE AS RELAYED THROUGH DAKELH PLACE-NAMES**

The following discussion centres on eleven works that were examined in this research as part of ascertaining the kinds of published information available on Dakelh place-names. In understanding the significance of the land to Dakelhne, including the role of places in defining their worldview, these works are valuable sources of information on the history, linguistic composition and meanings of toponyms, which indicate how knowledge of places is conveyed through naming, and in this sense, why toponyms are an important part of Dakelh culture.

**Dakelh Place-Names in Father Morice’s Writings**

Undoubtedly, the earliest and most comprehensive records of central Dakelh toponymy comes from the works of (Father) Adrien Gabriel Morice, O.M.I. His *Au Pays de L’ours Noir- Chez les Sauvages de Colombie Britannique (In the Land of the Black Bear- Among the Natives of British Columbia)* (1897), *History of the Northern Interior of British Columbia* (1978 [1904]), *British Columbia Maps and Place-Names* (1907), *The Carrier Language* (1932), and *Carrier Onomatology* (1933) all contain references to Dakelh place-names. The names appearing in *History of the Northern Interior of British Columbia* (1978) are those of settlements and villages, sites of battles, trading posts and fishing stations and even some pre-contact locations of Dakelh trade with coastal indigenous groups like the Tsimshian.
Explanations of the significance of names are found sporadically throughout the book, as in the case of the legend of Nak’al and the abundance of fish that the river Yokogh brings to the village of Portage (Morice 1978). Likewise, *In the Land of the Black Bear* (1897), which details Morice’s overland travels into central British Columbia, includes descriptions of lakes, rivers and mountains and their names as well as the harvesting techniques his Dakelh companions used. In this work, Morice teaches that the indigenous place-names are illustrative and functional and that generally, places are not named after people. An example is the name Ukwe-ses-nè-re-thel-krèh-nu [Oogwususneghetelgehnoo] (“island over which the black bear uses to escape us”) (Morice 1897: 295-296), a prominently-sized island in a lake that eventually came to be called Morice Lake. The meaning of the name of the island hints at its enormity, in the sense that it is so large that a bear can effectively hide itself from hunters, and warns of the difficulty of bear-hunting on the island.

Morice took an interest in Dakelh toponymy because it assisted in his explorations and mapping of Dakelh country. He also found that place-names offered clues to understanding the intricacies of the Dakelh language and the ways Dakelhne perceived their natural surroundings. *The Carrier Language* (1932), which Morice regarded as his *magnum opus*, refers to place-names for the purpose of explicating the linguistic composition of Dakelh words. He discussed how Dakelh, like other indigenous languages of the Americas, is principally a “concretizing and particularizing idiom” (Morice 1932: 95), and pointed to place-names as an expression of this quality. While place-names are classified as proper nouns in English, they differ conceptually in Dakelh. The names of places, like those of stellar constellations, animals and plants, were explained, as being personified, the condition of which is reflected in the existence of toponyms as verbal nouns in the language. To put it another way, Dakelh place-names contain the “verbs of locomotion” (Morice 1932:95), used
also to describe human action, and therefore have the ability of portraying places as they appear to the eye. Morice gave several examples that demonstrates that Dakelh place-names are far from being “still-life” or “in stasis” descriptions of places: Na-zkhoh ([Nazkoh] or Nazko or Blackwater River) = across-river; Yûtsû ([Yoodsoo] or Cambie Lake) = way down towards the water; Łtha-khoh ([Lhdhakoh] or Lhtakoh or Fraser River) = one within another-river; Ni-tcah-khoh ([Nicahkoh] or Nichahkoh or Nechako River) = rear-down against-river (Morice 1932:59-60).

In Carrier Onomatology (1933) and British Columbia Maps and Place Names (1907), Morice gave further details about the meanings and linguistic characteristics of Carrier place-names and geographical terms. Of interest are the three study place-names that are described in Carrier Onomatology: Thès-sra-pen ([Tessghabun] or Tesgha or Pinchi Lake), Ṝez-khoh ([K’uz koh] or Kuzkwa River) and Tces-ra-ñ-pen ([Chusghangbun] or Chuzghun or Tezzeron Lake) (1933: 647-648). While the meanings of the first two names are uncertain, the third name is evocative of travelling on water. According to Morice, the name’s constituent parts translate literally as “paddle after lake” or Paddle Lake (1933:648). A discussion of geographical terms or the referents in place-names also appears in both these publications, five of which are found in the study place-names: cœs or yœs ([shus] or [yus], meaning a wooded knoll or crest of hills), tzæl ([dzulh], meaning mountain above timberline), t’ la ([tl’a] or tl’at, meaning extremity or lake end furthest from outlet), thiztli ([tizdli], meaning the end of the lake nearest to outlet or outlet itself), khol ([koh], meaning river or stream) and peñren ([bunghun], meaning lake) (Morice 1902:50-52; 1933:653, incl. Footnote 66). The first and last geographical terms deserve a little more explanation as they can change form when becoming a part of place-names. Cœs [shus] and yœs [yus] are allomorphs of the word for knoll or an elongated chain of hills. The former is used as a word in its own right (i.e., as
a word in a sentence), while the latter is used in toponymic compounds (Morice 1902; Poser 1998). Lake names can contain the whole term, *peñren [bunghun]*, as in Tsa- peñ- ren [Tsa bunghun] or variants of the term, *peñ [bun]* and - *ren [-ghun]*. *Peñ [bun]* can only be used in a compound with other words to achieve full meaning as in *bun-kut*, which signifies a locative idea (Morice 1933:647, 653), that is, a particular part of a lake or the area surrounding a lake, as opposed to the lake proper. In toponyms, *peñ [bun]* emerges at the very end. The suffix –*ren [-ghun]*, although appearing at the end of lake names, functions as a postposition that suggests “proximity, reference and connection” and supersedes the noun *peñ [bun]* (Morice 1933:647). Stuart Lake or Na-ḳal-ren [Nak’alghun], for instance, differs from other lakes through its proximity to and metaphorical association with Na-ḳal ([Nak’al] or Mount Pope).

**Dakelh Place-Names in the Works of Steward, Kobrinsky, and Akrigg and Akrigg**

Other than their linguistic significance, as exemplified by the works of Morice, place-names have been of interest to anthropologists studying Dakelh land use patterns and social organization. Julian Steward, who carried out field research on Dakelhne of Stuart Lake in the 1940s, studied the transformation of the basic Dakelh social unit from loosely-characterized hunting bands to the hierarchical potlatch-rank system. Steward’s focus was on how such change had influenced the group’s notions of territoriality in such a way that extended family-owned tracts of land or *keyohs* came to be under the control of individual or nuclear families. In his field notes (c.1940), there is a list of Dakelh villages and camps on Stuart, Pinchi and Tezzeron lakes. Accompanying these place-names are annotations concerning their meaning, the resources found at the sites, permanent and temporary settlements, camps and the official names of these places (where none existed, brief
explanations were given as to what the Dakelh names of these places designated) (Steward c.1940). Names of stream mouths and lake outlets constitute the majority of toponyms on the list, which hints at the locations of hunting and gathering territories along shores of creeks or lakes, terminating at head of lakes or the headwaters of creeks. Although place-names do not figure, as such, in his publications, it is plausible that Steward used them in connection with data on resource harvesting and the seasonal mobility of people in tracing the change from mutual to exclusive land tenure among the Stuart Lake Dakelhne. 5

Vernon Kobrinsky’s *The Tsimshianization of the Carrier Indians* (1977) is also focussed on reconstruction of Dakelh social history and contains some discussion of names in relation to the sept6 system. For example, Nak’azdli and Tache, the largest villages on Stuart Lake each comprise a sept, the members of which are called *Nag azdliy hwideyniy* and *Thace hwideyniy*, respectively (Kobrinsky 1977:204). Being the most productive salmon harvesting locations, these downstream-located villages are also those with the largest number of

---

5 With the establishment of the registered trapline system, a mechanism for administrating fur harvesting, in 1926, the boundaries of *keyohs* were inscribed within the government’s province-wide land management system (Morris 1999: 45-46). Under this new system in which Dakelh territory was divided between white and indigenous ownership, Dakelhne were allotted areas that partly covered their original *keyohs* (Fiske 1987: 195). Through the registered trapline system, *keyoh* lands, originally based on usufruct, were turned into “commodities for purchase and sale”, thereby, altering the Dakelh traditional land use system (Fiske 1987: 195). This change is embodied in the contemporary synonymous use of “keyoh” and “trapline” among Tl’azt’ennee, signifying the recognition of *keyohs* based on the limits of people’s registered traplines (Morris 1997: 47). It could be further argued that changes brought about by the registered trapline system to Dakelh land tenure were in fact preceded by those that took place in the days of the fur trade. Fiske (1987: 188-189) notes the emergence, during the fur trade, of “clan” or “company” lines, which were shared by members of a phratry. Controlled by male phratry leaders, these trapping lines intersected *keyoh* territories and were devoted to fur production for commercial trade (Fiske 1987: 188). Essentially, “clan” or “company” lines demonstrate the shift from a primarily subsistence-oriented economy to one involving a mixed subsistence-commercial economy that, in turn, induced changes in the land use, settlement and lifestyle patterns of Dakelhne.

6 Agglutinative to languages like Chilcotin and Sekani, Dakelh is a language with considerable dialectical variation. The main dialects of the language are: northern (Babine), central (Upper) and southern (Lower), with further sub-dialects existing in each dialect group (Ives1990). Septs are defined as groups of villages sharing a standard dialect that is spoken with a degree of variation depending on region (Tobey 1981). For example, the central Dakelh villages of Nak’azdli, Tache, Binche, K’uzche (Grand Rapids), Yekkoche (Portage) and Dzitl’ainli (Middle River) each speak a sub-dialect of the uniform version of Dakelh that is trans-intelligible to all six villages.
members (Kobrinsky 1977). The life-giving quality of places is monumentalized through place-names that acknowledge the rivers, creeks and lakes that connect, nourish and define people (Kobrinsky 1977). It is in this sense that sept nomenclature and geographical nomenclature are inseparable.

Several Dakelh or Dakelh–originated place-names are featured in Philip Akrigg and Helen Akrigg’s *British Columbia Place Names* (1997). This book, published in various editions, includes about 2,500 alphabetically-arranged entries explaining the names of the geographical features, cities and towns of British Columbia. Where applicable, the authors point out derivations from indigenous words in the place-names and supply the meanings, although the sources of such information are not outwardly stated. They likely do not come from indigenous informants. A look through the Philip and Helen Akrigg fonds at the University of British Columbia digitized archival collections (UBC n.d.) reveals the prolific series of secondary source materials such as articles, maps, correspondence and reports that were used in the authors’ research into the history of British Columbia. Two of the study place-names, Pinchi Lake and Tezzeron Lake, appear in *British Columbia Place Names*: the background for both names includes a simple description of location (e.g. north of Fort St. James), a statement that these names stem from Carrier Indian words or names, and an explanation of their meanings (Tezzeron Lake is from the Carrier word that means “moulting lake” or where ducks and geese moult; Pinchi Lake is a Carrier place-name which means “lake outlet”). For Pinchi Lake, there are brief explanations about the place-name’s history: the name was already known as early as 1811 and recorded as “Pinchy” in the journals of Daniel Harmon, a fur trader with the Northwest Company and one of the first Europeans ever to settle in Dakelh country. Another fragment of history relates Morice’s intention to change
the place-name from Pinchi Lake to Rey Lake, which was, in the end, foiled by a decision from Victoria to maintain the Indian name (Akrigg and Akirgg 1997).

Dakelh Place-Names in the Works of the Carrier Linguistic Committee, Nak’azdli First Nation, Hall and Poser

A number of works by Dakelhne themselves, or in cooperation with linguists, exist on their culture-history and language. In 1974, with research support from the Summer Institute of Linguistics, the Carrier Linguistic Committee (CLC), a group of Nak’azdli and Tl’azt’en language and cultural educators, produced a booklet of Dakelh place-names and maps called Central Carrier Country. The toponyms in the book are those of the general, more major or noticeable landforms found in the Nak’azdli and Tl’azt’en traditional territories. Although the focus is broad and on widely-known geographical features, the work is the first modern compilation of Dakelh place-names since Morice’s publications. The spellings of place-names in the booklet follow the CLC writing system, a phonemic roman orthography developed as a standardized means for documenting central Dakelh dialects. Four maps found at the end of the booklet represent the territories of the main central Dakelh groups: Nak’azdli, Tache, Binche, Yekooche (Portage), K’uzche and Dzitl’ainli. Place-names on these maps are also listed alphabetically by category (mountains, islands, etc.), conveniently allowing for identification of such as the presence of common root words, prefixes and

7 After Fr. Achille Rey, who was the Oblate Assistant Superior General during Morice’s years as a priest in Stuart Lake (“Correspondence, 1956, with G.S. Andrews regarding the names of Fr. Morice’s maps which are Oblate names” by Gaston Carrierre, O.M.I. Tl’azt’en Natural Resources Office Collections).

8 Morice was determined to do away with the indigenous names of places that were already part of common usage in his time because he thought that the anglicized forms of these names (created by provincial geological survey authorities) were erroneous and so far distorted from the original names to the point that they sounded ridiculous. This was often the reason given by him for striving to have these names replaced by the names of notable individuals of his era, specifically his Oblate superiors, contemporaries and friends. Morice was bitter about the province’s decision to keep the Indian names on the map; see his invectives against this move in his 1905 and 1933 papers. For a list of names proposed by Morice and juxtaposed with the official map names of places in the northern interior of British Columbia, see T.P. Jost (1907).
suffixes. For instance, only Stuart Lake’s island names are listed in the booklet, but they proffer an interesting observation about the way they are named and where they are distributed. Out of a total of 17 island names, nine end with noo (the Dakelh word for island), five begin with noo, two have no reference to noo in their constructions, and one has the term cho attached to noo, as its ending. Looking on the map, islands with noo at the end of their names are generally distributed throughout the lake, whereas those with noo at the start of their names seem concentrated around points where rivers or creeks converge with the lake. Such patterns yield clues as to why places carry the names they do as well as their economic and cultural significance. The booklet lists 101 toponyms: 19 mountains, 17 islands, 53 lakes and 12 rivers. Four of the study toponyms are included: Chuzghun, Tesgha, K’uz Koh and K’azyuş.

Place-names are encountered also in people’s recollections of the past, as communicated orally and re-told in writing. In her book, The Carrier, My People (1992), Lizette Hall describes the customs and subsistence lifestyle of Dakelhne as well as the events marking the establishment of European power in Dakelh lands through the fur trade, establishment of Catholic missions, and the residential school system. Place-names are mentioned throughout the book in conjunction with the clan or phratry system, legends, the locations of pre-contact village sites,⁹ past episodes such as massacres and the travels of chiefs, and travel and trading routes. Of special interest is Hall’s description of the traditional Dakelh livelihood, which contains information about the importance of geographical features such as islands, river mouths and lake outlets in the subsistence activities of fishing and netting waterfowl. The types of harvesting technology employed at particular sites rely on

⁹ According to Hall (1992), the two lakes of the study area, Tezzeron Lake and Pinchi Lake, were among eleven locations that served as ancient village bases.
factors such as the volume of water, velocity of the flow and consistency of the river or lakebed. Such information allows an understanding of the significance of place-names as markers of a site’s utility, including the conditions that contribute to its worth.

In 2001, Nak’azdli First Nation published a booklet, *Nak’azdli t’enne Yahulduk* (*Nak’azdli Elders Speak*), consisting of elder life histories and a glossary of Dakelh terms, personal names and place-names used in each biography. The biography of Betsy Leon, in particular, was of interest as it contains information on the study area, and offers insight into how places acquire their names. Leon’s reminiscences centre on the seasonal subsistence round that entailed extensive travel and knowledge of harvesting and food preservation techniques. Her stories also bring to life the people who once trapped, hunted and fished in particular places, and through her recollections of places, people and events, a picture of the past emerges that highlights the importance of the mountains, lakes and rivers to the survival of Dakelhne. The place-names mentioned in Leon’s biography are often accompanied by gloss translations that aid in classifying the names. For instance, Sai-tel (“wide sand bar”), No Hair Island (named as such due to a general absence of trees), and Lhezdulk’un (“red dirt”) mirror the appearance of the places they mark. Alternatively, toponyms like Khasghaila (“fireweed”), Lhotsuli (“small fish spawn”, referring to pea-mouth whitefish), and Tesgha (“resting area for birds”) reflect the preponderance of certain plant and animal species in places. There also exist place-names that act as landmarks or signposts, guiding people to other, perhaps more significant places like the oronyms (mountain names), Beti (“beneath it there’s a road”), and Lhodudul (“fish spawning”). In some cases, it is possible that place-names carry symbolic or historical associations such as the oronyms, Udzi (“heart”) and Duneza’ (“nobleman”) (Nak’azdli First Nation 2001). These names and their translations allow a glimpse into the types of geographical features that are named, and the knowledge
that place-names unveil about the places they designate as well as the people who coined them.

A total of 157 place-names are found in *Nak’albun/Dzinghubun Whut’en Bughuni* (*Stuart/Trembleur Lake Carrier Lexicon* (1998)), the most recent version of a bilingual dictionary for the Stuart-Trembleur dialect. Dr. William Poser, the linguist who worked on assembling the dictionary, began the project with primarily grammatical questions in mind. Although his initial plans did not include the compilation of a dictionary, it arose as a by-product of the research material generated for the original project on Dakelh grammar (Poser, pers. comm., 24/10/04). Material for the dictionary comes from Morice’s writings, the *Central Carrier Bilingual Dictionary* (CLC 1974), *Nak’albun Whudakelhne Bughuni* (Yinka Dene Language Institute (YDLI) and CLC 1991) and interviews with several native Dakelh speakers. Place-names were included in the lexicon along with other kinds of cultural information such as the medicinal use of plants and personal names (those of distinctively Dakelh origin or borrowed from French or English). Such accommodations were made in the dictionary because it is the only available repository, at present, for such information (Poser, pers. comm., 24/10/04).

Dictionary entries for toponyms contain a description of location (including proximity and connection to other physiographic features), official and popular (unofficial) names, and on occasion, comments about etymology, folk interpretations and pronunciation. The most designated geographical features in the dictionary appear to be lakes, followed by islands, mountains and rivers. Thirty-three of the 157 place-names are accompanied by etymologies, indicating that their meanings and linguistic constructions have been verified by Tl’azt’en and Nak’azdli community language experts. The information provided on the place-names in the dictionary is useful in understanding the fine details of Dakelh toponymy. When studying
the list of place-names, it becomes apparent that many locally-used (unofficial) or popular names of places are either translations or transliterations of the original indigenous names. For instance, the Dakelh toponyms, Chuntsi Noo (“fir island”), Tsabunghun (“beaver lake”) and Dunih Noo (“kinnikinik island”) have English counterparts (or words borrowed into English such as “kinnikinik”, which is of Algonquian origin), by which they are commonly known, that exactly reflect their translations. Other Dakelh place-names like Tootibun or Tooti, Ts’azcheh and Chuzghun have been borrowed into English and their sounds respectively transliterated (and indeed transformed) into the anglicized forms, Chuchi Lake, Kazchek Lake and Tezzeron Lake. Other interesting patterns concerning Dakelh toponymy emerge by way of place-name referents. Oronyms, for example, seem to typically contain the terms, tse (“rock”), ti (“great”), dzulh (“mountain”), shus (“knoll”) or yus (the allomorph of shus that appears in compounded forms of place-names), as in Lhole Tse (no allogenous name), Sedlo Ti (no allogenous name), Nih Dzulh (no allogenous name), Shus Nadloh (Mount Milligan) and K’azyuš (Pinchie\textsuperscript{10} Mountain). As seen in earlier examples, not all place-names have referents indicative of the physiographic features represented. Some examples of toponyms that do not possess referents are Nak’al (Mount Pope), Tesgha (Pinchi Lake) and Tuseda (Tusayda Lake). However, some modern forms of these original place-names affix referents to the names, reflecting perhaps the influence of English place-naming conventions (Poser, pers. comm., 24/10/04). For instance, Nak’al is now alluded to as Nak’al Dzulh, and Tesgha, as Tesghabun. Further examples of changes in names lie in how referents are altered in terms of sound (and not meaning), as observed in the names, Nak’alghun

\textsuperscript{10} Poser (1998) uses two other spellings of this name, Pinchi and Binche, in the lexicon. Binche is used to designate the village of Binche, and is also (supposedly) the folk name for Pinchi Lake. Pinchie and Pinchi are used for the purpose of differentiating between two similarly-sounding place-names that occur in two separate locations: Pinchie Mountain (K’azyuš) situated in between Pinchi and Tezzeron lakes, and Pinchi Mountain (Betsen Dzulh), along the southern shores of Pinchi Lake, in the area between Stuart Lake and Pinchi Lake.
(Stuart Lake), Nak’azdlung (outlet of Stuart River, where the village of Nak’azdli is located) and Nak’azlunkoh (Stuart River). The suffixes of these names have fallen into disuse and have been replaced by other forms, so that they are now known as Nak’albun, Nak’azdli and Nak’alkoh (Poser 1998).

Other than an opportunity to learn about Dakelh place-name trends, such as those discussed above, the dictionary also provides insight into a difference of Dakelh place-names, which are rarely dedicatory of people. As exceptions, Jenicho Noo and Sisulk’ut are examples of place-names that commemorate the elders who were once associated with these places.

Other than an opportunity to learn about Dakelh place-name trends, such as those discussed above, the dictionary also provides insight into a difference of Dakelh place-names, which are rarely dedicatory of people. Several names are, in fact, nominalizations of verbs, which convey a sense of vivacity. This characteristic, explored earlier in review of Morice’s findings on Dakelh place-names, is worth illustrating further here, as names embody the distinctive quality of communicating a complete thought (which sometimes covers quite elaborate information) in just two words: Ts’ulh Yalhduk (“helldiver speaks”), Duk’ai Džtì (“trout are expensive/ important”) and Sustunk’ut Nusuy (meaning “a bear walked about on the ice”) (Poser 1998). While these are instances of place-names that are based on nominalized verbs, the difference in tense between the first two names and the third is noteworthy. The past tense in the third place-name may indicate a happening of historic significance, perhaps an exceptional event (as in the improbability of bears being active in the middle of winter) (Morris Joseph, CURA Place-Names Information Session (CPNIS), 13/05/04).

REGAINING PLACE, LANGUAGE AND IDENTITY

Despite the incursions of government, missionaries, homesteaders and industry into their territory, Tl’azt’enne have managed to negotiate a place for themselves in their territory (Morris 1999). Appeals to the government for more reserve land or to exchange existing
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11 As exceptions, Jenicho Noo and Sisulk’ut are examples of place-names that commemorate the elders who were once associated with these places.
reserves for more productive and valuable parcels of land, the launching of blockades and protests, seeking compensation for loss of land and livelihood due to infrastructure development, securing timber rights through a Tree Farm Licence and the creation of community economic development options summarize the strategies that have been employed by Tl’azt’enne to increase their land rights and to compel the government to recognize their aboriginal rights and title (Morris 1999). Since the rise of native activism in the 1960s and 1970s, aboriginal groups have identified self-government as the basis for restoring and prolonging their cultures, traditional governance systems as well as their sense of identity and worth (see McGregor 2000). To achieve control of their own affairs, Tl’azt’enne have identified land, culture and education as the most critical components of rebuilding their community (see Tl’azt’en Nation n.d. b; CSTC 2006). The Treaty Negotiations Process Tl’azt’enne are presently involved in is based on the realization of these self-determining components in the areas of health, social welfare programmes, housing, economic development, conservation and ownership of natural resources, and education.

Two primary means of achieving cultural continuity are being explored by Tl’azt’enne: native language maintenance and the integration of native language and culture in education (Tl’azt’en Nation n.d. b). Tl’azt’enne have been involved in language and cultural maintenance activities through the YDLI and the Chuntoh Education Society (Chuntoh). The YDLI represents speakers of Carrier and Sekani, and operates in collaboration with government, tribal councils, schools and universities to address the issues of native language revival, maintenance, documentation, teaching and curriculum development (YDLI, Current Projects n.d.). For instance, the Stuart-Trembleur lexicon project marks an important step in mapping the consistencies and changes in Dakelh grammar, usage, personal names and toponyms over time, and is of considerable value in
terms of the lexicon serving as a means of preserving the Nak’azdli and Tl’azt’en dialects in written form. The YDLI also serves as a depository of linguistic and historical information on tape (YDLI, Current Projects 2004). For example, Dakelh language materials produced by the CLC (with funding from the Summer Institute of Linguistics) in the 1970s are held by YDLI office in Vanderhoof, B.C. (Catherine Coldwell, pers. comm., 20/05/04). These materials offer a sample of the pioneering work undertaken jointly by Dakelh speakers and linguists to record and teach the Dakelh language.

Whereas the YDLI was founded by the CSTC and is an umbrella organization representing Carrier and Sekani speakers, Chuntoh specifically addresses Tl’azt’en needs in research and education. Like JPRF, Chuntoh is jointly managed by Tl’azt’en Nation and UNBC, and is governed by a Board of Directors with representation from these parties as well as School District 91. Concerned with promoting and supporting environmental education and cultural research, Chuntoh oversees outdoor experience programmes that combine TEK and conventional science concepts (Chuntoh Education Society pamphlet n.d.). A major project undertaken by Chuntoh is the running of *Yunk’ut Whe Ts’o Dul’eh*, the outdoor culture-based science camp programme offered to three local aboriginal schools and two local non-aboriginal elementary schools.

**Yunk’ut Whe Ts’o Dul’eh**

As with other aboriginal communities across Canada, Tl’azt’en Nation has recognized the crucial need to educate its children in the knowledge, language and values of their ancestors. In 1995, Tl’azt’en Nation identified “[Tl’azt’en] culture and language [as] the fundamental building block for [their] future and survival as a Nation” (Tl’azt’en Nation 1995). In determining the means to ensure that Tl’azt’en culture and language learning continue among
younger Tl’ażt’enne, Tl’ażt’en Nation identified the need for the Dakelh oral tradition and the connection of culture and language learning to seasonal activities related to land and water as essential parts of developing a Tl’ażt’en-centred education (Tl’ażt’en Nation 1995). This need was put into motion through increased efforts in incorporating the Dakelh language and culture in the curricula of both the Eugene Joseph School and the Tache Educational Centre. However, to bridge the gap between educating Tl’ażt’en children and youth in their culture and language, and motivating them to complete their basic education and pursue post-secondary education, especially in the sciences and natural resource management, an on-the-land programme was envisioned by Tl’ażt’en Nation as an opportunity for cultural and scientific education in the context of the land.

In 2002, Chuntoh was established to address the need for an outdoor education programme that combines science and TEK. As part of its goal of promoting cross-cultural learning and stimulating interest in environmental studies, Chuntoh commissioned the development of the Yunk’ut Whe Ts’o Dul’eh outdoor culture-based science camp programme. The programme consists of five modules based on the Dakelh seasonal round, which integrates TEK, technologies and subsistence activities with western science concepts and methods (Mitchell 2003). Offering hands-on learning activities targeted at Grades 5 and 6 students, the programme incorporates the British Columbia Ministry of Education’s Prescribed Learning Outcomes for Science and Technology Studies (K-12). The topic content of each module offers a rationale, learning objectives, a list of suggested activities and resources, and corresponding grade-appropriate science skills that are addressed through the learning activities. For instance, Module 1, Dak’et (Fall), introduces learners to the activities traditionally carried out by Tl’ażt’enne during this season: the movement from summer fishing camps to keyohs; subsistence activities engaged in during this season such as
fishing, trapping, and the gathering of berries and other edible plants; and the instruction and training of youngsters by means of legends and stories, and through practical experience involving observing and tracking wildlife and manoeuvring a canoe. These traditional Dakelh activities serve as a basis for introducing conventional science topics such as ecology and species adaptation and interaction as well as the rituals associated with harvesting observed by generations of Tl’azt’enne (Mitchell 2003).

With funding from the First Nations Education Steering Committee in 2003, the Dak’et (Fall) and Khit (Winter) modules of Yunk’ut Whe Ts’o Dul’eh were trialled with the participation of school children from Tl’azt’en Nation, Nak’azdli First Nation and Yekooche First Nation. Since then, Chuntoh has received funding from Promo-Science, a National Science and Engineering Council of Canada programme, for further development and implementation of Yunk’ut Whe Ts’o Dul’eh (Sherry and Leon 2005). With ongoing financial support, the outdoor culture-based science camp programme can realize its long-term objectives of increasing the participation of elders and other cultural role models in the running of the programme, training and employing community members in delivering programme modules, encouraging greater cross-cultural learning through the inclusion of non-indigenous students in the programme, and promoting indigenous students with an exceptional interest in science in local environmental and monitoring projects. A critical means of realizing particularly the last goal is by building into the Yunk’ut Whe Ts’o Dul’eh programme a love for the land and a Dakelh sense of place, which can be accomplished through teaching students the indigenous toponymy of their territory. This study, through demonstrating the potential of Dakelh place-names in educating about language, oral history and the land, points to the importance of the land in giving Tl’azt’enne a sense of cultural
identity and belonging. This understanding of self is crucial for success in all aspects of life, and carries immense implications in educating culturally and for individual empowerment.

CONCLUSION

Land is an indispensable part of life for Tl’azt’enne. Today, Tl’azt’enne are active participants in protecting what remains of their traditional territory and have entered into treaty negotiations as a means of defining their future. The land remains the basis of Tl’azten existence: people continue to depend on the land for subsistence, to define themselves, to communicate and to remember. Given that places on the land form a central part of the Dakelh worldview, it is explicable that Tl’azt’enne see themselves as stewards of the land, and their future defined through a greater role in maintaining their culture and way of life by active participation in all aspects of life, the foremost being education. To carry on teaching future generations about what it means to be Tl’azt’enne, places on the land must continue to exist. Without a land base, the power to self-determine, to find in indigenous language and culture the resources for building self-esteem and a positive indigenous identity, is undermined.

The next chapter will present the methodology employed in this study. The chapter will outline the steps taken in working with Tl’azt’en Nation to compile and comprehend Dakelh toponymic knowledge. The process of developing guidelines for the application of this knowledge in the Yunk’ut Whe Ts’o Dul’eh culture-based science camp programme will also be explained in Chapter Three.
Chapter Three: RESEARCH WITH TL’AZT’EN NATION: A COLLABORATION IN PLACE-NAMES RESEARCH

INTRODUCTION

Collaborative or cross-cultural research is a process whereby power is shared in the creation and validation of knowledge (Gibbs 2001). When academics and indigenous groups choose to collaborate, not only are scholarly interpretations enriched to provide a broader perspective of the issues under study; the opportunity for indigenous values, attitudes and practices to be brought to “the centre” is also engendered through such a partnership (Tuhiwai Smith 1999: 125). In late 2003, I was presented with an opportunity for collaborative research when UNBC was awarded a five-year Social Science and Humanities Research Council grant, the Community-University Research Alliance (CURA). The project, “Partnering for Sustainable Resource Management”, involves four research streams, defined by the Tl’azt’en as critical to their community sustainability: improved forest co-management, eco-tourism, science/environmental education and TEK (Tl’azt’en Nation & UNBC CURA 2005).

This chapter describes the toponymy research that I undertook as part of the Perpetuation of Tl’azt’en Ecological Knowledge or TEK stream of the CURA project. The methods employed in researching and documenting Dakelh toponymic information as well as the steps followed in applying this information will be discussed in this chapter. As a major objective of the research conducted under the TEK stream is for Tl’azt’en Nation to gather and transmit their cultural and ecological knowledge to all Tl’azt’enne, this chapter also serves as a guide for what to expect in terms of the opportunities and challenges of place-
names research, and offers a model for collecting, analyzing and interpreting place-names, which could prove beneficial for future work on indigenous place-names.

THE RESEARCH PROCESS

*Collaborative Research with Tl’atz’en Nation*

Fieldwork entails a “betweeness of place” (Perramond 2001: 154), much uncertainty and sites of inquiry that are artificial in the sense that “the field” becomes dislocated from physical space and the flow of time through the act of marking boundaries, of ascertaining “in” and “out” (Katz 1994:67). While a totally *emic* perspective is unattainable in research, an informed *etic* perspective is possible if the researcher is aware of her/his own historical, gendered, political and cultural “situatedness” (Denzin and Lincoln 2000; Grenier 2000; Fair 1997; Baxter and Eyles 1996; Katz 1994). As an outsider, belonging to a different culture, I was aware that the study I was carrying out could be biased by my own perceptions of how landscapes are perceived by the study community, the significance of certain landscape features and ways of interpreting place-name information. Throughout the research, I remained vigilant of how such bias can influence the way data collection instruments are designed, which in turn influences responses (Dunn 2000). With the understanding of how, in the past, research conducted in certain communities has had an adverse impact on people, becoming a means to repress and victimize (Gibbs 2001; Denzin and Lincoln 2000), this study tried to maintain transparency in all stages of its inquiry. Throughout the fieldwork, I provided weekly reports to the CURA TEK Stream Tl’atz’en Leader Beverly Bird. This practice was an essential communication tool, and was circulated among a panel of elders assigned to my project (see below) as well as Tl’atz’enne working on genealogy, education
and place-names. In this way, the reports gave community members an opportunity to offer comments and corrections.

To ensure that the study included and fairly represented Tl’azt’en perspectives, an atmosphere of openness regarding the kinds of information that were being collected, the goals of the research and how the study could prove beneficial to the community was maintained throughout the research. Particularly during the fieldwork, it was possible for community members to question, scrutinize and offer suggestions concerning aspects of the research that were either of interest or concern to them. My draft thesis was also made available for review by Ms. Bird, Deborah Page (then CURA Science/Environmental Education Stream Tl’azt’en leader) and Beverly Leon (CURA Community Coordinator).

Selection of Dakelh Toponyms to Research

In keeping with the principles of community-based research (Gibbs 2001; Battiste and Henderson 2000; Grenier 1998; Tuhiwai Smith 1999; Hart 1995; Johnson 1992), of significant importance was conducting the study under the direction of the Tl’azt’en community. The research methods and procedures, developed in adherence to protocol outlined in the *Tl’azt’en Nation Guidelines for Research in Tl’azt’en Territory* (Tl’azt’en Nation n.d. a,) were approved by both the UNBC Research Ethics Board (see Appendix 1) and Tl’azt’en Nation Chief and Council (Band Council Resolution no. 0520). To ensure community participation in the planning, execution and evaluation stages of the research, the idea of striking a steering committee made up of community elders and researchers was proposed by Beverly Bird. The function of the committee was intended as being two-fold: to choose the most suitable place-names for the study towards their incorporation into the *Yunk’ut Whe Ts’o Dul’eh* programme as well as to provide advice as the research proceeded.
However, due to time and logistical constraints, Ms. Bird took on the responsibility of selecting the toponyms to be researched. This alteration in plans worked out well given Ms. Bird’s long-time involvement in Tl’azt’en cultural and treaty research and her lead role in the TEK stream of the CURA project.\(^1\) Ms. Bird was actively involved in disseminating information and seeking feedback about the place-names project, and was thus in regular contact with community elders and other cultural experts.

One criterion used by Ms. Bird in selecting the toponyms was relative location: the practical consideration of the proximity of the named places to where the *Yunk’ut Whe Ts’o Dul’eh* programme is held each year so that children who participate in this culture-based science camp programme can visit or at least see these places from where the camp is based. Hence, toponyms were chosen from within the John Prince Research Forest (JPRF) land base, the venue of the *Yunk’ut Whe Ts’o Dul’eh* programme. Another criterion used by Ms. Bird was the physiographic or cultural-use descriptiveness of place-names. Several types of watercourses, for example, were chosen because segments of their names inform as to the direction of the flow of water. Place-names based on the types of resources found on or near named features provided a third criterion. With these criteria in mind, Ms. Bird chose a total of nine\(^2\) place-names from within and adjacent to the JPRF for my study: two lakes (Pinchi and Tezzeron Lakes), one mountain (Pinchi Mountain), one island (no English or French

---

\(^1\) It would be interesting to know how the suite of study toponyms would have differed if the steering committee had chosen the place-names. However, given Tl’azt’en Nation’s determination to select the place-names for the study, it is understandable that the choice was in the end made by a community member, Ms. Bird, who is a geographer by training and who is well-versed in place-names research.

\(^2\) It should be noted that a trail was initially chosen by Ms. Bird; however, it was eventually omitted from the set of study toponyms because of the absence of knowledge, among interview participants, of its presence, exact whereabouts and name. A promontory on the western portion of Tezzeron Lake was substituted for the trail but this place was also unfamiliar to interview participants, name- as well as use-wise, and thereby, eliminated from the set of place-names.
name), two creeks (Hatudatehl Creek and Tezzeron Creek), two lake outlets (no English or French names) and one river (Kuzkwa River).  

**Extant Sources of Dakelh Toponymic Information**

Over the years, Tl’azt’enne have performed several studies either concerning or involving place-names. The band has built a *Tl’azt’en Nation Place-Names Database*, stemming from projects authorized and conducted by the band. The *Tl’azt’en Place-Names Study* (1996) and the *Tl’azt’en Place-Names Project* (2003) were specifically carried out to document Dakelh toponymy, the former concentrating on areas generally throughout the traditional territory, and the latter, the Stuart-Trembleur Lakes region. Two broader studies conducted by the Tl’azt’en Nation Treaty office— the *Elders’ Interviews* (1984-1995) and the *Tl’azt’en Traditional Use Study* (TUS) (1998-1999)— produced some documentation of Dakelh place-names in the context of mapping land use and occupancy and elders’ life histories. A project carried out under the auspices of the YDLI to compile a Dakelh language lexicon in 1994 involved verifying some of Carrier place-names culled from the works of the Oblate missionary, Adrien Gabriel Morice, and the recording of additional place-names in interviews with Dakelh speakers. Other than these projects, maps created by the CSTC such as the *Carrier- Sekani Territory Southern Section* (1995) and the *Tl’azt’en Nation Traditional Territory* maps (2004) also make up sources of Dakelh place-names and their locations.

As a substantial collection of place-names from within Tl’azt’enne traditional territory has already been undertaken, my thesis research focussed on verification and content analysis

---

3 For a list of the nine study place-names, see Figure 4.2 in Chapter Four.

4 A series of interviews conducted to produce Tl’azt’enne and Nak’azdli elder biographies.
of the nine study place-names. A considerable amount of primary source information came from the 1996 and 2003 projects, which produced an index card notation system of place-names and mylar overlays depicting locations of traditional toponyms. This method of documenting toponyms was used in the *Tl’azt’en TUS* (1998-1999) and the *Tl’azt’en Place-Names Study* (1996), cataloguing information by map number, landform, associated legend or myth, natural resource and cultural site. From these and various other cultural research projects spearheaded by Tl’azt’en Nation, the community has developed a computer database, known as the *Tl’azt’en Nation Place-Names Database*, which serves as a depository of Dakelh toponyms collected from within the Tl’azt’en traditional territory. Base information on the study toponyms, such as map number, location, type of feature, English name and translation, was obtained by Ms. Bird for my research from this database.

Because information gaps exist in the database records of the study place-names, it was necessary to review recordings and transcripts of past interviews, particularly those conducted with *keyoh* family members whose lands fall within the study area. Interviews of interest were those pertaining to folklore, oral histories and traditional use of lands and resources projects such as the *Elders Interviews* (1984-1995) and *Tl’azt’en TUS* (1998-1999). I examined the transcripts of these projects for references in the form of legends, stories, environmental, cultural and traditional use information, to places and toponyms in the study area.

In the past, individuals with an interest in the history of their family’s *keyoh* have also collected *keyoh* place-names from their oldest living family members and used them to construct maps of their hunting and trapping territories. While I was unable to view these
maps\textsuperscript{5}, many of my research participants talked of there being such a thing as \textit{keyoh} place-names, exclusive to family members who hold the territory. These place-names may exist outside the band’s place-names database.

Published and other non-Tl’azt’en works containing reliable, thoroughly-researched and analytical information on Dakelh place-names are few. As described in Chapter Two, I identified eleven works that, refer to some of the study place-names\textsuperscript{6}: Morice’s \textit{Au Pays de L’ours Noir- Chez les Sauvages de Colombie Britannique} (1897), \textit{History of the Northern Interior of British Columbia} (1978 [1904]), \textit{British Columbia Maps and Place-Names} (1907), \textit{The Carrier Language} (1932), and \textit{Carrier Onomatology} (1933); Steward’s field notes (c.1940); CLC’s \textit{Central Carrier Country} (1974); Kobrinsky’s \textit{The Tsimshianization of the Carrier Indians} (1977); Akrigg and Akrigg’s \textit{British Columbia Place Names} (1986); Hall’s \textit{The Carrier, My People} (1992); YDLI’s \textit{Nak’albun/Dzinghubun Whut’en Bughuni-Stuart/Trembleur Lake Carrier Lexicon} (1998); and Nak’azdli First Nation’s \textit{Nak’azdli t’enne Yahulduk- Nak’azdli Elders Speak} (2001). Each of these works provides a piece of the puzzle that is Dakelh toponymy.\textsuperscript{7} These works were helpful in obtaining background information on the study place-names as well as methodological suggestions about the kinds of issues to consider when conducting research on Dakelh toponymy. Location, alternate names, etymology, physiographic nomenclature, local geography and history, and variant spellings of names are all useful in coming to a fuller understanding of place-names.

However, the information obtained on the set of study place-names from these sources was

\textsuperscript{5} Tl’azt’en Nation has chosen to restrict access to some of its internally-generated maps and documents during treaty negotiations, due to the potentially sensitive nature of these materials.

\textsuperscript{6} Specifically, there was no published information available on four of the place-names: Tezzeron Creek, Hatdudatehl Creek, the mouth of Pinchi Creek and the island at the far eastern end of Pinchi Lake.

\textsuperscript{7} See Chapter Two for a discussion of each work.
basic and fragmented, and seldom went beyond a passing mention of the names. It failed to uncover important particulars about oral history, the traditional subsistence lifestyle and the Dakelh language. Hence, after comparison of information on the study place-names from extant materials (place-names database, folklore, elder life histories, and interview transcripts from cultural and forestry projects), it was evident that I needed to carry out interviews to seek the knowledge central to the aims of my project.

**Participant Selection**

Several facets of the nine place-names had to be verified, including spelling, dialect, location, translation, meaning and whether the places were associated with any stories or legends. These gaps or discrepancies in the information called for interviews with cultural experts, Tl’azt’enne who are knowledgeable about the Dakelh language, traditions and life on the land. For this purpose, it was important first to gain an understanding of the Tl’azt’en-led place-names studies that had been undertaken to date through preparatory interviews with community researchers who were part of these studies. As a result, I interviewed Renel Mitchell (Researcher, Traditional Use Study 1999), Margaret Mattess and Pauline Joseph (Researchers, Tl’azt’en Place-Names Project 2003) and Beverly Bird (Researcher, Tl’azt’en Place-Names Study 1996) about the purpose of the Tl’azt’en place-names research projects, methodology employed, and areas of interest within the Tl’azt’en traditional territory. I also asked for suggestions as to whom I should interview for my research; each person provided the names of a number of Tl’azt’enne who are either members of families whose *keyohs* belong in the study area or who are regarded by the Tl’azt’en community as being practised in the Dakelh language and culture. This list of names served as a launching point for the recruitment of participants for both the pre-test and formal interviews of this research.
To ensure representativeness in the choice of Tl’azt’enne to interview, I employed a “snowballing” technique based on a peer recommendation process. In streamlining lists of potential interview participants to achieve a “requisite” list of Tl’azt’enne who have knowledge of places within or in the vicinity of the study area, people were asked to rank their nominees according to two categories: Category I, comprising the five most important individuals to interview about Dakelh toponyms in the JPRF area, and Category II, comprising other individuals generally knowledgeable in the Dakelh language and culture. Originally, my plan was to invite persons receiving a nomination in Category I, and to those receiving two votes in Category II. Despite the lists of potential interview participants seeming at first rather meagre, considerable overlap was obvious after the first five formal interviews had been held. The lists converged upon individuals (mostly elderly males) belonging to the Monk, Tom and Pierre families, whose keyohs are intersected by the study area. Accordingly, the list of Tl’azt’enne knowledgeable about the JPRF area was determined.

---

8 This is a modified version of the process developed for a Forestry Innovations Investments (FII) project (Sherry and Fondahl 2004), which is in turn a modified version of the Aboriginal Forestry Planning Process (AFPP) expert selection method that was developed by Dr. Erin Sherry and Melanie Karjala (Karjala and Sherry 2003).

9 A total of twelve people were nominated as research participants; ten of these twelve people were available to be interviewed.

10 Several people explained to me that knowledge of the keyoh and livelihood related to hunting and trapping is passed down from father to son. My pool of pre-test and formal interviewees involved individuals ranging from 40 to 80 years old, with the majority of individuals being male. Only one younger male interviewee, Johnny Tom (early thirties), was nominated, and the general impression received from several community members was that he seemed to be “an exception to the rule”, in that most youth do not know the Dakelh language or the land as well as their fathers and grandfathers.
Interviews

The literature on working with indigenous peoples’ knowledge advises against the use of formal questionnaires (Grenier 1998; Tobias 2000; Hart 1995; Johnson 1992). Research participants tend to be intimidated by such a mode of idea exchange and alternatively, relate better to informal, “non-Cartesian” approaches to sharing knowledge through the medium of stories and firsthand, personal experiences. Given the very specific task of collecting information on nine place-names, I decided that the use of an interview guide, consisting of open-ended questions, would contribute both to consistent final documentation and provide my interviewees with the chance to freely express their understandings and knowledge of places and place-names. Therefore, a set of questions was devised, pre-tested and revised before interviews were carried out.

The interview guide was designed to verify and expand on information from the place-names projects community members have carried out themselves or participated in, on the nine selected place-names in and around the JPRF. I wished to address the knowledge gaps in the information available on the chosen toponyms from published sources and Tl’azt’en-produced repertories (i.e., Tl’azt’en Nation Place-Names Database, place-names index-card notation system, maps and dictionaries) by eliciting additional information through interviews.

Prior to pre-testing, the interview package (consisting of letter of introduction, project summary, consent form11 and questions) was distributed to Margaret Mattess, Pauline Joseph, Beverly Bird, Morris Joseph and Beverly Leon. While some scholars (e.g. Davison et al. (2006)) question the cultural appropriateness of the use of consent forms, Tl’azt’en CURA research team members advocate the need for obtaining the consent of community members who are participants in research projects. During the course of this study, my Tl’azt’en collaborators participated in vetting the wording of the consent form used, and in explaining to participants its use in my research. Furthermore, the Tl’azt’en Nation Guidelines for Research in Tl’azt’en Territory (see Section 3) stipulate the obligation for researchers to obtain the consent of Tl’azt’enne involved in research.
and Beverly Bird for review. Their feedback with regards to the ordering and wording of interview questions, content of the letter of introduction, and information layout and wording of the consent form assisted in refining these documents for the purposes of clarity, cultural appropriateness, and easy reading.

Pre-testing was initially planned with three participants, using the questions and maps prepared for formal interview. To ensure age and gender representation, Beverly Bird recommended three persons. In the end, only one pre-test (with Theresa Austin) was carried out, due to the others’ unavailability.\(^{12}\) To compensate for the loss of other opportunities to pre-test the interview questions, Ms. Bird delivered the interview guide for review to notable community members who have been involved in directing or running Dakelh language programmes or in Dakelh cultural research (Catherine Coldwell, Betsy Leon and Margaret Mattess). An evaluation of the readability of maps, content, wording and timing of questions, as well as the length of the interview was solicited from Theresa Austin and the other reviewers, and the feedback was used to fine-tune the interview guide as well as my interviewing technique.

All research participants received an interview package, hand-delivered by Beverly Leon and Morris Joseph (Researcher, Tl’azt’en Treaty Office)\(^ {13}\). The package consisted of a letter of invitation summarizing the objectives of the research, an informed consent form, and a copy of the interview guide (see Appendix 2). The chance to preview the interview questions helped nominees decide if they wanted to participate, and prepared them in advance for the kinds of issues that would be discussed during the interview.

\(^{12}\) All those recommended by Ms. Bird did suggest names of individuals to interview.

\(^{13}\) Mr. Joseph was assigned by Ms. Bird to my project as co-interviewer and translator. As former Tl’az’t’en Band Chief (1990-1992), he is well-known and respected in the Tl’az’t’en community.
Formal interviews were then conducted with Pierre John, Walter Joseph Sr., Robert Hanson, Sophie Monk, Frank Duncan, Louise Alexis, Elsie Alexis, Catherine Coldwell, Stanley Tom and Alexander Tom. The interviews were held in Tache, either at the Tl’azt’en Education Library or in the homes of interviewees, with the exception of three: one was held at the interviewee’s home in Binche, the other two in Fort St. James, at the JPRF office and Camp Morice. During interviews, the participants were shown maps of the study area, and the toponyms of interest were either pointed to or referred to by their allogenous (English or French) names. The participants were then asked for the traditional Dakelh names of the nine places, any alternate names, dialectal affinity, and literal translations and glosses. They were asked to expound on translations and interpretations in light of the eco-cultural attributes of the places, and to focus especially on those places they knew most about. The probes used to elicit information were: How long has this place-name been in existence? Is it known popularly by community members, young and old alike? Is it used elsewhere in the traditional territory? Are there any legends or stories connected to it?

14 All interviewees received an honorarium for their participation in the research. The pre-test interviewee’s participation was acknowledged with a gift. Tl’azt’en researchers feel strongly about giving credit to Tl’azt’enne who have contributed their knowledge or perspectives to research projects, on condition that the participants are comfortable with having their identities revealed. The consent form used in this study gave interviewees the option of electing to either have their name mentioned or withheld in the thesis and ensuing publications; all interviewees chose to be identified.

15 All participants were interviewed once, with the exception of Robert Hanson, whose interview required two sessions. I interviewed all participants (with Morris Joseph’s assistance in three interviews), except for Stanley Tom and Alexander Tom, who were interviewed by Beverly Leon.

16 An orthophoto of the JPRF area was also available to research participants as an extra recall aid; most participants preferred the map as a way to locate and remember places over the aerial depiction. Tl’azt’en Nation intended to provide ground photographs of the nine places whose toponyms were under study but in the end, did not.

17 In the context of toponymy, once the literal translation of a place-name is obtained, it is oftentimes necessary to obtain a gloss or meaning of the place-name based on its root words. This is important in making the place-name understandable in English. An example is the Dakelh place-name Tsinteltehnoola, which literally translates as “burbot [lingcod]-underwater-island” (Poser 1998: 302). A gloss for this place-name, “island where lingcod are found underwater”, enables speakers of English to form a general understanding of this toponym’s meaning.
While the interview guide was always at the interviewees’ and my disposal, participants were free to converse about subjects not directly related to toponymy but all the same lent insight into the importance of the land to Tl’azt’enne. Hence, the interviews contain sections where participants discuss life before the land was settled by Europeans, childhood days spent in the bush or visiting other villages, harvest activities, places in their own keyohs, changes to places on the land and the consequences these changes will bring to future generations. These episodes of “straying” from interview questions not only proved to be an “ice-breaker”, allowing the opportunity for better acquaintance between researcher and participant, but provided the context for understanding “the ‘cultural logic’ on which ideas [stemming from the interviews] rest” (McCracken 1988:25, quotes in original). Impromptu and exploratory moments in the interviews presented opportunities to gain perspective on the cultural norms, symbols and ways of knowing of my research participants, which I believe has drawn me to a more inclusive understanding of Tl’azt’en toponymy and its context. On a deeper level, these moments epitomized the idea that the landscape performs an important role in the make up of identity and sense of place, rendering an understanding of how places on the land are experienced and internalized by Tl’azt’enne.

A challenge that I faced during the interviewing stage was “elder burnout”. Two nominated individuals refused to participate in the research, as they were weary of being tapped for information. I also listened to many complaints from interviewees and colleagues at the Tl’azt’en Treaty Office that many elders felt that they were sharing their knowledge in research projects with no obvious or concrete returns to the community. It is clear that many are uncomfortable with the idea of a formal, sit-down interview, and it is regrettable that given logistic and time constraints, other methods of gathering information such as interviewing at fishing camps or while taking a tour of the land, could not be arranged. These
opportunities may have helped in gaining further insight into indigenous conceptions of place and may have lent an understanding, within the proper social context, of the value of such wisdom and its application (Johnson 1992). Nevertheless, as the topic of place-names was of interest to the Tl’azt’en community at large, I was able to interview the majority of recommended interview participants who imparted valuable knowledge on the place-names of interest as well as information from their involvement in other place-names and Dakelh language projects. Therefore, although I could not experience in person the places whose names I studied, I learned about them through the knowledge and understandings shared with me by interviewees who have experienced them firsthand.

Co-interviewing with a community member who is fluent in English and Dakelh and has considerable experience in the interviewing was a benefit to the research project. I was indeed fortunate to have been able to work closely with Morris Joseph. While most interviewees were able to understand the interview questions without hesitation and express themselves confidently in English, a few needed questions re-phrased or translated into Dakelh. Mr. Joseph’s presence at the interviews assuaged the formal “research atmosphere” with a measure of conviviality and reassurance, and he was able to clarify responses as

\[18\]

In view of the ambiguity that can arise from similar sounding English and Dakelh toponyms that designate entirely different locations or geographical features, it would have been very beneficial to have visited the place-name sites in person for the reasons given by Ludger Müller-Wille (1985). Müller-Wille (1985) points not only to the methodological importance of documenting the precise locations of place-names to avert the problem of confusing the true whereabouts of similar sounding names but stresses that noting the relative position of the places in question to main reference points such as nearby mountains, lakes, rivers, etc. as well as characteristics of the places themselves, would greatly add to building a context from which to understand how place-names work and their significance to people. Regrettably, in this study, GPS locations nor a visual record consisting of photographs or video-recordings could be taken of the place-name sites. It is quite possible that not seeing the places in person has resulted in only a partial appreciation, on my part, of the place-names and what they mean to Tl’az’t’en. On the other hand, my not seeing the nine places has perhaps resulted in my putting less of an outsider’s filter on what I heard in interviews; I was able to focus on what people were telling me about the places and their names without subjecting their words through particular notions I would have formed through seeing the places.
needed. Having a Tl’azt’en community member share in the query helped ensure that the research was a community-focussed project.

The interviews ended with an invitation to participants to share other information about Dakelh place-names they felt important, and to recommend others to interview.\textsuperscript{19} Two interviews were video-recorded, the rest audio-recorded. Recordings were requested by Tl’azt’en Nation, for archival purposes as well as to allow the interviewers the opportunity to focus primarily on facilitating the interviews rather than note-taking. Mona Anatole, Tl’azt’en Treaty Researcher, and I transcribed the interviews with Morris Joseph’s assistance in translating the portions carried out in Dakelh. Original copies of recordings and transcripts are archived at the Tl’azt’en Nation Treaty office.

**DATA MANAGEMENT, ANALYSIS AND VERIFICATION**

*Content Analysis*

Once interviews were translated and transcribed, content analysis began, whereby data were structured “to identify patterns within the text” (Kitchin and Tate 2000:225). This was accomplished through the coding and summarizing of data, to ultimately arrive at “how participants coproduce …meaning” (Silverman 2000:831). Content analysis undertaken in this research, therefore, can be described as involving a “systematic study of messages conveyed in the text” (Sherry 2004a:4), consisting of three steps: “data reduction, data display and conclusion drawing” (Sherry 2004b:2).

The first stage of the content analysis process consisted of evaluating each preparatory, pre-test and formal interview transcript for key words or phrases. The utterances

\textsuperscript{19} Many interviewees named Chief Harry Pierre (then chief of the CSTC, formerly chief of Tl’azt’en Nation (2000-2002) as an individual to interview, particularly about the western portion of the study area which embraces his family’s keyoh. Several attempts were made by myself, Beverly Bird and Beverly Leon to arrange a meeting with Chief Pierre but due to his schedule he was not able to meet.
of interest to my study pertained to toponymy, geographical nomenclature, legends or stories, language, *keyoh*, subsistence or habitat information, and environmental, social and cultural change.

As these utterances were flagged, general annotations were made for each word or phrase with **m** used to indicate memos or notes about the transcript data, and **i** used to indicate my own thoughts about the data (Kitchin and Tate 2000: 237-238). This exercise constituted a pre-analytical phase in the content analysis process with the recording of “first impressions” of transcript data. At this point, observations were made only on the basis of individual transcripts to get a sense of the assumptions and beliefs that spring from the key utterances contained in each (McCracken 1988). The next step was to undertake a comparison of observations from each transcript in seeking links between them. Further annotation took place, giving rise to more developed observations. These observations, in turn, revealed that a process of categorizing and linking was occurring, where the focus of the analysis turned away from the main body of the transcript to my own observations on the segments of text from which they emerged (McCracken 1988). The assessment of observations from each transcript provided a means to gain deeper insight into my data by stimulating thought on the grounds on which the data could be assigned to categories. This process involved considering my research questions together with my observations on the interview data to develop a series of themes or master categories (Kitchin and Tate 2000). The final step in the content analysis stage consisted of a review and categorization of all the annotations I had generated. This entailed the coding of observations, where utterances and

---

20 Annotations were initially made by hand in the margins of downloaded transcripts. When these annotations were completed for all interview transcripts, they were compiled by interview with their corresponding utterances and typed in a Word document. The Word document for each interview consisted of a two-columned table, where utterances were placed in one column, and their corresponding memos and ideas in the other column. The utterances and annotations were then numbered.
their corresponding annotations were grouped under themes. From this point onwards, it was possible to map out the linkages between themes (McCracken 1988) and to see the progression from the concrete and descriptive in the original transcripts to the abstract and interpretative in the themes developed (Holland 1995).

After the interview data were analyzed, it was presented to the community for verification and feedback. Community review of the content analysis was vital in terms of ensuring that the information was accurate and interpreted properly, as complete as possible, and that the analysis was representative of Tl’az’t’en values (Sherry 2004b: 20). A copy of the draft thesis was delivered to Beverly Bird for comment as well as to Renel Mitchell, Beverly Leon, and Deborah Page, who were identified by Ms. Bird because of their knowledge of Tl’azt’ en culture and experience in the conduct of qualitative research.21

A panel of elder experts, known as the Tl’az’t’en Place-Names Committee, was consulted to verify the findings on each study place-name. Chosen by Beverly Bird and Deborah Page, the Committee consisted of Catherine Coldwell22, Mildred Martin, Pierre John, Sophie Monk, Helen Johnnie and Betsy Leon. The Tl’azt’ en Place-Names Committee was asked to review my interpretation of interview data on each place-name, and to respond to specific questions geared at addressing gaps in the research such as the uses of places and

---

21 All four women have worked in various capacities in Tl’az’t’en-led and Tl’azt’ en-UNBC joint research projects. Deborah Page, then leader of the CURA Tl’az’t’en Science and Tradition (Education) research stream is a long-standing and active member of the CLC, an independent advisory body that provides support to Dakelh language and culture programmes in the Nak’azdli and Tl’azt’ en communities. She facilitates language meetings, as part of the CLC’s efforts to maintain the Dakelh language. Renel Mitchell who has lived and worked for many years among Tl’azt’ enne, has been involved in developing the Yunk’ut Whe Ts’ o Dul’ eh culture-based outdoor science camp programme, and has worked on the CURA project as a community researcher. Beverly Leon is CURA Tl’azt’ en Research Coordinator. Through her work in coordinating research and educational activities related to the JPRF, Ms. Leon has been an active promoter of Tl’azt’ en values in resource management. She has presented at conferences focussed on sustainable resource management and has also worked as a module instructor for the UNBC Field Applications in Resource Management course.

22 Mrs. Coldwell (née Bird) is a founding member of the CLC. She collaborated with linguists such as Richard Walker, David Wilkinson and Shirley Walker, and William Poser on dictionary, place-names and traditional plant use projects, and continues to be involved in Dakelh language and cultural programmes.
linguistic make-up and spellings of place-names. I prepared a place-names verification document for this purpose, which was delivered to Beverly Leon and Deborah Page, who facilitated the verification sessions. I believe this protected the indigenous concepts, terms and place-names used in the thesis from being misconstrued, misrepresented or ignored altogether. As far as minimizing error in the form of inaccuracy, memory attrition or misrepresentation on the part of interviewees, I was often struck by the level of accuracy and honesty they strived towards. When a participant was doubtful about a place-name, its meaning, location or related narratives, he or she was inclined to not comment on it in the interview, and in some cases, even offered to consult someone else who might be more sure. As one participant emphasized during an interview, “I don’t know that one. I can’t just make it up. That wouldn’t be telling the truth” (Walter Joseph, CURA Place-Names Interview (CPNI), 2/06/04).

Guidelines for the Incorporation of Dakelh Toponymy into Yunk’ut Whe Ts’o Dul’eh

With the feedback from the Tl’azt’en Place-Names Committee, I revised my analysis accordingly (Chapter Four), and began work on developing guidelines for the incorporation of the toponymic information into the Yunk’ut Whe Ts’o Dul’eh culture-based outdoor science camp programme. In considering how toponymy offers opportunities to learn about land, language and oral history, I found Adele Pring’s (1999) paper inspirational. Pring’s ideas of Mapping, Locational Distribution, Directional Skills and Decision-Making, on which

---

23 Two verification sessions were held. The first session was held 27-28/04/05 to address general questions I had on the study area as well as specific questions related to the each of the study place-names such as physiographic and biotic descriptions, traditional uses of the named place, spelling(s), and legends or stories associated with the named place. Beverly Leon and Deborah Page co-facilitated this session. After examining and incorporated this information into my thesis, I still had questions; thus, a follow-up session was arranged with the Tl’azt’en Place-Names Committee (16/12/05 and 6/01/06). Deborah Page facilitated the December verification meeting, she and I facilitated the January 2006 meeting together. The original tape recordings of these sessions are housed at the Tl’azt’en Treaty Office.
she has developed a basis for introducing TEK of place in geography curriculum not only proved useful as a starting point in conceptualizing the drafting of the guidelines but modelled a creative way to develop progressive approaches to teaching about the relationship between aboriginality and the land.

The drafting of the guidelines or curricular suggestions was based on four themes that emerged from the content-analysis stage of the research: 1) Place-Names as Indicators of Dakelh Geographical and Historical Knowledge; 2) Place-Names Commemorative of the Ancestral Past; 3) The Role of Place-Names in Educating about Land and Language; and 4) The Role of Place-Names in Educating about Conquest and Re-Conquest. As part of this process, it was necessary to consult the British Columbia Ministry of Education’s curriculum documents, the *Integrated Resource Packages K-7*, as well as, the *Yunk’ut Whe Ts’o Dul’eh* culture-based outdoor science camp programme, to ascertain how place-names could be drawn into the science camp curriculum. A battery of prescribed learning outcomes was obtained from the *Integrated Resource Packages K-7* to form an understanding of the key concepts and skills that are taught in Grades 5 and 6 (the targeted grade level for the outdoor science camp programme). With this information, it was possible to gain insight into the *Yunk’ut Whe Ts’o Dul’eh* programme participants’ knowledge base, skill level, and expected learning attainments, and to develop an understanding of the types of learning activities the participants would benefit from. Upon review of the *Yunk’ut Whe Ts’o Dul’eh* programme, a list of topics was identified according to whether they addressed water travel, traditional subsistence activities, and places of cultural and resource importance to match the four themes generated from content-analysis of the study place-names. Through this identification, it was then possible to create a five-step process that served as a method for supplementing the topics with place-names content (see Chapter Five). Additionally, a
sample set of questions and activity ideas was developed on the basis of one toponym to illustrate an application for these guidelines (see Chapter Five). It is hoped that these guidelines and sample lesson ideas will aid in making the place-names information gathered and analyzed through this research available in a variety of ways to Tl’azt’en children and youth. Because of the interdisciplinary nature of the subject matter of the study place-names (i.e., navigational, environmental, historical, and political), the information will find relevance beyond its environmental, science and social studies applications in the outdoor science camp programme. Hence, given that sense of place is the underlying theme of the toponymic information, its applicability is foreseen in daily school life, even in the humanities-based subjects of language arts and fine arts.24

**CONCLUSION**

This chapter, in detailing the methodology of my study, has traced the collaboration between Tl’azt’en Nation and myself in researching nine Dakelh place-names of the JPRF area. From the study’s inception to its end, Tl’azt’en Nation members selected the research topic, choose the place-names to be researched, determined the participants to interview, and provided feedback as the research developed through the fieldwork, analytical and final write-up phases. In return, I have contributed to this partnership by modelling how toponymic information can be analyzed, interpreted, validated, and utilized in an educational programme, the *Yunk’ut Whe Ts’o Dul’eh* culture-based outdoor science camp programme.

---

24 This expectation finds validity in Tl’azt’en Nation’s expression of interest for the development of educational materials such as a place-names workbook that can be used at the Eugene Joseph School in Tache (CURA Steering Committee Meeting, March 2006). The Chuntoh Education Society, which oversees the delivery of educational programmes in the JPRF, and the CURA Science and Tradition (Education) research stream will take on the task of creating such educational materials from the toponymic information produced through this research. A copy of the draft thesis was sent for comment to both the Chuntoh Education Society and the CURA Education stream parties through Beverly Leon and Deborah Page.
In the following chapter, a profile of each of the nine place-names examined in this research is given. Through a reflection of what each topoynm contains, it will become apparent why place-names continue to be an important part of the Dakelh culture. The place-names examined function beyond merely marking or indicating places; rather, they are rich in information that relates the intricacies of the Dakelh language, history, ancestral personalities, and the land.
Chapter Four:
THE LAND IN LANGUAGE: DAKELH GEOGRAPHICAL NOMENCLATURE AND PLACE-(names)

INTRODUCTION

This chapter offers a discussion of the nine Dakelh toponyms that were examined in this research. A place-name profile will be given for each study place-name, consisting of linguistic, historical and social descriptions gathered from interviews as well as documentary sources of Dakelh language and culture. In providing the necessary context from which to understand the nine Dakelh toponyms, this chapter will profile the geographical terms that are common to the place-names under study. It is important to consider these terms as they disclose topographic knowledge that is necessary for appreciating the environmental knowledge contained in or associated with the toponyms. The descriptions of geographical terms are based on information gathered through the place-names verification process and written sources, and explain how the terms function as toponymic referents or designators. Through the profiles of toponyms and geographical terms, Dakelh place-naming traditions are better understood, aiding comprehension of the significance of the land to Dakelhne.

DAKELH GEOGRAPHICAL NOMENCLATURE

From the way Athapaskan place-names are linguistically structured, it is apparent that the land is mirrored in language. Place-names, especially those designating water bodies, are often based on a system of words indicating location, which are at times accompanied by affixes that delineate direction as well as distance (Henry and Henry 1969; Lord 1996). The system of directionals is complex and defined according to the flow of rivers or the main
waterways in a watershed that aid in orienting and guiding people as they travel between places, allowing for a depiction of the geography of Athapaskan movement and settlement through toponymy (Henry and Henry 1969; Munro 1945; Kari 1996a). The geographical terms in place-names, for instance, demonstrate how rivers and streams are designated, which is significant in view of how major rivers or parts of streams flowing past villages might have once been used to mark territorial boundaries as well as to determine one’s whereabouts (Munro 1945; Kari 1996a). Designated “the river”, these fluvial arteries likely symbolized the pathway of commerce and contact between different groups of people (Munro 1945). Hence, names of major waterways such as Yukon, Tsutsi and Skeena all denote “the river” (Munro 1945) that served to transport people to and from other territories. If main waterways served as thoroughfares that linked settlements to distant territories, their tributaries were used to travel within local territories. These waters were part of “everyday” survival systems, linking people to fish lakes, family hunting and trapping territories and other inland places. The toponyms of tributaries reflect their function, suggesting the types of subsistence resources found in them as well as in areas surrounding them (Munro 1945). In this sense, rivers and streams are akin to trails that facilitate travel and survival, each marking boundaries and directions through their names. Along with the toponyms that represent other geographical features, river and stream names form “multifunctional sign networks” that are part of the make-up of Athapaskan cognitive maps (Kari 1996b: 443; Kari 1996a).

Directionals can be evidenced in geographical terms that act as the physiographic referents of place-names (see Saxon et al. 2002). In Tl’azt’en territory where rivers and lakes abound, the most common directional terms are those that describe the course or flow of streams and rivers (see Chapter Five). These trails of water, which lead into or out of lakes, operate much like a compass in describing the alignment and inter-connectivity of places.
When common directional terms are coupled with prefixes and suffixes, they become specific, in the sense that location is dependent on the speaker’s (or traveller’s) perspective (Henry and Henry 1969; Jett 1997).

A sample of Dakelh geographical terms that are referents in the study place-names or connected lexically to these referents is given in the following table. For reasons of convenience, they are grouped according to whether they are water places, land places close to or on water, or terrestrial places. A close examination of these terms reveals some interesting differences between Dakelh and English designations of geographical features. For instance, in Dakelh, there are three different terms for river mouth, a term to indicate the point at which a river merges with a lake, a term to describe the reach of a cliff into water, terms to distinguish between mountains that are treed and bare, and a term for rocks used to set fishing nets (Poser 1998).
### Water places

#### Rivers/streams/creeks:
- 'ukoh (river, creek or stream)
- 'ukoh whuyaz (creek or stream)
- kootl'at (headwater)
- lhghaninli (meandering stream)

#### River/stream mouths:
- nus suli (river mouth)
- took'eche (where a river/stream/creek enters a body of water)

#### Lakes:
- bunghun (lake)
- buncho (big lake)
- bunyaz (little lake, pond)

#### Bays:
- tl’oh (bay)
- tatl’oh (inlet)

### Land places on or close to water

#### Islands:
- noo (island)
- nooyaz (islet)
- noo nulat-i (floating island)

#### Reefs:
- takadiz'ai (reef)
- tatse (rock in water)

#### Points:
- whulatoh (end, extremity, point of land in water)
**Shores:**

- **taba** (shore or beach between high-water line and water)
- **tabasaik’ut** (beach)
- **busk’ut** (riverbank)
- **bunba** (shore of lake)
- **’ukooba** (shore of river)

**Extremities of lakes:**

- **tat’ah** (understood as “head of lake” in English but “end of the lake” in Dakelh. -Tl’a means “posterior” and indicates the farthest point from the lake outlet)
- **talhdzulh** (outlet part of lake)
- **taldzul** (open water near outlet of lake which never freezes, though surrounded by ice)

**Land places**

**Mountains:**

- **dzulhzai** (bare mountain)
- **dzulh** (mountain above timberline)
- **dzulh-eguz** (valley or mountain pass)

**Knolls/Hills/Ridges:**

- **shus/yus** (crest of hills, timbered mountain, hill or knoll)
- **handunit’ai-i** (hill)
- **hawhodit’ai** (hill)
- **haoodilyya-un** (rolling hills)
- **whenun** (hillside)
- **tl’ada** (hilltop)

**Rocks:**

- **tse** (rock)
- **tsecho** (boulder)
- **tset’ezch’eh** (rock cliff)
- **tse’an** (rock cave)
- **tsewhedankat** (crag)
- **tsezus** (moraine)
- **tsedlooh** (rock anchor for fish net)

---

Figure 4.1
A Sample of Dakelh Geographical Terms. **Source:** Poser 1998.
Geographical Terms Associated with Dakelh Toponyms Researched

The central place that landscape occupies in Dakelh thought can be witnessed in the Dakelh language through special terms used to describe the state of geographical features. For example, there are several nominalized verbs used specifically to describe “contained” bodies of water such as lakes and ponds as opposed to “flowing” bodies of water like rivers and streams. In this case, the prefix, *ta-*, indicates the body of water designated and the verb stem tells whether it is long or wide:

- *Tanyiz* = it (the lake or pond referred to) is long [*dinyiz*=long]
- *Tantel* = it (the lake or pond referred to) is wide [*dintel*=wide]
- *Tadindat* = it (the lake or pond referred to) is narrow [*dindat*=narrow]


In addition, *ta-* can be combined with *d-,* to give a more detailed description of lakes and ponds. For instance, the *d-* form can show that some aspect of a lake or pond is more important in distinguishing it from another lake or pond of comparable dimensions:

- *Tadinyiz* = it (the long and narrow lake or pond referred to) is long [here the length of the lake is emphasized over the width of the lake]
- *Tadintel* = it (the long and narrow lake or pond referred to) is wide [here the width of the lake is emphasized over the length of the lake]


Other aspects such as a lake or pond’s volume and temperature are also indicated by nominalized verbs starting with *ta-:

- *Tadizbun* = it (the lake or pond referred to) is full
- *Tanizul* = it (the lake or pond referred to) is warm


These lake and pond terms hint at the richness of descriptions of water bodies in the Dakelh language. There is indeed an abundance of hydronyms in the Dakelh language possibly owing to the pre-contact locations of Dakelh villages, which were chiefly distributed by

---

1 It should be noted that the *ta-* prefix can also denote action, as in the case of throwing something “into water”, and position, as in the case of *taba* (“water edge” or “shore”) (Poser 1998:282). *Ta-* is also used to indicate that something is submerged in water as in the case of *tachun* (“water log” or “deadhead”).
Migrating salmon have greatly influenced and dictated the Dakelh subsistence round. To optimize catches, people who were once nomadic, settled in places where the yearly salmon runs could be intercepted. This pattern of settlement continues with the primary Dakelh villages of the Stuart-Trembleur watershed such as Nak’azdli, Dzint’lainli, Yekooche, Tache, Binche, and K’uzche, located at lake outlets and river mouths. Lake outlets have been principal harvesting points, guaranteeing the most successful catches. Although river mouths received fewer numbers of salmon (see Hudson 1983) as a result of interception at lake outlets, they nonetheless played a role in admitting the fish towards final spawning creeks. Lake outlets and river mouths are also places where waters remain open during winter while the rest of the lake system freezes. Other than fishing, open water holds subsistence potential by attracting waterfowl and amphibious mammals (e.g., beavers and muskrats). Benefits to settlements being located at lake outlets and river mouths were probably also realized in the event of failed salmon spawning runs. In such circumstances, people would have had the alternative to harvest other species of fish such as whitefish or spring salmon (Hudson 1983). To move between streamside-located villages or to move in and out of a watershed to harvest different species of fish, waterfowl and game, transport by water would have been key to people. Knowledge of the lake outlet and river mouth parts of...
lakes, together with knowledge of other geographical features (i.e., hills and peaks in the horizon, islands, bays, headlands, etc.) that landmark these parts, served as aids in water travel to both up- and downstream places. Examples of environmental knowledge that exists in Dakelh terms for geographical features are given below.

**Tizdli (lake outlet).** In place-names, lake outlets, or the headwaters of a river are designated to aid in moving through a lake. This term contains the kinds of information relevant to travelling towards the headwaters such as the direction of water flow (CURA Place-Names Verification Session (CPNVS), 16/12/05). In the past, lake outlets were the gateway to downriver travel and also signalled the need for specific methods of fishing which could take advantage of the low volume and narrow course of water associated with such places. The upper course of streams, where waters directly discharge from lakes, enabled the construction of weirs and the use of fish-traps like *k’uncay* [*k’oondzai*] and *nazxwet* [*nazghwut*] (see Morice 1893). Other than salmon, these traps were used to catch smaller species of fish like carp and kokanee (Hudson 1983; Morice 1910).

Besides the term *tizdli*, there were also other terms to inform people, as they moved downstream, of their impending exit from a lake. *Ts’eninli-un, whot’a* and *kootl’at* are terms used to generally designate that the outlet end of the lake and headwaters of a river or creek are to be encountered. The stem *-ninli*, for instance, means both “current” and “to flow” (Poser 1998: 229). When coupled with the prefix, *ts’e*, *-ninli* can be interpreted both as “towards, to or at the current” and “towards, to or at the flow”, indicating movement downstream with the pull of the river current (Poser 1998: 306). The final suffix, *-un*, attaches to *ts’eninli*, to convert it to a noun or place where something happens. Combined with *-un, ts’eninli* embodies the concept of “lake outlet” or “the place where flowing occurs.
or where there is current” (Poser 1998: 324). The terms, kootl’at and what’a are terms that mean “headwaters of a stream” and “outlet of a lake”, respectively, and appear exclusively in the works of Morice (1932: 81, 111). Just as the upriver sides of lakes are generally designated in Dakelh by the suffix, -tl’at, kootl’at is a geographical term used by Morice that can be possibly glossed as “stream end”, referring to the headwaters of a stream or the point at which waters pour out of a lake. Whot’a, also appearing as hwo’tat in another one of Morice’s publications, literally translates as “down below”, referring to the downriver side of a lake, where waters move downstream and eventually flow out of the lake (Morice 1902: 51).

**Took’etch (river mouth).** Knowledge of creeks or rivers flowing into lakes is also an important aspect of travelling and subsisting; therefore, mouths of rivers or creeks are designated in Dakelh place-names. In analyzing the etymology of took’etch, the term is broken into its constituent parts, took’et and -che (CPNVS, 16/12/05). Took’et generally hints at places where water can be obtained such as water holes, springs and wells (Poser 1998: 293), approximating the meanings, “water place” or “water on” or “water at”. The stem, -che, which literally means “tail” (Poser 1998: 68) is significant because it is an example of the mnemonic quality that generally characterizes indigenous place-names. Therefore, like tigdli, took’etch contains nested meanings.

When streams flow into lakes, they terminate there or are at their “tail-end” (CPNVS, 16/12/05). At this point in the lake system, streams appear sluggish, although generally wider and deeper than when they began to flow from their source. In some cases, particularly when a river mouth is recognized for its potential as a fishery, a special term is used to mark its

---

2 It should be noted that the suite of Dakelh place-names examined in this research did not include river mouths. A discussion of river mouths is given here because the information completes the context from which to understand the workings of geographical terms as water travel aids.
importance. The term, –che, used in place-names to represent the mouth of a river is preceded by –koo when a fishery is designated. Tsaaooche and Yekooche, both well-known fisheries, are examples of Dakelh toponyms that incorporate –koo (Poser 1998: 140; Hall 1992; Hudson 1983; Yekooche First Nation n.d.).

Another geographical name for river or creek mouth is nus suli. Nus translates as “front”, and while suli seems to have no specific meaning on its own, nonetheless adds to the understanding of streams entering a lake. A “forward” or “frontward” flow from the river mouth is indicated in this term, giving the direction of flow as downriver or with the current.

**Tl'at (no standard English equivalent).** –Tl’at is the stem in place-names designating the “end of the lake” (see fond- du- lac in Morice 1933). Originating from tl’u, which means “behind” or “posterior”, -tl’at is known as such because of where it is located in the context of the “forward” flow of the lake. As the part furthest away from the lake outlet (CPNVS, 27-28/04/05) where waters are calmer, “tail-waters” hint at floral and faunal potential. For instance, colonies of bulrushes (Typha latifolia) thrive in such an area of slow-flowing or standing water, and serve as a source of habitat and food to waterfowl, wrens, blackbirds and muskrats (Mackinnon et al. 1999). Another species of aquatic vegetation that grows abundantly in still waters is the water lily (*Nuphar lutea spp.*), which shelters small fish. Additionally, the leaves of the water lily are a source of food during the summer for moose.

Nak’albun (Stuart Lake), Tesgha (Pinchi Lake) and Dzinghubun (Trembleur Lake) contain sites that take tl’at as part of their names. Nak’alat, Bintl’at and Dzintl’at are not only located away from the outlets of lake systems to which they belong but also from principal villages located in each system. In this sense, the term tl’at could also signify that travelling
to the “end” or “back” of a lake is to move upstream and away from settlements. *Tl’at*, therefore, serves an orientating function in travelling the waters of Dakelh country.

*’Ukoh (river).* The basic form for “river”, “creek” and “stream” in Dakelh is *’ukoh* (Poser 1998: 34). The term *’ukoh whuyaz*, or its contracted form, *’ukohyaz*, specifically denotes “creek”, “stream” (Poser 1998: 34) or “small river” as conveyed by the suffix –*yaz*, which means “small” (Catherine Coldwell, CPNI, 25/06/04). Only in distinguishing a river (big stream) from a creek (small stream) in conversation, would a speaker use *’ukoh whuyaz* or *’ukohyaz*. Otherwise, there seems to be no differentiation between “river” and “creek” in Dakelh, even with respect to place-names (CPNVS, 16/12/05). Unlike specific references to “river” and “creek” in English place-names, Dakelh stream names only carry the compounding form3, -*koh* (Poser 1998: 140), which can refer to either river or creek. The seeming unimportance of whether a stream is a river or creek can be attributed to the function of these waterways as connectors. Streams are akin to roads leading to settlement areas, hunting grounds and other areas of cultural importance. With the understanding that the headwaters and mouths of streams are consistently designated and named in the Dakelh language, it can be said that streams, regardless of their size, are primarily significant for their role in enabling access to different parts of the country.4 In Dakelh territory, where settlements are typically located adjacent to lake systems, the places where streams enter or exit lakes make possible connectivity and contact.

3 With the exception of Tanizul *’Ukoh* (CLC 1974), all streams in the vicinity of the study area are designated names that are compounded by the suffix –*koh*.

4 The size of streams and other conditions would, however, dictate the mode of travelling (e.g., from travel by watercraft to travel by foot along streams).
**Bunghun (lake).** Several forms stemming from bunghun can be observed in Dakelh toponymy. -Bun, bunghun and –ghun are generally the particles that refer to “lake” in toponyms. Neither the first nor the third form can stand independently as words; rather, they have to exist in combination with proper nouns or, as is possible with Dakelh, nominalized verbs, in order to be understood as “lake” (Poser, pers. comm., 24/10/04). The context that determines the usage of each of these three forms is defined according to whether the lake in question is under communal or family use. It is thought that bun place-names generally belong to those lakes that are communally used, whereas bunghun place-names characterize the lakes, often small in size, that fall within a family’s trapline or keyoh (Morris Joseph, pers. comm., 26/03/04). Lake toponyms taking the suffix –ghun, denote those lakes that have been either communally used or “owned” but possibly also played a special role in marking or “proclaiming” culturally significant sites such as mountains and ridges (CPNVS, 27-28/04/05; CPNVS, 16/12/05).

**Noo (island).** The basic term for “island” in Dakelh is noo. However, another term, took’echenoo, exists to mark islands that are positioned at the mouths of streams (Poser 1998: 236). Dakelh island place-names generally carry the geographical referent, noo, generally at the end, but occasionally at the beginning dependent on where the islands are distributed in a body of water (Poser 1998: 293). From examining the distribution of island names in Stuart Lake, a pattern emerges whereby place-names starting with noo like Noocho, Nootsul and Noo Whudin’ai are chiefly located in the mouths of rivers. In contrast, islands found elsewhere in the lake have place-names that end with noo, like ‘Adih noo, K’i noo and Jenicho noo. A possible explanation as to this difference is related to the importance of islands to fishing, for instance, in the setting of nets and fish traps. A connection between the
idea of fishing and the adverb *noo’*, which means “upriver” or “upstream” (Poser 1998: 236), implies the movement of spawning salmon and indicates that islands in the mouths of rivers may have been utilized as prime salmon fishing sites. As *noo’* is also the possessive form for “island” (see Poser 1998: 236), toponyms beginning with *noo* may also suggest that these places have been used or owned by certain families (see Morris 1999).

**Dzulh (mountain).** Mountains are important places to the Dakelhne. They provided alternative subsistence resources to a people whose staple diet consisted of fish. In the likelihood that salmon were late in coming or scarce, mountains offered a variety of game, such as groundhogs, bears and mountain goats. People regarded them as places of survival (Betsy Leon and Catherine Coldwell, CPNIS, 31/03/04). Mountains may have also been esteemed for the mysticism they imbued. They were remote places where the practice of vision quests and rites of initiation into adulthood occurred, where young men and boys came to receive visions of their animal helpers and to dream about the hunt (CPNVS, 06/01/06). While *dzulh* is the common Dakelh term for mountains, more specific terms correspond to elevation. Very tall mountains that rise above the timberline are specifically known as *dzulh* whereas a timbered crest of hills or long chains of hills that increase in height are called *shus* (or *yus* when appearing in a place-name) (Poser 1998: 101, 281; Morice 1902: 50). On occasion, *tse* (meaning “rock”) is also found in mountain place-names (see CLC 1974). In some instances, mountain place-names do not carry *dzulh, shus* or *tse* and may appear as single or compound nouns, like Utzi and Whula juś, or a nominalized verb like, Na-hulṭē meaning “one that got thawed out” (Morice 1933: 656).
PROFILES OF DAKELH TOPONYMS RESEARCHED

The nine Dakelh place-names (Figure 4.2) that were examined in this research indicate information related to resource use, travel on water and the physical characteristics of landforms. Like the other twenty-two place-names that have so far been documented in the study area by Tl’azt’en Nation (Beverly Bird, pers. comm., 15/03/04), this sample of names largely designates water places. Through presentation of nine place-name profiles, this section builds on the previous discussion on Dakelh geographical place-name referents by linking the topographic particulars of places with associated ethnographic and resource use information, gathered through interviews and written sources. Examination of these nine toponyms reveals how place-names relay descriptions of the physical and the biotic, and the historical and mythical in their function as locators of places and memories.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dakelh name</th>
<th>Official name</th>
<th>Other names</th>
<th>Geographical feature represented</th>
<th>Location (see Figure 4.3)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.Chuzghun</td>
<td>Tezzeron Lake</td>
<td>Chuzghun bun</td>
<td>Lake</td>
<td>Lake lies parallel to and north of Stuart and Pinchi Lakes at the northern-most bounds of the JPRF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.Chuz tiḍli</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Lake outlet</td>
<td>Far western end of Tezzeron Lake; Kuzkwa River flows out of Tezzeron Lake through Chuztiḍli</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.K’uz koh</td>
<td>Kuzkwa River</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>River/Creek</td>
<td>Stream flows out of Tezzeron Lake in the northwestern portion of the JPRF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.Hadoopatelh koh</td>
<td>Hatdudatehl Creek</td>
<td>Ningwus koh</td>
<td>River/Creek</td>
<td>Stream flows into the middle of Tezzeron Lake at its northern shore</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Chuzghun koh</td>
<td>Tezzeron Creek</td>
<td>Yuts’uzuk Yat’uzuk Chuz koh</td>
<td>River/Creek</td>
<td>Meandering creek located at the far eastern end of Tezzeron Lake; stream flows above Yatzutzin Lake</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Tesgħa</td>
<td>Pinchi Lake</td>
<td>Bin koh Binche bun Tesgħa bun Qez-ren [Juzghun]</td>
<td>Lake</td>
<td>Lake lies in between Stuart Lake and Tezzeron Lake</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Bin tiḍli</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Bun tiḍli</td>
<td>Lake outlet</td>
<td>Southwest portion of Pinchi Lake</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Bintl’at noo</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Bintatoh Bintat tl’at</td>
<td>Island</td>
<td>Far eastern end of Pinchi Lake</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. K’azyug</td>
<td>Pinchi Mountain</td>
<td>K’uz yug Binche Dzulh Tesgħa Dzulh Natadilht’o⁵</td>
<td>Mountain</td>
<td>Mountain located in between Pinchi Lake and Tezzeron Lake</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Figure 4.2**
Dakelh Toponyms Examined in this Research.

⁵ The spelling of this toponym has yet to be verified by the CLC.
Figure 4.3
**Chuzghun.** Despite the etymology of *chuz*, which translates as “snowflake” (Poser 1998: 71), the place-name Chuzghun refers to the idea that the lake is a “down feathers place”, commonly regarded as a nesting place for waterfowl (Catherine Coldwell and Betsy Leon, CPNIS, 31/03/04; CPNVS, 27-28/04/05). *Chuz*, in this context, refers to the moulting process water birds undergo after the nesting period (Catherine Coldwell and Betsy Leon, CPNIS, 31/03/04; CPNVS, 27-28/04/05). One way of decoding Poser’s etymology is to consider the appearance of bird down in water, which resembles snowflakes (Catherine Coldwell, CPNI, 25/06/04). Robert Hanson (CPNIS, 03/06/04) felt that the prefix of the place-name, *chuz*, was amiss, and that it should rather read as *ts'uz*, meaning “feather”. As *ts'uz* is also the prefix of the word *tsuzchus*, meaning “down feather”, this observation conforms to the idea of a “moulting lake”, the term used by Akrigg and Akrigg (1997: 265) to describe Tezzeron Lake as a place “where ducks and geese moult”. 6 The suffix, *-ghun*, which is rarely found in Dakelh lake toponyms, was translated by the panel of elder experts as “a lake located by or along a ridge” (CPNVS, 27 – 28/04/05).

While the lake is a sanctuary for migrating waterfowl, there is an alternate interpretation for the etymology of Chuzghun. According to Stanley Tom and Alexander Tom (CPNI, 21/12/04), *keyoh* holders, the place-name refers to old, hollow trees that line the lake. Since these trees grow thickly on the lake shoreline, they give the lake the appearance of a basin when viewed from a distance, from on top of an incline. The trees were described as “getting old and …soft…[like] dry wood standing [or] a beetle infested tree…[they are]

---

6 “Tezzeron” was unanimously regarded by research participants as a corruption of the native name, Chuzghun. Many instances of the kinds of corruptions produced by the early surveyors and travellers in Carrier territory are found in Morice (1933, 1902). Some corruptions are based in inaccurate transcriptions of the native name, which have the effect of distorting or excluding the original sounds of the name. Other corruptions are mistakes in interpretation such as designating whole geographical features by a name reserved for a part on or within them, or giving a native geographical term of a feature as its proper name.

7 The only other lake in Tl’azt’en territory known to carry the suffix *-ghun* is Stuart Lake. The lake used to be once known as Nak’alghun (Poser 1998) but has since been replaced by the name Nak’al Bun.
hollow and fall apart when [struck]”. The interviewees gave the meaning of the prefix, *chuz*, as “soft wood” and the suffix, *-ghun*, as “area”, subsequently translating the whole name as “a body of water surrounded by trees” (CPNI, 21/12/04).

Also significant is the consideration of the short forms or contractions of place-names that are used by Dakelh speakers as an alternative to the complete forms of names. Stanley Tom and Alexander Tom suggest that Chuzghun derives from a special term, *chunzool*, “hollow wood”, which is contracted to *chuz* in the place-name Chuzghun (CPNI, 21/12/04). Stanley Tom and Alexander Tom’s description of the trees that grow along the lake suggests black cottonwood (*Populus balsamifera ssp. trichocarpa*), which can be found growing on low to medium elevation, on moist to wet soil (Mackinnon et al. 1999: 19). When old, the bark of these trees is dark grey in colour and deeply furrowed. Interestingly, the name “cottonwood” was applied to these trees because they produce seeds with cotton-like hairs that drift through the air like “giant summer snowflakes” (Mackinnon et al. 1999: 19). This phenomenon may correspond to the idea behind “Snowflake Lake”, the etymology for Chuzghun provided by Poser (1998: 67). Traditionally, cottonwood would have been utilized in several ways: tall trees would have been hollowed out to make dug-out canoes, the cambium layer of the tree would have been eaten and the tree would have also been used as a fuel source (MacKinnon et al. 1999 Hall 1992).

Morice’s interpretation of the etymology of Chuzghun is also worthy of note. He gives the meaning of the name as “paddle after lake” or Paddle Lake (1933: 648). Discrepancies, however, exist between Morice’s translation and that espoused in succeeding Dakelh language and cultural research. The main discrepancy lies in how the sounds in the place-name were recorded in writing. For instance, Morice transcribed the prefix of Chuzghun as *tces*, which, according to the CLC transcription rubric (see YDLI 2000)
corresponds to *chus* rather than *chuz* (Poser 2000). The word, *chus*, does mean “paddle” and may reflect Morice’s familiarity with local knowledge of the lake as a place to obtain wood for making canoes and paddles. This may have had an influence on how he transcribed and interpreted the name. Another discrepancy is Morice’s recording of the name of the lake as Tces-ra-ñ-pen [Chus-gha-ng-bun], whereas the CLC (1974) and Poser (1998) give it as Chuzghun. Poser (pers. comm., 24/10/04) remarks that the name Chuzghun is sufficient in itself, and that the addition of *bun* (meaning “lake”) to the name is unnecessary, perhaps indicating the influence of English. In interviews, research participants generally used both forms of the name interchangeably, although most were in agreement, as was the Tl’azt’en Place-Names Committee (CPNVS, 27-28/04/05), that the correct form is Chuzghun.

The suffix –*ghun* was a point of obscurity in the place-names verification process, as none of the Tl’azt’en Place-Names Committee members could confidently explain the meaning of the term (CPNVS, 27-28/04/05). Speculations, for instance, were made about –*ghun* being a short-form such as *bun* for *bunghun*. However, while all three terms are common designators in lake names, there is a difference in usage among these terms (Morris Joseph, pers. comm., 26/03/04). The explanation hinges upon the size of lakes, and accordingly, *bun* and –*ghun* are both representative of big lakes like Nak’albun and Chuzghun, while *bunghun* is a designator for smaller lakes found within *keyohs*. Maps of Dakelh place-names (CLC 1974; CSTC 2004) seem to complement this perspective with *bun* and –*ghun* apparently referencing lakes of considerable breadth, and *bunghun*, the smaller lakes that intermittently dot the landscape.

Chuzghun is the setting of a legend that involves mystical power. In prefacing the legend, Robert Hanson (CPNI, 10/06/04) shared his reminisces of a miraculous event that
took place on his father’s *keyoh* at Queht’tsuhl’tsun’ket⁸, near Babine Lake. As a child, Mr. Hanson had witnessed his uncle, Joe Hanson, saving the life of a man who accidentally swallowed a rabbit bone and was choking to death. Joe Hanson was a powerful medicine man and a dreamer of the giant fish that lives in Chuzghun. Mr. Hanson was summoned by his uncle to fetch a pan of water and to watch the water intently for a sign. As Joe Hanson ministered to the choking man, a snake suddenly appeared in the pan of water. Despite it being a cold winter’s day, the snake swam around vigorously, and it was taken as a good omen. Joe Hanson then placed his mouth on the man’s throat for a considerable length of time, and when he finally spat into the pan of water, the snake had disappeared, leaving in its place, the rabbit bone. This was how the dying man was saved.

Chuzghun is believed to be where a giant Dolly Varden trout lives. According to the legend as told by Robert Hanson (CPNI, 10/06/04), people were afraid of the fish and travelled the waters of Chuzghun with caution. One day, the chief of Chuzghun, Soon Dayi, set out in his birch bark canoe to travel to the other side of the lake. Before he left, his people had a ceremony to honour him for his wisdom and bravery. They drummed for him and gave him the song called, “Big Dolly Varden Is Swallowing Me”. The chief sang the song as he paddled his canoe, when all of a sudden, a big fish slammed against the side of the canoe, causing it to sink. Someone cried out, “Soon Dayi, what’s wrong with you? I thought they had a song ceremony for you?”⁹ It was at this instant that the chief recovered from fright. He deftly placed his paddle on top of the canoe, dipped his hand in the water and rubbed the side

⁸ The spelling of this toponym has yet to be verified by the CLC.

⁹ When this story was re-told a second time by Robert Hanson, a name, Bah’eel’doh, was mentioned. From the manner the story was relayed, this character might have been the chief’s travelling companion, and a medicine man. Bah’eel’doh may have conjured up the giant fish to test the chief’s mettle.
of the canoe. At this moment, the canoe took on a life of its own and jolted off like a speedboat. As a result, the chief was saved.

**Chuz tịzli.** The outlet of Chuzghun is called Chuz tịzli, indicating the outflow or downstream movement of lake waters into K’uz koh (Kuzkwa River). The suffix of the name, tịzdli, signals exit from a lake, as one travels downstream with the current. Tịzdli is also the point of exit for species of fish, such as kokanee, that swim with the current and leave the lake system to spawn. Chuz tịzdli, therefore, is a prime fishing area during the kokanee spawning season. The stream issuing from the lake carries the fish downstream until the mouth of the stream at K’uzche is reached, where spawning takes place (CPNVS, 27-28/04/05). While tịzdli is lexically understood as “lake outlet” (i.e., the noun designating the place where a river originates), research participants translated the term in an evocative manner that summoned the specific attributes of the lake outlet. Tịzdli was explained as “that flows out”, “starting to flow” (Catherine Coldwell, CPNI, 25/06/04); “flowing creek” (Sophie Monk, CPNI, 03/06/04); “water running out of a lake”, “beginning of a running river”, “river running out of a body of water”, “flowing away from a body of water” (Stanley Tom, CPNI, 21/12/04); “running water” (Alexander Tom, CPNI, 21/12/04); “where water runs out” (Walter Joseph, CPNI, 02/06/04). From these translations, it is apparent that the Dakelh term for “lake outlet” is much more than a mere label for a place on a lake— tịzdli indicates a transformation from the state of water in an enclosed body to that which is outward- and free-flowing, and moving. It is not surprising then that the term is classified as both a noun and a verb (Poser 1998), which express the dual nature of tịzdli as a sign as well as an animated entity.
The prefix of this place-name is the same as that of the lake itself, showing belonging in the Chuzghun lacustrine system. Traditional use information recorded for this area suggests that geese and ducks are found in abundance here, where they utilize the shoreline around the lake outlet for nesting (Robert Hanson, CPNI, 10/06/04). While Chuzghun as a whole freezes during the winter, certain areas around Chuz tizdli are known to be ice-free and open (CPNVS, 27-28/04/05). Unfrozen stretches of water enable the over-wintering of some species of waterfowl: their presence, in turn, attracts fur-bearing predators to the lake outlet. Thus, lake outlets are known as places for harvesting waterfowl and fur-bearers.

The chief harvesting activity that was performed in the past in the Chuzghun area, as a whole, was the netting of waterfowl. People caught water birds using nets made of hide or willow, cut into strips and dried, and then woven together to form a net. Nets were left dry for they are lightweight in this state and easy to transport, and only soaked when it was time for them to be set in lakes (CPNVS, 27-28/04/05). Once the nets were set on the water, people in boats drove the fowl into the nets, and slaughtered them by wringing their necks (Hall 1992; Morice 1897). Fittingly, Chuz tizdli is associated with a legend about netting ducks (CPNVS, 27-28/04/05). According to the legend, a man was netting ducks near the lake outlet and had several successful catches. However, he was ruthless in his determination to catch even more ducks, and rashly, dived into the water with his net. The man was never to be seen again, as he was swept away by the current. This calamity would never have taken place if it were not for the man’s greediness.

K’uz koh. The river trailing out of Chuz tizdli has been described as going “downing down” until it meets the Tache River (Robert Hanson, CPNI, 10/06/04). The use of “down” as a verb, in its progressive form, to describe the flow of K’uz koh is significant. Such a term is
evidence of how people continue to think in Dakelh, despite conversing in English.

“Downing” seems to be the literal translation of the Dakelh verbal noun that implies motion as well as direction. While the source of K’uz koh or Kuzkwa10 River is Chużghun, the river is thought to have acquired its name from its terminus, K’uzche village (Pierre John, CPNI, 02/06/04). A plausible reason as to why the river is so named might be K’uzche’s importance in the yearly sockeye salmon harvest. The waters of K’uzche teem with salmon every autumn as the fish ascend Tache River, eventually making their way upstream via Kuzkwa River (CPNVS, 27-28/04/05). Located at the intersection of the two rivers, K’uzche is a well-known fishery, where people used to construct weirs to harvest salmon. This important food source and the place where it can be obtained plentifully resonate in the name, K’uz koh. The river’s connection to K’uzche is observed in how it plays a role in sustaining the sockeye salmon cycle as it acts as both a channel and spawning bed for the migrating fish (CPNVS, 27-28/04/05).

The banks of K’uz koh abound with fur-bearing species such as muskrat, otter, beaver, mink, marten, fisher and lynx (CPNVS, 27-28/04/05). The river shore is also known to be a nesting area for waterfowl (Robert Hanson, CPNI, 10/06/05). The whole length of the river, therefore, is a prime trapping area, and has been an important Dakelh subsistence survival area like other riparian areas in the traditional territory adjoining lake inlets and outlets (CPNVS, 27-28/04/05). Although the river is shallow, people have travelled on it using canoes, and this draws links to how the river may have been used to transport people

10 “Kuzkwa” is believed by research participants to be a corruption of the native name, K’uz koh. While this is likely to be the case, it should be noted that the –kwa suffix is the common designator for “river” or “creek” in the Babine language (Poser, pers. comm., 24/10/04; Morice 1902). It is not known at this time if the western portion of Chużghun and K’uzche village itself were once occupied by Babine speakers, either through intermarriage or reciprocal use of these areas by Babine families. Further research will hopefully yield greater insight into the etymology of Kuzkwa.
upstream to the outlet of Chuzghun and beyond, or downstream to K’uzche and other settlements located at river mouths or lake outlets such as Tache and Teeslee.

The etymology of the prefix of K’uz koh remains baffling. Morice (1933: 648) mentioned this toponym in the context of his discussion of the fluvial arteries of Stuart, Trembleur, Pinchi and Tezzeron lakes but was unapprised as to the meaning of k’uz.

Informants interviewed in past Tl’azt’en traditional use and place-names projects as well as part of this study have also found the prefix obscure and untranslatable. However, one participant (Walter Joseph, CPNI, 02/06/04) did venture a hunch based on his understanding of the place-name K’uzche and the course of K’uz koh as it flows by the village. K’uzche was translated as “half a tail” as k’uz11 sounds like the Dakelh word for “half”, ’u’k’uz, and as –che is the literal meaning for “tail”. Considering that K’uz koh flows by K’uzche and then makes a loop outwards when it joins the Tache River, the translation “half a tail” may refer to the incomplete or brief emergence of the river at the village site before being swallowed up by its bigger counterpart. The word, ’u’k’uz also means “a side of fish” (Poser 1998: 36), possibly referring to a division of the salmon spawning pathway through K’uzche and K’uz koh. A further implication of k’uz is the idea of “parts that make up a whole”12 (Poser 1998:149), as in the case of K’uzche and K’uz koh, which are “paired” or “harmonizing” sites due to their proximity to each other, the wildlife and fish they sustain, and especially the salmon that they harbour every fall.

11 It is likely, from noting this trend in other Dakelh place-names and generally in Athapaskan place-names, that k’uz is the contracted or short form of ’u’k’uz.

12 This is Poser’s definition for k’uz when it is used as a suffix. However, the definition is nonetheless important to consider as it is related to that of ’u’k’uz. The underlying concept of both terms refers to a whole composed of two corresponding parts that are suited to each other, and intended to be used together.
**Hadoodatelh koh.** Flowing from its source, Hadoodatelh, a small lake lying in between Inzana Lake and Tezzeron Lake, Hadoodatelh koh (Hatdudatehl Creek) enters Chuzghun at its northern shore. The creek has been described as being long and wide, flowing over a great distance from the north (Robert Hanson, CPNI, 10/06/04). While the creek is too shallow to be navigable, there are trails along the creek (CPNVS, 27-28/04/05) that can be used to reach its upper portion. Hadoodatelh koh is a place that has been utilized for berry-picking. Blackberries, cranberries and soapberries are some of the species found growing along the creek, and in the past, people came to this area from Fort St. James and Binche village to harvest them (Robert Hanson, CPNI, 10/06/04). Interestingly, an alternate name for this creek, Ningwus koh, reflecting its value as a berry-harvesting site, was recorded in previous Tl’azt’en cultural research. Ningwus koh, literally translates as “soapberry creek” (Place-Names Study 1996). Besides berries, the creek holds other kinds of food resources such as char and whitefish as well as waterfowl (Robert Hanson, CPNI, 10/06/04).

Hadoodatelh koh was generally alien-sounding to all research participants, with many confused by the name’s sounds. Catherine Coldwell remarked that the name sounded like a Sekani word that could have become part of Dakelh usage through contact with the Sekani people from the Nation Lakes area (CPNI, 25/06/04). In tracing the etymology of the name, Morris Joseph (CPNIS, 13/05/04), Robert Hanson (CPNI, 10/06/04), and Catherine Coldwell (CPNI, 25/06/04) felt that the name might be representative of lake bottoms. The connection with lakes comes from the fact that the creek takes its name from the lake it flows out from (Catherine Coldwell, CPNI, 25/06/04). The same individuals also thought that something was irregular about the last syllable of the name, telh\(^\text{13}\), which seemed incongruous and

\(^{13}\) *Telh* is a word in Dakelh meaning a small hand-held basket used while collecting berries. However, the presence of *telh* at the end of the place-name seemed out of place and wrong to many interviewees.
untranslatable. Morris Joseph and Robert Hanson felt that *teh* was a more reasonable substitute as it literally means “underwater” or “the bottom of water” (CPNI, 10/06/04). The term *teh*, in other words, denotes “lakebed”, and fits within the context of the toponym being originally a lake name. Catherine Coldwell thought the name pertained to the ground or bottom of the lake being soft (CPNI 25/06/04).14 According to the Tl’azt’en Place-Names Committee, the toponym makes reference to the land, the significance of which can only be grasped through visiting the creek area (CPNVS, 27-28/04/05). While this is undoubtedly true, given that indigenous toponyms largely describe the physical environment, it may be possible to get a preliminary idea of the name through studying its constituent parts and through comparing the name with other similarly constructed Athapaskan names.15 Hence, the linguistic make-up of Hadoodatelh koh together with the descriptions of the geography of the creek area, including the lake from which it originates, may provide an initial translation of the place-name.

Hatdudatehl Lake has no linkage to any major rivers in the Inzana Lake area, except for the river that flows out of it, and is likely a spring-fed lake (CSTC 2004; B.C. Ministry of Sustainable Resource Management 1999; CPNVS 06/01/06). A breakdown of the toponym tends to support this idea. The prefix, *ha-* means “out, from” (Poser 1998:106), and indicates the presence of something outside a container after it has moved or been moved out from the container (Poser 1998: 509). –*Doo*, the second syllable, can be traced to *ndo*, meaning “up or above” (Poser 1998: 84). –*Da*, the third syllable, refers to “surface of water” (Poser 1998:

---

14 The softness of the lakebed refers to its muddy or silt-like quality, where sediment is either suspended or settled (Catherine Coldwell, CPNI, 25/06/04).

15 For instance, in the Dogrib language, several prefixes can be attached to root words to form one large word (Saxon et al. 2002: 22). The term -?a, for example, which translates as “extending (or going out) over space” can be coupled with prefixes such as ho- and go- to describe trails, landforms and other areas on land which are distant but situated in a line (Saxon et al. 2002: 23). When the prefix ta- is included, the name refers not only to pieces of land near water but also to bodies of water like lakes and rivers (Saxon et al. 2002: 24).
73), and teh (“l” sound omitted in accordance with interviewees’ thoughts about the final syllable) refers to “underwater” (Poser 1998: 287). A rough translation for Hadoopatelh, according to this analysis, might be “from the bottom of the lake to the surface of water and over”, indicating the underground spring that drives the lake water up and over into the rivulets and the creek that flow off the lake.

**Chuzghun koh.** There are three Dakelh names for Tezzeron Creek, the meandering creek that empties into Chuzghun. In general, interviewees for this study were not sure about the Dakelh name for this creek but Morris Joseph, Robert Hanson, and Stanley Tom reasoned that since the river leaving Tezzeron Lake at its western end is not named after its source, the creek coming into the lake, then, had to be its namesake (CPNI, 10/06/04 and 21/12/04). Hence, Chuzghun koh\(^\text{16}\) and Chuz koh were given as the Dakelh names for Tezzeron Creek (Morris Joseph and Robert Hanson, CPNI, 10/06/04; CPNVS, 27-28/04/05).

The creek winds its way into Chuzghun from the north-easterly portion of the Tl’azt’en traditional territory, and is said to be too shallow to navigate completely (CPNVS, 27-28/04/05). Alexander Tom recounted a time when he travelled by motorboat on the creek with an older person who warned him of the danger of being mired (CPNI, 21/12/04). The elder used a special name for the place, which consisted of the word *desk’ut*. The term, *desk’ut* literally means “it is shallow” (Poser 1998: 81), referring to the swampy and muddy stretch of the land that the creek cuts through and merges with, as it makes its way down into

\[^{16}\text{It is not clear as to whether this is a direct translation into Dakelh of the English place-name, Tezzeron Creek, or if this is the original Dakelh name that was appropriated and altered by the first Europeans who came to Dakelh territory.}\]
Chuzghun.\(^{17}\) The creek is thus risky to travel, necessitating the use of a name that serves a cautionary function.

Provided that Chuzghun koh is a difficult creek to navigate, landing places on firm, dry ground must have been staked out to either land boats or to get ashore to tug marooned boats to open water. Therefore, unsurprisingly, there exists a place-name recorded for this creek that hints at the idea of a boat landing area. Yuts’uzuk (CSTC 2004) or Yat’suzak (Tl’azt’en Nation 2003), as this creek has been alternatively called, may denote “swooping upwards from water” (Morris Joseph, CPNIS, 13/05/04). This gloss translation refers to the act of bringing a boat or canoe ashore. Further examination of this name reveals that it does not designate the whole creek as such; rather it marks a specific site on its right bank that was used as a boat landing area, where people gathered before travelling downriver into Chuzghun (CPNVS, 27-28/04/05).

**Tesgha.** This lake is officially known as Pinchi\(^{18}\) Lake, and as noted earlier in this thesis, the name “Pinchy” was already in use when the first fur traders came to Dakelh territory. Akrigg and Akrigg (1997) assert that Pinchi is the Dakelh term for “lake outlet”, although others have found differently. In presenting Pinchi Lake, Morice (1933), for instance, began his discussion of Pinchi Lake by pointing to Pinche (Binche), the Dakelh village on Stuart Lake. While he explained that the village of Pinche is located at the mouth of the stream that flows out of Pinchi Lake and empties into Stuart Lake, Morice hinted at a further connection

---

\(^{17}\) Poser (1998: 80) gives another term, *dehooska*, for shallow water that pertains especially to navigability. Perhaps the place-name containing *desk’ut* has an added significance, implying the kinds of biota that are characteristic to this area or the types of subsistence technology required to harvest in such an environment. This is highly likely given that Chuz koh is a resource-rich area— it is a spawning creek for kokanee, lake trout and rainbow trout, and also supports a number of fur-bearing species (CPNVS, 27-28/04/05).

\(^{18}\) Alternatively spelled Pinche, Pinchie and Binche. The first two spelling variants are due to Morice’s transcription system for Carrier used in his scholarly works. This system was very likely replicated in part by provincial geographers and surveyors who mapped and named places in British Columbia. The last variant is the CLC’s transliteration of Morice’s Pin-tcê (1933: 647).
between the village of Pinche and the lake. The implication rests on the idea that the name, Pinchi, was given to the lake by some of the first Europeans who arrived in the area. It might have seemed commonsensical to the newcomers to name the lake and its out-flowing stream after Pinche village since the area in the vicinity of the village became associated with fur-traders and missionaries who either used or occupied the area. Pinchi, in this regard, came to landmark the European presence in Dakelh country. A Hudson’s Bay Company guardhouse, built under the order of Chief Factor Gavin Hamilton to intercept fur-trading between Pinche natives and free traders, stood near the Pinchi Lake outlet (Morice 1978; Munro 1945). In 1869, upon their arrival in Dakelh country, Fathers Lejac and Blanchet built a cabin on the east bank of Pinchi Creek, at the point where it empties into Stuart Lake (Hall 1992). The name Pinchi became especially famous when in 1937, cinnabar was discovered at the north end of Pinchi Lake; subsequent to this discovery, a mercury mine was opened on the shores of the lake, around which a new village, called Pinche Lake village, began to prosper (Munro 1945). Theresa Austin believes that the original name of the lake was substituted for Pinchi because it was obscure and unpronounceable to the first Europeans to come to Dakelh territory (CURA Pre-Test Interview, 17/05/04).

Morice gives the Dakelh name for Pinchi Lake as Thès-sra-pen [Tes-sgha-bun], which was the same name recorded by the CLC in 1974 (Morice 1933; CLC 1974). The only difference in the name recorded by the CLC is that it lacks the suffix –bun, which is the place-name referent meaning “lake”. Research informants also provided Tesgha as the Dakelh name for Pinchi Lake, with Catherine Coldwell commenting that it is one by which the older people knew the lake (CPNI, 25/06/04). However, other participants were divided in their opinions as to the correct form of the name, oscillating between the use of Tesgha and
Tesghabun in their conversations about Pinchi Lake. Like Morice (1933:647), they were unsure about the etymology of the name, with Morris Joseph and Alexander Tom venturing that the prefix, tes hints at the bottom or bed of the lake, while the suffix, -gha, points to the “hairy”, “furry” or “mossy” quality of the lakebed (Joseph, pers. comm., 10/06/04; Tom, CPNI, 21/12/04). The idea of the name’s meaning being related to the “hairy” condition of the lakebed is further connected to the kinds of animal life that are found in the lake system. Robert Hanson stated that the lake is called Tesgha because it harbours plenty of fish, particularly whitefish (CPNI, 04/06/04). Catherine Coldwell and Betsy Leon remarked that Tesgha, like Chuzghun, is a place of refuge for migrating waterfowl, and as a consequence of this shared function, the lakes are thought to be connected (CPNIS, 31/03/04).21 Tesgha was also compared by the interviewees to Vanderhoof, a town approximately 70 km south of Fort St. James with acres of open fields, where geese congregate and rest before their northbound migration. Hence, the name was interpreted as “overnight resting” (Betsy Leon, CPNIS, 04/06/04).

20 The problem with changes to Dakelh place-names due to the ever-expanding influence of the English language was discussed previously in Chapter Three. Tesghabun is an example of a changed place-name, as the addition of -bun to the name is unnecessary, likely reflecting English usage. Keeping in mind that not all place-names carry referents, Morice’s inclusion of -bun to both Tesgha and Chuzghun is likely idiosyncratic, intended as a way of normalizing the Dakelh lake names in his publications. Poser (1998) also gives Tesghabun for Pinchi Lake, which may be a result of accommodating his Tl’azt’en and Nak’azdli collaborators’ preference for the newer form of the name.

21 Yet another indigenous name for Pinchi Lake is discovered in Morice (1932: 59). Its form hints at an even further connection between Pinchi Lake and Tezzeron Lake. The name is given as Qez-ren [Juz-ghun], the prefix of which is indistinct to Morice, even as the suffix approximates “after”. Although more information is required to understand this inferred connection, it is interesting that it may refer to the concept of “paired sites” observed in other Athapaskan place-naming traditions. “Paired sites”, in relation to Dogrib toponymy, are places that are closely located, are named similarly, and which commemorate culturally and historically significant sites (Saxon et al. 2003: 48-49). The portage area between Pinchi and Tezzeron Lakes is likely an area with significant cultural value (i.e., presence of pit-houses, pictographs, old trails, medicinal plants and stories of giant animals), and the idea of the lakes bordering this area may qualify them as “paired sites”.
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31/03/04) and “resting area for geese” (Catherine Coldwell, CPNIS, 31/03/04).

During the verification stage of this research (CPNVS, 27-28/04/05), a name not previously recorded for Pinchi Lake was provided. Elder experts who were consulted gave the name Bin koh as the Dakelh name designating the entire lake (CPNVS, 27-28/04/05). The experts concluded that Tesgha was the place-name used to designate only a portion of Pinchi Lake, namely where there is a lush or abundant growth of underwater plants and weeds. They remarked that such an area sustains whitefish, and would typically also be an important fishing site. The area possibly envelops shallow bays with emerging weed growth or sandy bottoms found at the eastern end of Pinchi Lake.22

Bin koh, as a lake name, is an anomaly as –koh is the generic term for streams in Dakelh place-names. Kari (1996b) notes a similar inconsistency in the Koyukon lake toponym, Niq’e Xose, which carries a stream, rather than a lake, designator. Literally meaning “great stream”, Niq’e Xose designates a large lake at the head of the upper Hotolno River, its etymology remaining a mystery. The same holds true for Bin koh, for which the elders have no explanation. The first part of the toponym, bin, has been a point of ambiguity to generally all research participants with Sophie Monk commenting that it is a strange-sounding name (CPNI, 03/06/04) and Catherine Coldwell remarking that it could be the name of a person whose keyoh used to belong in the area (CPNI, 25/06/04).23 Poser gives bin as “middle of the lake” but this translation may be based on folk etymology, in the sense that the meaning of bin may have been concocted based on something that is familiar or part of

22 Pinchi Lake is a relatively shallow lake with a mean depth of 23.9 m, and includes a shoal that is 760 ha. in size at its eastern end (BC Adventure Network n.d.). This area has also been described by Alexander Tom as the shallow end of the lake (CPNI, 21/12/04).

23 Morice (1933: 648) also found the meaning of the name, Pin-tcê [Binche] difficult to analyze. He offers that the first syllable in the name, pin [bin] comes from the final syllable in impiñ [imbing]. This word refers to “dove” in Dakelh, which Morice (1933: 648) describes as “a bird now perfectly unknown to the country, but quite abundant two or three generations ago”.
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ordinary life (Poser 1998, pers. comm., 24/10/04). Binche, the name of the village located at the mouth of the creek that flows from Pinchi Lake into Stuart Lake, offers clues concerning bin. From its location on Stuart Lake, Binche seems as if it is situated in the middle of the northern shore of the lake. Because Pinchi Creek flows past Binche village, Stuart Lake appears as if it has a tail24 in the centre of its upper shore. Another possible understanding for bin as “middle of the lake” touches on the mid position of Pinchi Lake flanked by Tezzeron Lake to the north, and Stuart Lake to the south.

The presence of bin as a referent in Babine lake toponyms (Bear Lake and Burns Lake region) is common (see CSTC 2004). It is likely, then, that bin found in Binche and Bin koh is an alternative form of the Dakelh bun,25 the formative indicating “lake” in place-names (Poser, pers. comm., 24/10/04). As observed above with regards to the place-name Kuzkwa, Bin koh may carry vestiges of Babine influence; the reasons behind or means by which this influence occurred is not fully known. Perhaps the advice of Catherine Coldwell to consult the Tl’azt’en and Nak’azdli genealogies in seeking the origins of bin would yield some answers to these questions (CPNI, 25/06/04).26

Yet another name recorded for Pinchi Lake by Morice (1932: 59) speaks to the lake’s proximity to Pinchi Mountain. As with Dakelh toponyms for Stuart and Tezzeron lakes, Morice’s recording of Qez-ren [Juzghun] for Pinchi Lake conforms to a pattern found in

24 As previously explained the suffix –che in place-names refers to the mouth of a river, where a river ends or flows into another body of water. –Che, in this context, has a riddle-like semblance because it can also be interpreted as the “tail-end” of a river, as it flows to its terminus. The translation, “river mouth in the middle of the lake”, given by Poser (1998:49) corresponds to this idea.

25 The term bun as seen in Tl’azt’en and Nak’azdli lake toponyms may have variants in the Southern Carrier region. For instance, in the Nazko-Blackwater region, several lake names start with pun, including Punchaw Lake, Pungut Lake, Punti Lake, Puntzi Lake and Punchesakut Lake. These names are possibly the anglicized forms of native names or geographical terms.

26 Tl’azt’en oral tradition recounts the movement of Babine people to Stuart Lake during a period of famine. This likely happened in the last half of the nineteenth century, when indigenous peoples in the British Columbia interior were devastated by the measles and smallpox epidemics as well as by a scarcity of food (Hudson 1983).
names of lakes that are adjacent to mountains. The suffix –ghun, as discussed earlier, signifies that a lake lies in the vicinity of a mountain, and is allied to it. Links between mountains and the lakes that border them could be metaphorical, referring to events in myth time. Other links may be commemorative, heightening awareness of the subsistence potential or spiritual implications of places associated with the lake-mountain complex, as in the case of Pinchi Lake and Pinchi Mountain.

Tegsha, like Chuzghun, is steeped in mysticism. Stories and legends associated with the lake deal with medicine power and mysterious happenings. Stanley Tom related how his father suffered from severe shock when he came face-to-face with a grizzly bear while setting traps along the lake (CPNI, 21/12/04). Soon after, he became extremely ill and was almost on his deathbed, but was cured by a medicine man. Another story concerns an elderly man who was ice-fishing with a gaff (CPNVS, 27-28/04/05). He suddenly lost grip of his gaff and found that the fish that he was trying to catch had swum away with it. The man thought that he would be able to find his gaff once winter was over and the ice was gone. He thought that the gaff would float to shore. When spring came, he looked for his gaff in vain. By mid-summer, however, the man heard that someone had found a spear at a spring near Honeymoon Island on Stuart Lake. He travelled to the island and found, to his surprise, that it was indeed his gaff. Many people wondered at this strange occurrence and some even concluded that the gaff was brought to the spring by the “little people” or dwarves who are believed to live in Nak’al (Mount Pope).

**Bin tizdli.** Just as Chuz tizdli signals the outlet of Chuzghun, Bin tizdli marks the outlet of Tegsha or Bin koh. The prefix, *bin*, comes from the name, Bin koh, and the suffix, *tizdli*, refers to where the waters of Bin koh begin to flow. An alternative to this name was provided
by Stanley Tom, who stressed that the correct name for the lake outlet is Bun tizdli. He further remarked that the name Bin tizdli is a “short form” or contraction of Bun tizdli (CPNI, 21/12/04).27

Bin tizdli is associated with a myth that binds it with Stuart Lake. Like the legend associated with Tesgha, this legend’s plot begins near Bin tizdli but unravels in Stuart Lake. A rock painting depicting the legend is located near Bin tizdli, which is also where the protagonist of the legend, a giant frog, lives. The frog is said to hide itself underground and only appears above ground at certain times of the year. It is believed to be harmless, and is said to possess magical qualities, which enables it to help people. According to the legend, in times past, there were clusters of islands all over Stuart Lake. One day, a big frog appeared at the lake, and scared all but two of the islands upstream, towards the end of the lake (where places like Tache and Yekooche are found today). This is why, nowadays, only two islands remain downstream, close to Fort St. James (Robert Hanson, CPNI, 10/06/04).

**Bintl’at noo.** This name designates an island that is located at the far eastern end of Tesgha, where lake waters shoal. A sandbank in this area connects Bintl’at noo to the mainland at low water, making it possible to walk from island to mainland and vice versa (Stanley Tom and Alexander Tom, CPNI, 21/12/04). The island is forested and once served as a year-round

27 Contracted forms of place-names are also found in other Athapaskan languages like Apache (see Basso 1996) and Dogrib (see Saxon et al. 2002). While it is not evident what situational or logical contexts dictate the use of toponymic contractions, some explanation of their uses is given for both the Apache and Dogrib place-naming traditions. Basso (1996: 90) states that the short-forms of place-names are used in normal, everyday conversations such as relating where one has been or where one is going. On the contrary, when there is a need to inspire or inculcate, as intended in the imparting of a moral, the full versions of place-names are provided. Saxon et al. (2002: 40) argues that like the short-form of “town” seen as the abbreviated “-ton” in long-established English language place-names like Kingston and Washington, compounded or old Dogrib place-names have been made shorter over time. The meanings of contracted place-names are difficult to decipher because the roots of words and the indicators that are contained in them become gradually lost, presumably due to changes in culture and language.
traditional camp that was used as a base for fishing and hunting activities. The name, Bintl’at\(^{28}\), is also used to designate the farthest end of Pinchi Lake (CPNVS, 27-28/04/05).

The prefix of the name, bin, comes from the name of the lake, Bin koh, and the suffix –tl’at, refers to the end or “posterior” of the lake. The term, -tl’at, seems to be tacit, and is translated by speakers of Dakelh as “the end of the lake”, without specifying which end of the lake is indicated. Clarification is found in Morice (1902), where tl’a is described as being the designator for the upstream part of a lake. As upstream travel in Dakelh country is concurrently a movement further away from settlements, the subtext of “posterior” or “backside” that –tl’at accommodates is fitting. Essentially, as one travels upstream away from settlement areas, one journeys into the “backwaters” of the country, towards hinterland places.

Another name for the island is Bintatoh (Stanley Tom and Alexander Tom, CPNI, 21/12/04). This name refers to the location of the island “in between” or “in the middle of” or “among” where lake waters shoal. In this sense, the island stands as a “buoy”, signalling the shallowness of the lake. The suffix -toh means “among” or “amid”, a form observed also in the name Nak’altoh (in Stuart Lake), which refers to the “widest part of the lake” (Poser 1998: 292). When occurring in lake place-names, -toh likely means “among waters” or “in the middle of waters”. This interpretation is compelling because the name Bintatoh acts not only as the name for the island but the name for the widest part of Pinchi Lake.

K’azyus. Also spelled K’uz yuṣ (Tl’azt’en Place-Names Database 2003), this mountain consists of a brecciated fault (Pinchi Fault), a narrow limestone escarpment that defines the western boundary of the JPRF, and a ridge that runs between and slopes down to Pinchi and

\(^{28}\) Bintl’at is possibly a contraction of the name, Bintat tl’at, whose particle, -tat, may in turn be a short form of tat’lolah meaning “inlet” or “bay” (Poser 1998: 286). Stanley Tom and Alexander Tom gave the name Bintat tl’at, explaining that it was used to specifically designate a bay at the end of Pinchi Lake (CPNI, 21/12/04).
Tezzeron Lakes (UNBC n.d. c). Rocky outcrops originating from the limestone escarpment are found along the course of K’uzkoh, the river that flows into K’uzche (BC Ministry of Sustainable Resource Management 1999). K’uz koh, K’azyus and K’uzche are all linked in name, indicating a relationship between the mountain, river and village. Trails are found all over K’azyus, revealing how the mountain was once trekked for gathering medicinal plants, hunting and trapping (CPNVS, 27-28/04/05).

Besides its role in indicating places and resources, K’azyus possesses an additional significance. If Nak’al or Mount Pope is used as a basis for comparison, seeing that it is also a feature after which other features are named, it would seem that mountains connected with places that replicate their names are imbued with mystical significance. Nak’al, the focal name-giving feature of the Stuart Lake area, according to Morice (1933: 647), assumes this role because of its physiography and its associated myth. Nak’al is emulated in place-names like Nak’al bun, Nak’al koh, Nak’altoh, and Nak’azdli, which lie in the general vicinity of the mountain. These places not only bring to mind the mountain but also resound with anecdotes based on the legend about dwarves. Similarly, stories associated with K’azyus tell of medicinal plants, snake pits, swamps, and magical and giant animals (Robert Hanson, CPNI, 10/06/04; Stanley Tom and Alexander Tom, CPNI, 21/12/04). People are said to display both reverence and caution when visiting places on the mountain. Indeed, certain places are altogether taboo, and to risk venturing into these places is to court ill fortune.

The etymology of the prefix k’uz was discussed earlier (see K’uzkoh). While most participants were able to give the name K’azyus as the Dakelh name for Pinchi Mountain, most were unsure about the meaning of the prefix of the name. In general, participants were
confident about the meaning of the suffix, -yu₂⁹, which was described as “hill”. Catherine Coldwell expanded on this concept, explaining that -yu₂ is an archaic Dakelh form meaning “ridge” (CPNI, 25/06/04; see above discussion on yu₂ vs. dzulh, p. 61).

An alternate name for Pinchi Mountain was supplied by Stanley Tom and Alexander Tom whose family keyoh belongs within the study area (CPNI, 21/12/04). Natadilht’o was given as the mountain name, which makes reference to the area between Pinchi Lake and Tezzeron Lake. According to the Toms, the name, which means “water rising” or “flooding”, points to the abundance of water in the area around the mountain. From the vantage point of Pinchi Mountain, myriad bodies of water give the impression that the surrounding land is inundated by water — the geography of the portage involves multitudinous ponds, small lakes, swamps and streams. Additionally, as Pinchi Mountain used to be blanketed by deep snow (Robert Hanson, CPNI, 03/06/04), the spring thaw could have resulted in cascades of water flowing down the mountainside causing floods to break out. The name Natadilht’o suggests an alternate understanding of the significance of the mountain, namely as a place where flooding was a phenomenal and spirited spectacle.

---

²⁹ Morris Joseph (CPNIS, 13/05/04) who never hunted or trapped in the study area, and was therefore unfamiliar with places there, translated yu₂ as “snow”. His translation was totally reliant on seeing the name in writing. Without the aid of another Dakelh speaker who knew the area well, Mr. Joseph could not tell whether the word referred to “snow”, “ridge” or “wolf”. This problem points to the importance of sounding out names to understand their meanings. Even with a standard orthography in place, the CLC Writing System, many Dakelh speakers still rely on oral transmission to communicate in their language. Mr. Joseph literally translated K’uz yu₂ as “on the side of snow”, and explained its meaning as “on one side of the mountain there is snow”. Interestingly, he translated k’uz as a member or part of a totality, which is similar to the translation given to the word in the toponym, K’uz koh.
CONCLUSION

This chapter has demonstrated that a wealth of information can be obtained about places on the land through toponyms and the geographical terms that make up their structure. Dakelh toponymy, as discovered in this research, seems to be patterned according to water bodies, particularly lake systems and the rivers or creeks that flow into or out of them, and orography (mountains, hills, ridges, etc.). Such information, when pieced together with ethnographic details from Dakelh oral history and written versions of Dakelh history and antiquity, allows a more complete perspective of Tl’azt’en physical and cultural geography. The purpose places have served in subsistence and travel, and in the ways people think of themselves and the landscape that sustains them, can be understood through the names given to geographical features and sites. This chapter, therefore, shows that it is necessary to include the social and historical contexts of places in the linguistic investigation of place-names to arrive at a deeper understanding of how Tl’at’enne have relied on the natural environment for physical sustenance as well as for self-definition and identity. Through this approach, toponymy can be utilized to understand the special function of the land in aiding remembrance of, and connection with, indigenous history, culture, knowledge and language. This idea will be considered in greater depth in the next and final chapter of this thesis, where the toponymic information presented thus far, will be conceptually developed and organized according to four themes, demonstrating a methodology for analyzing, interpreting and utilizing place-names information in community educational initiatives such as the Tl’azt’en Nation Yunk’ut Whe Tso Dul’eh culture-based science camp programme.
Chapter Five:
USING DAKELH TOPONYMIC KNOWLEDGE IN YUNK’UT WHE TS’O DUL’EH CULTURE-BASED SCIENCE CAMP PROGRAMME

INTRODUCTION

As observed in previous chapters, toponymy offers the opportunity to explore the past, and to understand how the physical landscape was relied upon to survive, move between places and to assert territoriality and identity. For people like the Tl’azt’en, who lived a semi-nomadic lifestyle and to whom material accumulation was of little importance, place-names constitute a means to appreciate the knowledge, memory, and value of the land. In terms of present-day reality, with the deterioration, on a global scale, of the majority of indigenous languages and means of livelihood, oral tradition — the traditional medium of teaching and learning about aboriginal knowledge and history — is threatened. A case in point is Tl’azt’en Nation, whose younger generation is increasingly unable to speak Dakelh and removed from on-the-land activities. This has created a void in cultural continuity, where Tl’azt’en children and youth are not receiving a comprehensive education, that is to say, one that involves a specifically Tl’azt’en sense of knowledge, history and identity.

This final chapter considers the potential of Dakelh toponymy in educating about Tl’azt’en language, culture and TEK, and offers ways to incorporate toponymic knowledge into educational programmes, such as the Yunk’ut Whe Ts’o Dul’eh culture-based science camp programme, aimed at creating awareness among indigenous children and youth about their cultural heritage. At the analytical or content-analysis stage of this research, four main themes were discovered and formulated to understand the importance of traditional place-
names to the Tl’azt’enne: 1) Place-Names as Indicators of Dakelh Geographical and Historical Knowledge; 2) Place-Names Commemorative of the Ancestral Past; 3) The Role of Place-Names in Educating about Land and Language; and 4) The Role of Place-Names in Educating about Conquest and Re-Conquest. The themes facilitate an understanding of what life would have been like in the Dakelh past, and more importantly, provide insight into the seemingly inherent “environmental consciousness” (including morals related to personal and community well-being) that is said to be characteristic of indigenous cultures. The chapter ends with a series of recommendations in creating a place for toponymy in the Yunk’ut Whe Ts’o Dul’eh culture-based science camp programme. It offers guidelines for a methodology in using Dakelh place-names when teaching children about the science behind physical and biotic processes and phenomena to provide them with Dakelh environmental knowledge that is specific to place – the thesis’ original goal. In addition, the guidelines focus on more multi-disciplinary applications for the use of Dakelh topoynmy, such as educating on the role of land in defining the Tl’azt’en as a people, and understanding the effects of colonialism on land, language and oral history. To exemplify the guidelines I offer sample lesson ideas based on one study toponym.

CATEGORIES OF DAKELH TOPONYMIC KNOWLEDGE

Place-Names as Indicators of Dakelh Geographical and Historical Knowledge

Place-Names as Navigational Aids

Dakelh topoynms are aids in travel on water and on land. Some of the study toponyms were found to exhibit particles that act as directionals. For instance, place-names with the particles, -che and tizdli, are directionals indicating direction into or out of a lake system (see Chapter Four). These particles, unlike the global direction given by a compass, give direction from a
local vantage point. In the Dakelh culture, where rivers and creeks were the primary mode of travel in the past, these particles intimate people’s reliance on waterways to leave and return to their home territory. Another example of a directional is -t’l’at, a suffix sometimes found in lake place-names that denotes “the end of the lake”, referring to those areas that are found upstream from major settlement areas. This particle seems to indicate to travellers on water that a movement away from a settlement into more remote areas is occurring. Conversely, for travellers coming downstream, the place-name suffix -t’l’at would have signalled imminent arrival at a settlement. Together with the aid of other landforms (such as mountains, hills, islands, coves, etc.), knowledge of the –che, tizdli and –t’l’at parts of lakes guided travellers on water to both up- and downstream places.

**Place-Names Containing Environmental Information**

Biotic information that hints at the resource-potential of places can also be found to reside in place-names. In this study, toponyms carrying –che and tizdli particles, as well as the place-names Chużghun and Tesgha contain environmental information pertaining to faunal life cycle, and critical habitats such as nesting and refuge sites. Serving as navigational aids, -che and tizdli place-names also suggest opportunities for hunting, snaring and fishing by the very nature that the places marked by these names are typically those that remain open or ice-free during the winter. River mouths and lake outlets attract species of birds and mammals, and allow for certain methods of fishing even when lakes are mostly frozen. In some cases, as with the toponym Chużghun, stages of the life cycle of animals are evoked. Chużghun summons up the yearly migration of waterfowl northwards, the birds’ need for shelter in lakes and slow-moving rivers and creeks, and the processes of moulting and nesting that the birds undergo after they find refuge. Perhaps the most obvious example is the literal
translation of Chuzghun, “Snowflake Lake” (Poser 1998: 67), referring to “where ducks and
geese moult” (Catherine Coldwell and Betsy Leon, CPNIS, 31/03/04; CPNVS, 27-28/04/05).
This information on waterfowl is part of Dakelh knowledge relating to subsistence. Through
observing the seasons, habits and habitats of the birds, it was possible to predict their arrival,
to locate when and where they nest, and to develop efficient harvesting strategies. At the time
of the moult, waterfowl are at their most vulnerable, being largely grounded and awkward
away from water. Accounts of the traditional means of clubbing or netting waterfowl in the
moultng stage are given in Morice (1897) and Hall (1992).

Tegsha (meaning “hairy or furry bed or bedding” (Morris Joseph, pers, comm.,
10/06/04/; Alexander Tom, CPNI, 21/12/04)), the lake that lies parallel to Chuzghun, is also
associated with waterfowl, in terms of it serving as an “overnight resting” place (Betsy Leon,
CPNIS, 31/03/04). The lake is known to be where geese and ducks flock before flying off to
other lakes in the vicinity to nest because parts of the lake are shallow enough for grasses and
other semi-aquatic plants to flourish. Such an ecosystem sustains a variety of waterfowl as
well as whitefish fry, which typically use the blades and stalks of the grasses to hide
(CPNVS, 27-28/04/05). According to Dakelh knowledge, the shallow eastern portion of
Tegsha is habitat for whitefish, which head towards these shoal waters to spawn (Robert
Hanson, CPNI, 10/06/04). The island, Bintl’at noo, located at the eastern end of Tegsha, once
served as a fishing and hunting camp: this lake system was associated with the autummal
activities of harvesting whitefish and waterfowl.
**Place-Names Offering Clues to the Dakelh Subsistence Round**

Environmental and historical information are also found to exist in Dakelh place-names. At times such information is indirect, implicative of the activities and events that have taken place in the areas toponymically marked. For instance, the toponym Bilhk’a (Whitefish Lake) translates literally as “snare\(^1\) and arrow” (Walter Joseph and Pierre John, CPNI, 02/06/04), indicating the kinds of traditional technology used in subsistence activities. Oral history and historical accounts elucidate the types of activities that were performed at the places marked by these place-names. Dakelh material culture, in particular traditional subsistence equipment, was often economical in both design and purpose: a single tool fulfilled a number of functions. For example, nets used for fishing could also be used for catching waterfowl or beaver, and the materials and methods used to fashion a net were also those that could be used to create a battle shield (see Hall 1992). From the 1900s to 1940s, Bilhk’a played an important role as a source of whitefish to people from throughout the Stuart-Trembleur watershed (Hudson 1983). Bilhk’a was also associated with hunting and trapping (Robert Hanson, CPNI, 10/06/04). The name of the lake emphasizes the value of the lake and its surrounding environs as a place where it is possible to hunt, trap and fish. People travelled to this lake in the fall, when whitefish were plentiful in areas of the lake where spawning occurred (Sophie Monk, CPNI, 03/06/04). The wooded recesses of the periphery of the lake contributed to Bilhk’a’s significance as they provided access to other subsistence resources, namely small and large game.

Place-names can also refer to the resources needed to fashion traditional tools or other items. The toponym Chuzghun carries an alternative meaning to “where ducks and geese moult” — “soft wood” (*chuz*; Stanley Tom and Alexander Tom, CPNI 21/12/04). Black

\(^1\) The term “snare” is an all-embracing term for any device that snags or catches, and includes such implements as snares, snare wire, nets and webs (Poser 1998: 60).
cottonwood, which grows abundantly along this lake and whose wood is highly pliable, was used to make dugout canoes and paddles (Hall 1992). Through a reflection of Dakelh material culture in place-names, the richness of the traditional subsistence round is relayed.

Dakelh toponyms are occasionally literal, textual representations of landscape features, describing the terrain or topography as it appears to the eye. In the case of Hadoodatellh koh (Hatdudatehl Creek), the role of place-names as descriptors of the landscape is glimpsed. The name, consisting of adverbial particles, describes the creek as it pours out of its source, Hadoodatellh (Hatdudatehl Lake), spilling up and over the almost shoreless lake², and flowing downwards into Chuzghun. These characteristics are reflected in the name Hadoodatellh, which translates roughly as “from the bottom of the lake to the surface of water and over” (CPNVS, 06/01/06).

**Place-Names Commemorative of the Ancestral Past**

**Place-Names Alluding to People and Events in the Past**

Place-names contain historical information in relation to the sites where people became known through certain events or the activities they customarily engaged in. Some place-names like Houniyelwhodistine and Tsasdeskesdestse³ (Walter Joseph and Pierre John, CPNI, 02/06/04) bring back memories of individuals who were associated with certain practices that were carried out at specific places, making a piece of the past accessible through toponyms. Houniyelwhodistine, for instance, is the name of a place where, a long time ago, a man called Houniyel hung a rock lashed with a strip of red willow on the branch of a tree. This name

---

² Hadoodatellh was described as a lake that freezes early due it being located at an elevation (CPNVS, 06/01/06). It was also remarked that the name, Hadoodatellh relates to the lake’s depth and to the fact that there is hardly any shoreline to it, so much so that people have never set nets at the lake, and have only relied on hooks when fishing (CPNVS, 06/01/06).

³ The spellings of these toponyms have yet to be verified by the CLC.
continues to occupy the imagination of people who visit the place today so much so that they are said to look up into the trees to try to spot the suspended rock. Similarly with Tsasdeskodestse, the life of a man is commemorated through the specialty he was known for, namely the cooking of bear fat; however, the name of the man is not part of the place-name, which gives the impression that the preparation of bear fat somehow takes precedence over the doer of the activity.

These last two place-names, although not part of the suite of toponyms examined as part of this research were discussed during interviews, participants emphasizing that traditional place-names are still important to Tl’azt’enne due to the function of toponyms as repositories of memories. They often remarked that every place on the land is named and that the names, besides describing topography or resources found in places, commemorate and celebrate the past and the people who once lived off the land. Unsurprisingly then, there are places like Houniyelwhodistine and Tsasdeskodestse that are named after people and the practices of long ago that have become part of Dakelh identity through remembrances. These names appear to be of special significance to Tl’azt’en elders because they evoke memories of people who were alive when the first Europeans came to Dakelh territory, and life as it was before contact.

In place-names discussions, it was typical for interview participants to connect the names with past experiences of travelling on their keyohs. Names were remembered in the context of the activities performed at places or through the legends and historical events that are associated with places. Participants, when asked about the toponymy of their land, offered stories of childhood travels, hunting and camping trips, berry picking and medicinal plant gathering as well as of other work carried out in the bush, such as cutting cordwood and clearing land. Place-names are obviously remembered in the context of performing on-the-
land activities, an idea which would find application in a culture-based outdoor education programme such as *Yunk’ut Whe Ts’o Dul’eh*, given that learning about indigenous language and oral history cannot take place fully without a personal connection with the land.

**Place-Names Associated with Narratives**

Occasionally, place-names evoke narratives bordering on the mythic and/or involving the superhuman. These accounts, in providing the context needed to understand the significance of places-names and the places they mark, give topoynms depth. Explaining the origins of places and phenomena, being prescriptive and cautionary, or allowing a momentary view of mystical power, these stories carry a subtext that demonstrates the strong spiritual ties between people and the places they depend on. The place-names *Chuaghn* and *Bintizdli*, for instance, are associated with accounts of giant animals that tell not only of medicine power but show how the land is sacred. The presence of animals such as giant Dolly Varden trout and frogs (see Chapter Four) suggests an offsetting of human might and a creation of balance in the interactions between humans and animals. Giant animals serve as powerful reminders that not all things in nature can be controlled or known with surety. It is in this regard that places exude a kind of importance or sacredness, which creates awareness and respectfulness in people as they travel through the country.

A cautionary message often underlies tales of giant animals. One episode of the story of the giant frog of *Bintizdli* tells of a time when a man came to seek the frog with the intention of capturing and selling it to a zoo (Robert Hanson, CPNI, 03/06/04). What ensued was a catastrophe, where the man drowned during a sudden squall that blew in over the lake. The story warns of the consequences that can befall those who trespass or exceed the bounds of another’s space and privileges. The place-based legends dealing with giant animals (see
Chapter Four) seem to also relate to a time in the past when animals were extraordinary and endowed with special powers that could either aid or thwart humans. For fear of suffering misfortune, people travelled with caution through places associated with such animals, always respecting their existence and space. Such stories emphasize the importance of knowing where one was going, respect for all life, and respect for the land.

Giants as well as giant forms of animals are also featured in narratives relating to the origins of places. Ulhts’acho, an island upriver from the village of Nak’azdli on Stuart Lake is the namesake of an ogre whose tragic death caused its formation (Catherine Coldwell, CPNI, 25/06/04). The story not only tells of the origin of the island as well as a nearby islet with which it is paired, but relays a moral about respect for life and land. Gluttony made Ulhts’acho kill his dog— his only companion— to get at the lingcod livers in its stomach. On his binge, Ulhts’acho carelessly flung the carcass of his dog into the lake, and when he finally realized what a heartless deed he had committed, he waded out to retrieve the body of his dog. He never returned. His body, like his dog’s, after being tossed by the waves and swept along by the current, finally settled and became an island. The story of Ulhts’acho exemplifies the interdependence between humans and animals, and cautions against impulsivity, greed and mistreatment. Above all, the story touches on the continuity between life and the earth—people and animals can be transformed after death into landscape features that endure through the seasons, and that stand sentinel at the coming and going of generations of Dakelhne.

Despite the instructive and deterring nature of the stories contained in place-names, they also exist for enjoyment and in marvel of the various phenomena in nature. A playful episode of the legend surrounding the giant frog of Bin tízdli recounts how the frog stealthily made its way one day to the mouth of Pinchi Creek, and without warning showed itself to a
cluster of islands near the mouth of the creek (Robert Hanson, CPNI, 10/06/04). The islands were in such a state of alarm that they leapt upstream and clear away from where Pinchi Creek flows into Stuart Lake. This is the reason why there are no islands nowadays near the mouth of Pinchi Creek nor are there many downstream from the creek entrance.

**The Role of Place-Names in Educating about Land and Language**

**Patterns of Land Use and Occupancy as Revealed through Place-Names**

**Toponymic Clusters**

Toponymy can assist in tracing the ways the land has been used by people (Muller-Wille 1984; Rankama 1993; Kari 1996 a&b; Collignon 2006). In the Dakelh physical landscape, toponyms seem to take on two basic patterns depending on where they are distributed. A general examination of place-names maps (CSTC 1995 & 2004; CLC 1974) reveals that there are systems of place-names in areas near settlements and hinterland areas. Toponyms are numerous around village sites like Nak’azdli and Tache. The clusters of names indicate visibly prominent topographic features such as mountains, lakes, creeks, rivers and meadows. These names appear to be “regional” toponyms that may be part of the general knowledge of Dakelhne of the Stuart-Trembleur watershed (CPNVS, 6/01/06). As the features and their names seem to be generally known, it is plausible that these areas have been under communal appropriation, that is to say, they have been used by the general Dakelh populace of the Stuart-Trembleur watershed irrespective of village or keyoh affiliation. Renel Mitchell (pers. comm., 23/10/03) remarked that toponyms around village sites seem to frequently evoke legends, in contrast to place-names located at a distance. A preliminary supposition, which further research will substantiate concerns people’s intense familiarity, through use or remembrances or both, with these places. Presumably, the mountains, lakes and rivers around
villages were the first landmarks that people learned as children to orient themselves as they travelled overland, as well as on lakes and rivers. These places can be thought of as “identifiers” or “pathfinders” that guided people as they journeyed to and from their base villages. As a system of “beacons”, it is likely that these places were simultaneously conceived of as sacred due to this auxiliary role. The deified eminence accorded to landscape features was possibly concentrated in, and heightened through legends. As legends were told and re-told, they became a part of people’s knowledge of the landscape, increasing familiarity with and understanding of the natural world. These myths give topoynms their mnemonic quality, whereby physiographic features locate and fasten happenings in the past. Such is the transformative role of the landscape in transcending its physical magnitude to existing as a realm of reflection, imagination and possibility.

**Toponymic Chains**

A second basic toponymic pattern found in Dakelh country is one of “chains”. This system of place-names is characteristic in areas where *keyohs* are found. The “chain” pattern is found in the study area, where place-names can be traced around specific portions of lakes and rivers or creeks, giving the effect of an elongated thread of names. This pattern is due to the presence of place-name locations around lakes and along rivers and creeks, where people set up bivouacs and positioned nets, snares and traps (CPNVS, 6/01/06). Place-names in the *keyoh* are representative of “topographic minutiae” consisting of such landscape features as capes, bays, ponds or pothole lakes, islands and knolls, the names of which are remarked to be known only to the *keyoh* holders whose lands include these features (Stanley Tom and Alexander Tom, CPNI, 21/12/04; Robert Hanson, CPNI, 10/06/04; Walter Joseph and Pierre John, CPNI, 02/06/04). As those who hunt, fish, gather and trap in customarily-defined areas
inherited from elder male relatives such as fathers and uncles, *keyoh* holders are intimately familiar with their territories. Places within *keyoh* territories are regarded as having been named by the male progenitors of current *keyoh* holders, and thought to be a sign of the deep knowledge of the land possessed by the earlier *keyoh* holders (Stanley Tom and Alexander Tom, CPNI, 21/12/04; Walter Joseph and Pierre John, CPNI, 02/06/04). Because of the *keyoh’s* importance in providing members of a family with a variety of food, places could be named to reflect either directly or indirectly the types of subsistence resources they harboured. Additionally, as the ownership of a *keyoh* is normally delegated to members of a family, the events (corporal as well as spiritual) that have taken place within its bounds are also inherited through place-names.

**The Functionality and Lyricism of Keyoh Place-Names**

As with many of the study place-names within the JPRF, *keyoh* toponyms show a utilitarian quality: they often designate the subsistence-related aspects of places. For instance, the *keyohs* east of Stuart Lake contain several small lakes whose names announce their subsistence value. Lake toponyms such as Duk’ai Hooni (“there are rainbow trout there”), Duk’ai Dizti’ (“the rainbow trout are precious there”), Lhooz Lai Unli (“there are a lot of chub in there”), and Lhotsuli (“where the fish spawn”) literally label the usefulness of the lakes from a subsistence standpoint (translations provided by Catherine Coldwell, CPNI, 25/06/04).

At times, features that are recognized communally as a landmark and concurrently claimed as part of someone’s *keyoh*, carry more than one name, indicating a variety of views as to the value of the features. Landmarks may carry metaphorical rather than utilitarian names. Heightening their mnemonic capacity, metaphorical names can consist of hyperbole
and puns related to the shape of the landscape feature. On the other hand, the different names attached by keyoh holders to these well-known landscape features indicate a specific type of knowledge, related to the resource importance of the features, to their role as keyoh boundary markers or to episodes concerning the features in some way. K’azyuś (Pinchi Mountain), located between Chuzghun (Tezzeron Lake) and Tesgha (Pinchi Lake), is an example of a feature that carries an alternate keyoh name. While the name of the mountain is generally known as a spiritual marker (see Chapter Four), the Tom family identifies this feature as Natadiliht’o, a name which refers to the annual flooding at the base of the mountain. It is an episode with which this family is well acquainted, given their occupation of this area for generations. The mountain may also perform a role in denoting the margins of the Tom family’s keyoh.

**Place-Names as Symbols of Authority and Knowledge**

Keyoh territories are defined according to both physical and social bounds. On a material level, keyoh limits are marked by “posts”, or “topographical partitions” by way of hills, mountains, watersheds, meadows, and trails (Margaret Mattess, CPNIS, 19/05/04). Lakes and islands, which can also be claimed as part of a family’s keyoh, are also used as posts (Stanley Tom and Alexander Tom, CPNI, 21/12/04). Although keyohs are thus demarcated, there remains a degree of reciprocity in sharing land and resources (see Chapter Three). This is observed in the social ties between keyoh holders and others. On a social level, keyoh boundaries are maintained through respect and deference towards the family members who have disposition rights to the piece of land.

In interviews conducted as part of this research, participants were reluctant to talk about places in somebody else’s keyoh. This reluctance seems to be steeped in anxiety of
trespassing on and misrepresenting another’s authority over and knowledge of a specific area used for subsistence. The unwillingness to discuss another’s keyoh was explained cogently by Walter Joseph, who remarked that talking about places in someone else’s keyoh is an intrusion synonymous to crossing or cutting through the keyoh without having first informed the owner (CPNI, 02/06/04). While keyoh boundaries are not absolute, there is an unspoken rule between keyoh holders and others that obtaining permission to use or travel through the keyoh is obligatory. This is a tacit acknowledgement of the keyoh holder’s tenure and authority over the keyoh. Even conversing about the place-names in another’s keyoh is a breach of respect and trust because the place-names can be specific to the keyoh in which they belong, forming not only a part of the owner’s knowledge of the keyoh but standing also as authoritative symbols of that knowledge.

*Place-Names Illustrative of the Intricacies of the Dakelh Language*

Place-names play a role in illustrating the complexities of the Dakelh language. Through this study’s place-name interviews, it became apparent that Tl’azt’en elders actively engaged in a unique means of conveying their thoughts. Although the medium of communication in the interviews was largely English, participants nonetheless used the language in a “Dakelh sense”, indicating how deeply immersed they still are in their own language and culture. An interesting phenomenon that arose repeatedly in interviews was the phrase “to hunt fish”, which seemed to hold a larger meaning than that presumed in the literal, verbatim understanding of these words.

The term “hunt”, as used by interview participants, allows for an examination into Dakelh traditional subsistence. In Dakelh, “hunt” seems to be synonymous with “subsist on”, “survive on”, “be nourished by” or “live on”, and includes fish and game-based subsistence-
related occupations without there being any distinguishing terms for them except syntactically when these activities are understood according to context as “hunt”, “fish” or “trap” (Poser 1998: 107). Rather than being simply a word describing a certain type of subsistence activity, “hunt” seems to be a metaphor for adapting to one’s environment. This idea would correlate with the theory of Athapaskan pre-historical social units of small hunting bands, whose members travelled extensively in search of food, particularly large game. Perhaps, over time, as people such as the Dakelhne came to settle at mouths of rivers and creeks, the term “hunt” began to assume a generalized meaning, used to signify other ways of surviving on the land such as fishing and the snaring of small game. People may have depended on fish as an alternate source of food when game was scarce (Ives 1990; Vanstone 1974). It is also likely that the same hunting implements used for game, such as spears, were also used for fish.

Discussions with Tl’azt’en elders about topoynms also point to other interesting aspects of the Dakelh language such as dialects and sub-dialects, which are apparent only to a trained ear that can identify variations in the manner words and names are pronounced. The ability to recognize dialectical differences is valuable in analyzing the mixing of dialects, loan words and pronunciation differences in the Dakelh language, including place-names. To encapsulate such language phenomena, the formative –bin as observed in several place-names within the Tesgha (Pinchi Lake) system (i.e., Binche bun and Bin koh (two of the five recorded names for Pinchi Lake), Bin tigdli and Bintl’at noo), remains obscure as it is a term with no apparent meaning to the Dakelh speakers of the Stuart-Trembleur region.
As discussed in Chapter Four, the origins of -bin might be traced to Babine territory⁴; however, more investigation is required to ascertain if this is the case or if the term was appropriated from the name of a person whose keyoh was at Tesgha’s outlet. As region dictates how Dakelh is spoken in various villages, further research may determine if variations in the standard dialect of a village are attributed to inter-marriages between members of different Dakelh bands, in-migrations of people from other bands, or borrowed terms from other groups (e.g. coastal aboriginal groups, Europeans). This knowledge may help to trace genealogies, kinship ties, and to piece together details that provide context to past events.

Place-names are a vital part of understanding and remembering the Dakelh language and culture. Elders, who travelled and worked on the land in their younger days and whose parents led a bush lifestyle, are clearly those who remember the traditional Dakelh place-names and who still speak the Dakelh language fluently. To them, place-names comprise a kind of *lingua franca*, where the names serve as a tool for communicating about the past. Through the “language of place-names”, past events and people who once lived off the land are memorialized in present-day conversations. Oftentimes, the knowledge of place-names held by elders is enigmatic to younger people who lack the language proficiency and experience of working on and travelling through the land. Therefore, the substance place-names offer in knowing the land the way the Dakelh ancestors once did is only available in its profundity to the initiated, specifically elders and those raised in the bush way of life.

⁴ Of special interest is Leslie Main Johnson and Sharon Hargus’ (2006) research on Witsuwit’en ethnogeography, through which a number of Witsuwit’en geographical terms have been studied. In drawing connections to the origins of -bin, it is worthy of note that the Witsuwit’en concept of “creek flowing out of a lake” has been documented by Johnson and Hargus to exist in the terms bin ts’ani or bin tezdli.
The Role of Place-Names in Educating about Conquest and Re-Conquest

An Altered Landscape, An Altered Lifestyle, An Eroded Toponymy

Through the interviews conducted as part of this study, it became clear that etymological analysis of toponyms alone is insufficient to grasp the full meaning of names. Rather, the physical attributes of a place, the activities carried out there and the people linked to it comprise information that is necessary to achieve the full meaning of toponyms. Place-names research, such as this study, builds an understanding of the role place-names have played in the lives of Dakelhne through a consideration of linguistic as well as ethnographic evidence.

When the voyageurs, trading company men, missionaries and settlers came to Dakelh territory, they picked up the indigenous names of places albeit in pidgin, which eventually became mapped and transcribed. The corruption of sounds in Dakelh names was thus made official, displacing the essence and original meanings of the names. These corruptions represent a loss of indigenous language and culture, and contribute to the overarching process of colonization, where one’s own language and worldview become alien and meaningless. The anglicized versions of Dakelh names symbolize an erosion of ancestral knowledge.

The landscape as the elders once knew it, through firsthand experience or through stories about it that they were told as youngsters, is not the same entity that is available to present-day Dakelhne (Margaret Mattess and Pauline Joseph, CPNIS, 19/05/04; Walter Joseph and Pierre John, CPNI, 02/06/04). Certain irrevocable and large-scale changes brought about by resource development schemes, compounded by an alteration of lifestyle whereby people have become less reliant on the land for their livelihood, have alienated the younger generation of Tl’azt’enne from drawing on the land for a sense of self (Walter Joseph and Pierre John, CPNI, 02/06/04). When the land and people are thus changed, it is
perhaps inevitable that place-names are not understood anymore according to their original contexts (Walter Joseph and Pierre John, CPNI, 2/06/04).

A significant part of comprehending the full meaning of Dakelh toponyms is to know the places they depict. As remarked upon time and again by the elders who were interviewed as part of this study, the land is indeed a visual reference of place-names. When the landscape’s hues, textures and forms are seen firsthand, place-names begin to make sense to the observer (Margaret Mattess and Pauline Joseph, CPNIS, 19/05/04; Catherine Coldwell, CPNI, 25/06/04; CPNVS, 06/01/06). So important is this visual referencing that it could be said that without experience of the actual places, toponyms are nothing more than husks. This is why the land has to be travelled and experienced firsthand in order for places and place-names to be remembered and understood, a notion that suggests the immense value of outdoor education programmes such as Yunk’ut Whe Ts’o Dul’eh in helping indigenous children and youth to engage with the land.

However, gaining knowledge through spending time on the land may not be as straightforward as in the days when British Columbia was still largely “uncharted territory”, and when places remained untouched by logging, mining and road building. Research participants recalled changes in cherished and familiar places such as ancient trails cut up by modern roads (Theresa Austin, CURA Pre-Test Interview, 17/05/04), and the drying up of a swamp, a treasured Labrador tea harvesting place, caused by intensive logging around the area (Margaret Mattess, CPNIS, 19/05/04). Such disturbances or changes to the landscape have resulted in memories of places gradually dimming because alterations to a place affect its environment (Walter Joseph, CPNI, 02/06/04). For people who have relied on the predictability of faunal and floral resources that places have offered over time, changes to places can cause a loss of livelihood and certainty (Walter Joseph and Pierre John, CPNI,
02/06/04). This is the point when a place is truly abandoned, ceasing to have meaning to people (Walter Joseph and Pierre John, CPNI, 02/06/04). In this situation, toponyms marking such places would eventually lose their meanings, too, for the basic reason that the sources of their very existence are changed or destroyed (Walter Joseph, CPNI, 02/06/04).

Today, most Dakelh place-names remain largely incomprehensible and even arcane to the younger generation due to their not knowing the Dakelh language and the limited time they spend on the land (Catherine Coldwell, CPNI, 25/06/04; Robert Hanson, CPNI 03/06/04). Nonetheless, there is an increasing sense of cultural pride amongst the younger generation of Tl’atz’enne about their heritage. An example of such resurgence is evinced by the use of a unique suite of toponyms by younger Tl’atz’enne. These toponyms are direct translations of the English place-names in Tl’atz’en territory (William Poser, pers. comm., 24/10/04), and while not bona fide traditional Dakelh names, their presence indicates the fervour amongst younger people to regain the language and culture of their ancestors. Examples include English names like Pinchi Mountain and Tezzeron Mountain, which have been translated verbatim into Dakelh as Binche Dzulh (or Tesgha Dzulh) and Chuzghun Dzulh, respectively (William Poser, pers. comm., 24/10/04).

**Place-Names as Identifiers of Belonging**

The *keyoh*, while existing on a functional level as a “larder”, carries symbolic meaning in how it acts as a vessel of tradition. It is frequently referred to as “a place for survival” (Walter Joseph and Pierre John, CPNI, 02/06/04; Catherine Coldwell, CPNI, 25/06/04; Stanley Tom and Alexander Tom, CPNI, 21/12/04; CPNVS, 27-28/04/05) but the meaning of this phrase surpasses its subsistence importance. On a social level, *keyohs* symbolize family and personal autonomy in the sense that they are places of belonging within the greater
Dakelh social structure. In short, *keyohs* are places where it becomes possible for individuals to attach in a personal way to the land. Other than being places to hunt, fish, gather and trap, *keyohs* offer respite and retreat (Stanley Tom and Alexander Tom, CPNI, 21/12/04). It is in this sense as a place for self-restoration, that the word “survival”, used to describe *keyohs*, is fully realized.

Toponyms play a role in the notions of belonging and individual autonomy through the kinds of places they mark. Through naming, people endow places with significance and power (Basso 1996; Thornton 1997b). In Tl’atz’en territory, the internalization of the land by people is observed in the way the landscape features are thought about—an unequivocal example is how mountains are thought to be incarnations of ancestors or characters from well-known legends (Renel Mitchell, pers. comm., 23/10/03; Walter Joseph, CPNI, 02/06/04; Morris Joseph, pers. comm., 10/06/04). In essence, to know the land is to know oneself and one’s ancestors. Place-names figure in an important way in this knowledge as they anchor particular pieces of information to particular places on the land (Basso 1996). In short, the names of places function as repositories of memories. As people move through the land, they gain experience of it as well as knowledge of their ancestry and history. To have gained experience of the land is to have gained knowledge of the names of its places and attendant narratives, which creates a sense of home and rootedness. This is why Tl’atz’enne, once a nomadic people, can be said to have regarded every place travelled regularly to as “home” (Teresa Austin, CURA Pre-Test Interview, 17/05/04).

Knowing the land continues to be important, given the pervasive onslaughts on indigenous culture. As people confront a past of occupation, racism and alienation, newer forms of conquest must also be contended with. There are a myriad of ways in which the land can be taken away from Tl’atz’enne besides large-scale forestry and mining endeavours. A
seemingly benign encroachment on aboriginal culture is the “cocacolonization” that is found the world over, where youth are exposed to and mimic popular culture, which has at its roots a set of norms for social living that differ from indigenous culture. As indigenous children and youth subscribe to these assimilative trends, they increasingly become dissociated from the land, their birthright (see “Statement of Philosophy”, Tl’atz’en Nation 1995).

GUIDELINES FOR INCORPORATING DAKELH TOPONYMY INTO YUNK’UT WHE TS’O DUL’EH CULTURE-BASED SCIENCE CAMP PROGRAMME

Learning and using indigenous place-names is a means of revitalizing indigenous language and culture. As repositories of language, land and oral history, place-names bridge the present with the past, enabling an understanding of TEK in the context of how landscape features functioned as travel aids, and markers of subsistence sites and historical events. It is through an appreciation of the ancestral past that the present generation of indigenous people form an appreciation of who they are today; in this way, place-names have a role in sustaining cultural identity and therefore, have much to contribute to indigenous education. As indigenous place-names promote understandings that are aboriginal and entwined with place, they stand as a powerful medium for educating about conquest, social justice, and indigenous rights and title.

A significant part of the Tl’atz’en-initiated Yunk’ut Whe Ts’o Dul’eh culture-based outdoor science camp programme (see Chapter Two) lies in its goal of creating an opportunity for youth to become immersed in the land and the Dakelh culture. To teach about the land in the context of the Dakelh culture, it is crucial to introduce learners to how Dakelhne conceive of the land and their place within the landscape. Place-names are valuable aids as they make the land accessible in human terms, as signs, pathfinders, containers of
knowledge (e.g. environmental, historical, geographical), and meditations of events and people of long ago. In teaching Tl’azt’en youth to re-connect with the land, place-names have an inestimable importance because they are tangible markers of places on the land that give substance to the culture of their people. Therefore, incorporating Dakelh toponymy in educational programmes, such as the *Yunk’ut Whe Ts’o Dul’eh* programme, has the effect of re-instating Dakelh names on the map, of keeping the land from being lost to Tl’azt’enne (Pauline Joseph, CPNIS, 19/05/04).

The guidelines offered below (Figure 5.1) for including Dakelh toponymy in the *Yunk’ut Whe Ts’o Dul’eh* programme are meant as broad recommendations to be utilized and adapted as needed in teaching the Dakelh subsistence round-related modules of the programme (see Mitchell 2003). Following the guidelines is an example using one *Yunk’ut Whe Ts’o Dul’eh* unit, and focusing on the toponym Chuzghun, to demonstrate possibilities for the implementation of the guidelines in developing lesson ideas (Figure 5.2).
Step 1: Determine a set of guiding questions for each toponym. In deciding how to introduce Dakelh toponymy to students, it is important to devise a set of guiding questions to frame the lessons. These questions will serve as a basis for determining the focus of teaching about Dakelh land, oral history and language through toponymy.

Step 2: Identify units from Yunk’ut Whe Ts’o Dul’eh to introduce the toponyms. Several units in Yunk’ut Whe Ts’o Dul’eh lend themselves to exploring many of the place-name elements that stemmed from the content-analysis stage of this research, including: Dakelh knowledge related to travel and subsistence; sense of place; and sense of environmental responsibility. Appropriate units to select will be those that conceptually match the guiding questions developed in Step 1.

Step 3: Determine a list of skills that students should gain from toponymy learning activities. In determining the types of skills that students should gain from toponymy learning activities, the British Columbia Ministry of Education’s Prescribed Learning Outcomes (K-7) for Science and Social Studies can be used as a guide to setting grade-level appropriate goals and expectations. It is also important to identify cross-curricular linkages to these subject areas that would allow, for example, for the strengthening of literacy and numeracy skills. Above all, the identification of skills specific to Dakelh knowledge of the land (yun) must be undertaken with the assistance of elders and other cultural experts in order for students to receive a solid on-the-land education. As a starting point to developing a list of culturally-specific skills and experiences, the Tl’azt’en Culture and Language Program goals and subject area learning outcomes could be consulted for direction as they outline, from a Tl’a’zt’en perspective, curricular objectives that are important for children and youth to attain in knowing and living their cultural heritage (see Tl’a’zt’en Nation 1995).

Step 4: Determine a set of toponymy learning activities. Toponymy learning activities should be aligned with the guiding questions developed in Step 1 to demonstrate to students that the information contained in place-names indicates Dakelh knowledge of the landscape. Mapping activities should be planned to teach students the locations of place-names as well as the geographical terms for landscape features. In order to get a “true sense” of the places mapped, site visits should be organized with the assistance of elders or keyoh holders. As those who know the Dakelh language and the territory visited, elders and keyoh holders will be invaluable in sharing their knowledge about the importance of places. In addition to recognizing and placing toponyms through maps and site visits, Dakelh place-names should be used to teach Dakelh. Through place-names, students gain the opportunity of learning the Dakelh language in the context of the land. Language lessons based on toponymy and planned in conjunction with teaching students about the land and the subsistence lifestyle of Dakelhne are vital in demonstrating the idea that the landscape is mirrored in the Dakelh language, which contains words and terms for understanding the intricacies of the geography of Dakelh country. Some possible aspects of the Dakelh language that can be taught through toponymy include compound words, contractions, nominalized verbs and directionals.
Step 5: **Determine a set of toponymy reflection activities.** An important consideration when indigenous toponymy is taught is the idea of how place-names came to be and how they have undergone change or become displaced. Exploring the issue of indigenous toponymic change should be placed within historical context, so that students can gain perspective on the circumstances that may have contributed to such change. Instructional approaches could be framed according to specific places, events that took place there, how these places underwent a name change, and how, as a result of name-changing, the indigenous meanings invested in places became misplaced or eclipsed by the European names ascribed to places by explorers, fur-traders, missionaries, settlers and government. To portray a balanced perception of the past, it is crucial that students are encouraged to explore the contributions of Dakelhne who have striven to keep the Dakelh language and culture alive through these waves of colonization. An important point to address to students at this stage is how learning Dakelh place-names is a way of returning to the land, the Dakelh language and oral history.

Another important consideration when teaching Dakelh toponymy is the idea that people have engaged with the land by observing specific codes of behaviour. These codes of behaviour are intimated in place-name narratives, which relate the Dakelh cultural mores of respect and care for the land and cooperation amongst people. Such stories could be employed to instil in students a sense of environmental responsibility, and to help them appreciate that their people have used the land in a sustainable manner.

**Figure 5.1**
Guidelines for Incorporating Dakelh Toponymy in the *Yunk’ut Whe Ts’o Duleh* Culture-Based Science Camp Programme.

The following sample lesson ideas provide a look at how the toponym Chużghun might be used to supplement a lesson unit on waterfowl using the above guidelines. The lesson approaches focus on introducing students to: the notion that Dakelh place-names, like other indigenous place-names, assume more than a designative or dedicatory role, and largely encapsulate information about the land; and the idea that place-names are an important part of the Dakelh culture because they chronicle the Dakelh language, narratives and places on the land.
**Place-name**
Chuzghun (Tezzeron Lake)

**Guiding Questions**
1) How have indigenous place-names been used in naming places? (Focus: Naming as a way of “bookmarking” places on the land that are indicative of routes and resources)
2) How have European place-names been used in naming places? (Focus: Naming as a way of commemorating historical personages, dedicating places in the “new world” to places in Europe (e.g., Kingston, London, St. Petersburg, Athens))
3) What is the literal meaning of this place-name? (Focus: What Dakelh words are found in the name? What do they mean?)
4) How does this place-name relate to the names of other nearby places (e.g., Chuz tizdli, Chuz koh, Tesgha)?
5) How is the literal meaning of this place-name reflected in what the place signifies to Tl’azt’enne (e.g., in terms of hunting, fishing, snaring and gathering)?
6) What kinds of Dakelh knowledge of the land (environmental, navigational, etc.) are contained in the place-name?
7) What relationship does this place-name have to the natural and social history of the place?

**Units from Yunk’ut Whe Ts’o Dul’eh to include learning activities about Chuzghun**
1) *Birds* (Module 4: Shin De)

**Learning Skills (General)**
Possible community-established learning outcomes dealing specifically with toponymy may include:
1) Understanding that Dakelh place-names are a form of Dakelh history.
2) Learning that there may be more than one Dakelh place-name for a place due to the special names *keyoh* holders attribute to places as well as the more generally known ones.
3) Understanding that different groups of Dakelhne are named after places such as rivers/creeks, points farthest away from river mouths, river mouths, lake outlets and the confluence of rivers (e.g., Nazkot’enne, Tl’azt’enne, Yekooche t’enne, Nak’azdli t’enne, Lheidli t’enne).
4) Learning Dakelh geographical nomenclature as a means to identify the physiographic features referred to in place-names and to tell the direction of water flow in a lake (i.e. through –che and tizdli).
5) Learning the Dakelh names for important landmarks (e.g., hills, mountains, islands, shoals and points) used in travel and to locate other important places.
6) Learning the Dakelh names for camping and fishing areas.
7) Learning the Dakelh names for historically-used places including trails, medicinal plant gathering sites, and places connected to legends.
8) Understanding the concept of “user’s right” with regards to *keyoh* lands, and learning the protocol associated with obtaining permission to use these lands.
Possible community-established extension learning outcomes* relating to toponymy may include:

1) Learning about different kinds of water (e.g., the running water of rivers vs. that of contained bodies of water vs. the standing water of marshes, swamps and bogs).
2) Learning the characteristics of lakes and rivers (e.g., streams and parts of lakes that remain ice-free during the winter; velocity of water flow in lakes and rivers based on season and shape of shoreline; presence of vegetation and other life forms).
3) Learning rules for safety when travelling on rivers and lakes (e.g., during winter freeze-up and freshet, different ice conditions, finding direction, paddling on fast rivers, knowing the locations of currents and large waves, gauging water depth).
4) Learning about natural and anthropogenic influences on lake and river systems (e.g., water erosion on land and rocks; effects of human refuse, industrial pollutants, water diversion mechanisms such as dams on water bodies and the flora and fauna they sustain).
5) Learning about traditional land use etiquette related to harvesting.

*Adapted from Dene Kede (1993).

Toponymy Lesson Ideas

Using Chuzghun to teach about Dakelh knowledge of geese and duck migrations and habitat in Birds (Yunk’ut Whe Ts’o Dul’eh Module 4: Shin De):

Introductory exercise: Students are supplied with a black and white Tl’azt’en Traditional Territory map with names of lakes in Dakelh. With the aid of a map key containing English translations of these place-names, students are instructed to colour lake toponyms relating to fish using one colour, names relating to waterfowl another colour, etc. Such an exercise would bring about instant comprehension that place-names contain information related to the environment, and could be followed by a discussion on where place-names come from, why so many places in the Tl’azt’en Traditional Territory are named after subsistence resources, what a name like Duk’ai Hooni (“the rainbow are precious there”) could possibly indicate in terms of the quantity as well as the quality of fish, and what particular characteristics of the lake make it such a rich habitat for fish.

Depending on age and maturity level, this mapping exercise could be supplemented by introducing students to a map of the same area but with the official or generally-known English, French or anglicized indigenous names for places. Students could be assigned small group work with some groups given the task of examining the Dakelh place-names on the first map in classifying them according to similarities they find in terms of prefixes, suffixes and root words. The same task could be assigned to other groups for the place-names on the second map. Students can then compare their classifications of place-names, taking note of how certain names are descriptive of the landscape and others commemorative of people, how certain names seem to consist of two or more words and others unintelligible, meaning-wise, etc.
Cross-curricular applications:

*Mathematics*- students could be asked to calculate the percentage of “bird” place-names vs. the percentage of “fish” place-names and to depict this information using a bar graph or pie-chart.

*Language Arts*- students could be asked to compose a story around the origins of one Dakelh or allogenous place-name. The story could take the form of a legend, travel narrative or diary entry, where the main elements of the story (characters, setting, plot) would have to be mind-mapped first.

**Main exercise:** Now that students have some idea of the kinds of information Dakelh place-names contain, Chuzghun (Tezzeron Lake) can be introduced to them in some depth. The lesson should start with general orientation questions to locate the lake on the map. Here, students should be encouraged to respond using the geographic vocabulary (e.g., cardinal directions) they have already learned in school (e.g., “to the north of Pinchi Lake”, “eastwards of Trembleur Lake”, etc.).

Students should also be asked if they have ever visited the lake and to describe the environs of the lake in as much detail as possible. To elicit detailed descriptions of the lake, students could be asked first to draw and label parts of the lake, and then to share what they remember of the lake with other students. An important question to address to students is if they know who the *keyoh*-holding families of the area are. This could spark discussion on subsistence hunting, which could serve as a good lead-in to introducing students to the resource value of Chuzghun, and to how the *keyoh* system functions (both before and after traplines became registered).

A short language activity consisting of examining Chuzghun and two other place-names, Chuz koh and Chuz tizdzi, which share its noun stem (*chuz*) can be carried out with students to arrive at an understanding as to how this stem has come to signify two meanings: 1) “where geese and ducks moult”, “moult ing lake”, “down feathers place” (a general Tl’azt’enne interpretation); and 2) “soft and hollow trees” (a *keyoh* holder’s interpretation). From here, students can be introduced to the etymology recorded for Chuzghun (“Snowflake Lake”) and both meanings can be compared to this etymology to consider how they may relate.

Chuzghun contains environmental information relating to habitat, life cycle and animal migration. These three terms should be defined with students and could be a part of an ongoing activity, where students have access to a bulletin board or blackboard to list real-life examples relating to each concept.

Chuzghun refers to the stage of moult ing in the duck and geese lifecycle, which provides the context for also teaching about habitat (i.e., nesting, feeding, and timing of the moult), and migration (i.e., the moult typically precedes migration). Students could be asked for examples of animals that moult (e.g., snakes shedding skin, moose shedding hair, etc.) and for reasons why they do so. The discussion could then be brought to considering why and when ducks and geese moult.
Students should be informed that some northern species of drakes, for instance, often have colourful plumage during mating season but that this is moulted away in the summer to give the male ducks a more subdued, female-like appearance.

Students could be asked to research the lifecycle of ducks and geese, paying special attention to why moultng is part of the birds’ lifecycle, and how this stage affects the birds’ ability to function (i.e., fly, swim, feed, defend itself, etc.).

Through the latter question, students could be encouraged to think of the birds’ habitat—the types of places they would need to be in, when moultng, to improve their chances for survival. The kinds of habitats found in the Chużghun area should be explored with students so that they can connect the name Chużghun (i.e., “where ducks and geese moult”) with the particular characteristics of the lake that sustain waterfowl. Elders and keyoh holders should be invited on tours around Chużghun to teach students about these places.

A connection could also be made to Tesgha when teaching about Chużghun as habitat for ducks and geese. Tesgha is associated with migrating waterfowl, with its name referring to portions of the lake that are characterized by weedy aquatic vegetation, typically places where ducks and geese take refuge.

The activity ideas in this section provide the opportunity for students to understand that place-names not only record the Dakelh language but also ancestral knowledge of the resource value of places. Accordingly, students should be led into discussion on the following points: 1) What were our ancestors doing at the time of year when ducks and geese moulted? 2) What plant and animal resources were they using at this time of year? 3) Why might knowledge of where geese and ducks can be found when they are moultng have been important to our ancestors? 4) What did they know about Chużghun that helped them survive? 5) How do you think they might have used this information to help them care for the land, plants and animals?

**Reflection exercise:** To reinforce the idea that place-names reveal the importance of the land as a basis of identity and survival to Dakelhne, students should be taught the narratives that are contained in place-names. One narrative that can be used to illustrate the time-honoured value of respect for nature is the story associated with Chuz tizdli, the outlet of Chużghun. “The Man Who Dived for Ducks” is a cautionary tale that instructs about the consequences for being greedy. To hone students’ Dakelh language listening skills, the story could be related first in Dakelh, and then in English, and then in Dakelh again. After listening to the story, students could be asked to create a storyboard, illustrating the story’s beginning, middle and end. For each portion of the story, students could create a short description of the events taking place. This could be done in English as well as Dakelh. Discussion of the story could revolve around the following questions: 1) Why was the man diving for ducks? 2) What time of year could this have been? 3) Why was he using a net? 4) What materials were used to make the net? 5) What are some other ways he could have used to catch ducks? 6) What may account for the tragic ending of the story? 7) What lessons can we learn from the story? Students could then be asked to reflect on ways that
they can apply these teachings in their own lives, at school, in their community, and when out on the land.

**Project ideas:**

1) Students could be assigned to record and map the place-names of their *keyohs*. They may focus on one or more sets of toponyms, including the names of water bodies, landmarks, fishing spots, etc. As part of documenting knowledge of the land and oral history contained in place-names, students could interview parents, grandparents and others knowledgeable about the *keyoh* about the meanings of and stories associated with the toponyms collected. The information gathered on *keyoh* place-names may then be displayed in the form of a booklet with maps, stories and a glossary of place-name meanings.

2) Students could be assigned to research other place-based stories known in Tl’atz’en territory. Students could research what the stories teach about the fauna, flora, or other resources of a particular place, as well as what the stories impart on a moral level. The stories could be written and illustrated by the students for presentation to children in lower grade levels (e.g. Kindergarten, Grades One and Two). For enrichment, the students could be asked to compare the stories on the basis of plot, characterization, setting and theme. The stories could then be grouped according to shared motifs (i.e., stories involving only animal characters, stories involving a journey, stories involving medicine power, stories that tell of the origins of a place, etc.). With the use of map symbols to denote story categories, this information can then be displayed on a map to obtain a visual representation of the location and distribution of stories in Tl’atz’en territory.

3) Students could be assigned to research the place-names of other Dakelh regions. A map showing the toponyms of Dakelh-speaking areas of British Columbia can be provided to students to learn the names of geographical features in other dialects, which may indicate boundaries of land tenure. For instance, in the case of Dakelh lake toponyms, students will discover patterns that map the traditional spaces of other Dakelh-speaking peoples—*-bun* (Stuart-Trembleur watershed); *-bin* (Babine-Witsuwit’en); and *-pin* (Nazko, Ulkatcho). Students could be asked to select one or two names from each region to study. Some possible questions to help them focus their investigations are:

1) Does the name indicate a water or land place? 2) Is it a compound form (i.e., a name consisting of two or more words)? 3) What do the words in the name mean? 4) What does the name’s prefix and/or suffix refer to (e.g., adverbial particles, geographical terms, directionals)? 5) Does it resemble any Dakelh names found in Tl’atz’en territory?

For enrichment, students could search to see if an official name exists for each Dakelh place-name being studied. The official names could be researched to determine if they are allegenous names or anglicized Dakelh names. By tracing the etymology and contextual information (i.e., land use activities performed at the place, people who used the place, events that occurred at the place, etc.) of the place-names, a history of place, reflecting Dakelh and European perspectives, could be created.

---

**Figure 5.2**

Sample Lesson Ideas for Incorporating Toponymy into the *Yunk’ut Whe Ts’o Dul’eh* Culture-Based Science Camp Programme.
The guidelines and lesson approaches mentioned above are meant as general recommendations for including toponymic information in instruction. They should be treated as a starting point and should be adapted to the particular programme’s workings (i.e., length of camp, venue, teaching personnel, students’ learning levels, etc.). Indeed, as the *Yunk’ut Whe Ts’o Dul’eh* programme is run and taught mostly by individuals who are not trained teachers and therefore not well-versed in the British Columbia school curriculum, the guidelines were developed in a “commonsensical”, lay format. They offer a step-by-step approach in conceiving ideas and strategies for including toponymic information into an existing teaching framework. However, as mentioned in Step 3, the *Integrated Resource Packages* for Science and Social Studies (B.C. Ministry of Education n.d.) might be consulted for direction in terms of the learning content and skills that should be covered by grade level. The ideas provided here take into consideration that trips onto the land to observe wildlife, gain outdoor survival skills, and tour culturally important places as part of the overall operations of the science camp will be more meaningful after children learn the significance of places on the land to Dakelh cultural continuity. To this end, visiting the places will inculcate a Dakelh sense of place in students, in that places will become concrete points of their own history.

The cooperation of Tl’azt’en elders, cultural experts, *keyoh* holders and Eugene Joseph School teachers will be invaluable towards helping students learn about the land through place-names. Elders, cultural experts and *keyoh* holders should be relied upon to teach certain aspects of toponymy lessons, particularly in explaining the language of place-names and the traditional use information contained in place-names. If possible, these individuals should accompany students on tours of the places, to point out how people have lived on the land, and how landscape features were used as landmarks while travelling on the
land and as markers of subsistence resources. School teachers can provide support to camp instructors in determining grade-appropriate learning content, instructional strategies and activities, and to develop the home-school-science camp relationship, by carrying out preparatory and follow-up activities based on the learning content to be addressed in the science camp. Specifically, in regard to toponymy, teachers can assist by teaching or revising, for instance, basic map-reading and map-making skills; concepts of ecology, habitat and niche; and historical events related to the fur trade, settlement and the establishment of missions in central British Columbia. Such work undertaken with students prior to and following their participation in the science camp not only helps them gain mastery of the content taught during camp but also provides a way for teachers and parents to become a part of the science camp learning experience. Student projects designed as part of preparing for and following up on the science camp should factor in parental participation, where parents are able to play an active role in helping their children learn about on-the-land activities, the Dakelh language, and Tl’azt’en history as understood through the balhats or clan customs and the keyoh system.

In the process of generating greater understanding and awareness of Dakelh place-names, this study has met with two key limitations, namely, my inability to communicate in Dakelh, and to gain Tl’aht’en perspectives of the landscape and place-names by engaging in dialogue with my research participants out on the land. The limitations of the study may be overcome when Tl’aht’en Nation trials the place-names analysis methodology proposed in this research in initiating its own examination and analysis of other names in its traditional territory. Future studies should consider on-the-land tours with Tl’aht’en elders and keyoh holders as the primary means of gathering knowledge about Dakelh place-names. These place-names knowledge gathering sessions should also be carried out in Dakelh whenever
possible to capture more fully the concepts related to Dakelh place-names and Tl’azt’en conceptions of the land. As intergenerational transference of language and culture is of great concern to Tl’azt’enne, Tl’azt’en youth should actively collaborate with elders and other Dakelh language and cultural experts in verifying and analyzing place-names. These experiential means of documenting knowledge and wisdom of toponyms will result in more holistic understandings of Dakelh place-names, which may be otherwise truncated due to reliance on maps as a means for orientation and remembrance.

A recommendation with regards to further supplementing the Yunk’ut Whe Ts’o Dul’eh programme with toponymic information involves including the names of landforms that have been used by Tl’azt’enne as landmarks and subsistence sites. This study was based on toponymic information that originated from largely water or water-related features; hence, it would be also useful to include for study the names of land-related (e.g., hills, boulders, mountains, eskers, etc.) features, as they may expound on the workings of landscape features as landmarks or points of reference that are used when travelling on or by water and on ice. Another consideration for studying the names of land-related features is their potential in marking subsistence or culturally-significant sites. Thus, it is of key importance to locate toponyms connected to plant gathering sites and places where certain animals are known to consistently visit (e.g., mineral licks, berry patches, etc.) for inclusion in the Yunk’ut Whe Ts’o Dul’eh programme in view of the potential layers of meaning (e.g., women’s and keyoh holders’ knowledge of the land) that can be introduced in the science camp curriculum.
CONCLUSION

Through the development of place-names information gathered through this research in four themes—1) Place-Names as Indicators of Dakelh Geographical and Historical Knowledge; 2) Place-Names Commemorative of the Ancestral Past; 3) The Role of Place-Names in Educating about Land and Language; and 4) The Role of Place-Names in Educating about Conquest and Re-Conquest—this final thesis chapter has demonstrated the means by which toponymy can be utilized to educate about land, language and history. As discovered in this research and explored fully in this chapter, Dakelh toponyms continue to occupy an important place in the make-up of Tl’azt’en identity—place-names aid remembrance of people and events in the past, and are markers of a continued Tl’azt’en presence on the land. Knowledge of toponyms demonstrates personal experience with the land, and to learn place-names is to learn about the land. The Tl’azt’enne who were interviewed during the course of the research have indicated that place-names represent much more than the places themselves; to know place-names is to be also acquainted with the narratives and memories linked to the places marked. In this way, toponymy contributes to the continuity of oral tradition: place-name referents, meanings, attendant narratives and memories are relayed when people know and use toponyms. An interesting point that interviewees brought up time and again during the research was the notion that travelling to named places is of utmost importance to appreciate the essence of place-names. This point supports the idea that to truly know place-names, one must have a relationship with the land: travelling on and harvesting from the land are ways of establishing a personal connection with the land. Travel entrenches patterns or systems of place-names in people’s consciousness, binding them with places on the landscape, which serve as repositories of ancestral knowledge.
The toponymic information dealt with in this research also suggests, upon review of anglicized Dakelh place-names or official or allegenous place-names for landscape features in Tl’azt’en territory, that toponymy has a part to play in evaluating the past, in appreciating the varied perspectives of historical events that have taken place in the area. Given that toponymy can assume this explicatory role, it is a valuable tool for teaching children and youth about their ancestry. This thesis exemplifies the utility of indigenous toponymy to create awareness of indigenous environmental knowledge as well as to unveil the processes of colonization that have contributed to overshadowing such knowledge. In this regard, the methodologies described in this thesis for analyzing, and utilizing toponymy in education can be employed generally, that is, in educational endeavours involving other indigenous as well as non-indigenous place-names.

Taken as a whole, this thesis has revealed how the notion of belonging and home is intimately linked to human understandings of place, conceived of in this research through a consideration of toponymy. Knowing the earth and rocks, water and sky, the plants and animals, and the events and stories of a place, make the place a part of those who inhabit it. For Tl’azt’enne, to whom the land is an indispensable part of cultural identity and heritage, the link between rights to land and rights to language and culture is embodied in the idea of remembering places and using Dakelh place-names. As demonstrated through this thesis, place-names provide the opportunity for Dakelh language maintenance and the learning of oral tradition, both vital issues underlying Tl’azt’en cultural continuity. Furthermore, to know one’s language and culture is to know oneself and to know with confidence where one is going in life. Knowing the place-names and stories of one’s homeland is part of knowing one’s language and heritage. But the intensity of the connection between knowing the toponymy and stories of one’s homeland and knowing one’s language and heritage depends
on the health of the land and the intactness of places on the land. The well-being and completeness of places are vital not only for place-names to be known and stories to be remembered but ultimately for the continuity of TEK and indigenous identity. Therefore, utilizing indigenous toponymy in a community-driven educational project like the *Yunk’ut Whe Ts’o Dul’eh* science camp programme promotes knowing, cherishing and protecting places through direct, personal involvement with the land.

While this thesis concentrated on a very small suite of Dakelh place-names, it has produced two methodologies for working with toponymy: 1) to analyze extant written source and TL’azt’en Nation project materials relating to Dakelh toponymy; and 2) to develop guidelines for incorporating toponymic information into curriculum. It is hoped that these methodologies will serve as a model for TL’azt’en Nation’s own examination of, and inclusion into educational projects, the six hundred-odd Dakelh place-names that have been collected to date by the community. As the guidelines, offered in this thesis, for incorporating Dakelh toponymic knowledge into curricular initiatives will be eventually trialled by the CURA Education Stream in including Dakelh place-names content into the *Yunk’ut Whe Ts’o Dul’eh* programme, it is envisioned that TL’azt’en Nation will have a more consultative role in fine-tuning the guidelines in meeting the community’s own specific educational aims. Consequently, the value of this thesis to TL’azt’en Nation lies in its explication of how place-names can be examined for information concerning the environment, language and history, and how such information can be applied in education. The thesis marks a starting point in TL’azt’en Nation’s efforts at making the place-names of its territory known and used by its children and youth.
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APPENDIX B

Interview Guide

INTERVIEW QUESTIONS

N.B. Sections A&B to be asked of Walter Joseph, Sophie Monk, Robert Hanson and Pierre John. Only Section B to be asked of all other interviewees.

A. The following questions address your involvement in place-names work carried out within Tl’azt’en traditional territory:

1) Have you carried out your own place-names project?
   a) When was your project carried out?
   b) Why did you choose to do a project on place-names?
   c) Which areas did your project cover?
   d) How did you get information on place-names? (Who did you talk to? Were they your family members? Did you use a map? Did you go out on the land? Did you take any photos?)
   e) What kinds of information on place-names did you get? (Did you get any legends/stories? Can you give some examples of place-names that contain myths/stories? Why do you think that some come with myths and others don’t?)
   f) Did you record this information? (Where is this information kept? Can I take a look at it?)
   g) What did you do with this information? (Did you put the names on a map? Do you plan to put it into a book?)

2) Have you been involved in other place-names projects?
   a) Which ones?
   b) How were you involved? (Which areas were you interviewed on? What sorts of questions were you asked? Did you look at a map or photographs? Was it easy to remember places using that map? Why/Why not?)
   c) Which areas did these projects cover?
   d) Why were these projects carried out? (When were they carried out?)
B. The following table provides the English name and location of the place-names you will be asked about:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DAKELH PLACE-NAME</th>
<th>ENGLISH PLACE-NAME</th>
<th>LOCATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Kuzkwa River (Two separate features: the mouth of the river and the cove closest to the mouth)</td>
<td>93K15- north on east bank off Tache River</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>93K15- outlet of Tezzeron Lake, far western portion of lake</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Tezzeron Creek</td>
<td>93K9- Tezzeron Creek</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Tezzeron Lake</td>
<td>93K9- Tezzeron Lake</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Hatdudatehl Creek</td>
<td>93K9- North of Tezzeron Lake</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>93K9- west side of creek, at mouth of Pinchi Creek at Pinchi Lake/ mouth of river on Pinchi Lake</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Island, southeast Pinchi Lake</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>Trail, north of Pinchi Lake, south of Pinchi Mt.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>Pinchi Lake</td>
<td>93K9- Pinchi Lake</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>Pinchi Mountain</td>
<td>93K9- northeast of Pinchi Lake South of Tezzeron Lake, north of Pinchi Lake</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Do you know the Dakelh/traditional place-name for this place? (Point to features on map, show photos/orthophoto)

2. Is this a Tl’azt’en or Nak’adzli place-name?

3. Is this place known by any other (alternate) name than what you just gave?

4. Can you translate (give a ‘word for word’ translation of) any of these Dakelh names into English?

5. What do these translations mean or refer to? (Why do you think it’s called this?/ Why is this place named this way? What does it tell about the place? Does it tell anything about the plants or wildlife that belong to this place?)

6. Which of these places do you know best or most about?
a) Do you know how old the names of these places are or how long people have been using them?

b) Are these names known by most Tl’azt’en and Nak’adzli community members? What about among young people?

c) Do you agree with where these place-names are located? Do you know of a different location for these names? Or, are there other places that are called by these names?

d) Do you know any stories or legends about any of these place-names?

7. Not all places have names. In your opinion, what kinds of places have names? (What do place-names say about the land/environment? Why are place-names special to people?)

8. Have people ever been named after places?

9. Have you noticed any changes in the use and meaning of place-names?

10. Is there any other information you'd like to share about Tl'azt'en place-names?

11. Who do you recommend I talk to about place names in and around Pinchi Lake and Tezzeron Lake? Who is most knowledgeable about these places-names?