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This thesis examines 480 Tlingit shaman's charms using Panofsky's method of analysis. The ms. catalogue notes on 380 charms collected by George Emmons were compiled together with published information on 100 others to yield firm data on provenance, context, materials, frequency of various motifs, and use. This data is presented in a series of tables which are discussed in the text. The most frequently appearing motifs on charms were human beings of various types, and the most common animal motif was the land otter, but variability of motif type and complexity was pronounced. Examination of the Tlingit context of the shaman's practice and specific Tlingit beliefs about the land otter reveal that it was the animal most frequently connected with shamanism, and the most important to his practice. Tlingit cosmological structure was reviewed in order to locate the land otter in the Tlingit scheme and shed light on the taboos associated with it. The insights of Mary Douglas were referenced, comparing the ways the Tlingit structure is like others worldwide, and how the land otter functioned as an essential mediator between the secular and sacred for the Tlingit.
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"Shaman of the Taku Kwan dressed for practice, Gastineau Channel, near Juneau, Alaska."
G.T. Emmons photo, 1888.
Sawyer Archive

FRONTISPICE
INTRODUCTION

A. Art History and Anthropology

This thesis attempts an in-depth art-historical treatment of a class of small bone and tooth carvings usually called charms, which were used in various ways as magical amulets by the shamans of the Tlingit Indians of Southeastern Alaska. Such an attempt in itself requires a few words of explanation. In North America, art historians usually confine themselves to consideration of the artistic products of their own, or similarly literate, "high" civilizations. The obscure, exotic, and difficult works from the vastly varied non-literate peoples of North America have tended, with one or two notable exceptions, to be left by art historians to the mercies of some anthropologists for whom art is a problematic type of material culture.

There are good reasons for this. Absent or fragmentary documentation often frustrates the art historian who by training wishes to reconstruct the original context of a work or group of works. Where documentation exists, reliable information concerning the society from which the work came may be lacking entirely, or, as is usually the case, be quite incomplete. The art historian, furthermore, is likely to want to discuss that which came before, and after, the work under discussion, and how the work exemplified and contributed to its period, a project necessarily contingent
upon previous successful work by archeologists or ethnohistorians.

Such problems may do much to explain the neglect suffered by the artistic productions of so-called "primitive peoples", particularly in North American, but they do not excuse the ethnocentric denigration suffered when presented as a mere prelude to "high art", as happens in a number of sweeping histories of World Art, such as Gombrich (1961;K) and Hauser (1962;K). And yet, misstatements are perhaps understandable given the wealth of artifacts in relation to the paucity of data.

In spite of these considerations, interest in "Primitive Art" has never been higher, and descriptive studies by art historians such as Holm and Kaufman have begun to explore the rich visual universe of Northwest Coast art.

Anthropologists, who concern themselves almost solely with exotic, non-literate peoples, are primarily interested in the societies of such people and their internal relationships. Ritual, modes of production, mechanisms of societal functioning, ownership of resources, and other areas are all more energetically investigated than is material culture, which is considered to be a sub-discipline of relatively low status. The Anthropology of Art seeks to

1. The bibliography in this work has been divided for convenience into a number of separate sections. The capital letter which follows the date in bibliographical references refers to the section of the bibliography in which the full reference may be found.
discover whether a universal theory of artistic production and image recognition might be formulated which applies equally well to all human societies. (lecture notes, Anthropology 331, Anthropology of art, Marjorie Halpin, instructor, 1979-80.) Works in this tradition, such as Boas' *Primitive Art* (1955;K), and Anderson's *Art in Primitive Societies* (1979;K) take a broad overview of several primitive art traditions. For Boas (first published in 1895 and revised in 1927) the aim "is rather an attempt to determine the dynamic conditions under which art styles grow up" (1955:7;K). Anderson presents his work as the first since Boas' to "bring together in a single book the many insights that have resulted from the systematic study of art from primitive societies" (1979:xiv;K). He writes: "I have tried to present the principal issues that are relevant to the study of art as a cultural phenomenon" (ibid.) (emphasis mine).

This neglect of simple empirical study is best exemplified by noting that Anderson's lengthy bibliography, consisting of 307 references, includes only 46 (15 percent) that may be judged from their titles to be object-centered, and has but a single article of methodological focus (Haselberger, 1961;K), by a European art historian, no less. Eighty-five percent of the references use art to get at some other aspect of the society, or even at the nature of mankind.

This represents no small problem. A vast corpus of fascinating and little-understood art objects from an astoundingly varied panoply of human cultures would seem to
have, in large part, fallen between the cracks. The art historian who wishes to examine a specific "primitive" art object but who is lost without texts, and unfamiliar with the purposes of ethnographic description, has much in common with the anthropologist who wishes to do likewise but is stymied by the absence of sound methodological examples in the field of anthropology.

This thesis has been conceived in part as a means of addressing this lack. It is intended to demonstrate the complementary nature of art historical and anthropological approaches. It considers, in depth, and with Erwin Panofsky's art historical methodology, the small, highly varied "charms", principally of bone and marine ivory, used in magical practice by Tlingit shamans. This group of objects, of no mean artistic and symbolic significance, have heretofore received little serious scholarly consideration of any kind in any academic discipline.

B. Methodology

This investigation is based upon the metholodolgy formulated by Erwin Panofsky, a well-known art historian who worked exclusively within the Western tradition, particularly on the survival of motifs and themes from Classical Antiquity into Medieval and Renaissance times. His methodology has been used at least once previously for a Northwest Coast subject by Jennifer Gould (U.B.C.) in her Raven Rattle study (1973;F).
Panofsky's *Iconography And Iconology: An Introduction To The Study Of Renaissance Art* (1955;K) delineates a three-stage process of art historical investigation that unifies several complementary approaches into a sequential, coherent whole. His hermeneutical schemata, which this thesis essentially follows, is reproduced as Figure 2.

Panofsky's initial stage of art historical analysis, pre-iconographical description, consists of "identifying.... representations of natural objects such as human beings, animals, plants, houses, tools, and so forth" (ibid:28).

Panofsky, the historian of art and of symbols, considers the motif, or image, the basic, most significant element, but to the student of material culture, the canvas is as noteworthy as the painting. Investigation of the present topic, at the level of pre-iconographical description, requires compilation of available documentary information on provenance, material, and motif. Thanks to the perspicacity of George Emmons, who collected the vast majority of the shamans' charms, such data is remarkably full: but, as will be seen, it is not without its problems. Emmons' documentation must be regarded as an artifact as well, and as subject to scrutiny as the objects it describes. This thesis, then, is as much a study of Emmon's documentation as it is of the charms themselves, because we are, in the absence of other sources of information, largely restricted to compiling his assertions. There is no reason to doubt Emmon's statements regarding provenance and this is where discussion of his documentation begins. But, with his
### Iconography and Iconology:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OBJECT OF INTERPRETATION</th>
<th>ACT OF INTERPRETATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Primary or natural subject matter—(A) factual, (B) expressional—constituting the world of artistic motifs.</td>
<td>Pre-iconographical description (and pseudo-formal analysis).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary or conventional subject matter, constituting the world of images, stories and allegories.</td>
<td>Iconographical analysis.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intrinsic meaning or content, constituting the world of &quot;symbolical&quot; values.</td>
<td>Iconological interpretation.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**An Introduction to the Study of Renaissance Art**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EQUIPMENT FOR INTERPRETATION</th>
<th>CORRECTIVE PRINCIPLE OF INTERPRETATION (History of Tradition)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Practical experience (familiarity with objects and events).</td>
<td>History of style (insight into the manner in which, under varying historical conditions, objects and events were expressed by forms).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge of literary sources (familiarity with specific themes and concepts).</td>
<td>History of types (insight into the manner in which, under varying historical conditions, specific themes or concepts were expressed by objects and events).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Synthetic intuition (familiarity with the essential tendencies of the human mind), conditioned by personal psychology and &quot;Weltanschauung.&quot;</td>
<td>History of cultural symptoms or &quot;symbols&quot; in general (insight into the manner in which, under varying historical conditions, essential tendencies of the human mind were expressed by specific themes and concepts).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**Fig. 2**

The Three Stages of Art Historical Analysis (Panofsky, 1955:40-41; K.)
other attributions, which generally concern material, iconography, and use, we must use caution. The limitations of Emmon's documentation are discussed in turn in conjunction with the tables that present the data that are mostly his.

Of the second stage, *iconographical analysis*, Panofsky writes that the essential concern is to provide "insight into the manner in which, under varying historical conditions, specific themes or concepts were expressed by objects and events" (ibid:41). This requires integration of the empirical and documentary data compiled and evaluated in Chapter One with detailed knowledge of Tlingit ethnography. The specific question to be addressed is: what did the various charms originally mean to the Tlingit who made, used, and saw them? What was their original context? The very large number of motifs found on Tlingit charms, however, make it necessary to restrict the discussion considerably less the investigation at hand become utterly unwieldy. The land otter, the most frequent motif, has been selected for in-depth analysis. As will be seen, ethnographic and mythological sources shed considerable light on the original context of the potent land otter symbol.

Stage three, *iconological interpretation*, attempts to provide "insight into the manner in which, under varying historical conditions, essential tendencies of the human mind were expressed by specific themes and concepts" (ibid.). This writer asserts that such "essential tendencies" may reasonably be discovered no matter how alien the culture under
consideration. Detailed consideration of this issue is a major research topic in itself, but surely we are all human. Panofsky's method will be followed by considering the following: Why was the playful and remarkably intelligent land otter a unique and potent object of dread? Charms had magical power to effect cures. Why? How? And finally, with respect to charms and the land otter, how did the Tlingit address the fundamental human need for social and psychological stability. The insights of Mary Douglas are drawn upon to help us make sense of these basic questions.

Taken together, Panofsky's three stages of art historical analysis provide a most satisfying, complete framework of investigation which encompasses a broad spectrum of approaches. The historian of style need not suspect the investigator of symbols for dealing in intangibles, and the symbolists need not denigrate the stylist for dealing only in nuts and bolts. Each contributes an essential portion of the whole. Art history, having grown up with secular humanism, is more than a subset of material culture studies. They are complementary disciplines, and capable of enriching each other immensely.
CHAPTER ONE: PRE-ICONOGRAPHICAL DESCRIPTION

A. Sources

1. Collections

   a. Documentation

   Data were compiled on 480 Tlingit charms in 22 institutional and private collections. By far the greater number were those in the George Emmons' collections of the American Museum of Natural History, New York, the Field Museum, Chicago, and the Washington State Museum, Seattle. Fortunately, Emmons' collections were also the best documented. Financial constraints made it impossible to visit Chicago or New York, but Emmons' manuscript catalogues, which he wrote to accompany the collections that he sold to the afore-mentioned institutions, were made available to me by Dr. Alan Sawyer, professor, U.B.C. Fine Arts Department. (Emmons, mss. A.M.N.H. "E", A.M.N.H. - 19, F.M., and W.S.M.; E). Dr. Sawyer also freely made available the resources of his extensive slide archive, and many of his original photographs are reproduced in this study. Professor Bill Holm, of the University of Washington, Fine Arts and Anthropology Departments, introduced me to the resources of the Washington State Museum, and also made available his huge slide archive. Many of Holm's images are also here reproduced. The U.B.C. libraries were searched for published images of charms - compiled in Appendix II.
Of the 480 charms noted, unfortunately only 33 percent were seen physically or in a photograph. The remainder are known from Emmons' documentation. The decision was made to compile Emmons' data on unseen charms because, as the most prolific and conscientious collector on the Northwest Coast (Bill Holm, in conversation, October 1980), his voluminous original data deserves to be compiled and studied. Seventy-five percent of all charms included in this study were collected by this one man.

Emmons tried to supply place of collection, Tlingit name, use, and explanation of the motif(s) represented for every one of the well over 10,000 artifacts that he sold (Low 1977:8;I). Occasionally he also supplies the clan affiliation of the vendor or previous owner, but this is, unfortunately, quite rare. He often skipped one or several items of his customary list, and did so with no discernable consistency. As will be seen, particularly in the discussion of motifs, this causes major problems with his information. Insight into his standards of documentation and specific sources of information must await the researching of his notebooks and manuscripts, many of which are in the Provincial Archives of B.C. Frederica de Laguna is presently working with Emmons' papers and intends eventually to publish an edited version of the Tlingit ethnography on which he worked for many years.
b. George T. Emmons and his times

Emmons was perhaps better acquainted with the Tlingit than any other non-Indian of his period, 1880-1920 (ibid.). In his position with the U.S. Revenue Cutter Service, the only legal authority in Alaska before the 1890's, he covered southeastern Alaska, and acquired an intimate knowledge of native conditions and affairs. He collected, mostly by purchasing, but also by gathering materials from shamans' graves and abandoned village sites, anything portable that had in any way been modified or used by the Tlingit. This total of over 10,000 items was sold to a number of different museums. He was able to do this because of the unique conditions of the period. Alaska had been purchased from Russia in 1867, and the Russians had largely been content to leave the natives to their own devices, at least beyond the vicinity of Sitka. The decade beginning with 1880, which saw the first significant rush of American capital and missionary activity, marked a greatly accelerated decline of traditional Tlingit life. Hoochinoo, or moonshine, and venereal disease became rampant. U.S. gunboats shelled the villages of Kake, Wrangell, and others in the years 1869-1882 (Miller and Miller 1967: Ch. 6;I).

The 1880's saw many, if not most, of the traditional houses abandoned in favour of frame structures of milled lumber. By 1890, large numbers of Tlingit spent the summer in new canneries or commercial fishing stations, working for
wages with which they purchased durable goods. But, ten years earlier they had repaired in summer to ancestral fishing and gathering camps. Thousands of tourists visited southeastern Alaska on cruise ships, and a thriving curio trade in all manner of artifacts sprang up. (Porter 1893: Ch. 6;I). The ancient subsistence cycle was broken, and hoochinoo, venereal disease, missionary education and white contempt rapidly weaned the Tlingit away from the remaining faith they had in the power of the shamans to cure or kill (Miller and Miller:168-203;I).

In such an environment, Emmons was able to induce the Tlingit to part with objects that a very few years earlier would have been obtainable only at great risk. Edward G. Fast, who in 1867-8 obtained some Tlingit shamans' paraphenalia, presumably from shamans' graves, noted that it placed his assistant's life at risk to get it (Fast 1869:5-6;D). Emmons, though, who gathered over two dozen shamans' grave lots, seems to have done his looting with no greater risk than his purchasing, and was able to obtain information on grave lot artifacts from Tlingits who seem not to have minded his looting.

2. Previous Scholarship on Tlingit Charms.

Published scholarly literature on Tlingit shamans' charms is meagre. Only two articles have appeared in which they are the primary topic. George Emmons and G.P. Miles'
1938 (B) article is very brief, but does provide illustrations of nine charms, with notes on their iconography and use. Jonaitis' 1978(B) article in American Indian Art Magazine also provides a number of illustrations, but is far too brief to develop the ideas presented. Laguna includes a short note on charms and several illustrations in her 1972 study (689-690;G), as does Gunther (1966:157-158;F).

Two unpublished scholarly works of merit must also be mentioned. Carol Ann MacKinnon's M.A. thesis, A Study of Pendants and Spirit Charms Collected from the Northwest Coast: Ethnological Collections and Archaeological Recoveries (1979;F) presents data from the entire Northwest Coast, in a manner somewhat different than the present study. She does not significantly distinguish between the various northern Northwest Coast tribes, or compile Emmons' manuscript data. This is not to find fault with her work, which will be here cited. She provides significant justification for further effort by establishing that 66 percent of known Northwest Coast charms are from the Tlingit (ibid.:25).

Jonaitis' 1977 dissertation includes a six-page discussion of charms (88-93;B). It contains little quantitative data, but discusses well the major types and their uses as recorded by Emmons. As her title (The Relationship between the Social and Shamanic Art of the Tlingit Indians of Southeastern Alaska) implies, she provides an in-depth investigation of the shaman, his art, and places both in their social contexts.
Numerous art books, featuring primitive Americana and providing excellent photographs but minimal contextualization, feature at least one charm. They are too numerous to list here, but may be found in Appendix II.

3. Contemporary Sources

The 1880's saw a flood of American newspaper and magazine interest in the newly acquired Alaskan possessions. A number of popular works of travel and exploration contain references to curio traders and even shamans in action (see especially Seton-Karr 1887: 59, 125-133; I).

Bancroft's 1886 History of Alaska (I) provides a minutely detailed recapitulation of early Russian manuscript sources and immediate post-purchase events. U.S. Government publications of the era immediately subsequent to the Alaska purchase contain detailed information. Petroff's Tenth Census Report provides a list of Tlingit villages and camps and their 1880 population (1884; I). Petroff also presents earlier Russian and Hudson Bay Company figures. The reports of the U.S. Revenue Cutter Service (Beardslee 1882, Glass 1880-1882, and Lull 1880-1882; I) provide a wealth of detail on the chaotic conditions of the time. Beardslee offers his perspective on a case of witchcraft, tells us what the shaman was paid in blankets, and what the blankets were worth in dollars (1882: 58-59; I). Schwatka's 1885 Report of a Military Reconnaissance in Alaska made in 1883 (I) includes notes on the
strength and dispositions of the various kwans (Tlingit areal subdivisions) and their relative degrees of assimilation. The 1890 U.S. 11th Census report (Porter 1893;I) comments glowingly on the great progress made in the previous ten years in raising the Tlingit from heathenism, and of course provides reliable population figures which, together with those presented in 1884, are of great ethnohistoric value.

4. Histories

More recently, Gunther's Indian Life on the Northwest Coast of North America (1972:139-181;H) has contributed an excellent review of the early contact period in the late 18th century, augmented by careful ethnographic research and attention to the material collections made by the early expeditions. The text is accompanied by plates taken from the publications of the voyages of discovery, and a substantial bibliography. Polly and Leon Miller's Lost Heritage of Alaska (1967;H) provides a detailed and well researched popular history that carries through the 19th century and is specifically oriented to the native experience.
B. Provenance and Context of Recovery of Charms

1. Provenance Data

Eighty percent of the 480 charms in the sample (almost entirely obtained by Emmons) have specific provenance data. Location, or at least district, of collection was one of the items of information he most regularly supplied. Table I presents the data, discussion of which will appear in conjunction with that of Table II. Emmons' most frequent orthography is employed for obscure villages having no standard spelling. When collecting this data it became apparent that there existed no single compilation of the many obscure Tlingit villages and camps. For that reason a gazeteer of Tlingit kwans, villages and localities is presented as Appendix IV. A map which represents the Tlingit kwans (Figure 3) is taken from Laguna (1972:1:4;G). It has been modified slightly in the Henya/Kaigani area, as Laguna erred in showing only the southeastern portion rather than the entire southern half of Prince of Wales Island and adjacent islands as Kaigani Haida territory. In that southwestern quadrant were the Haida villages of Howkan, Klinkwan and Kaigani (Swanton 1952:570;H). As well, the Dry Bay of Laguna's map is equivalent to the Gonaho of Emmons, Swanton and others. Angoon (name of the central village) is equivalent to Hutsnuwu, and the Eyak-Chugach area is claimed by Emmons to have been the home of the
Fig. 3
(Adapted Fig. 1 Laguna, 1973:1:14;G)
Table I, p.1: Provenance of Tlingit Shaman's Charms

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Local Groups and Constituent Villages</th>
<th>Charms Collected from Local Groups</th>
<th>% Dist. of Charms</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Auk Kwan</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sinta Ka Heene</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Auk</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chilkat-Chilkoot Kwan</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>5.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chilkat River</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chilkoot</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dashu</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inderstucka</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kagwalter</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Klukwan</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>14.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gonaho Kwan</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ah-qwey R.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alsek R.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aukon Heene</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dry Bay</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>5.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>7.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guthleuh Kwan:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cape Martin</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Henya Kwan:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Klawack</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shakan</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuxecan</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hoonah Kwan</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arson Kee</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bartlett Bay</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cross Sound</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gandcon</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>5.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Icy Strait</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Porpoise Is.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thle-hu-gu</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W. Coast Chichigoff I.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>10.63</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table I, p.2: Provenance of Tlingit Shaman's Charms

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Local Groups and Constituent Villages</th>
<th>No.</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Groups</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hutsnuwu Kwan</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>7.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Angoon</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>5.83</td>
<td>35.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chatham Str nr Angoon</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td>1.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chyeeke</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>2.71</td>
<td>16.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Old Hootznahoo</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>2.71</td>
<td>16.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hood's Bay</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td>1.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Killisnoo</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>15.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kake-kuiu</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neltushkin</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>7.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>16.67</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sanya Sumdum</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sitka Kwan</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2.08</td>
<td>20.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nakwasina Bay</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>12.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peril Strait</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.42</td>
<td>4.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sitka Village</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>6.46</td>
<td>63.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>10.21</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stikine Kwan</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.42</td>
<td>3.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wrangell</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>10.42</td>
<td>96.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>10.83</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taku Kwan</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tongass Kwan</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.42</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yakutat Kwan</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1.46</td>
<td>31.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Port Mulgrave</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2.08</td>
<td>45.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yakutat Village</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.04</td>
<td>22.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>4.58</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tlingit</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>20.83</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Total</td>
<td>480</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Data compiled from G.T. Emmons ms. notes and published sources (see Appendix II)
Guthleuh kwan (Hodge 1910:765; H). Sanya, in the southern part of the Tongass area near Cape Fox, is not shown.

2. Comparison of Population and Provenance Data: Discussion of Tables I and II

Table II compares the totals of Table I with 1880 and 1890 population figures and with provenance data of Tlingit objects from the entire "E" catalogue of the American Museum of Natural History, some 2,566 items. The point of making this comparison is to examine the relationship between population, charms, and total artifact production, assuming that artifact production and collection were constant relative to population. Scrutiny reveals incongruencies which are supported by the known historical record.

The Auk kwan constituted 18.4 percent of the population in 1890, a rapid rise from 9.5 percent in 1880, but Emmons collected only 5.69 percent of his "E" catalogue artifacts from them, and but 1.9 percent of the 480 charms in our sample are from there. This may be explained by the rapid rise of the mining centre of Juneau on the site of Sinta-ka-heene (Emmons' spelling), or Tsantikihin. The Auk area, initially depopulated as were the other Tlingit areas, grew again as Tlingit flocked to Juneau to work as wage labourers. Such Tlingit, removed from their traditional villages, demoralized and often Christianised, appeared not to have brought their heirlooms with them.
The Chilkat, the strongest and most conservative Tlingit group, contributed more than their share of artifacts, and exactly their share of charms. It may be significant that Emmons had particularly good relationships with the Chilkat.

The nearby Gonaho area was entirely depopulated by 1890, and yet 6.7 percent of "E" catalogue artifacts and 7.04 percent of total charms are from there. These were collected from shamans' graves in the Dry Bay area. The absence of permanent villages in the Gonaho area since the early years of the 19th century is underscored by the mention by Emmons of deserted Gonaho villages (ms. A.M.N.H. "E":#409), and their absence in later American lists. Swanton (1952:541;H) characterises the Gonaho area as a summering place of the Yakutat, which it perhaps became as population declined, without its own villages. But, the censuses, taken in the summer show no one, perhaps due to continuing rapid depopulation. Emmons obtained important Gonaho pieces from Yakutat which shows where the survivors went.

Some kwans, such as Kake, Sanya and Tongass, were quite low in population by 1880 and even lower by 1890, and contributed even less to Emmons' hoard. The curio trade may be a factor in these discrepancies. Scidmore, writing in the 1890 census report notes: "A considerable trade in furs, baskets, and curios is carried on between Sitka and Yakutat." (Porter 1893:53;I). One may safely assume there was other movement as well. Portable "curios" were taken from outlying areas and sold at places where white tourists came in the
Table II: Comparative distribution and proportional relationships of 1880 and 1890 population, artifacts in the A.M.N.H. "E" Catalogue, and shaman's charms by Kwans

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Kwan</th>
<th>No.</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>No.</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>No.</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>No.</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Auk</td>
<td>640</td>
<td>9.49</td>
<td>896</td>
<td>18.4</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>5.69</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chilcat</td>
<td>841</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>610</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>503</td>
<td>19.6</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>13.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chilkoot</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>1.88</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>2.18</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>.312</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gonaho</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>1.48</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>176</td>
<td>6.86</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>7.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guthleuh</td>
<td>320</td>
<td>4.75</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>1.81</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Henny</td>
<td>587</td>
<td>8.71</td>
<td>319</td>
<td>6.55</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>3.94</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Huna</td>
<td>1008</td>
<td>15.0</td>
<td>449</td>
<td>9.22</td>
<td>317</td>
<td>12.4</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>11.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hutnsuwwu</td>
<td>766</td>
<td>11.4</td>
<td>414</td>
<td>8.50</td>
<td>311</td>
<td>12.1</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>17.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kake</td>
<td>408</td>
<td>6.05</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>2.18</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>1.87</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kiiu</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>2.37</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>2.36</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sanya</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>1.48</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>.534</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>.390</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sitka</td>
<td>721</td>
<td>10.7</td>
<td>861</td>
<td>17.7</td>
<td>414</td>
<td>16.1</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>10.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stikine</td>
<td>217</td>
<td>3.22</td>
<td>228</td>
<td>4.68</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>7.79</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>11.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sumduum</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>.842</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taku</td>
<td>269</td>
<td>3.99</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>.144</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>1.09</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.411</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tongass</td>
<td>178</td>
<td>2.64</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>.883</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>1.83</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yakutat</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>4.45</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>6.16</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>3.08</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>4.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tlingit</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>268</td>
<td>5.51</td>
<td>178</td>
<td>6.94</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>21.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>6742</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>4868</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>2566</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>483</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sources: Petroff 1884; I
Porter 1893; I
Emmons ms. AMNH-E; E
summer. Scidmore further writes of the Tlingit: "They have been keener than the whites in seeing the potentials of the tourist trade and sell their heirlooms and the crudest copies of their heirlooms for fabulous sums... they manufacture antiques, even Stone Age relics, with the shrewdness of Europeans" (ibid.:44).

Emmons collected fruitfully among the Hutsnuwus, overrepresented in the collections, who at that time had a large fish-reducing plant (at Killisnoo) and also old conservative villages. Possibly Tlingit from other kwans came there to work. Schwatka (1885;I) wrote of the Hutsnuwus "In regard to the medicine man, each tribe has one or two, and their influence, though almost lost among the Kootznahoo proper, is very strong with the Neltushkins, an ancestral village in the Hutsnuwu territory" (ibid.:69).

The Stikine area, in which Wrangell is located, contributed in excess of its population to the greatest extent. Wrangell, site of a U.S. Army post from 1867-1877 (Orth:1060;I) was a major port of call for tourists and a rendezvous place for the Tlingit.

In reviewing this data, it is important to recall that no such quantitative picture, however simple, of the relationship between artifact collection and population data has previously been attempted for the Tlingit. Sophisticated statistical analysis of the data would take us beyond the purview of this thesis; but even at the elementary level here
presented significant anomalies at least partially reveal the major forces shaping the Tlingits in the period 1880-1890.

A question about shamans' graves remains. (See Table IV for specific gravelot data). There were originally numbers of old shamans' graves in the underrepresented areas of Taku, Tongass, Kake and Sanya. What became of them? It is unlikely that many were looted by the Russians, as Emmons collected several grave lots in the immediate Sitka area. The areas of the missing grave lots had in common, though, rapid depopulation, and either central location (Kake, Kuiu, Sanya), or heavy involvements in the fur trade (Taku, Sumdum, Tongass). Perhaps graves from these depopulated areas supplied the earliest curio trade. Emmons collected from graves most successfully in either remote areas (Yakutat, Gonaho, Chilkat, part of Huna) or areas in which sizeable, local permanent populations remained in place throughout the chaotic nineteenth century (Sitka, Stikine, Chilkat).

Of course, it is also possible that Emmons' duties may have led him more often into some areas than others. And yet, the extent to which the correlations just discussed are supported by population figures and historical knowledge lends support to an overall impression of thoroughness on Emmons' part.
3. Incidence of Recovery of Charms from Shamans' Graves: Discussion of Table III

More questions about the curio trade are inspired by Table III. Emmons consistently identifies charms as shamans' implements, and gives them the Tlingit name sark-seate. This corresponds to Boas' (1892:179;G) s'ak set, bone necklace. However, as we see in Table III, only 15 percent of the charms with specific provenance data were recovered directly from shamans' graves. What of the others? For many, Emmons merely reports the locale of origin without comment. We do not know how, in fact, he did acquire them. Presumably he bought them from someone. A demoralized, partially Christianised Tlingit might well rob a shaman's grave, especially if the article was small, finely carved, easily concealed, and would bring a high price. Direct mention of carved bones and even charms as curios is made in the contemporary literature. Seton-Karr (1887;I) wrote of Yakutat: "The greater part of the articles of native manufacture brought for sale consisted of baskets in a variety of shapes, charms, carved walrus tusks, bows and arrows, and horn spoons." (emphasis mine)(ibid.:59). This goes far to explain the low rate of recovery from graves. It is also possible, and perhaps probable, recalling the Haida success with argilite, that walrus tusks or bones, a favoured material for charms, (See Table V) were even carved specifically for the tourist trade. None, however, are so documented. All curios were presumably sold as genuine.
Table III: Comparative distribution and proportional relationships of all charms, charms in grave lots, and all grave lot artifacts

| Grave lot objects | % of total | | | | |
|-------------------|------------|------------------|------------------|--------|
| Charms | Other | Total | documented | as grave lot | |
| Objects | | | | | |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Kwan</th>
<th>No.</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>No.</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>No.</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>recoveries</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Auk</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>6.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chilcat</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>35.1</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>30.1</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chilkoot</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gonaho</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>14.1</td>
<td>35.1</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>30.1</td>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Huna</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hutsnuwu</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>30.1</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>30.1</td>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sitka</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>12.1</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>9.2</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>9.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stikine</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>31.1</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>10.1</td>
<td>34.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taku</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tongass</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yakutat</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>359</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>418</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sources: G.T. Emmons ms. catalogues A.M.N.H. "E" and W.S.M.
Table IV, p.1: Inventory of artifacts recovered from thirty shaman's graves

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Armlet</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basket</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beating Stick</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Box</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bracelet</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charm</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crown</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drum</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hair Pin</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Head Dress</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Head Dress Mask</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Head Dress Orn.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mask</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miscellaneous</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Necklace</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rattle-Doctor's</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rattle-Gen Dance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robe</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spirit Club</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spirit Knife</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spruce Root Hat</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dance Wand</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spirit Wand</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wand</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wooden Carving</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wooden Figure</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>281</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>1281</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>301</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: G.T. Emmons WSM and AMNH "E" Catalogues
Table IV, p.2: Inventory of artifacts cont.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 1 2 1 1 6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td>85</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 3 1 1 3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>19</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1 1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>14</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
documented. All curios were presumably sold as genuine. These observations of course call into question the purity of the sample. It is significant in this connection that grave lots contained a wide variety of types of charms from crude to very elaborate, such as Fig. 9, found in a grave by Paalen in the 1930's. It would be difficult indeed at this juncture to know which charms were genuine and which, if any, were made for sale, although three W.S.M. charms, not included in this study, are considered fakes because of their unpatinated, unworn condition and uncharacteristic shape (personal communication Alan Sawyer). Many charms are obviously old, well-worn, with impregnated grease, but close scrutiny of motif combinations and carving styles might reveal likely candidates. Detailed scrutiny of the core sample of charms known to have been recovered from graves would yield parameters against which others might be judged. Such a study would require actual physical examination of many charms.

A few charms were not of Tlingit manufacture, but were used by Tlingit shamans. Athapascan (FM 78259 and others), Eskimo (WSM 1832-4), Aleut (E 1162), and Haida (E 867, E 1282) bone or tooth carvings were found among Tlingit shamans' paraphenalia by Emmons. This is consistent with the shaman's predeliction for strange or exotic objects.
4. Grave Lot Inventory: A Discussion of Table IV

Fifteen percent of the total sample of 480 charms are specifically documented by Emmons as recovered from shaman's graves. These are especially important. The associated artifacts, when considered together, tell much about the specific shaman to whom they belonged. The purpose in this section is not to consider a particular set of charms in the context of a specific grave lot, but to summarize grave lot composition data and make some general observations which may be built on later in the more richly contextualized discussion. Of the 29 assemblages of "Tlingit Shamans" grave artifacts listed in Emmons' manuscript AMNH "E" and WSM catalogues, only three (E 651-682 from Sitka, E 943-987, and WSM 1803-1852 both from Hutsnuwu) are specifically referred to by him as complete shamans' kits. The others, as may be seen in Table IV, are more or less fragmentary. Emmons frequently exchanged pieces and broke up sets so that his buyers might acquire the widest possible assortment of artifacts. Some assemblages contain but a few of the many types of artifacts used by the shaman and found in the complete kits, and others vary widely in the relative representation of various artifact classes. The three "complete" kits feature six, eight and eight charms, respectively, numbers which may or may not be significant. The Hutsnuwu grave lot which features eight charms, E 943-987, was unusually rich, containing as well
three necklaces, each of which consisted of bone and ivory pendants, and three robes, two of which were also festooned with bone and ivory carved pendants, or charms. There would not seem to be any set number of total charms which the accomplished Tlingit shaman would own. Clearly, some shamans at least possessed large numbers of them.

It has been suggested by Jonaitis (1981;B) that the Tlingit shamans had, when fully developed, eight masks, corresponding to eight spirits, eight being, on ethnographic evidence, the number of ritual completion for the Tlingit (Laguna 1972:2;761;G). As we can see by looking at Table IV, the numbers of masks in grave lots varies considerably, often being in the neighbourhood of four or eight, but ranging as high as eleven and as low as two in the lots containing masks. Interestingly, two of the three complete kits (E 943-987 and WSM 1803-1852) show no masks, this absence being perhaps compensated for by the larger numbers of head-dress masks or ornaments. Jonaitis does not mention these. It is not possible, on the basis of ethnographic evidence, to ascertain whether certain masks and not others were in use at any one time, whether they were used in one way and not another, or whether masks and headress masks were fully interchangeable. Nor is it possible to ascertain whether certain categories of charms according to use, perhaps, were intended to total up to a specific magical number. Despite Jonaitis' suggestion that eight masks is a complete set, conclusions based on such irregular evidence would seem to be questionable.
The data in Table IV show that there is great inconsistency in the kinds and number of artifacts included in graves. This supports the interpretation that Tlingit shamans were individualistic, and, while conforming to broad general rules of shamanic conduct and paraphernalia, varied widely according to their personal inspirations. As will be seen, this is an essential element of shamanism.

C. Materials, Discussion of Table V

The objects referred to as charms by Emmons are overwhelmingly of bone (41 percent) and "ivory", or teeth, of various kinds (36.9 percent). The ivory is predominantly walrus tusk, probably obtained from the Aleut. (G.T. Emmons ms. A.M.N.H. E 645-6) A.M.N.H. E 118 is a charm made of a reworked carving of Chinese soapstone which illustrates shamans' tendencies to utilize strange objects of mysterious origin.

Figure 4 is a Tlingit shaman's necklace made largely of undecorated bone rods. It is similar to that worn by the Taku shaman seen in the Frontispiece. Such necklaces made noise when the shaman leapt about in practice, adding to the dramatic effect. Furst, although not specifically discussing the Tlingit, (1977:2-3,18:C) suggests that bone, even if undecorated, bears considerable symbolic meaning as bone. He bases his argument on the central role of bone in fishing rituals: to ensure the continued supply of fish, the bones are
Table V: Materials from which charms were made

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Kwan</th>
<th>Chilkot-Chilkoot</th>
<th>Hays</th>
<th>Hoona</th>
<th>Hoonah</th>
<th>Hoonah</th>
<th>Kitka</th>
<th>Stikine</th>
<th>Taku</th>
<th>Tongass</th>
<th>Yakutat</th>
<th>Tingit</th>
<th>Total No.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bear Tooth</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>41 3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bear Tusk</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1 2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lynx Tooth</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1 2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mouse Tooth</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1 2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bone</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>223 47.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Antler</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5 1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deer Hoof</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1 2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Horn</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1 2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land Otter Tooth</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1 2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>223 47.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whale Bone</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7 1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hair Seal Tooth</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1 0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Killer Wh. Tooth</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3 0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sea Lion Tooth</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3 0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seal Tooth</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2 0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walrus Tooth</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1 0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whale Tooth</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7 1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sea Mammal Tooth</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1 0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walrus Tusk</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>160 33.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>160 33.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Tooth&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5 6.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wood</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1 22 4.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Data</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>146 68.14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Compiled from G.T. Emmons, ms. catalogues and published sources (Appendix II)
Fig. 4
P.M. 69.30.10 - 1988
Shaman's necklace
Alan Sawyer Photo
returned to the water so that the fish may be reincarnated again around them. Shamans also depict bones in their "x-ray" art and some are supposed to be reborn from their own bones during their initiatory crisis. Presumably, the soul resides in the bones, around which the flesh may be reconsituted.

Figure 5, a Tlingit-style charm with the provenance of Norton sound in western Alaska, well beyond Tlingit territory, shows the head of some land animal followed by a string of vertebrae without flesh. Here a charm of bone both signifies and is bone.

Interestingly, a small number of wooden "carvings" were used in ways analagous or identical to charms. Nine wooden "carvings," so-called by Emmons, rather than "charms", were carried in the hands of assistants of a Gunaho shaman (WSM 2047-2055). Other wooden pieces, representing the wealth-giving sea monster Konkodate (WSM 2270), were attached to a shaman's skin robe, as were bone or ivory charms and an unusual set of eight small, shallow masks (AMNH 16.1 995 1-8). The most interesting wooden pieces are AMNH 19-208,209 and 211. These, called charms by Emmons, were claimed by him to have been transferred to a patient's neck and there aided in warding off evil spirits. All other charms or necklaces so described are of bone or marine ivory, called ssark-seate, and said by Emmons to have great spirit power (WSM 920). Unfortunately, he does not offer a Tlingit name for the wooden ones. Evidently, charms did not have to be made of bone or tooth, although most were.
Fig. 5
Mich 74670
"Norton Sound"
Bill Holm Photo
Fig. 6
A.M.N.H.
Wood shaman's charm
Alan Sawyer Photo
Figure 6 represents one of the anomalous wooden charms in the AMNH. Unfortunately, it is not possible to say specifically which charm this is. The AMNH did not provide numbers to go with this case, and as will be shown in the following section, Emmons often mentions only the most prominent motif(s) on a charm, and does not provide much detail. It is thus not possible to match up his description of wooden charms with this example, which is identical in style to a number of bone charms. From the data available to this writer, it was only possible to deduce that this charm was indeed a wooden Tlingit shaman's charm from the Emmons' collection.

Teeth may also have had special significance as such. Their bonelike durability and their role in rending and devouring is consonant with the initiatory experience of many shamans, in which they are torn apart and re-constituted from their bones by their tutelary spirit (Eliade 1972:53-58;C). Figures 7 and 8 depict two nearly identical charms made of split sections of sea mammal tooth, each with a Raven motif. Unfortunately, provenance data other than Tlingit was not obtainable, as the two are quite likely from the same hand.

D. Methods of Manufacture

Ethnographic descriptions of the manufacture of charms are lacking. Emmons recovered a number of charm blanks, pieces of bone or tooth that had been sawn in half and
Fig. 7
A.M.N.H. 19-453
Alan Sawyer Photo

Fig. 8
MAI 4/1669
(Dockstader 1966
F. 120)
made ready for further work (E 1411-1412). He also recovered a jade chisel point or bow drill bit (E 2651), and a pump drill (FM 78041). Undoubtedly, making charms in pre-contact times was painstaking work. Perhaps the very difficulty of the art lent magic to the charms, especially so considering how remarkably well carved many of them are. Blanks were presumably sawn off with slate saws and carved with nephrite or quartz drills and chisels, probably in the manner of drilling to depth and painstakingly scraping away until the desired shape was achieved (Emmons 1923;E). The astonishing results can be seen in figure 9, for example. Recovered from a shaman's grave by Wolfgang Paalen in the 1930's, it is perhaps the most complex of all Tlingit charms. A mere 3.75 inches tall, it is a masterpiece of conception and technique.

E. Dating of Charms

A charm such as that in figure 9, or many another complex and well-carved charm, undoubtedly represented a considerable investment in time and labour. Considering the durability of the material, and the fact that Tlingit shamans were known to return to the graves of their predecessors to recover implements of practice to which they might be entitled and wish to use (probably because they had inherited one or more of the deceased shaman's spirits) (Emmons ms. AMNH E 409-432), certain individual charms are undoubtedly very old. Just how old is impossible to say, of course, but an article
Fig. 9
Paalen Collection
3.75 inches
(Inverarity 1950 #166; D)
as durable as a charm could remain in use for some centuries, at least. Emmons mentions several grave lots in which, he was told, relic implements were used by several consecutive generations of shamans.

Masks from Tlingit shamans' graves are known that show no evidence of having been worked with metal tools, and are painted entirely with native pigments (personal communication, Alan Sawyer). Certainly, many of the charms are as old as these, if not older, again considering the nature of the material. Many of the charms Emmons collected, as has been mentioned, have deeply ground-in grease and grime, and are worn smooth by many years of handling. Others are relatively clean and unworn. Detailed stylistic study to establish which charms may have preceded others in date of manufacture, and which may in fact have been made for the tourist trade, would be a major and quite problematic undertaking, quite beyond the modest aspirations of the present introductory study.

F. Style

Tlingit shaman's charms display so wide a range of style and skill of execution that categorization is impossible. Figure 10 shows three extremely crude charms made of bone. The spirit designations supplied by Emmons may be seen to be based on the paw, flipper, and wing motifs, respectively. Figure 11, at the other end of a continuous spectrum, shows a complex charm carved with consummate skill.
Fig. 10
A.M.N.H.: 19-508
bear
A.M.N.H.: 19-473
sea lion
A.M.N.H.: 19-474
bird
Alan Sawyer Photo
Fig. 11
A.M.N.H.: E 2708
Bill Holm Photo
What is more, figure 12 employs both formline design (the rigid, formalised, almost calligraphic two-dimensional style for which the northern Northwest coast is especially famous) as well as a much freer and more naturalistic style. The formline design, more often seen on non-shamanic art, seems to frame the chaotic, naturalistic and shamanic scene of devouring. Was the artist using the styles self-referentially, i.e., did the styles have meaning in their own right? There is no way of knowing.

Jonaitis (1983:130;D) discusses the question posed by the frequent crudeness of shamanic art of the Northwest Coast in contrast with the apparently higher skill of non-shamanic "crest" art (so-called because it is used to make visible the crest, or family symbol(s) of the owner). She suggests that the crudeness was often intentional, and served to jolt the shaman's client or audience with its rawness, symbolizing the dangerous spirits under the shaman's control. She writes, basing her conjecture upon Levi-Strauss' "irreducible" nature/culture opposition (Leach 1974:30;K): "The crude and energetic art works, so different from secular pieces, symbolize the . . . shaman's intimate association with the world of spirits, while the formal, conventional objects connote the shaman's reestablishment of social stability after malevolent forces created disorder." However, figure 12 features an indisputably well-carved charm which Emmons specifically states represents a most unpleasant spirit, Ke-war-khu, which lives in the clouds and is avoided by all other
Fig. 12
A.M.N.H. 19-450
"represents the spirit Ke-war-khu, ... much dreaded and avoided by all other spirits, believed by the Tlingit to live in a distant country in the clouds."
Bill Holm Photo
spirits (Emmons ms. AMNH 19.450;E). How this charm might fit into Jonaitis' formulation is unclear.

It is just as likely that the style of carving had little to do with the magical efficacy of the charm, which might function as a kind of storage battery for spirit power. Bancroft, in what is the earliest specific reference to a shaman's charm (1886: 700Fn;I), relates from Russian ms. sources the fascinating account of a Tlingit acolyte to the Russian Orthodox Church at Sitka who in 1829 was convicted of sorcery and banished to the remotest monastery in Siberia - a "mild" punishment - because he was observed dipping charms into the holy water. For this he was paid in furs by the shaman, to which the poor Tlingit was evidently apprenticed as well. The shaman, obviously not one to miss a trick, must have been trying to obtain some of the church's magical powers for his own. This is a clear instance of a charm's power (or potential power) deriving from something quite independent of its style or skill of execution.

G. Motifs

1. Problems in Motif Identification

It does not seem likely that Emmons could have had an informant for every charm or artifact, yet he rarely fails to identify motifs, including many that are quite obscure. He very rarely makes mention of informants, nor does he provide
us with the criteria he used in making attributions in the absence of informants. What seems most plausible is that Emmons sometimes had knowledgeable informants, as for example when he purchased charms from the heirs of a deceased shaman. At other times his sources must have been less knowledgeable, and he must have sometimes made his own guesses on the basis of resemblance to some previously well-identified piece. Not surprisingly, problems with his motif attributions are legion.

Figure 13 represents a charm from near Angoon which Emmons identifies as a "bear spirit with Tlingit spirits all about". Figure 14, also from near Angoon, but not identified as being associated with figure 13 (although it bears the sequential catalogue number) appears very similar indeed, but has the designation "Spirit of a whale ...". What are we to make of this? Was Emmons making things up because he felt he had to provide different designations to interest his buyers, or did an Indian, who may or may not have known what he was talking about, provide him with the identification? Or, perhaps, the identifications really are correct because charms represented whatever a shaman said they did, regardless of what they looked like. Emmons may even have mixed up the entry with some other one as he penned his voluminous catalogue. One thing is certain — we will never know. It does not seem likely that the charms which are so similar represent in fact such different animals. It is worth suggesting that the limp figures draped over the noses of the large heads recall drowning victims, and thus land otters,
Fig. 13
A.M.N.H. E 864
"Bear spirits with Tlingit Spirits all about."
From Shaman's Grave near Angoon
Alan Sawyer Photo
Fig. 14
A.M.N.H. E 865
Walrus ivory
"... Spirit of a whale, with Tlingit Spirits all about and wolf spirit in rear. Worn attached to dancing robe when practising about sick or bewitched."
From Shaman's Grave near Angoon
Alan Sawyer Photo
which, as will be made plain in Chapter Two, have intimate connections with the drowned, and stronger connections with Tlingit shamanism than any other individual animal.

In conjunction with the previous example of very similar pieces having widely divergent motif attributions, there is the parallel problem of extremely divergent pieces being called the same thing. Figure 15, at first glance an entirely abstract piece, is identified as a "wolf head". Upon closer examination one can discern ears, eyes (the large central squared ovals) and a U-shaped snout, presumably. How, then, does this relate to figure 16 whose major motif is also identified as a wolf head? The degree of abstraction is perhaps equally great, but there is no other correspondence. There are no correspondences, either stylistic or otherwise, between these two and the next, figure 17. It is also identified as a wolf by Emmons, and greatly resembles many charms called land otter. Further examples of these and other confusions could be brought forth at some length.

It is well to remember at this juncture that it is not the purpose of this work to sort out all such difficulties, but rather to report them while presenting Emmons' data. Emmons was, certainly, far more knowledgeable than any other white of his day, but he was also fallible. It is doubtful in the extreme that he would lie, but his information was only as good as his informants. Rather, the great variability of individual shamans' conceptions, artistic and otherwise, (not to mention the willingness of the Tlingit
Fig. 15
W.S.M. 1770
"Wolf head."
Wrangell
(Vancouver Art Gallery 1956: fig. 101;D)
"The large head is that of a wolf, and devilfish tentacles appear at the ears. The seated figure at the back of the charm is a bear."

(Wardwell 1978 fig. 66; D)
Fig 17
W.S.M. 1720
Wolf charm of ivory, "collected from the grave house of a deceased shaman of the Sitkine Kwan, near Wrangell."
Bill Holm photo
to provide answers to curious and well-meaning whites) no doubt went far to render the problem of motif identification especially difficult. This is disappointing, the more so because of the degree of confidence with which various species are identified in the classic two-dimensional formline design of the northern Northwest Coast (Stewart 1979;F) and on totem poles (Halpin 1981b:37;F).

Perhaps this is due to the different context of the shaman's art, which signified present, potent, spirit power, in contrast to secular art which exemplified the excellence of the lineage as illustrated by past heroics or mythical supernatural encounters. The shaman's power was enhanced by mystery (not unlike medical and psychiatric practitioners today). He did not practice to his own family, and often went to another village to practice (Laguna 1972:2:670;G). Strangers were not likely to know the precise identity of the shaman's spirits, and even less likely to know which charm or other implement represented which spirit. Specific data on whether some or any shamans' spirits were secret in fact is lacking, whereas crests (family symbols) were celebrated in potlatches, and thus were matters of public record.

2. Identification of the Land Otter Motif

We may now see what happens when we follow the single most commonly identified animal motif on Tlingit shamans' charms, the land otter, through a few of its
permutations. Figure 18 depicts an actual land otter, *lutra candensis*. It is "a large, elongated, streamlined, cylindrical aquatic weasel with a stout neck, small eyes and ears, a broad, flattened head, webbed feet for and aft, and a long heavy tail flattened at the bottom and tapering from a thick base toward the pointed (almost) tip" (Caras 1967: 191-192;J).

Figures 19 and 20 depict land otter charms that conform fairly well to the model just recited. Figure 19 particularly features an elongated quadruped with small ears and a long thick tail, marked with segmented lines intended to show vertabrae. Figure 20 (seen from above) lacks the long tail and has larger ears, but conforms in general outline and cylindricality. Figure 21, is also a most plausible otter. It features two outlined faces underneath. Laguna (1972:2:761;E) states that faces, when represented on other parts of an animal's body, in art, represent the *awani*, or indwelling anthropomorphic soul. This can also pertain to mountains, rivers, glaciers, hailstones, etc. However, since there are two small faces on figure 21, just what they meant to the shaman who originally made or commissioned this piece is unclear.

Figures 22 and 23 are also elongated, made of tooth, quadrupedal, and both are identified by Emmons as land otters. Figure 23 is double-headed and has a human in its mouth, and figure 22 has two supernumerary human faces, one at either end. Despite the bizarre nature, both are still sufficiently
Fig. 18
Lutra Canadensis:
the Land, or River, Otter
(Lee Rue, 1967:101;J)
(Note the thick long tail
and very small ears.)
Fig. 19
W.S.M. 926
Land otter charm, of bone, collected from the grave house of a shaman of the Stickine Kwan, near Fort Wrangell (Jonaitis 1978:fig. 1;B)

Fig. 20
A.M.N.H. E1285
Land otter charm, of bone, collected from "an old shaman's grave house on an island in Cross Sound."
(G.T. Emmons ms.)
Huna Kwan
detail, Alan Sawyer Photo
Fig. 21
N.M.C. VII-A-252 16.8 x 1.6 cm
Land otter, of antler
ex Lord Bossom collection,
collected by G.T. Emmons 1903-1916
(Hall 1983: fig. 2;I)
Fig. 22
M.A.I. 9/7950
"Land Otter"
Port Frederick - Huna
(Jonaitis 1978: Fig. 4;B)

Fig. 23
M.A.I. 9/7951
"Land Otter"
(Jonaitis 1978: Fig. 7;B)
otterish that we do not wish to quibble.

The foregoing may seem reasonably clear, but comparison of figures 24 and 25 reintroduce doubt. Figure 24 features rather large-eared "land otters" with skinny tails on top and bottom. Figure 25 shows a song-leader's staff from Yakutat which, on the strength of impeccable documentation represents a wolf. The resemblance is very close. It may be argued that it is a mistake to compare differing types of items, especially a piece of crest and shamans' art. Land otters are rare in crest art, in fact. The comparison was made because of the striking similarity, which echoes the similarities of wolf and land otter charms.

A nearly identical animal, identified by Feder (1971:figure 151;D) as a land otter, but left unmentioned in Emmons' original catalogue note, clings face downward to the back of a life-sized shaman's grave guardian figure (figure 26). It has circular pits along its spine which make a visual pun of spinal vertabrae/octopus sucker. On the basis of ethnographic evidence to be presented shortly, the more likely identification of this animal and indeed many others of like or related form, is in fact land otter. However, no attribution can be made with certainty.

Figure 28 finishes the point. This charm, without documentation other than "Tlingit", is unlike any other. It is conceivable that this represents a spirit in the process of transformation, possibly from or to an otter-like shape. The strangely elongated neck and the rubbery, curling legs suggest
Fig. 24
A.M.N.H. 19-457
Land otters top and bottom
Bill Holm Photo
Fig. 25

Song leader's staff representing a wolf, painted in red, blue-green, and black. Made for the Drum House Teqwedi by D.S. Benson for Joseph Abraham and was used in the potlatch for Sidewise House at Yakutat in 1916. The tail is missing. Now in the Denver Art Museum. The Teqwedi are a sibof the Wolf-Eagle moiety. (Laguna 1972:3:Pl. 163)
Fig. 26  
A.M.N.H. E 1915 (rear view)  
Emmons does not identify the animal on the figure's back.  
(Feder 1971: fig. 5; D)
Shaman's grave guard of the Chilkat Kagwanton. Represents the spirit Geastin, "which lives in the air above and is a very revengeful bad spirit that kills Tlingits when it meets them. He is represented as a man dressed as a Doctor with a shoulder robe on, which represents a spirit fish, in the stomach is another spirit fish, the mouth is open singing, and in the hands were originally rattles."

(Feder 1971: fig. 150; D)
Fig. 28
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Shape changing?
Sheldon Jackson Coll.
Bill Holm Photo
the plastic moment between the old shape and the new. We can gain perspective on the problems of motif identification by recalling that the shaman could transform himself into any of his tutelary spirits, and presumably, go directly from one form into another (Laguna 1972:2:690;G).

Laguna states that it is difficult to tell to what extent the shaman's tutelaries are distinct from and are controlled by him, and to what extent he becomes, and merges with them (ibid.:836). The charms represent the shaman's dreams or visions, and the spirits that protect him (ibid.:689) and thus, in a way, himself. It becomes apparent that simply calling a charm a wolf or land otter is not saying very much. Unfortunately, it is often, if not usually, not even possible to do that in any specific sense due to the extreme variability of form and limited documentation.

3. Motif Frequency Analysis: Discussion of Table VI.

We may now return to our discussion of the compiled documentary data, specifically that concerning the motifs found on charms. The liabilities of this kind of data have just been touched upon. Nevertheless, it is worthwhile to see what consistencies may emerge, and whether they are supported by the ethnographic record.
Table VI p.1: Motif Frequency Analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Motif Type</th>
<th>No.</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>No.</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>total</th>
<th>% of total</th>
<th>% of total</th>
<th>total</th>
<th>% of total</th>
<th>% of total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fish and Shark</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fish</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dog Fish</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Halibut</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>.71</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>621</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Needle Fish</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salmon</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sculpin</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shark</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>.5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Fish &amp; Shark</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marine Mammal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Killer Whale</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Porpoise</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sea Otter</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>.71</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seal</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sea Lion</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>.51</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whale</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Marine Mammal</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land Otter</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>12.1</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>44</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land Mammal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bear</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>23</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dog</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wolf</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mountain Goat</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>.8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Land Mammal</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table VI, p.2: Motif Frequency Analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Motif Type</th>
<th>No.</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>No.</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>No.</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bird</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bird</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>29</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blue Heron</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>29</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cormorant</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duck</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kingfisher</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loon</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Merganser</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oyster Catcher</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sand Hill Crane</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eagle</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>29</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hawk</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Owl</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raven</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hummingbird</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Bird</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monster</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gonokadet</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>29</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Sea Monster&quot;</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Monster&quot;</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Monster</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human and Yek</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shaman</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Witch</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yek (G.T.E.)</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Human and Yek</td>
<td>285</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>174</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table VI, p.3: Motif Frequency Analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Motif Type</th>
<th>No.</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Major</th>
<th>No.</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Miscellaneous</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Octopus</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>3.71</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crab</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mosquito</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frog</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>.71</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worm</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>.71</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>83</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canoe</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.41</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Circle Dot</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>.71</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cross</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soul Catcher</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.31</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protruding Tongue</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td></td>
<td>13</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Witch Torture</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.41</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Devouring</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>3.81</td>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pun</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.31</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spirit Transport</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.31</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>32</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Compiled from G.T. Emmons ms. catalogue notes
AMNH E & 19, WSM,
F.M., and published sources (Appendix II).
Table VII
Iconographic Complexity of Tlingit's Shaman's Charms

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Kwan</th>
<th>Motif Number</th>
<th>No. of charms</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Mean # of motifs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>with data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>with data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auk</td>
<td>3 1 2 1</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>181</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chilkat-Chilcot</td>
<td>32 4 5 5 2</td>
<td>531</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>1291</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gonaho</td>
<td>18 2 2 1</td>
<td>251</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>521</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Henga</td>
<td>7 1</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Huna</td>
<td>23 4 5 4 2</td>
<td>421</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>981</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hutshnuwu</td>
<td>38 18 4 4 1</td>
<td>681</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>141</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sitka</td>
<td>31 10 2 2 1</td>
<td>461</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>751</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stikine</td>
<td>22 5 4 5 3 1</td>
<td>401</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>871</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taku</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tongass</td>
<td>1 1</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yakultat</td>
<td>10 1 2 1 2</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>321</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tlingit</td>
<td>41 16 9 9</td>
<td>891</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2401</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>227 63 33 32</td>
<td>397</td>
<td>561</td>
<td>8851</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent (%)</td>
<td>57.16 8.3 8.1 3.0</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>12.361</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Compiled from G.T. Emmons ms., catalogue notes and manual inspection of published charms
(Appendix II)
Animal motifs were listed by ecological zone, i.e., whether marine, terrestrial, or avian species. Miscellaneous motifs such as those resulting from combinations of other motifs, such as devouring, or witch torture, are listed separately, as well as fragmentary motifs as noted by Emmons. Percentages were obtained by calculating the frequency of appearance of a motif based on the total number of motifs rather than the total number of charms. The number and percentages of instances in which a particular motif is found in combination with the land otter motif are also presented.

Humans of various types are the most frequently appearing motif, at 31 percent. They may be shaman (2.3 percent), witch (.9 percent), unidentified human (15 percent) or "yek," Tlingit for spirit, (13 percent). Yeks are visually indistinguishable from humans. When shamans are depicted they are the sole or major motif 80 percent of the time (sole means only motif, and major means predominant). While we can compile data on the various attributions given by Emmons and a few others, we cannot know with certainty which of the possible readings of a human motif were intended, and thus their true proportional representation. Emmons sometimes writes "spirit of a dead Tlingit", and at other times, simply, "dead Tlingit." Did he intend a difference or not?

The land otter is the most frequently appearing specific animal motif (12 percent). Sixty percent of the time land otters appear, they are the major or sole motif.
Land otters are combined with other land otters 44 percent of the time land otters appear. Recall that several, even many, motifs can be combined on a single charm. Other high scorers are bear, at 6.1 percent, wolf, at 3.5 percent, raven, at 8.1 percent, octopus at 3.7 percent, and devouring, at 3.8 percent. These low values for even the highest scorers are a reflection of the high degree of variability exhibited by charms, and by extension, shamans. In addition, the values are lower than would be produced by an actual visual inspection of the almost five hundred known charms. This is because many of Emmons', and others', catalogue descriptions are so terse that they represent an editing at best of the visual information inherent in the charm.

Going by ecological zone, fish constitute 5.5 percent of all motifs. Adding octopus to this category makes 9.2 percent. Marine mammals appear with 6.8 percent frequency (but when they do appear they are the major or sole motif 81 percent of the time). Together with fish and octopus, marine species appear as 16 percent of the total number of motifs.

Land animals, represented by only four species, compared to 14 marine species, show 10.6 percent occurrence, due principally to bear (6.1 percent) and wolf (3.5 percent).

Land otters, mentioned as the most frequent animal motif, are neither strictly marine nor terrestrial animals. As will be demonstrated, their favoured role makes sense when seen in this light.

Birds of 14 species (including, simply "bird", as
the fish included, simply, "fish") occur 12.6 percent of the time. Eight species are aquatic, equalling 2.4 percent representation, and five are not, equalling 9.5 percent. Of this, 8.1 percent is due to raven. Birds are the major or sole motif in only 32 percent of instances of their appearances.

Monsters, whether identified as "sea monster", just "monster" (usually resembling somewhat those called sea monsters, or "konokodate" (Emmons' most frequent spelling of "GonagAdet", the mythical Tlingit master of wealth of the sea), are reported as occurring only 2 percent of the time, and as the major figure in 50 percent of those occurrences.

Instances in which the overall frequency of appearance is low, but high as major motif, are expressions of the restriction of certain motifs to prominent positions in the rarer, more complex charms, such as killer whale. As shown in Table VII (immediately following Table VI), 57 percent of all charms either feature or are recorded as having but a single motif. Occurrence of more complex charms falls off rapidly, with a slight increase in the rate of occurrence at the more complex end.

Before we can proceed any further, however, we must turn to the ethnographic record. Having followed Panofsky's method and made careful note of the empirical data deriving both from the charms themselves, their original documentation, and contemporary Euro-American sources, we must now place this mass of material into the Tlingit context.
In closing this section it is worth mentioning that however long on data and short on analysis this initial empirical section is, it represents the first time such data have been gathered. Since Emmons' collections are the most well documented artifact collections from the Northwest Coast, the very assembling of raw data marks a significant advance over previous knowledge of this aspect of Tlingit material culture. In the chapters that follow, the attempt will be made to provide the context in which charms functioned magically to heal, and from which they have descended to us as fascinating and obscure art.
CHAPTER II: ICONOGRAPHICAL ANALYSIS

A. Sources on Tlingit Ethnography

Ethnographic description of the Tlingit began with the Russians, particularly Veniaminov, an Orthodox Priest (see Kashevaroff:1927;I). Holmberg, a Dane, visited the Tlingit in 1855 and wrote a brief work (1856,1863;G). Neither work has been translated into English, probably because both were cited frequently by Aurel Krause, a German (1885)(translation by Erna Gunther, 1956,G).

Krause provides a chapter on shamanism which includes eyewitness accounts of a curing ceremony and the public initiation of a neophyte shaman at Chilcat. Swanton's 1908 (G) study devotes six pages to shamanism and is especially valuable for its notes on social organization. A poignant contributor was Louis Shotridge (see Mason 1960; I), a Chilkat Tlingit who collected for the University Museum at the University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia and wrote a series of articles for the Museum's Journal (E) between 1913 and 1929.

A pause of several decades occurred before the next major original work was undertaken; this was Kalervo Oberg's dissertation, The Social Economy of the Tlingit Indians, written in the early 1930's. It was not published, however, until 1973. It provides a functional analysis of Tlingit social structure and economy, and includes a forward by Wilson
Duff that traces the evolution of Tlingit studies.

Catherine McClellan's 1954 "The Interrelationship of Social Structure with Northern Tlingit Ceremonialism" (G), is a concise discussion of the original context of "crest", or family symbol, art.

Ronald Olson's 1961 "Tlingit Shamanism and Sorcery" (B) provides unique anecdotal material that expands the range of activities known to have been engaged in by Tlingit shamans and witches.

The outstanding source on the Northern Tlingit is Frederica de Laguna's monumental Under Mt. St. Elias (1972;G). This exhaustive study of the Yakutat Tlingit is replete with verbatim statements of informants, describing life as remembered in every detail. Laguna, normally referred to as de Laguna, but who follows the shorter usage in her own bibliography, provides a rich discussion of shamanism, land otter men, and witches.

Sources on Tlingit mythology are few. Swanton's 1909 (G) Tlingit Myths and Texts contains material collected at Sitka and, primarily, Wrangell, from "Chief" Kadishan. A smaller collection of material from Yakutat is included in Laguna's 1972 study, mentioned above.

B. Tlingit Social Organisation

The Tlingit in 1837 numbered some 7500, not including Sitka and environs, according to a Hudson's Bay
Company census (Petroff 1884:37;I). They inhabited a score or more villages between Portland Canal, near Port Simpson, B.C., and Controller Bay, nearly to the Copper River. In summer they dispersed to fishing and hunting sites, and in winter they repaired to their substantial villages, for the ceremonial season and community life. They belonged to various areal subdivisions, termed kwan in Tlingit, and it is these which are represented on Laguna's map, fig. 3. Laguna makes clear the nature of kwans and overall social organisation:

"These (referring to kwans) however did not constitute a tribe in the sense of a politically organised and autonomous group. Rather, a sense of community identity definitely took second place to the "patriotism" felt by the members of each sib for their own matrilineal exogamous kin group .... Sib members recognised their common kinship even though they might be scattered in distant villages in different tribal (e.g. kwan) areas, for only a few sibs were restricted to one region.... A sib of any size is composed of several lineages or house groups (hit-tan), and the latter in turn may consist of a single house line or a cluster made up of "mother" and "daughter" houses .... The local segments of such a widespread sib may or may not be felt to form distinct sub-sibs, perhaps depending on the recency of the circumstances of their dispersal. On the other hand, a single sib in one locality may exhibit two (or more?) fairly independent lineages or clusters of houses (Laguna 1972:1:212;G).

Sibs, moreover, were all either of one or the other exogamous moiety:

"Because these divisions (moieties) are exogamous, their members stand toward each other in the relationship of husband and wife, father and child, spouse's siblings and sibling's spouses, between whom are reciprocal ceremonial obligations. Thus, at all the life crises of members of one's moiety, services were rendered by their "opposites" -- who, in turn, had to be repaid. Such repayments were generally made at potlatches, when debtors as hosts
entertained the others as guests, each side honoring and sustaining the other....

"It should, however, be emphasised that the moiety as such was not a social group. It had no organisation of its own, but was simply an arrangement for regulating the relationship between persons, because it ranged the sibs to which they belonged on one side or the other. The sib organisation remained primary....

"The two divisions for the Tlingit are named TlayInedi (for the Ravens) and CAkkuqedi (for the Wolves or Eagles), the latter being the same as the name for one of the sibs" (Laguna 1972:1:450;G).

It is the sib that owns the crests, the familial symbols which appear as crest hats, totem poles, "Chilkat" blankets, kerfed and painted boxes, house fronts, canoe prows, interior "screens," and all the other items used and displayed at potlatches. Crest art, completely distinct from the art of the shaman, features imagery celebrating myth and migration legends, heroic feats of ancestors, and present wealth of the lineage.

C. Tlingit shamanism

1. Definition

Laguna succinctly presents the complex context of the Tlingit shaman:

"The shaman ('ixt') is the intermediary between man and the forces of nature. He cures the sick, controls the weather, brings success in war and on the hunt, foretells the future, communicates with colleagues at a distance, receives news of those who are far away, finds and restores to their families those who are lost and captured by the Land Otter Men, reveals and overthrows the fiendish machinations of witches, and makes public demonstrations of his powers in many awe-inspiring ways.
He is the most powerful figure in his own lineage, and sometimes even in his sib. Though his fame may have spread far to foreign tribes, he is seldom consulted when those of his own line are sick and dying, for these he cannot save. Nor can he save his own children if they are bewitched. His patients are inevitably members of another sib, often residents in another village. His professional rivals may be colleagues in any sib except his own; his most deadly enemies, like those of any Tlingit, are the traitor witches which lurk among his closest relatives." (1972:670;G)

One might add that to the Tlingit the forces of nature are spirits with which the shaman can deal; the abstract notion of "forces of nature" is a Western interpolation on Laguna's part. The distinction is a critical one, inasmuch as the shaman's art displays the particular spirits owned by the shaman, and into which he can transform himself (Laguna 1972:2:670;G).

Tlingit shamanism functions in the context of an animistic, magical, and ecstatic religion. Compulsive magic was worked by witches who made little dolls, sik, incorporating some hair, spittle, sweat, or even bits of food that had fallen from the mouth of the victim. These dolls were then placed in a human or dog's corpse to rot away (Laguna 1972:2:730;G). Both shamans and witches were able to transform into various animals to perform their tasks of good or ill. Certain animals were more closely associated with witches; others, such as land otters, with shamans, and mice are associated with both (ibid.:828).

Torture of a witch is rarely the subject of a charm as in Fig. 29, while "dead" witches appear with slightly greater frequency. Witches being tortured are
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characteristically depicted with hands bound behind the back, tied to a rigid twisted queue.

2. Manner of Practice of the Tlingit Shaman

Laguna relates that:

"Seances were held for a variety of purposes, sometimes when the spirits came of their own accord to the doctor, and sometimes when he summoned them. A seance might be held as a demonstration of power, as when the shaman wished to impress his own people or a professional rival. Sometimes these demonstrations were preliminaries to the attempted cure, an encouragement to both patient and doctor. Some seances were to announce an unexpected event or an impending disaster about which the shaman's spirits had brought a warning; others were held at the request of anxious relatives to obtain news of an absent kinsman or to discover and save those who were lost and captured by Land Otters.

Swanton [1908:465;E] also mentions that the shaman might send his spirits to find sources of food or to fight spirits belonging to a shaman of an enemy tribe. Most seances, perhaps, were to cure the sick, a procedure which often involved not simply treatment of the patient, but a public inquisition to expose the witch responsible and to force his confession (see pp. 736-738). Shamans were also truly doctors in that they possessed considerable medical skill which could be dispensed without formal seance. In addition, some dispensed amulets or 'medicines' that brought luck of particular kinds.

"... While his (Krause's) reports, like Swanton's, indicate that the Tlingit shamans of southeastern Alaska had powers similar to those of Yakutat and Dry Bay, and held similar seances, details vary tremendously. This is because the spirits, and in consequence the powers and procedures of the shamans, usually belonged to particular sibs. One would not expect duplication of a seance unless the one shaman had obtained his powers from the other." (Laguna 1972:2:701-702;G).

This last observation is important in explaining the multiplicity of motifs and their combinations.

Seton-Karr saw a Tlingit shaman in action at
Yakutat:

"On the evening of the sixth a great beating of drums and sticks, which continued nearly all night, was heard in the village ....

"The interior of the house was lit by firelight. The shaman was seated, naked to the waist, performing incantations and machinations over a sick child, though the child was nowhere visible. His long hair, always left uncut, was streaming behind him. He was shaking his charms, throwing his body and contorting, uttering shrill cries, hissing and extending his arms, groaning and breathing between clenched teeth, jerking himself meantime in convulsive starts in cadence to the music. Seated around the fire a dozen Yakutat Indians were beating drums and pieces of wood together, keeping time to the jerks of the shaman's head and body. This old medicine man is quite blind, having been deprived of his sight in a fight with another medicine man (1887:128;I).

The child had been poisoned by arsenic left about by the very expedition to which Seton-Karr was attached (Laguna 1972:2:700:G). The musicians were the shaman's assistants, members of his own family. Seton-Karr fails to mention masks, and perhaps this shaman did not use them, or did not always use them. Recall Emmons' Hutsnuwu gravelot (AMNH E 943-987) which had 14 headresses but no masks. Most Tlingit shamans, though, did use masks, and these represented individual spirits. The shaman donned these sequentially, Emmons tells us, so much being charged for a series of four masks, so much for eight (Emmons ms. WSM 1344-1351;E). The shaman might wear, rather than a mask, a headress with a miniature mask attached to the front, or a bear claw crown. He most likely wore a necklace of bone charms, a waist and sometimes a shoulder robe of skin with charms and occasionally wooden carvings hanging from its painted surface, and a puffin bill.
fringe. Many other implements, and long hair and nails that are never cut, complete the picture (Laguna 1972:2:685-699;G).

No shaman, of course, had everything. The picture we have of them is built up across the full range of their individual practices. Emmons' grave lots are the primary evidence for the patterns of association of the many items, and their imagery, which formed individual kits.

3. Manner of Use of Charms

Not long after the seance for the little girl, Seton-Karr had opportunity to observe another one. It seems several Tlingit had assumed the arsenic, a dry, white, powdery substance, was palatable. Of this second seance, he wrote:

"Presently he stripped himself, and opening his box of charms, took out the wooden figure of a crane with a frog clinging to its back, and a bunch of sea otter teeth and carved walrus tusks. The latter he placed on the stomach of the dying man.... (Seton-Karr 1887:I).

The figure of a crane would have been the shaman's oyster catcher rattle.

The practice of placing charms on the person of the afflicted is mentioned several times by Emmons (AMNH E 2163, 19-208, E 679, and others), and Swanton mentions small bone images of water beetles which were "passed over sore places by the shaman to heal them" (Swanton 19038:459;E).

Table VIII shows the uses made of charms as described by Emmons. In the interest of brevity, record was not kept of whether Emmons mentions witchcraft in connection
with a particular charm or not, although detailed analysis of charms so associated might reveal differences from charms not so described. Unfortunately, Emmons nowhere mentions a specific manner of use of a charm in connection with witchcraft.

Note was taken of where the charm was worn and what was done with it in relation to the patient. Twenty-seven percent were identified as having originally been attached to a robe or dance blanket, and 22.4 percent as being for the neck, but whether as part of a necklace or whether as a separate, larger, pectoral ornament (so identified specifically by Emmons but once (MAI 9-7953), although there are many other candidates) is unclear. Twenty-three percent were without notation regarding use, primarily those not collected by Emmons.

Specific mention of what was done with specific unattached charms is rare. Two and nine-tenths percent were said to have been displayed or handled in ways not specifically stated. Three and five-tenths percent were recorded as being transferred to the patient, nine-tenths percent as being heated and then touched to the patient. Eleven and eight-tenths percent had multiple uses, which were scored separately. Emmons mentions touching the tongue of several land otter charms to the patient's body (ms. AMNH 19:633 and others). A "wolf" head charm with greatly exaggerated tongue shows the type, figure 30. Certainly these values are low due to under-reporting.
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Table VIII
Uses ascribed to charms in Emmons notes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Uses Ascribed</th>
<th>Numbers of Charms</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ear Pendant</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neck</td>
<td>140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pectoral</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robe or Dance Blanket</td>
<td>169</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Necklace (Piece)</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Necklace (Entire)</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Displayed-Handled</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transferred to Patient (left)</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heated or Touched to Patient</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Charm or Ornament&quot; etc.</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Under Clothing</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiple Use</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Data</td>
<td>169</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>648</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: G.T. Emmons ms. catalogues
        AMNH E and 19, WSM.
Figure 31 illustrates a shaman's waist robe from Chilkat. It demonstrates well the large numbers of charms a shaman might possess, and the manner in which they might be effectively displayed. Laguna mentions the shaman as having an entire box full of them (1972:2:689). Such large numbers of charms, relatively simple in form, were not intended for careful scrutiny by the shaman's clients, as were the more complex, individual pectoral ornaments. Interestingly, figure 32, a posed studio shot of the late 19th Century, features a shaman holding up a charm to the gaze of a woman patient. Presumably the studio shot bears some relationship, however tenuous, to actual practice. Emmons mentions some charms as being "displayed," but in what manner, precisely, is uncertain (E 636).

Figure 33 is a shaman's necklace. This allows us to mourn the loss of context that has occurred with the separation of so many charms from their original necklaces and robes. The charms on this necklace break down easily into opposing types. There are eight decorated and eight plain charms, and humans and animals. This suggests a connection with Laguna's contention that eight is the Tlingit number of ritual completion (1972:2:761;E).

There were, then, a number of different uses for charms, and a number of different types, ranging from ostentatious and elaborate, taking a central role in the healing seance, to virtually insignificant ones contributing but little to the overall effect of massed ivories and
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"Tlingit spirit doctor and sick woman"
This posed Winter & Pond photo depicts a bone charm in a purported manner of use. Is the woman fixing her gaze upon the charm or upon the doctor's face? (Andrews 1960:97;H)
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auditory enhancement. No other article of paraphenalia is recorded as having been used by leaving it with the patient in the shaman's absence (WSM 904 and others).

In the iconographical analysis of the land otter motif which follows, we will see how charms express in microcosm the entire world of the shaman's relationships and what this has to do with the charms' use and imagery.

D. Iconographical Analysis of the Land Otter Motif

1. Tlingit Beliefs about the Land Otter.

Land otters (kucda) are believed by the Tlingit to be, not animals in the ordinary sense, but transformed people. Specifically, they are people who have become lost in the woods or drowned, and whose bodies are not available to properly cremate and memorialise. They are dreaded because they have magic powers to confuse the mind of the unwary person, and can appear to one lost as his or her most dearly beloved relatives. They assist the victim "home", in reality to their den. Once there, the victim slowly turns into a land otter man (or woman), and may attempt to lure others to share its fate (Laguna 1972:2:744-748;G). Their canoe is the skate (Swanton 1909:28;G). It appears to one under the influence of the land otters as an ordinary canoe. Various charms may be used against them, such as dog bones (Swanton 1908:189;G), urine, excrement, or metal carried in the mouth (Laguna
1972:2:670;G). Dogs are never fooled by them (ibid.:832). Figure 34 depicts an anthropomorphic land otter man mask from Dry Bay. It is one of many such masks, and one of many such representations in Tlingit shamanic art.

Curiously, land otter hair is a good luck amulet. One of Laguna's informants acquired some in an abbreviated version of a guardian spirit encounter (1972:2:667;G). Such encounters are discussed in greater detail in a later section.

Several myths also show the dual nature of land otters. Swanton's myths numbers six, seven, and forty-five recount tales of families visited by privation and aided in their distress by land otters, which caused large quantities of food to come to them. These land otters, unknown to the afflicted, were members of their own families who had previously disappeared (1909;G).

2. Land otters as Crest Symbols

Figure 35 displays a canoe-prow figure in the form of a land otter man. Shotridge gave the oral history of this piece in 1922;E, and states that as a prominent piece of crest art it was supposed to commemorate the land otter-like nimbleness and death defying feats of a young warrior. As a canoe prow figure, it would be seen by all, and carry the sib's imagery far and wide. Shotridge also mentions that the young warrior's paternal grandfathers (& therefore of the same sib as he) were inmates of a Land Otter House. It is
Fig. 34
A.M.N.H. E 400. Shaman's mask "representing the spirit of a drowned Tlingit who has only half turned into an otter man, 'Kuch-tar-kar- Ko-see- tau-kah.' Worn by the doctor when dancing about the sick." Collected by Emmons at Dry Bay near the mouth of the Alsek River from the grave house of the shaman Gucta. (Laguna 1972:3:Pl. 191;G)
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unfortunate that the oral history of the naming of Land Otter House has not been recorded. As far as I know, the land otter's occurrence in crest art is rare, for all its frequency in shamanic art. Perhaps this was one of the families once aided by a land otter. Presumably such a perceived incident might qualify for crest status, but Swanton does not identify the sib of the legendary individuals, nor indicate any of the land otter stories as being crest associated.

The Land Otter house mentioned by Shotridge was at Sitka, of the Klooknah-adi sib. This corresponds to Swanton's L.uk.nAxA/ di, "King Salmon People," a sib of the Raven moiety. Swanton, however, lists no Land Otter house at Sitka in his lengthy list. He does, however, list a Land Otter house at Kake, belonging to the Tane/ di, "People of the creek TAn," also a Raven moiety sib (1908:399,401; G). Shotridge, in a separate article (1913:100; E) lists a Land Otter house at Klukwan, belonging to the Ga-nah-ta-de, corresponding to Swanton's GanAxA/ di, "people of Ga/ nAx," again a Raven moity sib. Interestingly, Kaka, the mythical first shaman was Kiksadi, also a Raven sib but quite distinct from those just mentioned (Swanton, 1909:140; E).

Shotridge's tale of the land otter man canoe prow figure, awarded the nimble youth as a memorial to his war exploits, and which graced his canoe when he arrived at Chilkat as guests at the first potlatch between formerly bitter enemies, illustrates a crucial difference between crest art and shamanic imagery. Even the land otter, intimately
involved with the practice of the shaman, as will be outlined momentarily, can be used emblematically as a crest symbol if a family has come to have a right to it. Note that the symbolic commemoration of the youth's exploits in the crest context was for the land otter's actual qualities as an animal, rather than the animal's dark and magical side, associated with shamanism.

3. Land Otters as Shamans' Spirits

According to Laguna's informant, the spirit that begins troubling a prospective shaman "is always called kucda (land otter)" (1972:2:674;G). This is apparently true for all Tlingit shamans, and not just those of a particular sib. Thus, while spirits were inherited, the land otter had the widest possible distribution.

The young shaman serves an apprenticeship in which he learns the many special taboos and practices of his profession, and eventually undertakes a spirit quest which is similar to the spirit quest known throughout most of North America. The object of his quest is to encounter the land otter spirit, and cut out the tongue of an actual land otter, in which is contained "all the secrets of shamanism" (ibid.:677). This tongue becomes the nucleus of the shaman's most powerful amulet, called skutch, (and) shown in figure 37.

Ethnographic descriptions of the Tlingit shaman's vision quest are extremely rare. (Laguna 1972:2:676-678;G).
"Bundle of twigs wrapped around the tongue of a land otter - 'Sheetche' - worn in practicing about the sick."

Found in the grave house of a Tłuk Wedding shaman on the Akwe River by Emmons before 1888.

(Laguna 1972:3:1119;G)
The prototype account is to be found in the myth of the first Tlingit shaman, Kaka. As Swanton relates in the abstract of the myth, Kaka

"was taken south from Sitka by the land otters and sent back again by the husband of a woman who had been carried off like himself. What they used as a canoe was a skate, and they kept him covered all the way. After a time one of his friends heard him singing in the midst of a fog, but they could not get near him until they had fasted two days. Then they found him laying on a log with blood running out of his nose and mouth. They brought him home, and he became a great shaman"(1909:420;G).

According the Laguna, the neophyte shaman, after a period of training and ritual abstinences goes off purposefully to encounter the spirit, whereas Kaka was abducted by the land otters. But his encounter is particularly intense, and inasmuch as Kaka is referred to as the first shaman, his spirit encounter (for the land otters and the other animals and phenomena he saw while in the custody of the land otters all became his shaman's spirits) is by definition prototypical.

Elements of this tale, at least, may be of considerable antiquity. The prostration, blood running from the nose and mouth, and the necessity of purity in others who would approach the initiate are identical to the descriptions of a number of Coast Salish guardian spirit encounters with powerful shaman's spirits, Olson 1967:152;H being a prime example. This suggests a wide distribution of such potent encounters. Benedict (1923;H) discusses the guardian spirit
relationship throughout North America, without, unfortunately dwelling on the initiatory encounter.

Elements of the myth of Kaka appear in the charm in figure 38, which is a Tlingit style charm photographed by Bill Holm while in the possession of the New York dealer, George Terasaki. A human figure lays supine on the back of a beast which certainly conforms well enough to our admittedly confused model of what a land otter may look like in Tlingit shamans' art. The tail of the otter(?) becomes a human face, and along its spine are circle-dot motifs, which are generally restricted to the Tlingit among Northwest Coast peoples, as it is a motif much used by the Aleut and Eskimo peoples farther West (Smith and Spier 1927;F). These may also be intended to represent octopus suckers, as such strings of circles or elevated circular depressions are often identified as being such. The land otter rests inside a canoe which at the right becomes the flipper of a marine creature. Without embarking on an examination of positively identified skate motifs in charms, which, going by our experience with land otters and wolves, is not likely to be conclusive, we cannot say with certainty whether the flipper motif is intended to represent a skate or a sea lion or seal. What is clear is that something animate has become the canoe. In view of the ideology of the guardian spirit relationship, this charm is very plausibly evidence of the fundamental guardian spirit power relationship of the Tlingit shaman.
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This points to a signal difference between the land otter on charms and that of the canoe prow figure. When the land otter image is incorporated in the art of the shaman it commemorates that individual shaman's encounter with the land otter spirit, and his continuing relationship with it. The youthful warrior had no such supernatural relationship, and the ultimate right to the land otter symbol had been acquired in the mythical past. This may be generalised to hold for all shamans' as opposed to crest art. Thus, the charm in figure 36, so similar in form to the canoe prow figure, is entirely different in conception.

Figure 39 is very similar to figure 38, but the land otter's head only is visible. In place of its body are three skeletal human figures (only two being visible, as the book from which the illustration was copied was overbound, obscuring a portion of the image). A row of rather more explicit octopus suckers lines the bottom of the canoe.

Figure 40, another Emmons piece, is identified as a sea lion spirit canoe. It has, however, the same basic arrangement as the land otter types, including an octopus, and human figures, one being prominent. Remembering that shamans from different sibs tended to have different spirits, with the exception of the land otter and possibly some others, we should not be surprised to see different animals and spirits in similar configurations. As well, more than one spirit could serve similar functions. A particular shaman likely did not have to rely solely on the land otter's skate canoe to get
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about in the spirit realms. The sea lion might serve equally well for spirit transport across the sea, as might the halibut, or killer whale.

The oyster catcher rattle, figure 41, is but one of many which show a supine figure similar to that seen on charms. This figure is identified by Emmons as a dead Tlingit, or dead shaman (dead equaling residence in the spirit realms). The whole configuration is the back of the oyster catcher, which forms the rattle as a whole, incorporating the other figures. Thus is illustrated the shaman's guardian spirit relationship with other entities than the land otter, and also the phenomenon known as shaman's flight, in which the shaman's spirit leaves the body to visit supernatural realms. The supine shaman motif is one of the more important elements tying together the rich tapestry of Tlingit shaman's imagery, displaying as it does the prostrate or entranced shaman receiving spirit power, and thus the guardian spirit relationship, which the shaman experiences with a number of spirits. Glancing back to figure 12, the same fundamental supine figure may be seen.

Figure 42 illustrates a variation on the theme. A shaman, recognisable by his claw crown, has the body of an octopus, the head of which is between his knees, and stands on the head of another creature, which has a large fish-like mouth. Although it is not easy to see in the photocopy, a small land otter is attached to the column-like motif at the side. This charm has the same elements as the previously
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Fig. 43
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"Mythical sea monster is shown with other animal and human forms."
Rev. Doolan, Coll. Pre 1900
(Wardwell 1978:Fig. 136;D)
"Sea monster. On the side are three seated spirits; at the tail is a spirit holding a spirit canoe full of dead men; on the belly is a bear spirit, and on the back is a shaman's spirit holding a spirit canoe with a land otter in it." (Laguna 1972:3:Pl. 183(G)
Fig. 45
L.M.A. 2-19101, Chilkat
Represents mythical strong man Kahasi
  tearing apart a sea lion.
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  Collected in 1891 (Invararity 1950: fig. 167;D)
Land Otters on Reverse (Harner & Elsasser
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Fig. 46
Duck-Toolh house post, Whale House of the Kon-nuh-ta-di at Klukwan. The face below represents the island at which the incident occurred. (Emmons 1916:pl. 3;E)
discussed spirit transport examples, but in different arrangement. Emmons (ms. AMNH 19-463;E) describes a charm featuring a shaman "standing on a fish coming up out of the water" and elsewhere (E 1012) "fish, which transports him through space unseen, and noiselessly." The shaman in figure 42 is standing on (plausibly) a fish, and thus also traveling. Other examples could be cited as well.

However, the theme of underwater spirit transport involving the supine figure of a shaman is not to be confused with depictions of sea monsters, usually the Gonakadet, depicted in figures 43 and 44. Figure 43 includes a plausible land otter, and 44 includes one specifically so identified. Figure 44 is particularly complex with its spirit canoe atop the monster. The initiatory role of the land otter spirit for the Tlingit shaman should prepare us for finding them in many different configurations that are not primarily based upon them visually. Their inclusion as a qualifier of shamanic power is one reason why they appear so frequently.

Figure 45 reiterates this point. It represents a mythical strong man, "Black-skin", a lazy useless child who trained secretly, acquired Strength himself as a guardian spirit and successfully rent a sea lion that had just killed the young he-man of the village. This charm has two small land otters on the back and one emerging from the breast of the principal subject. It also confirms the shaman's employment of specifically beneficial spirits, and of inherited spirits. Figure 46 depicts the same basic image on a house
post of the Whale House at Klukwan. The shaman's charm has more complex imagery for all its smaller scale. The bow of octopus tentacle and the auxiliary land otters speak of the shaman's present spirit power relationship, as does the otter(?) emerging from the breast of the mythical youth. It is unfortunate that we lack documentary association of this charm with a particular sib, but the existence of the motif on a house post identifies it as sib property. Almost certainly, the spirit was as well, and regularly inherited by successive shamans of the sib.

4. Conclusion

If we return to Panofsky's formulation, we may state that the specific theme being expressed in the image of the land otter and its various appearances, is the shaman's paradigmatic guardian spirit relationship. This relationship is with a potent object of dread that has, however, potential for benefit as well. The myths of the land otters' succor of families in distress indicate the potential to turn adversity to benefit in the shaman's supernatural contract with the land otter spirit and thus neatly underscore the shaman's ability to heal. To the Tlingit, acquisition of the land otter's spirit meant that a young shaman had achieved initiation into the shamanic college (speaking metaphorically, as there was no secret shaman's society among the Tlingit) and could then go on to acquire other spirits and become a complete shaman.
It is necessary however, to dig more deeply to discover why the land otter should be signaled out for these special attentions, and why the shaman's alliance with it was essential. This will be the subject of inquiry in Chapter Three.
CHAPTER THREE: ICONOLOGICAL ANALYSIS

A. Sources and guideposts.

Panofsky directs us, in the third stage of art historical investigation, iconological analysis, to relate what we have observed and contextualised, to essential characteristics of the human mind. With a nod to anthropology, we can without doing violence to Panofsky's formulation add "...and society". Panofsky's interest in intrinsic meaning or content (see fig. 2) of art works, and his personal predilection for this third stage of analysis is demonstrated by his co-authorship of *Saturn and Melancholy*, a "History of Natural Philosophy, Religion, and Art" (1964;F). This work traces the many occurrences of the ancient concept of Melancholy as one of the four humours, of its transformations from emanation of Saturn to abstract concept, and of course its myriad visual representation along the way.

Unfortunately, Panofsky, et al's, tracing of Melancholy begins and ends with a complex of ideas specific to one culture, albeit one changing through time. He gives us no clue as to how we might make cross-cultural comparisons. If we are to fulfill his dicta and thereby establish the validity of his approach in the field of the art histories of non-literate peoples, and thus the complementarity of the art historical and anthropological approaches, this problem must be solved. Inasmuch as ours is an anthropological topic, at
least conventionally, it is logical to seek methods for fulfilling Panofsky's directions in symbolic and psychological anthropology.

Mary Douglas, a symbolic anthropologist, begins a discussion of the laws of Leviticus with a penetrating observation:

"Defilement is never an isolated event. It cannot occur except in view of a systematic ordering of ideas. Hence any piecemeal interpretation of the pollution rules of another culture is bound to fail. For the only way in which pollution ideas make sense is in reference to a total structure of thought whose key-stone, boundaries, margins and internal lines are held in relation by rituals of separation" (1972b:202;K).

This is very clear. We need to delineate Tlingit cosmology in order to discover the "location" of the land otter, and perhaps that will tell us why it has the significance that it does. We may recall that the land otter was taboo, before the contact era, to all but shamans. But, why? And, what is the systematic ordering of ideas which, for the Tlingit, places the land otter in such a unique position?

B. Iconological Analysis of the Land Otter Motif

Significantly, the Tlingit separate their afterworlds according to manner of death. It is of considerable interest to note that these afterworlds are stratified and identified with levels of space in the Tlingit environment. Beginning at the top, Kiwa'a, or "Land Above," is the destination of those who die by violence, either in war
or from a beast. This realm is associated with the vault of the sky, actually above the sky, and the Northern Lights are caused by the spirits who reside there playing a game similar to shinny (Laguna 1972:2:766;G). \textit{Kiwa'a} is guarded against undeserved entry by watchmen standing guard at \textit{Gus-Wut}, "cloud hole," conceived as a hole in the vault of the sky (ibid.:770).

The next realm down, \textit{Kett Kiwa'a}, "Dog Heaven," is the destination of the souls of witches and other serious malefactors, especially those who have been killed for their crimes. This recalls the charm in figure 13, which was spirit of the air, and a "very bad spirit." Although the sky might seem to us like a rather pleasant place, evidently it was not for the Tlingit. As Laguna's informant put it, the spirits of the wicked "'floated up into the sky and moved around on the clouds -- got no place to go'" (ibid.:771).

Below the sky, of course, is the surface of the Earth, place of the ordinary Tlingit land of the dead, and identified with the cemetary which was either in the woods behind the village, or more often, across water from the village of the living, on a small islet. This realm, \textit{Sege gawu 'ani}, "ghost town," was the destination of all those who died ordinary and unremarkable deaths (ibid.:766).

The above groups, with the possible exception of the malefactors in \textit{Kett Kiwa'a}, were eventually reincarnated, ideally into the same family they had previously known. This is not the case with the final group, the spirits of those who
are drowned or lost in the woods. They, as previously stated, do not die. Instead, they become land otter people "kucda qwani". The crucial difference between this and the other groups is that there is no body to properly cremate and memorialize.

Food for the drowned, if the body is recovered, is placed not beside the fire, as it is for the terrestrial and celestial groups, but in the water, to mark the realm to which the spirit now belongs. If no body is recovered, of course, no food is offered to the spirit, as the individual has not died.

This cosmological stratification is echoed by the spirits of the shaman SlawA'n, called "spirit of the sea, spirit of the land, spirit from above, and spirit from below". (Swanton 1909:153;G). A like recitation is found in Veniaminov (cited in Laguna 1972:2:835;G).

If we return to the data compiled in table VI, however, we see that many of the animals symbolising shaman spirits found on charms were those that frequented the boundaries of these zones, or travelled between them. The foremost of these, of course, is the land otter, which feeds in the intertidal zone, but diving and shore birds figure prominently as do marine mammals, which frequent the surface. The oyster catcher, favored symbol for Tlingit shaman's rattles, feeds exclusively in the intertidal zone. Not surprisingly, food from this zone, "len-' Adi," or "things of low tide," is subject to a number of taboos, even though it is
a major food source. Laguna was told that

"At night time we don't eat anything from the beach ... It's ḗgas (taboo). It gives us nightmares (omens of misfortune?) and makes bad weather. A long time ago they didn't have any salty stuff in the house. And a young girl after she menstruates never eats anything from the beach for two or three years" (ibid.1:405;G), interpolations Laguna's.

Laguna also remarks that

"a shaman and the members of his immediate family, including his wife, were not allowed to eat beach food except during one month a year (February? March? April?) when the mythical Property Woman was supposed to go on the beach to gather and eat such food. Then it was eaten ritually by the shaman and his people to bring good fortune" (ibid.).

It is significant that land otters are largely nocturnal, and that it is just at night that humans cannot eat the same food as land otters. Also, late Winter and early Spring was historically the time of greatest scarcity, when beach food was the last line of defense against starvation.

It is clear, then, that the beach area, which the land otter frequents, is a zone of some ambiguity, and therefore danger. The land otter is thus a liminal being (from limen, edge) and acquires its qualities from its ecological position as a land mammal remarkably well adapted to an aquatic environment -- qualities that conflict with the Tlingit ordering of the metaphysical universe. Land otters don't fit. Obviously this must have a great deal to do with the land otters' pre-eminence among animal motifs on charms.
They do not even act like animals as they cavort, chortle and play endlessly at sliding down snow or mud banks. They can swim a quarter of a mile underwater, burbling as they go (Harris 1968:200-201;J).

It is apt then that the Tlingit see the land otter as luring their drowned or lost loved ones away by clouding their minds. If land otters do not fit the Tlingit scheme of things, neither does drowning. The distinction between accidental death in war or hunting and that from drowning is that war and the hunt are essential activities, however dangerous, and the men who fall victim to the perils inherent in these activities must be encouraged. Drowning, however, fails to respect individual qualities. A canoe upset in bad weather or by strong tidal currents, both of which are common, if not usual, in southeastern Alaska, may cause the deaths of all, whether babies or tough old fighters. The "clouding of the minds" part comes in when we think of the complex mental structures, essential to orderly life, life that makes sense, and their essentially arbitrary nature. Since the land otter straddles crucial mental boundaries as well as ecological ones, and is purposely related to a form of death that does not fit either, we may say that "falling victim to the land otters" involves blurring of these essential boundaries, and thus, indeed, a clouding of the mind.

There is more, however. It is altogether too coldly analytical to ignore the emotional effects of suppressed grief, which the sorrowing relations of the absent drowned are
unable to discharge by means of funerary display and potlatch. What is worse, inability to celebrate these essential rites of passage for the spirit of the deceased means that there will be no reincarnation of the soul. The loved one is thus truly lost forever, and the solace available by means of this certainty to the survivors of the conventionally dead is absent, which only compounds the emotional disorientation of the survivors of the drowned.

Turning our attention now to the shaman, we see that he is set up in a similarly anomalous social position. As the primary intermediary between the human living world and that of the spirits, the shaman is as liminal as the land otter. An elaborate set of rules sets him apart from ordinary people. He is not cremated, as are other Tlingit, but is placed in a grave house which no one other than another shaman of his own lineage dared ever approach. It was believed that when this structure decayed and collapsed, all parts fell simultaneously (Laguna 1972:2:699:G). His art was made for him by himself, or members of his own sib, rather than by his "opposites," as was the case with crest art (ibid.:687-8), and his food taboos, as mentioned, were uniquely strict. Even his daily appearance set him apart, as the Tlingit shaman never cut his hair or his nails. Thus, a particular human, the shaman, was conceived of and set up as having a supernatural alliance with the most liminal of animals, which had been selected as such and identified with a particularly unfortunate fate by means of precise, if unconscious rules.
To the Tlingit, and perhaps to people of most cultures, the spirit world is not a matter of abstract theory, but a direct experience in dreams, visions and myth. It is necessary to reflect but briefly on the possible long-term effects of spending a lifetime playing with the pictures in one's mind in the belief that the images there are publicly accessible and relate to a real, objective spirit world, rather than utterly private. Were an intelligent, dedicated shaman to spend the kind of energy dreaming and visualizing in trance, as many no doubt did, that graduate students today spend researching and writing — that is, being literate — he would undoubtedly achieve a mental world not only vastly different from ours, but one in which he could move through supernatural landscapes with all the lucidity and sense of utter reality known to us under the rubric "lucid dream", in which the dreamer is conscious of the fact that he is dreaming, and, continuing to dream, is able to influence its course (see Green 1968;K). An analagous process is Jung's "active imagination", a kind of enhanced auto-hypnotic daydream (see Hannah 1981;K). The continued fascination with the irrational and the unconscious in our own culture points to the universality of the compelling nature of the dream or spirit world.

The shaman is the professional specialist whose responsibility it is to understand, make sense of, and mollify the many forces, supernatural to himself, and ultimately psychological, embedded in a specific social matrix, to us.
He is the conduit for the necessary reciprocity between living people and spirits. Most Tlingit are untroubled by visitations of spirits in their everyday lives, and do not wish to have one foot in the spirit world as they go through life – Laguna and others make no mention, regarding the Tlingit, of the widespread guardian spirit relationships such as found among the Coast Salish. The shaman, by contrast, has regular access to the spirit world through dreams and particularly trance. Sleep, and thus dreams, are considered close to death, as evidenced by the Tlingit phrase nana\textsuperscript{\textregistered} kika 'aya 'u ta, "sleep lives face to face with death" (Laguna 1972:2:759;G). This resonates with Emmons' frequent assertion that charms represent the dreams of a shaman (Emmons ms. AMH E2708 and numerous others).

In a curing seance, the shaman withdraws into himself to make contact with his spirits. He becomes one or the other of them as he needs to travel or fight. The landscape or seascape through which he travels, and the location of his battles with hostile spirits is inside his mind, we would say, but we can follow the shaman no farther, being both personally and culturally less acquainted with trance and the inner landscape, than he.

The land otter, as prototypical shaman's spirit, represents in a way the entirety of the shaman's other-worldly experience, the dark and liminal aspects of existence. Its powers to cloud minds resonates again in this connection, for as symbol of the shaman's initiatory trance, it remains as
symbol of his ability to (as we might say) sink into the hall of mirrors within, or (as he might say), travel and transform in the limitless vastness of supernatural space. What he does there is of consuming interest to all. It is more than mere collective fantasy because as a human institution of paleolithic origin and global distribution, shamanism would seem to be of fundamental significance to the human species. The shamans' trance and the universal belief in spirits point to capabilities of the human mind that are of essential value in the survival and evolution of the human race.

C. Conclusion

By following Panofsky's method we have been guided to take a very close look at Tlingit shamans' charms and their contexts on three successively more abstract levels. It was necessary to touch on analytical insights developed by anthropologists in order to approach land otters in their symbolic matrix in the third stage of analysis, but in so doing we have integrated art historical and anthropological methods in a way that is, hopefully, sound and fruitful.
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APPENDIX I

- Museum Abbreviations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbr.</th>
<th>Museum Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AMNH</td>
<td>American Museum of Natural History, New York</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASM</td>
<td>Alaska State Museum, Juneau</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BAS</td>
<td>Museum of Ethnology, Basle, Switzerland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BLN</td>
<td>Museum of Ethnology, Berlin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BM</td>
<td>British Museum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CM</td>
<td>Cranmore Ethnographical Museum, Chislehurst, England</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DMNH</td>
<td>Denver Museum of Natural History</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FM</td>
<td>Field Museum of Natural History, Chicago</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LMA</td>
<td>Lowie Museum of Anthropology, Berkeley, California</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAI</td>
<td>Museum of the American Indian, Heye Foundation, New York</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAE</td>
<td>Museum of Anthropology and Ethnography, Leningrad</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MPA</td>
<td>Museum of Primitive Art (Metropolitan Museum) New York</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NMC</td>
<td>National Museum of Man, Ottawa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PAM</td>
<td>Portland Art Museum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PM</td>
<td>Peabody Museum, Harvard University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PU</td>
<td>Princeton University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROM</td>
<td>Royal Ontario Museum, Toronto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TM</td>
<td>Taylor Museum, Colorado Springs, Colorado</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UBC</td>
<td>Museum of Anthropology, University of British Columbia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UM</td>
<td>University Museum, University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weilgus</td>
<td>Private</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WSM</td>
<td>Thomas Burke Memorial Washington State Museum, Seattle</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX II

Published and Associated Tlingit Shaman Charms

Auk: AMNH 19-462: Jonaitis 1980: fig. 7; B.

Chilcat-Chilcoot: AMNH Neg. 291560: Jonaitis 1978: fig. 6; B.
AMNH E 634+5
AMNH E 636+7
AMNH E 638 through 40
AMNH E 683, 704A-D: Grave lot E 688-707
FM 78870: Jonaitis 1977: fig. 65; 1980 fig. 9; both B.
LMA 2-19101: Inverarity 1950: fig. 7; D. Harner and Elsasser 1965: frontis.; D. Elsasser 1968: 18; D. Furst and Furst 1982: Pl. 125; D.
PAM 48-3-107: Davis 1949: fig. 111; D. Gunther 1966: #349; D.
PAM 43-3-108: Davis 1949: fig. 114; D. Gunther 1966: #350; D.
PAM 43-3-110: Davis 1949: fig. 112; D. Gunther 1966: #352; D. Jonaitis 1978: fig. 3; B.
PAM 48-3-112: Gunther 1966: #354; D.
PAM 48-3-113: Gunther 1966: #355; D.

Gonaho: AMNH E 1665-6, 1669: Grave lot E 1653-1669.
AMNH E 2708: Vaillant 1939: pl. 92; D. Wardwell 1978: fig. 67; D.
FM 77872  Grave lot FM 77872-77878
FM 77873
FM 77878
FM 78226  Grave lot FM 78227-78242
MAI 4/1671  Laguna 1972: pl. 182; G.
MAI 9/7952  Laguna 1972: pl. 183; G.
WSM 2047 through 2064  Grave lot WSM 2026-2067

Hoonah:

AMNH E 839 through E 841
AMNH E 1283 through E 1287  Grave lot AMNH E 1283-1287
AMNH E 1480 A&B  Grave lot AMNH E 1474-1485
AMNH E 2711  Wardwell 1978: fig. 66; D.
AMNH 19-450 through 19455  Wardwell 1978: Fig. 64; D (19-450 only); Grave lot AMNH 19-450 - 19-455
MAI 4/1669  Dockstader 1966: fig. 120; D.
MAI 9/7950  Jonaitis 1978: fig. 4; B
MAI 9/7953  Laguna 1973: fig. 284;

Hutsnuwu:

AMNH E 864  Jonaitis 1978: fig. 2; B.
AMNH E 964 & E 968 through E 976  Grave lot AMNH E 943-987
AMNH E 1280&1  Grave lot AMNH E 1280-1281
MAE 211-24  Siebert & Forman 1967: fig. 82; D.
MAI 211-25  Siebert & Forman 1967: fig. 86; D.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site</th>
<th>Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MAI 211-32</td>
<td>Siebert &amp; Forman 1967: fig. 83; D.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WSM 1227 through 1231</td>
<td>Grave lot WSM 1221-1231</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WSM 1821</td>
<td>La Jolla 1962: fig. 18; D. Wardwell 1964: fig. 144; D.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WSM 1830</td>
<td>Grave lot WSM 1803-1852</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WSM 1831</td>
<td>La Jolla 1962: fig. 70; D.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WSM 1832 through 1834</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WSM 1847&amp;8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WSM 1922 through 1925</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WSM 1926</td>
<td>Jonaitis 1980: fig. 5; B.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WSM 1927</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sitka:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AMNH E 645&amp;6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AMNH E 649A,B&amp;C</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AMNH E 677 through 682</td>
<td>Grave lot AMNH E 651-E 682</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AMNH E 1494</td>
<td>Grave lot AMNH E 1490-E1495</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAI 1/2154</td>
<td>Dockstader 1966: fig. 120; D.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAI 9/7948</td>
<td>Dockstader 1966; fig. 119; D. Princeton 1969:p. 46, fig. 133; D. Samuels 1975:p. 211; K.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PAM 48-3-115</td>
<td>Gunther 1955:#356; D.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PAM 48-3-116</td>
<td>Davis 1949: fig. 15; D. Gunther 1966:#357; D.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stikine:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAI 2/2089</td>
<td>Dockstader 1966: fig. 119; D.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
PAM 48-3-48  Davis 1949; fig. 116; D.
Gunther 1966:#346; D.

WSM 904  Grave lot WSM 901-934

WSM 910 through
915

WSM 919 through
925

WSM 926  La Jolla 1962: fig. 15; D;
Jonaitis 1977: fig. 1; B.

WSM 927 through
930

WSM 1027  La Jolla 1962: fig. 17; D.

WSM 1203  La Jolla 1962: fig. 16; D.

WSM 1204  Inverarity 1950:#160; D.

WSM 1522  Inverarity 1951:#161; D.
La Jolla 1962: fig. 13; D.

WSM 1720 through
1723  Grave lot WSM 1720-1724

WSM 1770  Vancouver Art Gallery 1956: fig. 101; D.

Yakutat:

MAI 4/1666  Laguna 1972: pl. 182; G.

MAI 11/352  Wardwell 1964: fig. 138; D.

PU 5065A through
5065E  Laguna 1972: pl. 173; G.

PU 5104A through
5104J  Laguna 1972: pl. 173; G.

ROM 939-31-154  Gunther 1962: p. 85,#151; D.

Tlingit:

AMNH Neg. 291556  Jonaitis 1980: fig. 4; B.

ASM 11-B-803 and
11-B-804  Keithan 1959; D.
BAS IV-A-138  Gunther 1962: p. 312; D.
CM El17    Emmons & Miles 1939: pl. xxi, fig. 4; B.
CM El139   Emmons & Miles 1939: pl. xxi, fig. 3; B.
CM El141   Emmons & Miles 1939: pl. xx, fig. 4; B.
CM 1133    Emmons & Miles 1939: pl. xx, fig. 2; B.
CM 1138    Emmons & Miles 1939: pl. xx, fig. 3; B.
CM 1234    Emmons & Miles 1939: pl. xix, fig. 2; B.
CM 1821    Emmons & Miles 1939: pl. xxi, fig. 1; B.
CM 4928    Emmons & Miles 1939: pl. xix, fig. 4; B.
CM 12432   Emmons & Miles 1993: pl. xx, fig. 1; B.
CM 24537   Emmons & Miles 1939: pl. xxi, fig. 2; B.

DMNH 11426A through 11426H

FM 14310    Jonaitis 1977: fig. 32; B.
Lasser A and B Mirski 1972: unpaged; D.
MAI 1301    Harner & Elsasser 1965: p. 100;
MAI 9/7051   Jonaitis 1978: fig. 7; B.
MAE 5795-45  Siebert & Forman 1967: fig. 84; D.
MAE 5795-47  Siebert & Forman 1967: fig. 85; D.
MPA 57.82    Paalen 1943: p. 36; E;
             Inverarity 1950: fig. 166; D;
             Wardwell 1964: fig. 137; D;
             Coe 1976: fig. 311; D.
NMC VII-A-251  Jonaitis 1978:fig.5;B; 
              Hall 1983:fig.2;I.

PAM 48-3-45  Davis 1949:fig.110;D; 
              Gunther 1966:#344;D.

PAM 48-3-46  Davis 1949:fig.113;D; 
              Gunther 1966:#345;D.

PAM 48-3-49  Gunther 1966:#347;D.

PAM 48-3-109 Gunther 1966:#351;D.

PAM 48-3-111 Gunther 1966:#353;D.

PM 68-30-10-1907 Princeton 1969:fig. 47; D.

PU 5089  Princeton 1969; D.

PU 5095  Princeton 1969: p. 37; D.

UBC A-2478  Hawthorne 1975: fig. 25; D.

Weilgus A  Emmons & Miles 1939: pl. xix, fig. 1; B; 
              Wardwell 1964: fig. 136; D; 
              Maurer 1977: p.308, #484 & pl.28; D.

Weilgus B  Emmons & Miles 1939: pl. xviii, fig. 2; B; 
              Wardwell 1964: fig. 150; D.

RW 65-263  Maurer 1977: fig. 485; D.
APPENDIX III

Gazetteer of Kwans Villages and Camps


Akwe River: 35 m. S.E. of Yakutat Bay, 59°17'N., 139°03'W. "Originally applied to the whole drainage system between Italio R. and Alsek delta; usage restricted since 1901." (Orth:59) "Tebenkov shows two native settlements here, the one nearest Yakutat being called aiko bliizhn (near aiko), the other aiko dain (far aiko)." (Baker:86,88) Gonaho Kwan

Alsek River: 49 m. S.E. of Yakutat: 59°03'N., 138°34'W. Mouth is Dry Bay. Also called Harrison River, Jones River, Riviere de Behring. (Orth:68, Baker:94) Gonaho Kwan


Anchoon: west shore Admiralty I. 41 m. N.E. of Sitka: 57°30'N., 134°35'W. "Lost much population in the late 1880's when a fish reducing plant was established at Killisnoo." (Orth:78). 1880 pop. 420. 12 houses (Krause:69) Hutsnuwu Kwan

Ankau, the: estuary 0.6 m. long on W. end of Phipps Pen., 2.6 m. W. of Yakutat, 59°32'50"N., 139°48'20"W. (Orth:80). Site of shaman's grave houses emptied by Emmons. Yakutat Kwan

Ahrnklin River: 59°25'45" N, 139°32'20"W; 10 m. S.E. Yakutat.

Ar-son-kee: Village, Huna Kwan. (E 838-841)

Auk Kwan: on Stephens Passage and Douglas and Admiralty Islands, including the following villages: Anchguhlsu, Tsantikihin. (BAEB 145:571), and the area of Berners Bay (E 2683-90)


Bartlett Bay or Cove: extends N. 5 m. from Pt. Gustavus on E. shore of Glacier Bay, 58°27'N., 135°33'W. "Named about 1881 by Capt. W.E. George, local pilot, for Charles E. Bartlett, who bought fishing property and a claim on Bartlett Bay in 1884. Saltery in 1880's, cannery 1889. (Orth:108, Baker:118), see Khartheene. Huna Kwan

Behm Canal: ruins of large village sighted by Vancouver 27 Aug. 1793. (Krause:63) Hehl Kwan

Berner's Bay: E. shore of Lynn Canal. 3 m. across: 58°43'N., 135°00'W. (Orth:126). Site of mining camp "Seward City" (1890:50). No mention of village here, yet Emmons collected several grave lots from this area. Auk Kwan


Cape Fox Village: See Gash.

Cat Island: 2.3 m. long between Felice Str. and Revillagigedo Channel, 8.8 m. N. of Grave Pt., Duke I., 55°01'20"N., 131°15'00"W. (Orth:193). "the indians migrated to Port Tongass from Cot (sic) Island." (Corser 1922:22;G) see Dasahuk. Tongass Kwan

Chikan: See Shakan.

Chilkat Kwan: about head of Lynn Canal, including these village: Chilkoot, Deshu Dyea, Katkwaahltu (Kagwalter) Klukwan, Skagway, Yendestake (Inderstucka). (BAEB 145:541). Winter towns: Chilkoot, Katwaahltu, Klukwan, Yendestake; Smaller towns: Deshu, Dyea, Skagway (BAEB 30:1:262)


Chilkat River: flows to head of Chilkat Inlet: 59°12'30"N., 135°28'30"W. Chilkat Kwan
Chilkoot: locality on Chilkoot R., between Lutak Inlet and Chilkoot Lake, 12 m. S.W. of Skagway: 59°20'00"N., 135°33'10"W. 1890 pop. 106. 8 houses, pop. 120 (Krause:66) Djigot (BAEBAR 26:397). Chilkat-Chilkoot Kwan.


Chulchagu: opposite shore of mainland to Gandecan (q.v.), 5 houses. (Krause:69) Huna Kwan.

Chyeeke: village. Hutsnuwu Kwan. (E943-987)

Cross Sound: From Icy Strait 12 m. S.W. to Gulf of Alaska: 58°08'N., 136°35'W. Originally included Icy Str. (Orth:249). Huna Kwan.


Dasahuk: Cat Island Village (Olson 1961:209;g) Tongass Kwan.


Dry Bay: Mouth, Alsek River: 59°08'N., 138°25'W. "Also called Bering's Bay: named Bering River by Cook as he thought Bering anchored here in 1741." (Orth:285). Gonaho Kwan.

Dyea: Chilkat village at modern place of same name. (BAEB 145-541). Chilkat Kwan.

Ellis, Point: northwestern point of entrance to Tebenkof Bay, Kuiu I. 56°33'40"N., 134°19'00"W. "An Indian village here has been called Point Ellis Village." (Orth:311). 1890 pop. figs. typical of cannery: 17 white all male; 115 indian: 60 male, 55 female; 35 "Mongolian," i.e., Chinese, all male. Kuiu Kwan.

Fotshou's village: Taku River and Inlet. 1880 pop. 24. Taku Kwan.
Funter Bay: cannery site. 19 m. S.W. Juneau. 1890 pop. 20 native. Auk Kwan.


Gonaho: former Tlingit town at Dry Bay, mouth of Alsek R., Immediate territory called Gonaho kwan by Emmons. (BAEB 30:1:496, and BAEB 145:571)


Guthleuh Kwan: Controller Bay. BAEB 30:2:765 cites Emmons usage of this term for this group, but does not follow it, asserting that Yakutat people only summered there.

Hamilton Bay: Kekou I., facing Kupreanof I. 8 deserted and partly ruined villages all on steep promontories or rocky points sighted by Vancouver 13 Aug 1794. (Krause:63)

Hanaga: Henya. 1880 pop. 500

Hehl Kwan: Behm Canal (BAEB 145:541)

Henya Kwan: W. coast of Prince of Wales I. between Tlevak narrows and Sumner Strait including villages: Klawak, Shakan, Tuxekan

Hinauhan's Village: Stikine R. 1880 pop. 31

Hlahayik: On Yakutat Bay behind an island called Hlaha. (BAEB 145:541). Clach-a-jek (Krause:65), Ḫaxayɪ'k. inside of Ḫaxa, an island (ibid:270 fn. 18). The Clach-a-jek of Krause seems to be identical with Yakutat. (BAEB 30:1:552). No such place name on Yakutat Bay can be traced or found. (Gunther, note in Krause:270)


Hot Springs Bay: W. of Goddard, W. coast of Baranof I. 56°51'N., 135°24'W. Sitka Kwan

Hukanuwu: village on N. side of Cross Sound between mainland and Chichigoff I. (BAEB 145:541). Huna Kwan

Huna Kwan: on Cross Sound, encamping in summer northward beyond Lituia Bay, with these villages: Okvetskoe, Gaudecan, Hukanuwu, Klughuggue, Kukanuwu, Tlushashakian (BAEB 145:541)

Huna Village: see Gaudecan

Hutsnuwu Kwan: "grizzly bear fort" on W. and S. coasts of Admiralty I. with villages: Angwin, Killisnoo, Neltushkin (BAEB 145:541)

Icy Strait: 50 m. water passage between Chatham Str. and Cross Sound. 58°18'N., 134°45'W. (Orth:442). Huna Kwan

Iknou: W. coast of Little Kek I. (Krause:73, citing Camille de Roquefeuil, voyages 1816-19, Paris, 1823, who saw some palisades and a small piece of land planted with potatoes at this place) Kake- Kuiu Kwan.

Inderstuka: (Emmons mss) Gantagastaki. "village on right bank of river." Locality at Haines airport. 59°15'00"N., 135°31'15"W. (Orth:359). Yendestake. At mouth of Chilkat River. (BAEB 145:541). 1867 12 large houses, 1880 16 houses. 171 pop. (Krause:271, fn. #36.) "Between the population count of 1880 and 1890 an entire Chilkat village, one of four in which the Chilkat people lived, was wiped out by flu." (Miller and Miller 1967:198;i.) Inderstuka does not appear on 1890 list.

Indian River: 1 m. S.E. of Sitka. Former summer camp of Sitka Indians. (Orth:454) 1880 pop. 43. Location of fort destroyed by Russians in 1804. (Krause:70).

Kadishan's village: Stikine River. 1880 pop. 27. Stikine Kwan

Kagwalter: (Emmons mss) Katkwaahltlu: "town on the point of a hill." On Chilkat River 6 m. above its mouth. (Orth:501). 1880 pop. 125. 8 houses, pop. 125 (Krause:270, fn. #34). Chilkat Kwan


Kah-tinge-uam: site of old Hutshnuwu village on Admiralty I., across from Killisnoo. (Emmons ms. WSM 962, 1009, stone adze and carving, dug up)

Kake Kwan: on Kupreanof I., the designation being sometimes extended to cover Kuiu and Sumdum (BAEB 145:541)


Kash's village: Stikine River. 1880 pop. 40.


Katlan's village: Taku River and Inlet. 1880 pop. 106. summer camp. (Orth:501). Taku Kwan

Katlianski Bay: Katlian Bay, 5 m. long, 8 m. N. of Sitka. Named in 1809 for Sitka chief. (orth:501).


Khart-heene: Huna village site in Bartlett Bay (q.v.). (E 2585)

Killisnoo: E. coast of Killisnoo I., 2 m. S. of Angoon: 57°28'N., 134°34'W. Established in 1881 of combined natives from Angoon and Naltushkan, brought to work in a fish rendering plant. 1890 pop. 79; 1910 pop. 351 (Orth:519). Auk Kwan
Klawack: 5 m. N. of Craig on Prince of Wales I., 55°3'15"N., 133°05'45"W. Also Tlevak, Tlewak. Russian 1853 chart shows village W. side of Shinaku Inlet, former location before cannery estab. 1878. (Orth:530). Most important settlement on Prince of Wales I. Native labor cannery (elsewhere Chinese). About 50 native houses along beach. 1890 pop. 52. Henya Kwan

Klo Kwan: see Kake. Kake Kwan

Hlukkokoan village: (q.v.)

Klughuggue: see Thlu-hu-gu

Klukwan: north shore Chilkat River, 14 m. S.E. Glass Pt. 21 m. S.W. of Skagway: 59°24'00"N., 135°53'30" W. (Orth:531-2). 20 m. above mouth (BAEB 145:541) 1883 65 houses. pop. 500; 1890, 30 houses, pop. 326. Chilkat Kwan

Kohltiente's village: Stikine River. 1880 pop. 28. Summer camp


Koo Island village: 1880 pop. 82. Ku I., upper end of Port Camden, 4 houses sighted by Vancouver (10 Aug, 1794.) (Krause:63).

Kosh's village: Etolin I. 1880 pop.49. Summer camp. Stikine Kwan

Kukanuwu: N. side of Cross Sound. (BAEB 145:541). Kook-noo-oo (Emmons ms.) Huna Kwan

Kuiu Kwan: on Kuiu I. with village of same name at Port Beauglarc. (BAEB:145:541)


Kupreanof I. village: 1880 pop. 82. See Kake


Ledyanoprolivskoe: "perhaps a town of Tlingit, location not given, numbering 200 in 1835." (BAEB 30:1:761).

Loring: West Coast Revillagigedo I., near head Neha Bay: 55°36'12"N., 131°38'00"W. Fishing village established around salmon cannery, estab. 1885 (Orth:597). 1890 pop. 120 native.


Naha Bay: estuary 3 m. off Behm Canal, on W. coast Revillagigedo I.: 55°36'N., 131°41'W. (Orth:670). Tongass Kwan


Old Auk: see Anchguhlsu.


Porpoise Islands: junction of Icy Strait and Icy Passage. 5 m. S. Excursion Inlet: 58°20'N., 135°28'W. (Orth:770) (Dall:1883:190). Huna Kwan

Port Beaufort: see Kuiu

Port Houghton village: 1880 pop. 50. Sumdum?

Port Mulgrave: cove 0.9 m. long on S. end of Kantaak I., M. of Graveyard Cove, 1.8 m. N.W. of Yakutat: 59°33'45"N., 139°46'40"W. Yakutat Kwan

Pybus Bay: E. coast of Admiralty I. 57°16'N., 134°05'W. 1890 pop. 26 native.


Sakar: estuary 1 m. long, off El Capitan Passage, W. coast of Prince of Wales I., 55°57'45"N., 133°16'00"W. 1890 pop. 20 native. Cannery, seasonal settlement. Henya Kwan
Salmon Bay: cove 0.8 m. long, N.W. end of Clarence Str. on N. coast of Prince of Wales I.: 56°18'15"N., 133°09'00"W. (Orth:830). 1890 pop. 38 native. Cannery, seasonal settlement.

Sanya Kwan: about Cape Fox, village Gash, at Cape Fox (BAEB 145:541)

Saxman: village on Tongass Narrows. (Emmons 1971:8, which includes an 1889 Emmons photo of a house). 2.5 m. S.E. of Ketchikan, village founded in 1894 by Sam Saxman, school teacher. (Orth:843). Tongass Kwan

Seymour Channel Village: 1880 pop. 75.

Shakan: head of Shakan Bay, E. of Hamilton I., N.W. coast Koskiusco I.: 56°08'15"N., 133°27'35"W. Previous summer village, saw mill established in 1879, indian village grew up around it. (Orth:858). 1890 pop. 29 native. 60 m. N. of Klawak, sawmill and a dozen houses (1890:52). Summer village (BAEB 145:541) Henywa Kwan


Shustak's village: Etolin I. 1880 pop. 38. Summer camp. Stikine Kwan

Sikanasankian: locality at mouth of Grindstone Creek, 10 m. S.E. of Juneau. 58°13'N., 134°11'W. Former Tlingit village name meaning "small black bear town" (BAEB 30:675) (Orth:873). Sicknarsonkee, Emmons mss.

Silver Bay: 1880 pop. 29. A summer camp (BAEB 145:542) of Sitka

Sinta-ka-heene (Emmons mss.): See Tsantikihin.

Sitka Kwan: on the West coasts of Baranof and Chichigoff Islands, with these villages: Dahet, Keshkunuwu, Kuna, Keshtahedkaan, Old Sitka, Sitka, Tlanak, Tluhashayikan, Silver Bay (BAEB 145:541-2)

Sitka: village on site of modern town of same name (BAEB 145:541)
Sitka, Old: On Starrigavan Bay, 5.5 m. N. of Sitka, 57°07'50"N., 135°22'20"W. Site of Russian Fort Archangel Michael and settlement in 1799, destroyed by Tlingit in 1802. May be place listed in 1880 as Old Sitka. pop. 73. (Orth:721). On Katleana Bay. Cannery site. (Krause:72).

Skagway: village on site of modern town of same name (BAEB 145:541)

Stephens Passage Village: 1880 pop. 290. Auk Kwan


Takokakoan: village, mouth of Taku River (BAEB 145:541).

Taku Harbor: cove 0.6 m. across: 58°04'10"N., 134°00'30"W. Locality, E. shore Taku Harbour, collectively listed as 4 Taku-kon villages, pop. 269, by Petroff, 1880. Site of Hudson's Bay Co. Post 1840: 58°03'30"N., 134°02'00"W. (Orth:943).

Takokakoan: village, mouth Taku River (BAEB 145:541).


Tlanak: "Tlingit town in Sitka country, Alaska" (BAEB 145:541)

Tlistee: "a former town in the N. part of Tlingit region definite locality not known" (BAEB 30:2:765).


Tlushashakian: "town on top of sand hill." Old town on N. side of W. entrance to Cross Sound. In Huna country but is said to have been occupied anciently by many families of Wolf phratry, now scattered all over Alaskan coast. Perhaps identical with Klughuggue (q.v.) (BAEB 30:2:766).
Tokeatl's village: summer camp, location not given (Orth:973). 1880 pop. 26. Taku Kwan


Tongass: E. coast Tongass I., 54°46'30"N., 130°14'30"W. Former village, military post 1868-70. Fort Tongass. (Orth:976). 25 houses, very large collection of poles. One time of considerable importance as a native rendezvous. 25 m. to Port Simpson. When troops were there it did a thriving business (1890:50)

Tongass Kwan: at mouth of Portland Canal on N. side, with village of same name on Tongass I.

Towayat's village: Etolin I. 1880 pop. 82. Summer camp (BAEB 145:542). Stikine Kwan


Tuxecan (Emmons mss): Tuxekan. N. entrance to Tuxecan Narrows, 55°53'20"N., 133°14'30"W. "Tuxeu formerly chief Henya town but the Henya have now moved to Klawak." (Orth:966)

Whaley, Point: village at northernmost point of Revillagigedo I., seen by Vancouver 11 Aug. 1793. Very large, deserted, could have held 300-400 (Krause:63). Hehl Kwan

Windham Bay: S.W. 8 m. from Windham to Stephens Passage, 14 m. S. of Holkham Bay, 61 m. S.E. of Juneau. 1890 pop. 7

Wrangell: 56°28'00"N., 132°22'40"W. 1834 Russian stockade to prevent encroachment by HBC. 1839 leased to HBC - Fort Stikine 1839-44. 1867 U.S. military post, abandoned in 1877. Important supply post for gold rush up Stikine, 1861 (Orth:1060)

Wrangell, Old: see Kahktcatlan.

Yaktag village: at foot of Mt. St. Elias, pop. 150 (Krause:66) "No village mentioned here by Swanton but Yaktag is given as a native name in Orth:684" (Gunther in Krause:270, fn #30.)

Yakutat: main village of Yakutat Kwan, 59°33'N., 139°44'W. 1880 pop. 500, 1890 pop. 300 (Orth:1063).
Yakutat Kwan: principally about Yakutat Bay but extending westward in later times to the mouth of the Copper River, including these villages: Chilkat, Gutheni, Hlahayik, Yakutat (BAEB 145:542)


abbreviations:

1880 pop. figures from Petroff 1884;I
1890: Porter 1893;I
BAEB: Bureau of American Ethnology Bulletin
  145:Swanton 1952;H)
BAEAR: Bureau of American Ethnology Annual Report
  26:Swanton 1908;G
Baker: Baker 1906,I.
Corser: Corser 1922;G
Dahl: Dahl 1883,I
E: Emmons MS. AMNH-E;E
Krause: Krause 1956(1885);G
Orth: Orth 1967,I
WSM: Emmons MS. WSM;E