Significance of Hunting Territory Systems of the Algonkian in Social Theory

Author(s): Frank G. Speck and Loren C. Eiseley

Source: *American Anthropologist*, Apr. - Jun., 1939, New Series, Vol. 41, No. 2 (Apr. - Jun., 1939), pp. 269-280

Published by: Wiley on behalf of the American Anthropological Association

Stable URL: https://www.jstor.org/stable/662008

SIGNIFICANCE OF HUNTING TERRITORY SYSTEMS OF THE ALGONKIAN IN SOCIAL THEORY

By FRANK G. SPECK
and LOREN C. EISELEY

THOSE who have been following developments of investigation in the field of social typology and ecology among primitive (i.e. hunting and gathering) peoples will welcome the treatment given by Dr. Julian H. Steward in his recent summary; *The Economic and Social Basis of Primitive Bands*, Essays in Anthropology Presented to A. L. Kroeber, University of California, 1936, pp. 331–350.

Some comments evoked by closer attention to several points brought out in his article will not detract from its value as a contribution. Since the discussion offered here pertains solely to the section treating the northern Algonkian semi-nomads located in eastern Canada we shall quote only that portion of Dr Steward's paper which introduces his views on land ownership and its history in reconstruction.

The relatively unproductive environment of the nomadic hunting and gathering Algonkian-speaking tribes of Canada has limited population to 1 person per 5.3 square miles north of the Great Lakes and to 1 person per 34.6 or more square miles in the eastern sub-Artic region. The political unit is the band, which generally numbers several hundred individuals. Each band has a patrilineal chief, usually seasonal festivals, and often slight dialectical distinctiveness. Land, however, is owned by the family, which, according to Speck, consists of the "individuals of one family connection, primarily through blood but also through marriage relationship, who hunt together as a herd within the confines of a certain tract of country." The family tract is inherited patrilineally.[1]

This summary is clear, concise and essentially correct.

The discussion of these characteristics, in explanation of which he offers a historical solution based upon Dr Jenness's published conclusions in respect to prior history of the family land-owning unit, deserves more particular consideration. He proceeds as follows:

The *unusual feature of family land ownership* bears an intimate functional relationship to the highly specialized economy *introduced by the fur trade.*[2] Fur-bearing animals, expecially the beaver, may be husbanded in relatively small areas. Barter of pelts with the white man for other goods enables a group to subsist on an area which is smaller than would otherwise be possible. Jenness suggests that title to land originally rested in the band and that the family subdivision is a post-European development. He records, for example, that partition occurred among the Athabaskan-speaking Sekani on the headwaters of the Peace river during the last hun-

[1] *Op. cit.*, pp. 338–339. [2] Italics ours.

dred years, "after the necessities of the fur trade compelled the families to disperse among the different creeks and rivers." In view of this, it is understandable that Montagnais families were apportioned their land in the time of the Jesuit missionaries, and that Micmac family territories should be "less permanent, less hereditary . . . and the judicial power of the chief in the reassignment of territory. . . . rather more definite" than elsewhere. Among the Canadian Algonkians, therefore, the subsistence and land-owning unit is usually the bilateral family but the political unit is the band, which was probably formerly also the land-owning and in part subsistence and social unit.[3]

We have definite clearcut evidence of family territories in the earliest years of the 18th century which, even from a post-Columbian standpoint implies an earlier period of development. The fur trade did not become important until late in the 17th century. In view of very early statements as to small family groups dispersed in the woods and the complaints of the early Jesuits as to the Indian's roving proclivities it seems dubious that within the short space *following* Le Jeune (if we accept the argument of Jenness that the system did not exist at this time) the Jesuits succeeded in imposing such a system. The system would have had to have been put into operation sometime following 1634 and been widely accepted by, say, 1700. In view of the fact that throughout this period strife, movement and game destruction are paramount it seems strange that a few Jesuits in so vast a territory should so successfully have "apportioned" land to wandering hunters unacquainted with such a pattern, particularly when this concerned the winter activities of Indians away from the posts.

Jenness expresses his theory of band history in respect to the land rights of families in the following terms, referring in most generalized terms to the social life of the primitive migratory tribes of Canada.[4]

"Real" property he had none, for the hunting territory and fishing places belonged to the entire band, and were as much the right of every member as the surrounding atmosphere. Members of other bands might use them temporarily, with the consent of the owner band, or they might seize them by force; but land could not be sold or alienated in any way. It is true that in eastern Canada individual families, or groups of two and three families very closely related, have possessed their private hunting-grounds within the territory occupied by the band since the early days of European settlement; that they have handed them down from father to son, or in some cases to a son-in-law, in regular succession; and that the boundaries were so well defined by geographical features that in many districts we can map

[3] *Op. cit.*, p. 339.

[4] Diamond Jenness, *The Indians of Canada* (Bulletin 45, National Museum of Canada, 2nd ed., 1932, n.d. Chap. 9), pp. 124–125.

them today just as we map our counties. Nevertheless it does not appear at all certain that this system of land tenure pre-dates the coming of Europeans: for a similar partition of the territory of the band into family hunting grounds has occurred among the Sekani Indians at the headwaters of Peace river during the last hundred years, after the necessities of the fur trade compelled the families to disperse among different creeks and rivers. That the Montagnais, and presumably also neighbouring tribes in eastern Canada, did not subdivide the band territory prior to the advent of the fur traders seems to be indicated by a passage in the "Jesuit Relations," written only thirty-two years after Champlain's first voyage up the St. Lawrence. Father Le Jeune there says: "Now it will be so arranged that, in the course of time each family of our Montagnais, if they become located, will take its own territory for hunting, without following in the tracks of its neighbours." (Jesuit Relations, vol. viii, p. 57, 1634–6, and vol. xxxii, pp. 269–271, which latter also implies that the ownership of territories was vested in the band and not in individuals or groups of two or three families.)

About the same time (1935) Dr Jenness expressed his views of the lateness of development of the family hunting territory system in the course of a study of the Parry Island Ojibwa.[5] He gives the practice an age of "two or three hundred years, since the advent of the fur trade," and draws inference from some reflections which apply to the Ojibwa which he studied and which he turns to account for the eastern Algonkian in general. The same reference to observations by the Jesuit Le Jeune is used in support of the contention for post-European dating of the family ownership and control of hunting lands. Considerable stress is laid by Jenness upon the recorded statements that among both the Micmac and Ojibwa the chief of the band settled questions of hunting locations for the families when occasion arose. The following quotation summarizes his conclusions: "Now if the families had controlled their own hunting territories any assignment by the chief and elders would have been superfluous. It is quite clear, therefore, that in pre-European times, and for a short period afterwards, the eastern Algonkians, including the Ojibwa, recognized ownership of land by the band alone."[6]

Speck, in 1923, expressed a belief that the family hunting territory system of the northern Algonkian was an aspect of aboriginal culture in this area, and cited a case which he recorded among the Mistassini (interior of the Labrador peninsula) as evidence of the operation of the system independently and even in confliction with Hudson's Bay Company influence.

---

[5] D. Jenness, *The Ojibwa Indians of Parry Island, Their Social and Religious Life* (Bulletin 78, Anth. Series, no. 17. National Museum of Canada, 1935), pp. 4–6.

[6] *Op. cit.*, p. 6.

With the Hudson's Bay Company post at the foot of the lake the Mistassini were concerned in a manner which shows that the institutions of the family hunting ground must have existed before the post was laid out and founded. The company controls a tract about the post . . . upon which the employees of the post and their families live and hunt. They are for the most part half-breeds. This tract was originally acquired by the company for the support of its attachés. That the Indians had an idea of proprietorship in this tract is shown by the fact that about 1912 a dispute arose between the factor and three hunters of the Pitəwábənu family, whose range adjoins the company holding, over the killing of two moose on this district, to which the Indians laid claim by the right of prior possession. The killing of game on the ground was objected to by the company factor, but without success. I mention this to answer the possible question as to whether the appearance of the great company in the far north could have been an agent in the instruction of the Indians along the lines of territorial family subdivisions. It is quite evident, I believe, not only from the widespread nature of the family land divisions throughout the north, but from the testimony of history itself, that the coming in of the trading posts was not responsible for the inception of the territorial idea, but that they came in and adjusted themselves to such conditions, which were aboriginal to the northern tribes in general.[7]

The same writer took a more conservative view of the question of origin in 1931, after deliberating matters with Jenness, and summarized his position as follows:

To my mind, the early writers seem to have assumed, with good reason, the attachment of the various bands in the midst of which the posts were established, to the localities where they were found. Without contradicting the claim, a strong one in the minds of some students of the northern tribes, that the posts exerted an influence in bringing about the later location of some of the bands, as we know only too well, it seems clear that at the time of the coming of the first Europeans there were already bands with fixed locations residing on their ancestral river and lake territories in the southern portion of the peninsula.[8]

It has been frequently pointed out by those favoring an historic origin for the family hunting territory system that the latter bears an intimate relationship to the specialized economy of the fur trade. Quite certainly the family hunting territory does flourish under such a system, particularly as it has existed under later more stabilized conditions. What seems to be ignored, however, is the fact that evidence is not lacking to show that the non-agricultural Algonkians of the Laurentian area already relied heavily

[7] Speck, F. G. *Mistassini Hunting Territories in the Labrador Peninsula.* (American Anthropologist, Vol. 25, No. 4, 1923), p. 459.

[8] Speck, F. G., *Montagnais-Naskapi Bands and Early Eskimo Distribution in the Labrador Peninsula.* (American Anthropologist, Vol. 33, No. 4, 1931), p. 575.

upon the beaver as a basic economic factor in their existence *prior* to the introduction of the fur trade.[9] It is not only used as a source of furs but as food,[10] (particularly in those areas where caribou and moose are not plentiful) and while it is true that it is a non-migratory animal capable of being husbanded in small areas, the impetus for this type of hunting may reasonably have existed before the period of white contact.[11] Neither is it so clear that the fur trade made it possible for the people to subsist in a smaller area by barter, because trade placed enormous opportunities for economic exploitation in the hands of the whites who leveled outrageous prices in terms of skins. Simple wants were expanded until both native and white were forced to go farther and farther afield to supply themselves.[12]

The early destructive years of the fur trade were not concerned with game conservation. Contrary to the impression that these years may have tended to produce the family hunting territory there is evidence that, in the words of Greenbie, "From the beginning of the fur trade everything possible was done to keep the Indian a nomad."[13]

The fur trader opposed the desire of the missionary Jesuit to concentrate the people in permanent settlements and introduce agriculture. The nomadic Indians were wanted—those ranging far afield for the wholesale killing desired by the fur trade. In addition pressure and competition produced war and movement likely, if anything, to be detrimental to the survival of family territories. The statement from Le Jeune quoted by Jenness

[9] Innis, H. A. *The Fur Trade in Canada* (Yale University Press, 1930), p. 71, quotes from Champigny, 1649, as follows: "The reason that these . . . nations of the . . . south did not prepare their beaver better was that they had never worn the skins since they had been of no value to them before . . . whereas the Algonkians . . . wore the beaver at all times for clothing." See also H. P. Biggar, Early Trading Companies of New France, Toronto, 1901, pp. 30, 31–32 and S. Greenbie, Frontiers and the Fur Trade, John Day Co., New York, 1929, p. 61.

[10] Speck, F. G. *The Family Hunting Band as the basis of Algonkian Social Organization.* (American Anthropologist 17:293, 1915.) There are also many references to its use as food in the Jesuit Relations.

[11] Innis, who has widely combed the literature of this period, says (*op. cit.*, p. 25, footnote 2) that "most descriptions of beaver hunting stress the fact that at least two beavers were left in a lodge to breed. Increasing scarcity appears to warrant the conclusion that this ceased to be the case and that the beaver were annihilated." This passage is most interesting as bearing upon Speck's ideas regarding game conservation among the northern Algonkians. In addition it indicates again the probability of pre-Columbian beaver husbanding in limited areas, for if complete nomadism and movement prevailed there would be little point in foregoing the opportunity for a complete kill. Conservation implies a permanent interest in the territory. It may well be that superior weapons and new economic temptation destroyed or forced into the background for a time a game conservation concept which is actually aboriginal in origin.

[12] Greenbie, *op. cit.*, p. 98.

[13] *Ibid.*

as evidence against the aboriginal origin of the family territory system must be surveyed in this light. Father Le Jeune as well, is intent upon encouraging these "idlers" to "locate and cultivate the soil."[14] What type of band or family ownership of hunting territories may have been practised in the hinterlands is not likely to have markedly attracted his attention and the reference to families "following in the tracks of their neighbors" may be nothing more than pious surmise mingled with a desire to compare the barbarous state of the native at the time as against future missionary benefit.[15]

Indeed there exists in Father Le Jeune's writings a series of remarks which serve as a contradiction to his own statement as quoted by Jenness. Kenyon quotes Le Jeune's description of a harrowing winter spent in the woods with a related family group in 1633. In spite of Le Jeune's oft-quoted reference to families following in the paths of their neighbors he here refers to the family he is accompanying as turning northward to avoid another group "lest we should starve each other."[16]

Again, he speaks of the arrival of a small family group in imminent danger of starvation. Speaking of the charity with which they were received by his own group he comments, "these new guests *were not asked why they came upon our boundaries . . .*"[17] (Italics the authors)

Fright was also recorded when the "trail of several savages who were nearer to us than we thought" suggested that "they were coming to hunt upon *our very grounds.*"[18] (Italics the authors)

[14] *The Jesuit Relations and Allied Documents*, edited by R. G. Thwaites. (Cleveland, 1899, vol. 8), p. 57.

[15] The continual movement of the Indians was very distressing to the Jesuits from the standpoint of Christianizing them. Kenyon quotes the following passage from the Relations of 1642–43: "It is necessary to follow these people if we wish to Christianize them; but, as they continually divide themselves up, we cannot devote ourselves to some without wandering from the others." (Kenyon, Edna, *Indians of North America*, Harcourt Brace 1927, Vol. 1, p. 457.) The passage in itself well indicates the constant tendency for these people to disperse into small family groups, a tendency apparently older than the fur trade.

[16] Le Jeune, 1634, in Kenyon, *op. cit.*, Vol. I, p. 205. [17] *Ibid.* p. 205.

[18] *Ibid.*, p. 203. There are in existence, also, documents from a slightly later period which clearly indicates the existence of the family hunting territory system at a time early enough to make quite probable its aboriginal origin, particularly in view of Le Jeune's earlier references to boundaries. One such paper, dated 1723, is quoted by Innis as Appendix A in his volume on the fur trade (*op. cit.*). It reads as follows: "The principle of the Indians is to mark off the hunting ground selected by them by blazing the trees with their crests, so that they may never encroach on each other. When the hunting season comes, each family pitches its tents in the neighborhood of its chosen district, and having reconnoitred the paths taken by the beavers to their feeding ground, the traps are made . . . " etc. Dr. W. C. MacCleod, moreover, marshals potent though perhaps not quite such clearcut evidence for the existence of the trait

Reading this narrative one gets the impression that the group was living under conditions remarkably similar to those of the Labrador peoples of the present day. There is the same winter wandering of small family groups[19] on the edge of the subsistence level. Save for the greater fear of human enemies engendered by a wild and lawless period little seems changed. However land may have been inherited, a careful reading of the Jesuit narratives gives the lie to the complete nomadism so often dwelt on by the pious fathers. The nomadic qualities of the Indians are emphasized and made the subject of criticism at the same time that their avoidance of other groups makes it apparent that their wandering cannot have been as directionless as pictured. A careful reading of the evidence suggests that the fathers, associating property to a large degree with a settled agricultural existence, may have seen in the winter hunting of their peoples a life more chaotic and unplanned than was actually the case. Certainly subjective and relative judgments by the fathers as to the lack of arts, laws, etc. of the Indians do not always suggest discernment upon non-material aspects of culture, particularly in the case of so abstract and fluid a concept as that of band or family ownership of hunting territories, whichever type of ownership may actually have obtained among these people at the time of contact.

Constant and early references to small bands and family groups as well as the known reliance upon the beaver south of the height of land do not suggest that the dispersion of families along creeks and rivers is a post Columbian development in the case of the non-agricultural Algonkians,

---

among the Delaware of the very early colonial period from about 1630 to 1680. He suggests that the Delawares "coming but recently into the circle of diffusion of an agricultural economy . . . have retained in all its vitality, because of the relative recency of agriculture in their economy, an institution characteristic of their more primitive non-agricultural economy, in which the expediencies of the chase in the northeast of North America had recommended the disposal of family groups." Note that his evidence if judged acceptable fills in the gap in time between our quoted statement of 1723 and the time of Le Jeune. (W. C. MacCleod, The Family Hunting Territory and Lenape Political Organization, American Anthropologist 24: 448–463, 1922.)

[19] Father Biard writing in 1612 comments, "Even the members of the same tribe, united by a common location are seldom accustomed to meet together except to take measures . . . against a common enemy. (Kenyon, *op. cit.*, vol. II, pp. 23–29.) The charity noted among the Algonkians by Father Druilletes in 1647 (*The Jesuit Relations*, Vol. 32, p. 271) when he speaks of one starving group descending upon another is again suggestive of some type of land tenure concept, even if only the allotment type: "The good people were not reproved because they ran over *other people's marches.*" (Italics ours.) Naturally the exact composition of all these little parties is not determinable today, but many of them were doubtless family or related groups, and the fact that such charity brought comment evidences the fact that concepts of ownership were in existence.

however much it may be so among the Sekani as indicated by Jenness. Moreover, as we have previously indicated, beaver was heavily relied upon here previous to the development of the fur trade, whereas, in the case of the westward peoples, there was greater reliance upon migratory game as it also true in northern Labrador.

It would seem, in the light of the facts which we have now surveyed that the following observations are warranted:

First.—That reliance upon a non-migratory animal whose sedentary qualities might have encouraged family ownership of territories existed as a cultural pattern among the Algonkians of the northeast *prior* to the period of white contact.[20]

Second.—That the early statement of Le Jeune cannot be regarded as establishing a historical origin for the family territory because it deals in a most incidental manner with a complicated problem capable of subjective interpretation and bias particularly by one laboring under the European concepts of the time. This view seems further justified in view of other incidental references of a contrasting nature from the same source.

Third.—That judging from modern ecological studies the concept may have been fluid and adjustable to the extent that both patterns may have been in use by the same bands under differing conditions and for different purposes,[21] thus tending to militate against too strong an interpretation of Jenness' second point of evidence in regard to the chief assigning land in the case of some groups.[22]

All of these facts lead essentially to this conclusion: that the point at issue cannot yet be regarded as a closed one nor too much weight be placed on so casual a statement as Le Jeune's, particularly in view of other comments such as that of Roger Williams[23] and from which opposite conclusions may be inferred. Instances of primary and secondary types of family control of land and usufruct are recorded for Algonkian peoples farther south within the zone of native agriculture as well; namely the tribes of Massachusetts and Virginia. These instances have been grossly ignored in recent theoretical generalizations on the Algonkian nativity of the various land-holding systems in the eastern woodland of North America.[24] They have

[20] See Innis, *op. cit.*, p. 10.

[21] As Dr. A. I. Hallowell has pointed out usufruct and not actual land is the point at issue. (Paper in preparation.)

[22] D. S. Davidson (*Family Hunting Territories of the Tribes of Tierra del Fuego* (Indian Notes, Publications of the Museum of the American Indian, Heye Foundation, N. Y. Vol. V, 1928) pp. 397–401, ably discusses the fluidity of the concept as it exists both in the Northeast and elsewhere.

[23] As quoted by Speck, 1915, *op. cit.*

[24] Speck, F. G. *Territorial Subdivisions and Boundaries of the Wampanoag, Massachusett and Nauset Indians.* (Indian Notes and Monographs, Museum of the American Indian, Heye

a direct bearing upon points raised by Jenness and Steward in respect to influences emanating from centers of the fur trade and to band ownership under the jurisdiction of the band chief. We would call attention in particular to the Virginia Algonkian practise of annual allotment of individual hunting plots by the chief[25] after the manner of the Micmac and Ojibwa as stressed in discussion by Jenness. *Nota bene!* It appears to form one of the prerogatives of the chief, where the office is invested with authority in social and economic concerns, that decisions in respect to hunting locations of families and individuals are referred to him. These conditions are observed among the Algonkian tribes south of the St. Lawrence watershed and again among the communal hunters north of the Height of Land in some instances. It is in the area between the Height of Land and the St. Lawrence waters, in other words, in what we might label as the Laurentian region, that segregated family hunting of the Montagnais type prevails most characteristically. In this area the authority of the chief is at its minimum and family self-management at its maximum.

It is our impression that there existed, in the case of the non-agricultural Algonkians of the northeast a hunting pattern capable of encouraging family ownership and one which must be regarded as a special case somewhat distinct from other northern areas. The family territory system shades off into the band ownership of the caribou hunters as might be expected ecologically, some groups even *utilizing both methods under different circumstances.*[26] The writers express themselves as by no means convinced that

Foundation, No. 44, 1928), pp. 9–14; and Chapters on the *Ethnology of the Powhatan Tribes of Virginia, ibid.* (Vol. I, No. 5, 1928), pp. 312–330. W. C. MacCleod, *op. cit.*, 1922; also, *Significance of Matrilineal Chiefship* (American Anthropologist 25:520, 1923.)

[25] Speck, F. G. *Chapters on the Ethnology of the Powhatan Tribes of Virginia.* (Indian Notes and Monographs, Museum of the American Indian, Heye Foundation, Vol. I, No. 5, 1928.) p. 317.

[26] Speck, F. G. *Montagnais-Naskapi Bands and Early Eskimo Distribution in the Labrador Peninsula,* op. cit., pp. 576–577. "Comment seems to be in place at this point concerning the part played by the game animals of several categories as an influencing factor upon the type of land tenure and upon the distribution of the differing bands of the well-forested southern portion of the peninsula and those of the barrens of the north. In the former the animals hunted include, among others, the highly important moose and beaver; in the latter the caribou exceed other sources of food supply. It has been noted by some of those who are devoting thought to problems of northern ethnology that the tribal or band habitats are subdivided into inherited family districts only where provenience of the forest affords the varied animal food supply to be found more permanently and bountifully, and in more or less restricted haunts of sheltering environment,—the moose, beaver, porcupine, hare and the carnivorous furbearers. Where, on the other hand by contrast, the hunt is almost exclusively centered about the roving caribou, it has seemed, on theoretical grounds, that communal hunting, more like that of the Plains tribes in pursuit of the bison, would outrule the possibility of the localized family hunting territories. The problem has been outlined, as it existed in the minds of several

this ecological adjustment may not have been, in its main features, pre-Columbian, particularly in view of the less mobile conditions of that time.

The whole question of derivation of the practices of the tribes and bands considered from the point of view of communal-band versus segregated-family activity should also, we believe, take cognizance of conditions recorded in Siberia.[27] Dr Steward does not enter this area into his treatment,—quite deliberately no doubt. The inclusion of data from northeastern Asia, even considered only casually, suggests additional problems adding another trait to those which call for deliberation in attempting to understand what relation human institutions bear to the faunal set-up in the vast expanses of the north.

One of the more significant implications of the Asiatic data in their bearing upon the family hunting territories as earmarks of a deep level of circumpolar culture in one of its local phases, is the unavoidable fact that there the idea of family control cannot be traced to the sponsorship of the Hudson's Bay Company. The occurrence of the family hunting group system among the Penobscot of Maine is still another instance of its prevalence beyond the pale of influence of the great company. We would not pass lightly over these cases in considering the historical explanation offered by Dr Jenness and accepted through quotation without critical comment by Dr Steward. It seems that despite the deviations in intensity of family control in the land distribution of the various bands over the wide region

---

of us, in a recent paper by Davidson (Indian Notes, Museum of the American Indian, Heye Foundation, Vol. 5, No. I, p. 50). The case seems to be borne out with some consistency in respect to the hunting habits and band distribution of the groups south of the Height of Land and those north of this watershed throughout the peninsula, as far as available information permits a judgment. We can begin to see that the bands depending upon caribou fail to show the family territorial subdivisions that we are so familiar with in the mixed game area stretching across the forest zone. Thus, among the bands of whose social structure we have some definite knowledge, the northern families of the Mistassini, the Nichikun, Michikamau, Potisikapau, Ungava, the Barren Ground, the hordes east of Meisie river, and presumably those of the Hudson Bay coast, travel and hunt over the entire range of country regarded by them as their band habitat in communal groups of affiliated families. *It is required, accordingly, that a distinction now be made between the economic habits and social structure of the bands of the two areas. Two types should henceforth be recognized as prevailing in the Labradorean culture-area, the variation being traceable, I believe, to famine conditions and the natural history of the game animals.*" (Italics ours.) The point of distinction called for in the remarks just quoted has not been given its due in the discussions under review.

[27] "For the Palaeasiatic tribes, some Tungus, Tatars and others in northeastern Asia, the facts pertaining to the inherited family hunting and fishing territories are well known through references furnished by Jochelson, Bogoras, Castren, Hiekisch, Middendorf and Frazer among others, while for the Aleutians there is testimony from Veniaminoff, Petroff, Jochelson and Holmberg." F. G. Speck, Land Ownership Among Primitive Peoples, etc.: International Congress of Americanists, XXII, 1926, p. 325.

where some of the trait complexes are reported, there is beneath all a stratum of evidence in favor of latent family interest in the management of the game resources. That such are at times almost permanently eclipsed in the economy of some band groups—even tribes—and stressed by practice in others, while in still others, like those Speck has alluded to in the lower St. Lawrence, there is periodical shift from family to communal hunting, is not surprising.

Without desiring to postulate a formalized set of conditions always productive of the family hunting territory system among the lower hunters, it would yet seem that certain environmental and cultural conditions may broadly be regarded as conducive to such a system.

In the first place, it is a pattern which would seem to grow out of conditions promoting family isolation and a certain degree of permanency of residence in a particular territory, for only so can the family group develop patterns of ownership and attachment toward an individual tract of land. This, in turn, implies a highly localized and constant fauna to be exploited, and, in addition, a degree of limitation upon the number of such sites available; in other words, a population which has reached the point where the possession of such tracts has survival value.

From this standpoint it may be that the family allotment system,[28] either through the band chief or agreement among the hunters where no centralized control is present, may have been more common during the prehistoric past at times when movement was more frequent, residence less permanent, game more plentiful, and the pressures of outside exploitation removed.

[28] "It has been a constant Custom among all the Nations of Indians, to divide themselves into small Companies while they Hunt, and to divide likewise the Country among their several Parties, each having a space of 3 or four Miles Square allotted them, in which none of the others must pretend to Hunt; and if any Nation should encroach upon the Limits of another, in their hunting, they certainly draw a War upon themselves." (Cadwallader Colden, The History of the Five Indian Nations Depending on the Province of New York. Part I, Chap. I. Reprinted exactly from Bradford's New York edition, (1727) with an Introduction and Notes by John Gilmary Shea. New York, 1866, p. 3.) The author of the paragraph given above did not specifically designate the tribe to which his statement referred. It is possible from the context to infer that he had the "Adirondacks" in mind since they are discussed before and after the quoted passage, and it was in connection with their history in association with the "Five Nations" that he was prompted to bring the matter to the attention of his readers. A statement on the succeeding page of the narrative (p. 4) again refers to the Adirondack hunters and those of the Five Nations (in an episode which forms the substance of the legend) each party "taking his quarter to hunt in"—agreed allotment. Without identifying the reference too strictly with any specific tribe we may attribute its bearing to be upon groups in the upper St. Lawrence and Lake Ontario region and the period to have antedated 1727 by many years since its subject matter is legendary history of Iroquois (Five Nations)—Algonquin (Adirondacks) relationship. The above notice was brought to attention by Mr. N. Knowles.

As evaluation of these data proceeds we shall have to become more and more attentive to the points raised by Dr P. W. Schmidt in recent studies of the social-economic features of the territorial systems in the region under consideration. The theme, as a research project, has been dignified and stimulated by his suggestive and thoughtful interpretation of phenomena in world wide aspects. In the present paper—one prepared only to add thought to the discussion not to terminate any phases of it—we can only acknowledge the significance of his contributions and commit ourselves to a lengthier consideration of his mature and fertile ideas. Dr. Schmidt shares the view already entertained by some of us on this continent, that the family-owned and -operated hunting territories are associated with an old phase of culture possessed by the northern Algonkian jaegers, that it has been subjected to historic altering influences, socially internal and ecologically external, according to locality and stock background. His attitude is briefly expressed in a summary proposing that the close connection of land tenure with the family, as found among the northeast Algonkian, is undoubtedly a special characteristic of this group and of the oldest Algonkian in general. He believes that in contrast to other north American groups with land-tenure the northeastern Algonkian have a tendency to make the family rather than the loose extended family (grossfamilie) the carrier of land tenure principles, and where this characteristic has been lost or weakened it is, according to Schmidt, a result of non-Algonkian influence.[29]

We heartily concur in the opinion of Dr Hallowell that a number of the characteristic traits of the hunting territory system are extremely variable, judging from both the historical literature and recent investigation, and that the conditions making for variation in these traits have not been sufficiently investigated. A more intensive study of local faunal variation seems warranted along with a survey of its effect upon the property patterns of the band.

NOTE: This paper was prepared and in the hands of the editor of the *American Anthropologist* before the appearance of an estimable and extended review by Dr Cooper of the land tenure problem which appeared in the January–March (1939) issue. We find a striking parallelism of thought exhibited upon several points under discussion and regret our inability to make further comment at the present time. (F.G.S. and L.C.E.)

UNIVERSITY OF PENNSYLVANIA
PHILADELPHIA, PA.

UNIVERSITY OF KANSAS
LAWRENCE, KAN.

[29] P. Wilhelm Schmidt, *Das Eigentum auf den ältesten Stufen der Menschheit* (Münster, 1937, Band, 1, p. 151.)