

J. L. FISCHER
Harvard University

IN FIELD work in the Eastern Caroline Islands from 1949 to 1953, while employed by the American administration of the Trust Territory of Micronesia, I was struck by several differences between Truk and Ponape, two genetically related high island cultures which are separated by nearly 400 miles of open sea. Some of these differences involved customs and beliefs about animals, often referred to as totemic. In brief, something like classical sib (or clan) totemism is present on Ponape, while on Truk there is what might be called individual totemism connected with curing. However, although both cultures have exogamous matrilineal sibs, the connection of animals with sibs is weak or lacking in Truk,² and the connection of animals with medicine and disease is generally weak on Ponape, except as the sib totems are thought to punish offenses against themselves or their human kin.³

The question arises, why is classical sib totemism rather well developed in one of two related cultures and not in the other? An answer is here sought by relating totemistic beliefs and practices to individual socio-psychological problems or conflicts, and to the social structures of the two cultures as they generate these problems for typical individuals.

More specifically, the nature of the lineage on Ponape—and in both cultures the lineage tends to be equated lexically and conceptually with the sib of which it is a part—is such that it becomes an object of marked socio-psychological conflict or ambivalence for its members. In this situation totemic beliefs, myths, and practices serve as psychological supports of the sibs and lineages, thus helping the individual to accept his role as a sib and lineage member.

In Truk, on the other hand, the lineage as such is less an object of socio-psychological conflict, but there are important conflicts between generations. Although much of the conflict between elders and youths occurs within the lineage, the opposition of generations divides the lineage into segments according to age, and splits the psychological unity of the lineage as an emotional object. Thus a conflict about persons of different generation, especially elders but also those markedly younger than oneself, acquires priority for the typical Trukese over the general conflict of each lineage member with every other member. In these circumstances we find that totemistic beliefs and practices are practically nonexistent in connection with Trukese sibs and lineages, while similar beliefs about personalized animal associates are elaborated instead in connection with traditional medicine, the practice of which is especially a prerogative of old people.

It will be noted that the attribution of significance to differences in the lineage as an object of socio-psychological conflict does not in itself imply anything directly as to differences in the amount of interaction with lineage mates

in the two cultures. To be sure, there could hardly be a strong conflict about lineage members in Ponape unless there were considerable interaction of some sort with them, but it would be wrong to assume that psychological conflict is purely a function of the amount of interaction of the individuals in a group. It is just as much a function of conflict of individual interests. If the interests of the members were nearly always mutually reinforcing in group interaction, there might well be much interaction and little conflict.⁴

Before developing more fully the points made above, I wish to state that I consider unsatisfactory a diffusionist explanation that perhaps totemism never reached Truk. There are in fact some suggestions that classical totemism did once exist in Truk. One old Trukese informant told me that the *Pwe* or *Nipwe* sib, of which he was a member, was descended from the bat, *ni-pwe:-pwe*, and that it was formerly taboo for members to kill or eat bats. This statement is disputed by some other informants. Another informant told me of the origin of a certain clan on Pulusuk Island, an atoll to the west of Truk, from a porpoise which a man caught and married there. These and other similar ideas appear to indicate that the bare idea of sib totemism may well be old in Trukese culture, but it simply has not been elaborated by the Trukese or integrated very extensively into the culture in recent times.

PERSONAL CONFLICTS OCCASIONED BY SOCIAL STRUCTURE IN TRUK AND PONAPE⁵

In order to understand the differences in the socio-psychological problems with which members of the two societies are preoccupied, and thus approach the question of differences in totemism, we must investigate certain differences between the two societies in interpersonal relationships as occasioned by social structure. Defined broadly, the most striking difference between Truk and Ponape is with respect to the political systems. For one thing, the sheer size of political units on Ponape has traditionally been larger than in Truk. Truk is a group of many small, high islands of volcanic origin within a large, reef-encircled lagoon. More than a dozen of these islands were large enough to support permanent populations, and the larger ones each contained several traditionally independent communities with populations ranging perhaps from one hundred to five hundred. Ponape is a single, larger high island, which was traditionally divided into only five independent districts, each larger in area and population than the Trukese districts. The population of the Ponapean districts at present ranges from 1,000 to 2,500, and aboriginally was probably about three or four times this size.

Along with the greater size of Ponapean political units goes a much greater number of political statuses or titles, ordered in a number of hierarchical lines. Each title is unique and may be held by only one person at a time. Individuals start as youths at the bottom of one of these title lines and ideally advance progressively to higher positions. The lines themselves as well as the positions within them are of varying prestige, and individuals may be shifted from one line to another under certain circumstances. The rules for assigning titles are

assistance between lineage members. If a member has attained a high title by his feast contributions it is in large part because he has had the help of his brothers and other male lineage mates and of the lineage women, through the labor of their husbands, which the latter customarily owe their brothers-in-law. Moreover, the lineage in a sense shares in the possession of the high title of one of its members during his lifetime. All share in reflected glory and also benefit from the political influence of the holder of a high title.

But Ponapean individuals are not only in competition with members of other lineages; they are also in competition, suppressed though it be, with members of their own lineage. To be sure, not every member of a given lineage can hope to attain one of the higher titles. To retain the loyalty of their subjects and to maximize feast contributions, the chiefs feel it proper to distribute the choicer titles rather widely among the various lineages and sibs. But everyone, regardless of age, hereditary seniority, or wealth, may reasonably have some hope of achieving a better title than he now has, and the usual way of doing this is to prepare superior feast contributions, with important assistance from one's lineage mates. The result may be described as an each-against-all conflict in which the ambitious men in a lineage are covertly competing with each other for the labor and food supply of the lineage. This pressure tends to result in an abundance of food and hard work for all.

In Truk, with its lack of honorary titles, there is no such pressure for intralineage competition. The lineage makes feasts as a corporate unit, not for individual members in turn. Since there are few occasions for competitive feasting of any sort, even including competitive interlineage and intercommunity feasting, Trukese food production is more casual and is devoted mostly to satisfying daily needs. The labor required by the lineage of its members is thus more regular and predictable in Truk than on Ponape.

Since the Trukese have little reason to grow more or fancier food than they require for their daily diet, the food demands of the society can be met with considerably less labor in Truk. Moreover, since sublineage boundaries are less emphasized in Truk, lineage co-operation in food production and other aspects of life is facilitated, in contrast to Ponape, where lineage co-operation is often for prestige purposes and has a certain air of jealousy and reluctance about it. Since food production in Truk is oriented toward subsistence, the products are as a matter of course shared rather freely with lineage mates and members of extended families associated with a lineage.

This is not to say that there are no conflicts within Trukese lineages. There are, but the sort of each-against-all conflict described for Ponape is relatively unimportant. The most important conflict seems rather to be the generation conflict, which segments the lineage horizontally and extends beyond it as well. This emphasis on generation is of course connected with the previously noted Trukese patterns of automatically assigning seniority by chronological age and minimizing individual achievement. The psychological distinction emphasized here is not Ego versus all lineage mates individually but rather Ego and contemporaries as a group versus chronological seniors as a group, on the one hand, and juniors on the other.

The Trukese minimization of individual achievement within the lineage is correlated with a greater psychological dependence on the lineage and residence groups, and a greater physical dependence on them for subsistence needs. But with young adults in Truk there is not simply an absence of competitive pressures to produce: they are hardly expected even to pull their own weight. Trukese have traditionally taken the attitude that youth, including to a large extent the early years of marriage, is a time of relative irresponsibility when individuals are naturally preoccupied with romantic affairs. They seem to feel that it is both unrealistic and unkind to demand too much work from persons at this stage of life. Moreover, the older people express the sentiment that they must take care of the younger as long as they can, so that the younger people will feel kindly toward them when age renders them too feeble to continue working. Gladwin also suggests that since the old people are anxious about old age and feebleness, they are motivated to work by a desire to prove that they are still physically competent (Gladwin 1955). Consequently the burden of providing food falls, by our standards, to a disproportionate extent on the older people of the lineage and residence group.

As the older people grow feeble, they use their control of certain property to ensure that their juniors will care for them. By virtue of chronological seniority, the old people control the distribution of real estate among members of the lineage, and they are also the masters of valued esoteric lore. If their juniors fail to care for them adequately, the elders may transfer some of the lineage land to outsiders who have proved more thoughtful. Similarly, the esoteric lore may be taught to nonrelatives who are willing to pay for it with food, valuables, and services.

Relations between old and young in Truk imply special sociopsychological conflicts. The elders are hesitant to demand much of their juniors until absolutely necessary and consider that it is difficult to get the juniors to work, but still the elders know that they must some day transfer the major subsistence responsibilities to their juniors. It is not surprising that even the elders often do not approach the job of food production whole-heartedly. The daily food supply in many Truk households thus tends to be erratic, although the climate is favorable and the soil fertile enough for a stable food supply. The juniors, on their part, are liable to resent the elders for not providing food regularly enough, and for the threat of giving to outsiders valuable real estate and esoteric lore belonging wholly or in part to the lineage.

One difference between Trukese and Ponapean age conflict appears in relations between siblings. In Truk, an older sibling is an object of considerable respect and formal behavior, which may be taken as indicative of a concealed resentment. The greater the age difference between two siblings, the greater seems to be the stiffness between the two. However, siblings or lineage mates of about the same age are treated as friends and confidants. In contrast, on Ponape the relations between siblings and lineage mates close in age seem to be as stiff or stiffer than relations between those with a greater age difference. Also, I have heard a number of complaints in Ponape that a certain sibling was a "favorite child," while I do not recall ever having heard a term for this con-

cept in Truk. This again suggests the lesser importance of the age difference as a focus of resentment in Ponape, and also ties in with the Ponapean emphasis on individually achieved status.

TOTEMISM AND RELATED PHENOMENA

Having discussed the aspects of Trukese and Ponapean social structure which appear to me to be the foci of sociopsychological conflict for members of the two societies, I now wish to present for comparison some examples of totemistic beliefs and practices from the two societies. In this section I am defining "totemistic" quite broadly to refer to any serious belief or practice involving personalization of animals and an association of such personalized creatures with a human individual or limited human group. Totemistic phenomena in this broad sense occur in two general aspects of the cultures under discussion. These are, in the order of treatment below: (1) classical sib totemism, found principally on Ponape; and (2) individual medical totemism, found principally in Truk.

1. *Ponape*. As a sample of some Ponapean totemic material, I shall describe briefly the myths and practices associated with the Lasialap sib. I have chosen this sib because it is one of the largest and most important on the island and because I am most familiar with it. Incidentally, some sibs on Ponape have no known totem at present and probably have had none in recent precontact times. As a problem for further study I suggest that the sibs without totems may in general have had less political status over a long period of time. This would be consistent with points made below in the interpretive section.

Members of the Lasialap sib are the hereditary chiefs of U, one of the five petty states of Ponape. The name *Lasialap* means "Great Eels," *lasi* being an obsolete term for the freshwater eel, the sib's totem. The common name for eels today is *ke-misik*, literally, the "Frightful One." An outline of the origin myth of the clan is as follows:⁵

The clan is descended from three generations of eel ancestors which married gods or humans. The first of these eels was female; its child, which was later eaten by its human parents-in-law, was male; and the third and last eel, and chief character of the myth, was female.

Her human foster parents also attempted to eat the third eel, but she ate them instead. She then married an important chief, but left him when his people expressed their disgust with a gift of fish which she generously vomited up for them.

After this she settled elsewhere, devouring the people of another part of the island. Lured out to sea by a magician, some smaller fish attacked her but desisted on her plea for the children in her womb. She then traveled around giving birth to human ancestresses of the various branches of the Lasialap sib.

Lasialap people express their identification and relationship with eels in a number of beliefs and practices, of which the following are illustrative but not exhaustive:

1. They formerly fed eels and caressed them.
2. It is believed that eels would bite members of other sibs but not of Lasialap.

3. Lasialap people are forbidden to kill or eat eels. Other people do not harm eels in their presence. One Lasialap man told me that he tried eating an eel when the island was blockaded in World War II, and that consequently his jaws swelled up like an eel's gills.
4. It is believed that eels are likely to crawl out of the water and visit the homes of dying Lasialap people, like good relatives, and also, less frequently, visit the home of a Lasialap woman giving birth. Reciprocally, the people used to mourn dead eels.

2. *Truk*. Ponapean totemism is well exemplified by the Lasialap case, but it is not as simple to pick out an equally suitable illustration of the totemistic medicine animals for Truk, because of the great variability of practices and beliefs. This greater variability may be attributed at least in part to the more private and esoteric nature of Trukese medicine as compared with Ponapean sib myths and sib totemic practices. On Ponape the sib myths are known by all sib members, in outline at least, and the outlines of the myths of the most important sibs are familiar to the whole community.

But in Truk, knowledge of a medicine is restricted to the owner and a few selected pupils. Variations can easily arise. New medicines, it is believed, are occasionally revealed by spirits or animals appearing in dreams. Old medicines whose owner has died without transmitting them are sometimes "rediscovered" by learning them "anew" in this same manner in dreams.

Mr. Frank Mahony, District Anthropologist at Truk, writes of Trukese medicines: "Many of them are named after various kinds of sea animals. . . . The name of the medicine frequently indicates the main source of the medicine as well as the principal taboo, though this is by no means always true" (Mahony 1955). The application of the food taboo is variable, but to generalize from Mahony's and my own data, the rules in several instances allow the practitioner more freedom to consume the medicine animal than is granted to his own lineage mates, his acquaintances, or his patients and their households.

For example, on the west side of Fefan Island, in one kind of medicine, *sewi*, which is associated with the magician-war leaders (*itang*), the male lineage head knowing the medicine may eat the *sewi* fish but others in his lineage may not. Patients are sometimes debarred for the remainder of their lives from consuming the animals connected with certain medicines, while practitioners usually may consume their own medicine animals, although Mahony notes that practitioners may refrain from eating their medicine animal if their lineage has possessed the medicine for a long time.

As for acquaintances, strictly speaking they may usually eat the medicine animal in the presence of the practitioner if they dare, but the act would have connotations of disrespect or presumptuous intimacy, and an acquaintance would often be afraid of sorcery. As both Mahony and I have noted, Trukese believe that every medicine has its "bad side" in addition to its "good side." Supposedly, if one partakes of a medicine animal in a routine meal accompanied by the practitioner, the practitioner may later sorcerize the other person by consuming a medicine or saying a spell. The magical practice presum-

ably activates the identification of the practitioner with his medicine animal, which is physically divided between his own and his victim's stomachs, this being the link which magically transmits the practitioner's injurious wish.

Goodenough reports a case where such sorcery is obligatory on the possessor of the medicine. This case involves a resident of Romonum Island, the son of a famous *iang* who knew the medicine for needle fish: "Any needle fish . . . which he ate he had therefore to eat by himself. If someone else ate of the same fish with him he would have to mutter the spell afterwards to make that person sick (swelling of the throat) or become sick himself. After receiving a gift from his victim he would then perform the curative rite" (Goodenough 1955).

Most Trukese medicines are considered valuable esoteric lore because of the payments which treatment commands. Medicine is usually the property of old people. Formerly the payments sometimes included not only money, food, and valuables, but food trees and plots of land as well. The fruit of food trees given in payment for medicine became taboo to the original donors and relatives under pain of recurrence of the original malady.

Trukese often speak of a certain medicine as being the property of a certain matrilineal sib (*einang*). However, when I have pressed informants as to just what they mean by this, they have invariably said that the medicine is the property of one or more specific localized lineages in that sib and not of the sib as a whole. Moreover, they say that the medicine is not known to everyone in these lineages but to a select few; that usually an older person is the one who practices it and that he could, if he wished, teach it to his children or even, on receipt of payment or services, to nonrelatives outside the lineage. A younger person knowing medical lore would, I believe, be very hesitant about transmitting his knowledge to members of other lineages (except to his children) without the approval of both his elder lineage mates and his children, but an older person would feel less compulsion to keep the knowledge in the family, especially if he believed that he was being neglected by his children and younger lineage mates. Informants repeatedly mentioned this conditional bestowal by old people of medicine and other lore, and also of real property.

INTERPRETATION

It was postulated initially that differences in typical socio-psychological conflicts between Trukese and Ponapeans are functionally related to differences in totemistic beliefs and practices in the two cultures. This section tests the hypothesis by interpreting and comparing the symbolism of the totemistic phenomena in the two cultures presented in the preceding section with respect to the personal conflicts discussed at the beginning of the paper.

Before considering the data in detail, however, I wish to note some aspects of my approach to totemism and related phenomena. I assume, first, that totemistic phenomena are symbolic representations of typical human relationships in the society; further, that the native can not usually state fully the socio-symbolic nature of totemism—he assumes in the main that totemistic myths

are literally true; and further, that the social meaning of totemism is nevertheless present in repressed form in the unconscious mind of the natives and is the greatest single source of the individual motivation for totemistic beliefs and practices. In accord with psychoanalytic theory, the reason that thoughts about the social relationships represented in totemism are repressed is that they are ambivalent and full of conflict, and their overt expression would be disruptive to social relationships and psychologically painful to the individual.⁷ The concrete imagery of totemism may be a secondary and lesser reason for its development: a fable makes a more vivid impression than an abstract platitude.

Proceeding on the assumption that totemistic beliefs and practices in the main symbolically or metaphorically represent actual social conflicts, we can turn to the question of what conflicts are specifically suggested in the divergent totemistic practices in Truk and Ponape. I shall begin by considering the Ponapean material, which is more truly totemic, and then proceed to the Trukese material.

From a variety of evidence, examples of which are cited below, two distinct but not mutually exclusive interpretations suggest themselves for Ponapean totemism: (1) a narrower interpretation, treating the totemic animals as representing the mother within the nuclear family; and (2) a broader interpretation, treating them as representing the lineage and sib as a whole.

Considering first the interpretation of the ancestral eel in our example as a mother symbol, I would begin by noting the fact that the chief mythical eel is female, although initially there is a wavering between female and male eels.⁸ Further indications of the eel as mother symbol include its large size (suggesting the size of adults as they appear to children), the eel's attempt to feed her husband's subjects with food from within her and their ensuing disgust (suggesting the attitude of weaned children toward the breast), and the attack on the eel by lesser fish, who desist at her appeal for her unborn children (suggesting both the children's hostility toward the mother at the prospective birth of younger siblings and the eventual acceptance by the older siblings of the mother's reprimand for their jealousy).

Irrational totemic food taboos on edible animals such as the eel may be plausibly interpreted as signifying a general taboo on aggression or disrespect toward a parental figure—or in terms of conflict, as signifying an opposition of strong aggressive and disrespectful wishes against still stronger loving and respectful wishes. But a food taboo with specific reference to a mother figure, i.e., a taboo on eating the mother, further suggests a taboo on nursing and on the general dependence of small children on their mothers. Of course this is a taboo which must be inculcated in children everywhere as they grow older and younger siblings are born, but we also know that cultures vary in the manner of inculcation and in the resultant individual psychological traumata.

The portrayal of the eel in the myth as dangerous and cannibalistic, now being called the "Frightful One," is also consistent with the interpretation of the eel as a mother figure, in view of clinical studies in a variety of cultures

showing the tendency of children to depict mothers in their frustrating and demanding aspects as hostile witches, monsters, etc.⁹

The above interpretation, that Ponapean totemism represents in part a conflict around initial dependence on the mother due to her subsequent efforts to weaken or break this tie, suggests that we should investigate differences in child training to account for the presence of sib totemism on Ponape and its absence in Truk. I believe that the childhood conflict over dependence on the mother is in fact stronger in Ponape than Truk and that this is relevant to the elaboration of totemism in Ponape. However, I shall not give detailed evidence for this point here, since I also believe that a strong childhood conflict over dependence could be expressed symbolically in other ways than totemism, e.g., in fear of ghosts or animals not associated with lineal descent groups. In other words, an intense childhood conflict over dependence on the mother appears to be a predisposing but not sufficient cause for the development of totemism in a society.

I believe that to explain why the eel and other animals on Ponape are totemic in the classical sense, i.e., associated with sibs and lineages, we must further consider the relationship of the individual Ponapean to his sib as a whole, and especially to his lineage, in addition to his relationship to his mother. There are a number of indications that the totem animal represents the lineage and sib in general, as well as the mother in particular. The totem animal is said to be a sibmate, and is thought to behave in some ways like a sibmate: allegedly, it is not aggressive toward its human relatives and, as a good lineage mate should, it visits them on birth and mourns for them at death. Reciprocally, the sib members protect and formerly fed and mourned the animal as if it were a sib or lineage mate. We should also bear in mind that since Ponapean lineages are matrilineal, a female totem animal is an appropriate symbol for not only the mother but the whole lineage and sib as well.

When we review the typical sociopsychological conflicts for the two cultures as discussed earlier, we may note a considerable formal similarity between the Ponapean conflicts of mother versus child and lineage versus individual member. This coincidence is lacking with respect to the same conflicts in Truk. More specifically, as an adult a Ponapean is dependent on his lineage for food and for protection from enemies; in childhood he was dependent on his mother for the same things. As a child, the help his mother could give him was limited by his siblings' demands for help; in adulthood, the help the lineage may give is limited by the demands of other lineage mates (many of whom are terminologically "siblings"). The child's demands on his mother tend to be high because of his lack of experience and also, in Ponape, probably because of certain ways in which the mother handles her children, which will not be discussed here. The adult Ponapean's demands on his lineage tend to be high because of the competitive nature of the feast and title system. Once the child is weaned and becomes a responsible member of the nuclear family, he may not return to the breast or to his general infant dependence on his mother. Likewise, once the adult has learned to bear lineage responsibilities—

which on Ponape he learns at a fairly early age—he must continue to bear them for the rest of his life as long as he is physically competent.

While mother-child conflict over the child's dependence on his mother is also found in Truk (although probably weaker than on Ponape), this childhood conflict does not coincide with a very strong adult conflict of lineage versus individual member over the individual's dependence on his lineage. Since Truk lacks the competitive feast and title system, lineage members make fewer difficult demands on each other and there is relatively little competition among adult lineage mates of the same generation for lineage labor and property. The limited competition that exists is more between the younger adults as a group versus the older adults. In view of the relative industriousness of the older Trukese adults, the mother and parental surrogates continue to be objects of dependence for young adults for many years. The parents are thus not neatly replaced in this respect by the lineage as a whole, and the psychological equation of lineage and mother is more difficult than on Ponape, and less adequately represents the social situation.

In view of this relative weakness of the intralineage conflict as such in Truk, the near absence of sib totemism there is not surprising and is in accord with the positive relation postulated between sib totemism and intralineage conflict on Ponape.¹⁰

While the each-against-all conflict typical of the Ponapean lineages is minimized in Truk, it will be recalled that the Trukese intergeneration conflict was described as relatively intense and as possessing obstacles to its free expression. And while we find little sib totemism in Truk, we do find the individual medical totemism, with traditional medicine being largely in the hands of the older adults. This suggests that we should examine the possibility that the medicine animal complex may be an expression of the generation conflict there.

What specifically is the evidence for such an interpretation? A number of facts suggest that there is a symbolic identification of the medicine animals with the medical practitioners in Truk. One obvious fact is that the practitioner relies on the animal as a sort of extension of himself in curing and sorcerizing people. Moreover, it is believed in some cases that the animal originally taught the medicine to some human. Normally, of course, the actual medicine teacher is an older adult. In two cases where I have been able to ascertain the sex of the original medicine animal, it was male in one case and a brother and sister in the other. This is consistent with the fact that in Truk males are considered better medical practitioners for most purposes, except for specifically female complaints such as difficulties in childbirth.

Food taboos on the medicine animal are not absolute in Truk; often the animal is used in the medicine which may be consumed by the patient. The occasional medicinal consumption of the animal by the (usually younger) patient appears to symbolize the sacrifice of self which the older people feel they make for the younger. I have heard Trukese express the attitude that work is debilitating, but have received amused skepticism from those to

whom I have suggested that work, through physical exercise, would develop strength. Parallel to this reluctance about actual physical labor is a reluctance to use one's medical powers. For any one cause of illness, as classified by the Trukese, there is often a series of medicines graded in order of potency. The practitioners are generally suspected of using the weakest first (since it is generally the simplest and requires collecting the fewest ingredients) and only using the stronger if the weaker fails to work. This stinginess with medicine is regarded as a somewhat reprehensible but human failing. If the patient's medicinal consumption of the animal does symbolize the sacrifice of the elder practitioner (letting part of himself be consumed), then the existence of the practice itself and the reluctance associated with it are both symbolically consistent with the Trukese intergeneration conflict as described above.

In addition to these features of medicinal consumption, the food taboos themselves, though variable, also lend support to the symbolic identity of the medicine animal and the aged practitioners. It will be recalled that the practitioner himself is often permitted to eat the animal, although his patients, his younger relatives, and acquaintances, are often either forbidden to eat it or discouraged from doing so. If the medicinal consumption of the animal may be regarded as a symbolic imposition and dependence on the practitioner, the food taboos may be regarded as a symbolic deference to him. A practitioner is apt to regard violation of these taboos as a personal insult and an expression of contempt for his powers. On the other hand, if the practitioner eats the animal himself, this is purely his business and he is offending no one.

Mahony's statement that the practitioner himself may sometimes observe a food taboo on the medicine animal if the medicine has been in his lineage for several generations is of special interest. The fact that the medicine has not been transmitted out of the lineage for several generations is presumably an indication that in this particular lineage there has been less intergeneration conflict than average, since transmission of esoteric lore to nonlineage members is a common way for lineage elders to express their dissatisfaction with their juniors. In this special situation in Truk, the medicine animal tends to become in effect more of a lineage totem than a symbolic representation of the individual practitioner, and it becomes psychologically inappropriate for the practitioner to eat it. We may speculate that the sociopsychological situation in these "strong" Trukese lineages approaches that on Ponape, where food taboos on the sib and sub-sib totems are common. It seems likely, in fact, that if enough lineages in Truk managed to minimize the generation conflict for a long period, genuine sib totemism could be born (or perhaps reborn) in Truk within a few generations out of the possession of medicine animals by lineages.

CONCLUSIONS

Before summarizing the positive conclusions with respect to totemism in the two cultures, I wish to point out certain limitations in the aim of this paper. First, the ethnographic material reported is illustrative, and no full

coverage of either Ponapean sib totemism or Trukese medical totemism has been attempted. Either subject treated in detail could easily fill a monograph.

Again, this paper is not primarily concerned with the relationship of child-care practices to totemism, although cross-cultural research being conducted by Dr. John Whiting and myself at the Laboratory of Human Development Graduate School of Education, Harvard, indicates that highly significant relationships are demonstrable here. Of course a child care and an adult social structure hypothesis need not be mutually exclusive. In fact, many of us would expect consistencies between child care and social structure, so that eventually knowing one should help predict much about the other.

I do not claim to have exhausted the symbolic meaning of totemistic practices in the two cultures discussed, not to mention other cultures. Since expressive institutions such as totemism often have multiple meanings, there are no doubt other complementary hypotheses about the meaning of totemism which might be investigated in an exhaustive study. One might inquire, for instance, why a mother figure on Ponape is represented by an eel, which is a phallic symbol in many cultures and in certain other contexts in Ponapean culture. An answer might be found in terms of child care, but it would require more field data and space to demonstrate.

The main conclusions of this paper are that a relatively intense conflict of individual and lineage interests on Ponape is consonant with the classic sib totemism found there, and a relatively intense conflict of interests between older and younger generations is consonant with the medicine animal complex on Truk. While both conflicts certainly exist in both cultures, the difference in intensity or priority seems to be the most significant factor in explaining the difference in totemistic practices. Probably also relevant to sib totemism on Ponape is a stronger conflict about dependence on the mother in childhood. At any rate, this childhood conflict is present and works in the same direction as the conflict about lineage duties and privileges.

These conclusions imply that we should look for classical sib totemism not merely in cultures with exogamous sibs, nor again merely where there is an intense childhood conflict over dependence on the parents, but where some factor intensifies the conflict for members of the society between their interests as individuals and their interests as sib or lineage members. I would further suggest that comparisons between pairs or groups of related cultures, at least one of each group possessing totemism and one lacking it, would be a form of cross-cultural testing on a larger scale which would help discount irrelevant variation due to separate historical traditions.

NOTES

¹ This is a revised version of a paper originally presented at the 1955 annual meeting of the American Anthropological Association in Boston. The paper has been read in various stages and helpful advice offered by Thomas Gladwin, Ward Goodenough, Frank Mahony, Saul Riesenberg, and John Whiting. Goodenough and Mahony have also provided further field data as noted. Responsibility for the final form of the paper is of course my own.

² See also Goodenough 1951:84-85 for a further discussion. Goodenough's conclusions as to the present status of sib totemism in Truk are essentially in agreement with my own.

³ See Riesenbergs 1948 for a general discussion of Ponapean medicine.

⁴ While it is not directly relevant to the central thesis of this paper, I would note that although it appears to me that the lineage is an object of more intense conflict in Ponape, in terms of sheer duration of interaction with lineage members the Trukese probably rank higher than the Ponapeans, since the Trukese prefer group activity more in daily routine. The point made here about the importance of considering sociopsychological conflict rather than amount of interaction alone in understanding the development of totemism and allied phenomena is analogous to Malinowski's well-known point about Trobriand fishing magic. Malinowski noted that the Trobrianders had no magic in connection with routine fishing in the lagoon, important though this was as a source of food and in terms of time spent, but that there was magic connected with deep sea fishing, where the catch was uncertain and personal danger was involved (1948:51). Malinowski's discussion emphasized conflict due to material difficulties, while I am here dealing with social difficulties arising out of conflicts of interest.

⁵ For a discussion of Ponapean political and social organization, see Bascom 1946 and 1948, Riesenbergs 1949. For a discussion of the same for Truk, see Goodenough 1951. For Trukese character, see Gladwin and Sarason 1953. Most of the material in this section has previously been presented by one or another of the above authors, although they should not be held responsible for my reinterpretations.

⁶ This is based on my own unpublished manuscripts in the native language. The German ethnographer Hambruch gives versions of parts of this myth which coincide rather well, as far as they go, with versions which I collected in 1950-1953 (Hambruch 1932, subvolume 2:48, 124-125; Hambruch and Eilers 1936, subvolume 3:146-147).

⁷ This is essentially Freud's view of symbolism. For a recent presentation of this and other theories of symbolism, see Fromm 1951.

⁸ Several other Ponapean totem animals are also clearly female in the myths, including even the stingray, which would seem to be especially suitable for a male symbol. I know of no totem animal conceived of as primarily male.

⁹ Some of the totems are superficially benign, and include birds, edible fish, and even plants and fruit. However, regardless of superficial appearance to the outsider, the natives appear to conceive of all totems as ambivalent: potentially both hostile and benign on different occasions. Thus the apparently hostile eel defended her human children and generously offered people food, while the seemingly benign totems are thought to cause sickness if their taboos are violated. The culture has supplied, so to speak, the missing aspect necessary to represent the ambivalent mother and lineage. Thus if native beliefs as well as the objective characteristics of the totems are considered, the differences in the totems can be reduced to the question of which aspect has been supplied by the native imagination: positive or negative. With the eel and other dangerous totems the positive aspect has been invented, while with edible fish and the like the negative aspect has been supplied.

¹⁰ The point here is concerned solely with the strength of sociopsychological conflict about the lineage as a group for its members. The question as to whether Trukese or Ponapean lineages have greater solidarity is not under discussion here, and is irrelevant to the explanation of totemism advanced in this paper. Under this explanation, societies with highly solidary lineages but with little intralineage conflict as such would lack totemism, while a society with low lineage solidarity but highly ambivalent relations of lineage members to their lineage would have totemism. But since solidarity is irrelevant as an antecedent, a society with high lineage solidarity and highly ambivalent member-lineage relationships should likewise have totemism, and a society with low lineage solidarity and weak member-lineage conflict should lack totemism.

I would presume that the function or effect of totemism is to strengthen lineage solidarity in societies with strong intralineage conflict, but if the disruptive tendencies are strong the total resulting lineage solidarity may still be quite weak, even if totemic beliefs are very well developed.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- BASCOM, W. R.
1946 Ponape: a Pacific economy in transition. Honolulu, U. S. Commercial Company (mimeographed).
1948 Ponapean prestige economy. *SW Jnl. Anthropology* 4:211-221.
- FROMM, ERICH
1951 *The forgotten language*. New York. Rinehart.
- GLADWIN, THOMAS
1955 Personal communication.
- GLADWIN, THOMAS, and SEYMOUR B. SARASON
1953 Truk: man in paradise. *Viking Fund Publ. in Anthropology* 20.
- GOODENOUGH, WARD H.
1951 Property, kin and community on Truk. *Yale Publ. in Anthropology* 46.
1955 Personal communication.
- HAMBRUCH, PAUL
1932 Ponape. *In Ergebnisse der Südsee-Expedition 1908-1910*, ed. G. Thilenius. Series II B, v. 7, subv. 2. Hamburg, Friedrichsen, De Gruyter.
- HAMBRUCH, PAUL, and A. EILERS
1936 Ponape. *In Ergebnisse der Südsee-Expedition 1908-1910*, ed. G. Thilenius. Series II B, v. 7, subv. 3. Hamburg, Friedrichsen, De Gruyter.
- MAHONY, FRANK
1955 Personal communication.
- MALINOWSKI, BRONISLAW
1948 *Magic, science, and religion*. Glencoe, Illinois, Free Press.
- RIESENBERG, S. H.
1948 Magic and medicine in Ponape. *SW Jnl. of Anthropology* 4:406-429.
1949 Ponapean political and social organization. Washington, D. C., Pacific Science Board (typed).