

considerations of the subject), these objects are by no means commonly, such as are suitable for food, and Dr. Haddon's explanation of these does not appear satisfactory to me.

Thirdly. As I have just pointed out, the names of totem groups are invariably found to be the names of the objects that are natural to the locality where the clan groups reside. Now we know from historical records, to say nothing of the tradition of the natives themselves, that a very general displacement of tribes has taken place all over the American continent, and this within comparatively recent times; yet in every case, I believe I am right in saying, the totem names of both *individuals* and *groups* are names of objects characteristic of their present environment, many of which in numerous instances must have been quite unknown in the earlier habitat. What, then, is the legitimate conclusion deducible from these facts? Is it not that the names of some clan groups, at least, are comparatively modern and date at earliest from the first presence of the clan in its present territories? This does not agree with Dr. Haddon's hypothesis which expressly supposes the totem names to have arisen in the earlier days of man's history, when he dwelt in small, more or less, isolated groups in restricted areas. But it appears to me to support strongly the view I have advocated, that totem groups and new clans may arise at any time in the history of tribal society, and that the personal totem gives rise to the group totem. Tribes as a general rule increase in number, with the lapse of time and new clans spring into existence, after the manner of the Bear clan of the Tsimshian. How else are we to account for the presence of totem-group names which, have clearly arisen since the settlement of the tribe in its present quarters, as they are called by the names of objects known and common to their present, but not to their former place of residence. But these objections, strong as they are, I regard as comparatively minor. My chief and invincible objection lies in the total disregard of this hypothesis for the *psychic* factors of totemism, which my study of the question has compelled me to look upon as all-important and essential to the doctrine. I fail entirely to see how the evidence brought together by American and other students regarding savage man's mental attitude towards the universe can be set aside or neglected in any discussion of totemism. Life and nature are full of mystery to the savage from his birth to his death, but Dr. Haddon's theory wholly overlooks and ignores this and bases the origin of a doctrine which is confessedly full of "mystery" upon the common-place, unmysterious feeling of hunger. Again, I must be pardoned if my personal knowledge of the workings of the primitive mind prompts me to say this is more the view of a cultivated European than that of a superstitious savage. It is altogether too matter-of-fact for the mind of primitive man, who sees in the commonest and simplest