

superfluity of which could be bartered for the superfluities of other groups Among the shore-folk the group that lived mainly on crabs and occasionally traded in crabs might well be spoken of as "crab men" by all groups with whom they came in direct or indirect contact. The same would hold good for the group that dealt in clams or in turtles, and reciprocally there might be sago-men, bamboo-men, and so forth. It is obvious that men who persistently collected or hunted a particular group of animals would understand the habits of these animals better than other people, and a personal regard for these animals would naturally arise. Thus, from the very beginning, there would be a distinct relationship between a group of individuals and a group of animals or plants, relationship that primitively was based, not on even the most elementary of psychic concepts, but on the most deeply seated and urgent of human claims, hunger."

The point that strikes one first in this suggestion is that it knocks all to pieces the "Canon of Taboo," which is included in Dr. Haddon's second "element." Dr. Haddon is, of course, aware of this and explains it away by remarking that his suggestion "deals with incipient totemism" only. This again is, of course, an incomprehensible position from the American point of view, but it serves admirably to show that English students regard the social concomitants of totemism as its essential features—a *vis-à-vis*, as I have shown, impossible to hold if we would rightly understand this phenomenon of savage life.

Now the objections that arise in my mind as I consider this hypothesis are several and some of them deep-rooted.

First, these names come from *without*; they are not taken or assumed by the groups themselves, but are applied to them by the neighbouring groups. And while we have numerous instances of nick-names being given both to individuals and tribes by their neighbours, I can recall no instance where these names have been recognized and adopted by the individuals or groups thus named. Endless tribes and division of this country have had names descriptive of their habitat, the food upon which they chiefly live, their mental or physical characteristics, etc., bestowed upon them; but in no case that I can discover have those names been recognized or adopted by the people themselves; and to apply these names to them to their faces is to deeply insult them and wound their self-respect.

Secondly. If this were the true origin of group names we ought to find ample evidence of it in the names themselves. Now, a study of clan names as they obtain in America gives little support to Dr. Haddon's theory. For while they are generally called after the names of the objects of the *present* environment of the clan or group or tribe, (and this is a highly significant fact which has been too much overlooked in our