

monstrously are, rather than as different and distinct cults, as Dr. Haddon would have us regard them. To separate individual totemism from group or "typical" totemism seems to me to cut ourselves off from the very heart and root of the matter, from the only evidence that **can possibly help us to understand the purpose and meaning of totemism.** It is like asking the student of chemistry to be satisfied with his compounds and not seek to discover the elements that lie at their base.

As Dr. Haddon has informed us in his address that his view of totemism is that "understood by Tylor, Frazer, Lang, Hartland, Jevons, Durkheim and others," it becomes unnecessary to criticize the views of these gentlemen. We may at once pass on to examine the "suggestion concerning the origin of totemism" put forward by Dr. Haddon in the latter part of his address, and also the "guess" of Mr. Andrew Lang concerning "the origin of totem names and beliefs."¹ This "suggestion" of Dr. Haddon does not so much deal with the origin of totemism as I and other American students understand that doctrine, as with the origin of totem-group names. Thus, he remarks: "I take this opportunity to hazard a suggestion for a possible origin of one aspect of totemism. Primitive human groups, judging from analogy could never have been large, and the individuals comprising each group **must have been closely related.** In favourable areas each group would have a tendency to occupy a restricted range owing to the disagreeable results which arose from encroaching on the territory over which another group wandered. Thus it would inevitably come about that a certain animal or plant, or group of animals or plants would be more abundant in the territory of one group than in that of another. To take a clear example, the shore-folk and the river-folk would live mainly on different food from each other, and both would have other specialties than fell to the lot of the jungle-folk. The groups that lived on the seashore would doubtless have some natural vegetable product to supplement their animal diet, but the supply would probably be limited alike in quantity and variety. Even they would scarcely have unlimited range of a shore line and there would be one group of shore-folk that had a specialty in crabs, another would have shad-beds, while a third would own sandy shores which were frequented by turtles. A similar natural grouping would occur among the jungle-folk: sago flourishes in swampy land, certain animals frequent grassy plains, others inhabit the dense scrub, bamboos grow in one locality, various kinds of fruit trees thrive best in different soils; the coastal plains, the foot hills, the mountains, each has its characteristic flora and fauna. There is thus no difficulty in accounting for numerous small human groups, each of which would be largely dependent upon a distinctive food supply, the

¹ *Folk-Lore*, Vol. XIII, No. 4, December 25th, 1902.