new-born child may also make the crops *noa,* just as it may remove the taboo from a temporarily affected person.

In the Tonga Islands a person who became taboo by touching a chief or his property had to put away his sacred character, before he was allowed to make use of his lands, by touching the soles of a higher chief’s feet and washing in water. Strangers before penetrating into a village, priests after a sacrifice, warriors, women after child-birth, at puberty, the menstrual period, &c., must submit to lustration. Sometimes the purification was effected by inhaling the sacred contagion; in New Zealand a chief who touched his own head had to apply his fingers to his nose and snuff up the sanctity abstracted from his head. In other cases mere lapse of time suffices to cause the removal of a taboo; in Melanesia, where taboos are largely animistic, mourners go away for some months and on their return are free from taboo, the explanation given being that the spirit has got tired of waiting for them.

Indirect taboos are imposed in various ways, and unless they are removed may be as permanent as direct taboos, save that the death of the persons by whom they are imposed must result in their abrogation. In Polynesia a general taboo was imposed by proclamation; a chief might also taboo particular objects to his own use by naming them after a part of his person; more permanent was the taboo imposed by touching an object, but this too could be removed by proper ceremonies. In Melanesia, corresponding to the animistic character of *tambu,* a method of imposing taboo is to mention the name of some spirit.

Taboo objects were marked in various ways: a piece of white cloth, a bunch of leaves, a bundle of branches (in Melanesia) painted red and white, a stick with dry leaves, are among the methods in common use; in Samoa one mark of a taboo was to set up the image of a shark; in New Zealand it sufficed to give a chop with an axe to make a tree taboo. Particular taboos thus imposed seem to be abrogated by the declaration of the person who imposes them; on the other hand, he, no less than others, is bound by the taboo until it is abrogated.

9. *Taboo and the Evolution of Punishment.—*Penal codes may be largely, if not wholly, traced to religious sources of which taboo is certainly one; the violation of any taboo may imperil the life or health of other members of the community besides the offender; it calls for measures intended to discourage others, as well as for steps to avert the immediate evil; if a taboo imposed by a chief is disregarded, not only has his authority been set at nought, but he, and in the second place, other members of the community may suffer if the real offender gets off scot free, thanks to the *mana* which enables him to defy supernatural sanctions. The importance of this in the evolution of law and order is manifest; for whereas a chief would not intervene to protect the property of an individual simply to punish what we regard as a transgression, he is bound to do so when a taboo is broken. That the taboo may be of his own imposition does not affect the question, for he is bound to observe it himself, and conversely may suffer supernatural penalties when it is violated by another. Just as blood-guilti­ness may be wiped out by composition, the violation of a taboo may be atoned for by a money payment or similar consideration for the revocation of the taboo; this compensation seems to have a retrospective effect, and thereby removes the dangers brought into existence by the violation.

10. *Taboo and Moral Obligation.—*In proportion as a taboo becomes a custom and its sanctions fall into the background and are forgotten, its obligations thus transformed are one source of the categorical imperative, the distinguishing feature of which is that it is non-rational and instinctive. We are ignorant of the origin of exogamy and the prohibition of incest, the sanctions of which in Australia and among other peoples of low culture seem to be purely’ social, for as a rule irregular marriages seem to be regarded simply as offences against tribal morality; if the rules were originally of the nature of taboos, the transformation into customs must have been very early, and the same may be said of the rules by which the relations of members of the same kin are regulated.

11. *Royal and Priestly Taboos.—*Among people of low culture the chief, and in higher cultures the king, is sometimes held responsible for the order of nature, the increase of the crops, and the welfare of his people generally; it is therefore of the highest importance that nothing should diminish or perturb his influence, and, as a logical consequence, the life of the king, and to a less degree of the chief, is surrounded with a compli­cated system of taboos and ritual prohibitions. Even where this idea of the magician-king or chief is not found, his position is an expression of the more powerful *mana* dwelling within him; consequently the king or chief may not come in contact with the common folk, for fear his touch should blast them, as lightning withers the life of the oak. We can usually sec why a king or chief must hold aloof from those whom he might injure, but it is not always easy to see the basic idea of the taboos, if such they be, which aim at protecting the potentate, or ensuring his due regulation of the course of nature. Some African kings may not see the sea; another may not lie down to sleep; in the Mentawei Islands the chief will die who during an interdict eats at the same time as common people; it is frequently for­bidden to see the king partake of food. At a further stage of evolution these taboos degenerate into mere rules of etiquette, the violation of which involves the punishment of the offender, but the punishment is justified on formal grounds only. In early society the king and the priest often stand very near together; just as we find a war chief and a peace chief, so we meet with political and religious sovereigns. Sometimes the political king is also the priest and therefore sacred; the web of ritual prohibition woven round him may result in the creation of a secular authority like the Tycoon in Japan, who can rule the state without reference to the ceremonial observances prescribed for the nominal sovereign. Sometimes, on the other hand, the priest bears the title of king, but has lost even the shadow of political power and is free to perform his priestly functions. In these, however, as we see by the example of the flamen dialis at Rome, or the kings of fire and water in Cam­bodia, he is still hedged round by manifold restrictions as a person who must be protected from doing harm to others or suffering harm himself. In the exercise of his priestly functions he is called upon to offer sacrifice; before fulfilling his office he is often required to submit to additional ritual prohibitions; his personal sanctity, already great, is augmented, and his approach to the sanctuary facilitated. Conversely, the sacrifice over, he performs lustral rites, in part to free himself from the taint of errors of ritual, but also to desacralize himself.

12. *Funerary and Allied Taboos.—*Taboos of mourners, widows, and of the dead are common all the world over, but they are especially prominent in Melanesia. These are explained on an animistic hypothesis as due to the fear of the dead man’s spirit, but we seem to see traces, *e.g.* in Madagascar, of the idea that the contagion of death and not the wrath of the dead is the underlying motive; for it is not clear why the soul of a dead kinsman should necessarily be hostile. With funerary taboos may be compared taboos of warriors both on and after an expedition, taboos of hunters during the chase and especially after killing a dangerous animal, taboos of cannibals, and on participants in all other ceremonies which involve contact with death or the dead. Temporary seclusion and lustration before return to ordinary life are commonly prescribed for all in this category, even though their connexion with the dead be no closer than is implied in consanguinity. The property of the dead man is commonly burnt or deposited with him in the grave, in part as a protective measure, in part under the influence of belief in the continuity of this and the future life, and the need of supplying him with necessaries. Burial grounds are avoided, animals or plants from the neighbourhood are not used as food. Finally the name of the dead is not used, partly for fear of summoning him by the power of the word, but partly also from a conviction that, like the name of a king or chief, it is too holy or too dangerous for common use.

13. *Taboos of the Sick.—*Both disease and death arc unnatural in the eyes of the savage; they are often the result of the magic