

- P. 1 The page is better omitted in the pencilled part, as there are other theories, especially the "conceptional", and mine is not correctly stated.
- 1,2 Does "Western" apply to all of your region, north and south?
- 6 7 Bo'run'gur is here applied to "phratry totems". Query, does it apply to all the multitude of other sorts of totems, "district", "local", "personal", &c.? I think it does.
- 7 line 1 8 Is "leg" here equivalent to "thigh" or "bag" later given as the term for "stock" or "family"? "Phratry" is given (l.5) as equivalent to "family". "Stock" is better.
- paragraph 2. It is clear that some tribes of Crow and White Cockatoo phratries have female while others have male descent. Have any pure female descent alone? (Yes, S.W. - D.M.B.) Eaglehawk"has also been made a hereditary totem." That is, a hereditary familiar? --- this does not seem to imply that it is exogamous, I think.
- 8 line 19 10, line 3 These statements seem conjectural.
- line 10 from foot. It is almost universal that totem kins of the same name as the name-giving animals of the phratries are found within the phratries. (omitted in later version).
- (Note : see walitch and manitch totems)
- 9 Legends have no historic value, they are only guesses.
- 10 Howitt. He thought that promiscuity (as of your Waljuks) preceded his "group marriage".
- (Omitted in later version).
- (Note : in social organisation and also in Totems give special par. to Walj borungur.)

11

It now seems that as usual, the same totem does not appear in both phratries. Elsewhere in your book it does appear in both phratries, but not in the same districts.

(Omitted in later version.)

12 P. 1, V 2b

It is the two phratries that constitute "the local group", no local tribe has only one phratry. A man has not to seek a wife outside "the local group" (He has - D.M.B.) but outside his own phratry. A phratry localised by male descent is not "a local group".

It appears that Tondarup and Didarruk classes have only one "class totem", rain. (Two - rain and water - D.M.B.). If so this is contrary to such classes as have names that designate objects. What is the native name of Rain?

(Note in totems.)

That with female descent children inherit "a little bit" of the "class totem" indicates nascent transition to male descent, and a survival of female descent appears in "the little bit" handed on by mothers, where male descent prevails. These signs of transition are natural where tribes have the same phratries, but different lines of descent.

13 (omitted)

"Class totems", These have been given as Rain (for Tondarup and Didarruk). One Rain is not four Class Totems! What are these for Ballaruk and Nagarnook? Manna and White Cockatoo it seems. On your showing these four (three?) Class names are not derived from "Class totems" - that is, name-giving objects.

When you come to a "sea totem" this is common to coastal people of both phratries. It is thus not a "class totem", not the name-giving object of a class, and not even peculiar to any one

Note -  
also river  
people are  
hill totem  
bel borungur  
and hill  
people.

of the four classes. "Sea" may be called "borung" but is in no sense a totem. We usually speak of a "coast people" and a "bush people" but these are only topographical designations, sea and bush are in no way "totems", but apply to all the people indifferently whatever their phratry, class, or totem kin.

Apparently all these people whether with male or female descent, or both, have four subclasses as well as phratries. If so, the class names do not elsewhere descend from mother or father to child, the children are of the class to which their parent does not belong -- at least if I am wrong your tribes differ from all who are known to possess the four class system. "In the Vasse" &c. do you mean that the Emu is the name-giving "class totem" of the Nagarnook classes only, and that a child took it as class-name.

Note in social  
organisation.

Of course if you mean that Nagarnook is the name of a matrimonial class, and that a Nagarnook woman has Nagarnook children, this is entirely the reverse of the class system throughout known Australia.

There the children of a Nagarnook woman would be Ballaruk, and their children would be Nagarnook, and so on alternating for ever. If your people differ on this point it is highly important, but do they? If it be true that the class names do not alternate with each generation, these blacks "don't know their own silly old business."

14 P.3,  
V 2b

It is not clear to me whether Nagarnook means an Emu bird. If this is so this is a case of a translatable class name. Possibly Ballaruk is also an animal name of a class. But it is odd if in one phratry the two classes have animal names, while we do not seem to know the meaning of the class names in the other phratry, they don't mean Rain, do they?

I do not understand whether or not one set of totems exist in class Ballaruk, and another set in class Nagarnook; or ever whether there is a different set of totems in each phratry, as everywhere except among the Arunta. All the totems you are speaking of in p. 14 appear to be totems marking the four classes: two classes have only one totem, Rain, the opposite two have a totem (or name-giving object) apiece, as is usual, when the class names can be translated. In other cases a Tondarup man of the rain totem could only marry into one of the two classes in the opposite phratry. Your man married into both. This sort of thing implies obsolescence of marriage rules.

15

4

15

We now come to (a) "district totems", (b) "local or inherited totems". This looks as if districts are one thing and localities another. From page 59 I gather that "a local hereditary totem" means the totem inherited from the father, which is "localised" by the predominance of male descent. It cannot be localised where descent of the totem is derived through the female side alone. The "district" totem, being non-hereditary and non-exogamous, is, I think, a mere designation: it occurs in both phratries, and simply means "people of the cauliflower, strawberry, cherry, and so on country." If I am right, these "district" totems common to both phratries, merely cause confusion, especially when "district" and "locality" are treated as different things. The explanation on p. 59 should be given on p. 15. In fact (p.59) we have merely the familiar rule, no marriage within phratry, class, and hereditary totem kin. What we need is a list :-

Phratry A  
 |  
 Classes (2)  
 |  
 Hereditary totems  
 |  
 Their names

Phratry B  
 |  
 Classes (2)  
 |  
 Hereditary totems  
 |  
 Their names

16

Here you give a man's phratry, class and district object, but not his hereditary totem. This looks as if he had none.

"Local group or hereditary totems originated with single and not very remote ancestors", who chose certain totem for their families, through whom it descended "in some cases". Are there people with non-hereditary totems? So far we have had tribes of the common SouthEastern two phratry, four class type, sometimes of female, more usually of both male and female descent, the male line being dominant. But whereas, all over the world except among the Arunta, the exogamous totem has been hereditary in one or the other line from time immemorial, and even among Strehlow's Arunta the maternal totem is sacred and hereditary (though not exogamous) with your people the hereditary totem is apparently a new and not universal institution accompanying male descent, and created by recent males. The "groups" with hereditary totems are local, because of the precedence of male descent of the totem. Have you any tribes with female descent only of the hereditary totem? I do not think that the giving of the names of ancestors here, in the dog legend, is a proof of recent facts. Names are given in Aloheringa fables of all stages. This Dog story is a mere explanatory myth, like thousands of others, and as the dog totem was hereditary before, in most cases first explains its origin, in a form of the Kronos and Daramulun myths, and then asserts that the two named men gave it to their children, which is a thing that does happen in decadent, as in some dwindling American totemic societies. You go on to

show that the dog totem existed in both phratries, a thing that elsewhere only occurs among the Arunta and Kaitish.

19

The transmission of the Dog totem through mothers is mentioned as a solitary case. With the people practically extinct, and with the coexistence of both lines of descent of the totem, and with the confusions caused by mere complimentary totems, "district" totems, and so on, verily (p. 27)

"there is neither finality nor definiteness in the hereditary totem rules of the South West peoples." But are we to explain this fluidity on the ground that among them hereditary totemism is still in the making; or are we to say that the people have passed out of a condition in which the rules, as elsewhere, are final and definite, into a state of flux? As I understand, you take the phratries to have been definite and final at a very remote stage, and the lack of definiteness now is decadence, I think.

59

48

The hereditary totem is exogamous. But how can it be exogamous if it occurs in both phratries? The fact that it is exogamous does not look as if it were of recent origin. Where hereditary totems elsewhere in the world are exogamous, it is because the same totem never occurs in both phratries (where phratries exist). That the "class totem" may be married into -- that classmates may intermarry -- is a proof of extreme decadence, probably through scarcity of people, for a person marrying into his class must also marry into his phratry. In this case the only exogamous bar is the hereditary totem (for it is a bar), a state of law dubiously reported of some Kamilaroi, and found in North America among tribes which have abandoned the phratry altogether.

In short, your blacks here, are on the way to marry all but close consanguines, as among ourselves. This is proof that they are nearly emancipated from the ancient rules: so that the sort of hereditary totems they now "found" cannot be taken as proofs of the origin of totemism. The stories are myths, or this kind of totemism is a novelty. You have made it plain that, in some tribes at least, (I wish the tribal names were given) people may marry into their own class and phratry, and, I suppose, even into their own hereditary totem -- apparently only some of them have any hereditary totem.

73

Here we have marriage within the phratry; so of course the phratry law is obsolete, see also p. 71.

Thus the facts are to be explained by the decadence of the South Eastern system, for all its elements occur -- phratries, classes, totems -- and all their rules are broken, yet their only value is in the rules they enforce. The Central Australian system preserves all the rules except that of totemic exogamy. The present system of your tribes which have all the machinery of law, and break all the laws, is undeniably decadent, for phratries and classes are nothing if not machinery of law.