

Melbourne.
Oct 20/98

FRASER

19

My dear Sir, I have not yet been able to see Howitt & Fison with regard to your theory of totemism and am just jotting down a few remarks which may be added to after I have talked matters over with them. You will of course understand that my remarks are limited to Australian tribes & more especially to those of the centre. In the first place there appear to differ in regard to their totemic systems from those hitherto described but I am inclined to think that closer search will reveal the existence of ceremonies similar to the Intichiuma of the Arunta in many other tribes in which they have not yet been described & in which the social side of the totemic system is much more strongly developed than it is in our tribes. In the Dieri

& Warramunga tribes for example though we have not full details yet we have undoubted evidence of such ceremonies and in these tribes totemism regulates marriage. Such ceremonies are I fancy characteristic of the tribes occupying the interior of the continent & probably extending along the head of the Bight. We have as yet no evidence of any such in the E. & S.E. coastal tribes and except in the northern parts it is too late to search for them.

In thinking over the totem question I have been coming more & more to the conclusion that the religious aspect of the totem is the more ancient & that the ^{now existing} social aspect has been tacked on at a later period and, so far as our Central tribes are concerned, your theory that each group of people ^{originally} ~~was~~ charged with the duty of securing the multiplication of the particular object the name of which it bears appears to me to fit in admirably with the facts.

In many of the Central Tribes (Arunta, Ilpirra, Warramunga etc) the ~~social~~ religious aspect is developed almost to the exclusion of the

1809
78.00
107

social while in others (Dieri, Urapunga etc) the social is more strongly developed but at the same time the presence of initiation ceremonies indicates the existence of a religious aspect which is moreover identical in nature with that of the Arunta etc system.



A rough map of Australia is perhaps rather instructive in connection with this. The dotted outline with R. indicates the area occupied by tribes amongst whom the religious aspect is predominant R+S indicates that the tribes have the same religious aspect associated with the totem but that the social (as indicated by the totemic regulative marriage) is also well developed while S. indicates that

the social aspect is the predominant one. It is also worth noting that, over the large area in the centre where conditions of life are more precarious in the matter of food & water supply, the religious aspect predominates whilst it is least marked in the area which is well wooded & watered where the food supply is more constant. This serves to indicate, so far as Australia is concerned, a relationship between food supply and the development of the religious aspect of the totemic system at the present day.

The traditions of the Arunta seem to point very clearly to the former existence of a social arrangement the leading feature of which was that men of one totem had marital relations with women of the same totem and the explicit account of the introduction of the present social organisation may perhaps be regarded as strong evidence in favour of the supposition that the latter is of comparatively recent introduction as compared with the totems. It seems most natural for a savage to reason that in just the same way in which a kangaroo animal, for example, mates with another kangaroo so a kangaroo man should mate with a kangaroo woman & so increase the number of these men in their turn could increase the number