

FRAZER

Melbourne. (54)

? 14 July 14.03.

My dear Frazer,

Your third batch of proof has come today. I really do not know how to thank you for your generous help. The minute care with which you correct them makes me feel that you are spending time upon them which you can ill spare & might be spent with very much greater profit upon your own work.

If in the preface I only say that we are deeply indebted to you for reading over & correcting our proof etc I trust that you will understand that this is only a very lame acknowledgment of our indebtedness to you.

Yesterday evening I spent some long time trying to think how I could best acknowledge your help, while writing the preface, but the result was unsatisfactory.

I noted your remark in regard to the paragraph stating that the ~~amount~~ 'tide of change' had not as yet affected

the Arunta. The 'side of change' has appeared solely to Totemic matters but I have altered the text slightly so as to make things more clear & I think that in the revised proof you will find that this is made clear.

You will before this have seen that there is a par. in slip 60 which does not quite fit in with what was written in the introductory chapter in regard to the Arunta being the most unmodified tribe in regard to Totemic matters. This chapter was written before the introductory one in fact it was really one of the first written out & in arranging the one for the press I did not properly revise it. I was thinking when writing it of one aspect of the matter only and intend to alter it so as to make it read that the Arunta nation is probably the most primitive.

I have enclosed an or two points which would you be good enough to attend in connection with the

proof. If you more you could spare time to run through this I should be most grateful & it would save some three or four months of time. All of the corrections on the slips are in red ink and so can be easily seen and of course you are at full liberty to make any alterations you think wise.

You will observe that I am as far as possible avoiding the use of the letter 'ch'. They are not at all understood by foreigners and are most puzzling & misreading. It is just as good for British readers & preferable for foreigners. In some cases where ~~the~~ a word such as Chuvica or alchovisa has been frequently used I am allowing it to stand but in other such as Chupilla & Umitchana I am altering it and am consistently (or at least hope so) using Tj in all

new words.

The proof reader must be a
demon of cuteness - he spots
every inconsistency.

I am going to detain the
proof after the relationship chapter
until after return for Lake Syre.

If we find *intichiuma* in a
'maternal' hilt in full swing &
more especially a belief in reincarnation
I shall feel inclined to call to you.
Perhaps you will think I am laying too
much stress on this matter but it seems
to me one of very considerable importance.

The *Intichiuma* chapter troubled me when
reading the proof - it is not as clear as
it might be and I rather wish it had
been somewhat expanded - however it is too
late now and of course cognate matter is
dealt with in other chapters such as that on
Intichiuma.

Yours very sincerely

W. S. Aldwin-Bences.

1) On col. 6. of slide proof
occur the words:—

~~Bat~~
Banta lilleria (i.e. name
given to Wanamunga by outsiders).

This is not quite
correct - correct term for
insertion on proof proof
will come next mail.

2) Throughout
Chupilla ^(or Tjupilla) to read
Tjupila