

the details as to the tribes of the Lake Eyre district and of the Flinders Range are substantially the same as those given in a sketch-map which accompanied one of my pioneer papers entitled "The Dieri and other Kindred Tribes of Central Australia," which appeared in the *Journal of the Anthropological Institute* of August, 1890. This was the result of investigations made from 1871 to that date. In this instance, if I were to follow Mr. Mathews's example, I might suggest that he has "ignored" this pioneer work, and express something similar to his "wondrous agreement in our details." There is, however, nothing to wonder at in the agreement of two investigations of the same subject. My statements are based upon independent investigations, made in some cases many years ago, when the results were recorded for future publications. If Mr. Mathews finds instances in which his information has a "wondrous" agreement with mine, he may rest assured that his conclusions are correct.

My information as to the Yantruwunta class-names *Tiniwa* and *Kulpuru* was received from my correspondent the Rev. Otto Siebert, and was based on his personal knowledge, in 1897.

I learn from Mr. Mathews's letter that he has sent "more than one hundred contributions to various scientific societies." I have only met with two of them, neither of which recommended itself to me by its accuracy. It is therefore difficult to understand how I can have "ignored" statements of which I am ignorant.

It will be evident that there is no foundation for Mr. Mathews's injurious insinuations, which, I regret to say, bear upon them evidence of a personal animus. The case is one of *Honi soit qui mal y pense*.

A. W. HOWITT.

Metung, Victoria, July 8.

In the foregoing remarks Dr. A. W. Howitt states that at the time his book appeared, in 1904, he was not aware that I had published a description of the *Toara* (*Dora*) ceremony, and also a map of South Australia, four years previously. It seems incredible that he did not make himself acquainted with the current literature bearing upon the Australian aborigines up to the time he published his book.

If Mr. Howitt obtained his account of the *Dora* from Mr. Aldridge in 1882, it is remarkable that he did not publish it until twenty-two years afterwards, especially as he was very prompt in publishing his report of the *Kuringal* ceremony in 1884 and the *Jeraeil* in 1885. He does not, however, appear to have had much confidence in Mr. Aldridge's account of the laws of marriage and descent in vogue among the same tribes who practised the *Dora* ceremony. He says that Mr. Aldridge sent him "a number of tables of marriages and descents, which differed considerably amongst themselves; so much so that the correctness of some of them seemed doubtful." Mr. Howitt did not run the risk of printing more than one table out of them all, but even that one is erroneous, as I have demonstrated elsewhere.

Mr. Howitt refers to a "sketch-map" published by him in 1890.² In that map he showed the *Urapuna* (my *Arrabunna*) tribe as being located away to the north of the *Awmani* (my *Ahminnie*). Not content with this inaccuracy, he increased its magnitude by placing another tribe, which he called the *Wongkurapuna*, on the east of the *Urapuna* and *Awmani*. He was, apparently, not at that time aware that the two names, *Urapuna* and *Wongkurapuna*, represent the same people, the prefix *wonk* merely meaning "speech."

Again, the *Kuyani* (my *Kooyeeunna*), which I place on the southern end of Lake Eyre, is shown on Mr. Howitt's "sketch-map" as occupying the country I have correctly allocated to the *Kutchnamootha* tribe. His map is altogether a blank as to the numerous tribes occupying the country from south Lake Eyre to Port Lincoln and Fowler's Bay. Even Mr. Howitt himself did not reproduce his own map in his book of 1904, but preferred to

utilise one which is identical with mine. Spencer and Gillen were apparently misled by the worthless map of 1890. In referring to the *Urabunna* tribe, they speak of "the *Dieri*, whose territory adjoins the *Urabunna* on the south."¹ My map shows the *Urabunna* on the western or opposite side of Lake Eyre to that on which the *Dieri* is situated.

Mr. Howitt states that he got the phratry names *Tiniwa* and *Kulpuru* independently. Even if so, he should have made himself acquainted with and referred to my prior reports of 1899 and 1900. He shirks my statement that he "had never heard of the Blood divisions," and he also passes over my claim to priority in reporting certain important facts in the sociology of the *Wiradjuri* tribes.

It is asserted by Mr. Howitt that he has only seen two of my articles on the Australian blacks. I contributed five articles to the *Royal Society of Victoria*, of which Mr. Howitt was a member, and I was told that he took part in the discussions upon some of them. They were all printed in the *Proceedings of that society*, vols. vii., ix., and x., and these volumes were issued to Mr. Howitt in virtue of his membership.

Numerous articles of mine have been published by the anthropological societies of the following places:—London, Berlin, Washington, Paris, and Vienna, as well as by other societies. I presented forty separate copies (reprints) of various papers written by me on the aborigines to the public library in Melbourne in 1899. A bibliography of nearly all the articles published by me is printed in the *Journal of the Royal Society of New South Wales*, vol. xxxviii., pp. 376–381. The whole of my works are therefore within reach of any man who wishes to consult them.

As I am about to make a strong assertion, I will confine myself to five articles published in the *Proceedings of the Royal Society of Victoria* and twelve in the *Journal of the Anthropological Institute*. If Mr. Howitt still maintains that he has not seen these seventeen articles, I cannot believe him.

In regard to Mr. Howitt's remark that where I find "instances" in which my information agrees with his I may rest assured that my "conclusions are correct," I may briefly mention that on one occasion, in 1894, I did rely on Mr. Howitt's assertion that descent in the *Kaiabara* tribe is in the male line. From personal inquiries among the blacks in 1898 I was able to correct my former statement, and to show that descent is in the female line.³ Mr. Howitt, however, repeats his former error in his book at p. 229, where he says that "descent [in the *Kaiabara*] is in the male line."

Mr. Howitt accuses me of "personal animus." There cannot be any question about the "personal animus" which prompted him to ignore my prior work, which had the effect of temporarily misleading an English reviewer. Nor can there be any mistake about the animus evinced in the statement that he has "only met with two of my papers, neither of which recommended itself to him by its accuracy." His object in both cases is manifestly to make little of my work. Even now, while he tells us that he ignored my prior work in "ignorance," he does not express any regret, but attempts to justify the course he adopted.

In the present case both authors reside in the same country and are known to each other as workers among the same tribes. I cannot help repeating that it is both "marvellous" and "wondrous" if they did not make themselves acquainted with each other's publications, especially as there were intervals of four, five, and eight years in which to do so. Mr. Howitt's experiences should be a warning to others to avoid the pitfall of claiming originality for work which has already been published some years in scientific journals of undoubted repute.

R. H. MATHEWS.

Parramatta, New South Wales.

[No further correspondence can be published on this subject.—ED. NATURE.]

¹ "Native Tribes of S.-E. Australia," p. 231.

² *Journ. Anthropol. Inst.*, xx., p. 30.

³ "Native Tribes of Central Australia," p. 59.

⁴ *Proc. Amer. Philos. Soc.*, Phila., xxxvii., p. 33c, with map.