R. Needham

Endeh: Terminology, alliance, and analysis

In: Bijdragen tot de Taal-, Land- en Volkenkunde 124 (1968), no: 3, Leiden, 305-335

This PDF-file was downloaded from <http://www.kitlv-journals.nl>

ENDEH: TERMINOLOGY, ALLIANCE, AND ANALYSIS

The aims of this paper are: (1) to establish another terminology of prescriptive alliance; (2) to indicate a further example of formal variance between terminology and alliance; and (3) to present a case of special interest in the determination of symmetry and asymmetry in the analysis of prescriptive alliance.

The sources of evidence which are drawn upon span exactly a century, from a vocabulary published in 1855 down to field enquiries made by myself in 1955.

I

Ethnographic Record

Endeh is a district composing the southern part of middle Flores, in eastern Indonesia. The population, who in 1917 numbered about 120,000, speak a language of the Bima-Sumba group. There are two main dialects, the speakers of which are known as *ata djao* and *ata akoe*, after the first person singular pronoun in each; the former dialect has a sub-dialect known as *ngao*, and the *akoe*-dialect is divided into two unnamed sub-dialects. With this brief introduction, let us take up the evidence in chronological order of publication.

A nineteenth-century description of Sumba contains an "Ende" wordlist (Anon., 1855, p. 291), which includes the following relationship terms:¹

<i>atakie</i>	man	<i>kaée</i>	brother
<i>atafaai</i>	woman	<i>kaée atafaai</i>	sister
<i>baba soesoe</i>	uncle	<i>anak atakie</i>	boy
<i>ina soesoe</i>	aunt	<i>anak atafaai</i>	girl

¹ For the reader not familiar with Dutch orthography, *ie* = *i*, *oe* = *u*, *dj* = *j*; the Dutch *w* has more the value of the English *v*.

In the genealogical specifications given later, statuses are defined by the initials of English kinship terms, with the addition of Z, sister; e.g., P, parent; C, child; FZD, father's sister's daughter.

From comparison of the terms it appears that a more exact rendering of *atakie* and *atafaai* respectively would be "male" and "female". Given the common Indonesian term *anak*, child, the last two terms would then read "son" and "daughter".

The next source to be adduced is Roos (1877), who includes a larger number of terms in his Dutch-Endehnese vocabulary:²

<i>amboe</i>	grandfather	<i>ana</i>	child
<i>amboe ata fai</i>	grandmother	<i>ana ata aki</i>	son
<i>baba</i>	father	<i>ana ata fai</i>	daughter
<i>baba soesoe</i>	uncle	<i>ané ata aki</i>	nephew
<i>iné</i>	mother	<i>ané ata fai</i>	niece
<i>ari kae ata aki</i>	brother	<i>ata aki</i>	man
<i>ari kae ata fai</i>	sister	<i>ata fai</i>	woman
<i>éedjah</i>	brother-in-law		

This list tends to confirm that *ata aki* means "male", and *ata fai*, "female"; it further raises the possibility that they can mean "husband" and "wife". Roos also supplies certain related words: *sadji*, relative, kin (p. 539); *ari kae* is also given as "family" (p. 542); *koenoe woée*, "family" in the sense of *geslacht* (p. 544), a word often used ethnographically to denote some larger grouping of relatives, such as a lineage; and *fai waroe*, widow (p. 573). The term *waroe* may be presumed related to the common Indonesian *balu*, widow; in which case *fai* might be taken as the term for "wife".

More importantly, Roos reports that marriage between "nephew" and "niece" often takes place among prominent persons, which he explains as meaning that "the son or daughter of a man [marries] the daughter or son of his own sister"; the children of two brothers or of two sisters may not marry each other. It is also stated that a prominent person (*ata nggae*) may ask for the new-born daughter of his sister as the betrothed of his still very young son (p. 523).

The most important source of information is the encyclopaedic monograph on Endeh compiled by van Suchtelen (1921). This admirably compendious work takes account of previous descriptions, including reports by administrative officers, which are used both to supplement van Suchtelen's own material and for the purpose of comparison (p. 6).

Descent, succession, and inheritance in Endeh society are patrilineal; there are patrilineal exogamous descent groups (*poe'oe*); marital resi-

² Pp. (in the order of the terms as listed here) 544, 567, 554, 551, 539, 578, 548, 577, 540, 552, 550, 572.

dence is patrilocal (pp. 68, 88-89, 102-3, 107, 108). In general, the impression given is that of a segmentary system of a familiar type. The terms of relationship are given by van Suchtelen in various forms and places: in a genealogical diagram accompanied by a list describing the application of the terms (pp. 104-6); in scattered references in the text; and dispersed throughout the vocabularies (Dutch-Endehnese, *djao* and *ngao* dialects; *djao*-Dutch; *ngao*-Dutch) towards the end of the volume (pp. 253-326; 327-55; 356-417). There is a certain amount of orthographic variation: e.g., the term for elder brother is given as *ka-éh*, *kaéh*, and *kaëh*; that for mother's brother is more variously rendered as *ěda*, *éda*, and *edda*. The terms in the consolidated list are those of the *djao* dialect, except for *ipa*, sister-in-law, which is a *ngao* word (pp. 326, 376) for which the *djao* equivalent is reported as *rimeh* or *rimè* (pp. 326, 348). These terms, re-ordered and supplied with conventional genealogical specifications, are reproduced in Table 1.

In addition to this basic list there are certain other terms to be noted. Whereas the father's eldest brother is *baba nggaé*, as van Suchtelen reports, and the youngest *baba soesoe*, the "middle uncles" are known as *baba ora*, from *ora*, middle, between (p. 343), though it is not clear whether this is a distinct jural status. Similarly, the mother's sisters are *ineh nggaé* (eldest), *ineh ora* (middle), and *ineh soesoe* (youngest). There are also a number of terms for the preceding generations, beginning with *kadjo*,³ great-grandfather, and continuing back with *iro*, *aro*, *soea*, *pameh*, *noesoe*, and finally *nangeh* in the ninth ascending generation. Van Suchtelen states that these terms are employed reciprocally (p. 106), so that they apply to the corresponding descending genealogical levels also. Among the terms for MB, *nara ineh* (literally, mother's brother) expresses the most honour (p. 106); there is no comment on *ěda*.

It is possible to compile a parallel terminology in the *ngao* dialect, by extracting terms from the vocabularies, but this terminology poses special problems which deserve separate examination, and which are difficult in any case to resolve until the *djao* terminology has been analysed. The latter is, moreover, the better known, and the one that historically is the more relevant here. A decisive factor, finally, is that van Suchtelen couches his sociological descriptions in *djao* terms.

³ *Kodja* on p. 105, but *kadjo* later (p. 106). The latter form has independent support (see sect. III below).

TABLE 1

ENDEH RELATIONSHIP TERMINOLOGY (VAN SUCHTELEN, 1921)

1. <i>amboe</i>	PP, CC
2. <i>baba</i>	F
<i>baba nggae</i>	FeB
<i>baba soesoe</i> (<i>běsoesoe</i>)	FyB, FFBS
3. <i>ineh</i>	M
<i>ineh nggae</i>	MeZ
<i>ineh soesoe</i>	MyZ, FBW, FFBSW
<i>ineh mere</i>	MBW
4. <i>kaëh mere,</i> <i>nara ineh, ěda</i>	MB
5. <i>noö</i>	FZ
6. <i>aki noö</i>	FZH
7. <i>ari kaëh</i>	B, FBS, FFBSS
8. <i>kaëh</i>	eB
9. <i>ari</i>	yB
10. <i>nara</i>	B (w.s.), FBS (w.s.)
11. <i>wěta</i>	Z, FBD, FZD, FFBDD, FFZSD, FFZDD
12. <i>nasa</i>	FZ (w.s.), FFBDS (w.s.), FFZSS (w.s.), FFZDS (w.s.)
13. <i>édja</i>	ZH, WB, FZS, FFBDS, FFZSS, FFZDS
14. <i>ipa</i>	FZD (w.s.), FFBDD (w.s.), FFZSD (w.s.), FFZDD (w.s.)
15. <i>aki</i>	H
16. <i>fai</i>	W
17. <i>rimèh, rimè</i>	WBW, HZH
18. <i>ana</i>	C, FBDC, FBDC (w.s.), FZSC (w.s.)
<i>ana toea, ana nara</i>	BC (w.s.), FBSC (w.s.)
19. <i>anéh</i>	ZC, FBSC, FZDC (w.s.)

The first important indication of the employment of the terms is that *édja*, brother-in-law, is used exclusively between men; "it is also used when the brother-in-law relationship does not yet exist, but when simply the possibility of it stands open" (p. 106). It is defined as "brother-in-law in a general sense" (p. 106), and as it is used reciprocally it must denote both ZH and WB. Similarly, *ipa*, sister-in-law, is used only between women, and it likewise denotes, not only women who are

thus related by marriage, but also those who might possibly become sisters-in-law. As a reciprocal term it will denote both HZ (w.s.) and BW (w.s.).

A report of crucial value is that "a brother's daughter is by preference married to a sister's son" (p. 107), i.e., that the preferred marriage for a man is with the mother's brother's daughter. Van Suchtelen confirms this statement with an admirably exact genealogical description of the marriage regulations (p. 115). His accompanying diagram is in a form which today is unfamiliar and inconvenient, and may be recast as in Fig. 1.

Fig. 1. Endeh marriage regulations (after van Suchtelen, 1921).

The numbers of the positions in the original diagram have, however, been retained. Nos. 1, 2, 6, 4, and 10 are "the representatives of the original tribe" (*stam*, i.e., clan), meaning that they are patrilineally related men. Nos. 3 and 5 are women who have been married out of the clan:

"Their blood may not return to the [clan], in other words the marriage of 6 and 10 to 8 or 13 is out of the question. Similarly, with 6 and 11 or 7 and 10.

9 and 12 have become blood of another [clan]. It is thus permissible for them to marry 7 and 11, and this is in fact well looked on."

Marriage is forbidden between 8 and 12, and also between 9 and 13, a prohibition which van Suchtelen believes to be a survival from an earlier matriarchy (p. 103). Incest is called *sara nara wēta*, i.e., literally, fault brother sister (p. 260).

II

Interpretations

The ethnographic evidence on Endeh has been the subject of a number of interpretations and other observations. These are all brief,

sometimes merely incidental comments or mentions, but they demand attention as the only previous attempts to assess what form of social organisation is to be found there.

Wilken, citing Roos (1877), refers to the prohibition on marriage between parallel cousins, and stresses that marriage between the children of brother and sister is permitted and frequently practised. He derives the Endeh marriage regulations from "the period of transition from matriarchy to patriarchy, when, in addition to the original prohibition on marriage between sister's children, the prohibition on marriage between brothers' children began to form" (Wilken, 1866, p. 146).

Frazer, also citing Roos (1877), writes:

"... In Endeh ... the marriage of cross-cousins is very common, and is permissible in both forms; that is, a man may marry either the daughter of his mother's brother or the daughter of his father's sister. On the other hand, ortho-cousins, the children of two brothers or of two sisters, are not marriageable; in other words, a man may not marry the daughter of his father's brother or the daughter of his mother's sister" (1919, vol. II, p. 168).

He glosses this report with the comment that cross-cousins are allowed, "or rather expected", to marry each other (p. 169).

Loeb, although writing more than a decade after the publication of van Suchtelen's monograph, cites only Frazer as his authority on Endeh. Referring to "symmetrical cross-cousin marriage in eastern Indonesia", he lists Endeh as one of the places where "a man may marry either his mother's brother's daughter or his father's sister's daughter" (1933, p. 16).

The only major interpretation of Endeh society is that of van Wouden (1935), who bases his assessment for the most part on van Suchtelen. He interprets the ethnography as stating that the system of clans (*pu'u*) is disintegrating, and that the place of these groups has been taken by patrilineages (pp. 19, 91). The marriage regulations, he asserts, apply only to traceable relatives. In contrast to the prohibition on marriage between parallel cousins, he then refers to "a preference for cross-cousin marriage in its restricted form" (p. 19). This latter description has a special analytical significance: cross-cousin marriage, he says in his exposition of technical terms which he employs, has to be distinguished according to whether the man's choice is or is not restricted to the mother's brother's daughter; if it is so restricted the type of union is referred to as "exclusive cross-cousin marriage" (p. 7). In the Endeh case, he notes, marriage with the father's sister's daughter is forbidden, but "exclusive cross-cousin marriage is not obligatory" (p. 20). Never-

theless, MBD marriage puts its stamp on kinship relations to the extent that a woman calls the children of her father's sister's son, even though she may not in fact be married to him, by the term *ana* (children) (p. 20; cf. van Suchtelen, p. 107).

Van Wouden also lays special stress on the practice of adoption, in connexion with the marriage system. If a lineage (or a family) is threatened with extinction, a small son of a son-in-law is adopted, or the son-in-law himself may be adopted, or else a complete stranger such as a slave. The adopted individual is completely incorporated into the lineage, so that for instance the daughter of an adopted son-in-law may be married to her mother's sister's son; she comes to belong to the same group as her mother and mother's sister, and therefore marries a man from the same group as that to which the husbands of these relatives belong. In such a case, she and her mother's sister marry a son and his father (p. 20; cf. van Suchtelen, p. 108). Van Wouden finds this possibility to be entirely in accord with a unilateral marriage system. He also thinks it particularly remarkable that it is precisely this relationship which is specified, and not, for example, the marriage of a son of the adopted man with his mother's sister's daughter, a marriage which similarly would not conflict with clan-exogamy but which would, however, run counter to the unilateral marriage grouping (p. 20). He later compares the Endeh system to that of Sumba — where asymmetric prescriptive alliance is practised (Nooteboom, 1940; cf. Needham, 1957) — though he distinguishes the respective forms of MBD marriage in these societies as preferential in the former and as obligatory in the latter (p. 91).

Finally, van Wouden sees a very important evidence of a former system in Endeh in the fact that if a man possesses married daughters but no son, he can dispense one of his sons-in-law of the necessity to pay bridewealth in return for the right to adopt the latter's son — in which case the adopted boy is reckoned as belonging to the generation of his mother (p. 171; cf. van Suchtelen, p. 108). This change in generation van Wouden interprets as follows (see Fig. 2). If the boy's mother belongs to matriline *a* and to patriline 1, and her husband belongs to matriline *b* and to patriline 2, their son, as member of his mother's matriline and his father's patriline, is *a2*. His adoption does not affect his membership of matriline *a*, but he acquires membership in his mother's natal patriline and thus becomes *a1*. The fact that he belongs thereafter to his mother's generation must, van Wouden infers, undoubtedly be connected with a system of marriage classes, such that

if an individual is transferred to another clan this change must *ipso facto* be accompanied by a change in generation (p. 171).

Fig. 2. Adoption of daughter's son, according to van Wouden

The last theoretical reference to be noted is a mention by Lévi-Strauss. In a passage where he traces the topographical line between systems of *échange généralisé* (such as among the Batak and Sumbanese) and systems of *échange restreint*, he lists certain societies, beginning with Endeh and Manggarai, which are said to practise "bilateral marriage" (1949, p. 572). This listing has, however, no analytical value because it is at such a remove from the ethnographic evidence (cf. Needham, 1957, pp. 168-9; 1966, p. 154 n. 16). Lévi-Strauss does not cite van Suchtelen, or even van Wouden, and instead relies on Loeb (1933); but Loeb himself relies, as we have seen, on Frazer (1919), who has actually read some of the ethnographic record, viz., Roos (1877).

III

Notes from Mamboru, Sumba

At this point we can supplement the ethnographic record with some more recent, if less certain, evidence. This consists of notes made by myself in January, 1955, on the island of Sumba.⁴ I was making a

⁴ My research on Sumba (1954-55) was carried out with the aid of a Senior Studentship awarded by the Treasury ("Scarborough") Committee for Studentships in Foreign Languages and Cultures, at the instance of the University of Oxford, to both of which bodies I am most gratefully indebted.

Since the delay before publication may appear regrettably long, I should explain that at first I made nothing of such material because I assumed that I should soon return to the island; but this proved, year after year, not to be feasible after all — and then there were the increasing pressures of teaching

preliminary and comparative study of forms of social organisation in the western parts of the island, and in the course of this enquiry I paid a brief visit to the district of Mamboru, in order to investigate the possibility of eventually making a study of asymmetric prescriptive alliance there.⁵

On the coast, not far from the rajah's residence and the administrative centre of Mamboru, is the village of Mananga ("river-mouth"), a settlement of Endehnese descended from immigrants from Flores. One afternoon I walked through the village, on the way to swim in the bay, and met a group of men repairing a boat. I stopped and conversed with them for a while, speaking Malay, and also took occasion to make some routine notes on the relationship terms and rules of marriage. The chief source of information, and the most authoritative, was Haji Abdul Fatah bin Haji Abdullah. It was by reference to his genealogy that the application of a number of terms was checked. I had not read the ethnographic literature on Endeh, and my questions were not usefully directed by the present theoretical concerns.

There have long been contacts between Endeh and Sumba, for the most part in the form of slave-taking and plundering raids on villages near the coast. I was told that a small sailing-boat, with a following wind, could make the trip from Mamboru to Endeh in about four or five days; with a contrary wind, in seven. The journey to Manggarai, western Flores, took about two days; and to Sumbawa, about three or four days. Ships from Endeh used to be a constant menace to Sumba, and from the eighteen-thirties onwards there are repeated historical references to their depredations (cf. Roos, 1872, p. 122; Wielenga, 1926, pp. 4-6, 10). The Endehnese also secured, by 1831, a monopoly on trade with Sumba, a position which they protected by murdering interlopers who came to the island (Roo van Alderwerelt, 1906, p. 243); so it appears likely that, as the modern Endehnese told me, they were

and academic administration, together with other duties and demands which have continued to divert me from my own ethnography. It is with difficulty enough that I have managed to compose the present paper, and to embody some very exiguous observations; but it is nevertheless my committed intention to concentrate much of my future work on Sumba and eventually to take up serious ethnographic investigation on the island.

⁵ I have a useful basic knowledge of the system, down to the level of the smallest alliance groups, but in the circumstances of my stay I could not make the complete record of individual marriages in all of these groups such as is essential to an adequate understanding. Failing the chance of an early return to Sumba, however, I intend to publish, when I can, a provisional account of Mamboru society.

settled at Mananga long before the Dutch government was established in Mamboru (cf. Roos, 1872, pp. 88, 89; ten Kate, 1894, p. 194). Other colonies were established at Wai Kalo, further to the west on the northern coast, and then at Kodi, the westernmost district of the island.

According to official census records,⁶ the Endeh population of Mananga in mid-1954 totalled 244, consisting of 59 men, 69 boys under the age of eighteen, 60 women, and 56 girls. These were all Muslim; there were no Muslims elsewhere in Mamboru. They speak the *djao* dialect (*jau* in my notes). There are today, it was reported, no marriages between Endehnese and Sumbanese: the former would not permit their women to marry Sumbanese unless these became Muslim, and since the Sumbanese practise asymmetric alliance and regard wife-givers as decidedly superior they would not wish to contract such marriages either; on the other hand, the Sumbanese would not wish to give one of their women to an Endehnese, for she would have to enter Islam, her children would belong to no Sumbanese clan and could claim no rights in their mother's clan, and the wife-givers would lose the paramount advantages of an alliance. Nevertheless, Roos reports that in fact many Endehnese had in his time married with Mamboru (1872, p. 88); and I myself have a record, in the genealogy of Karoku clan (Sangu Mata), of the marriage, four generations ago, of a Sumbanese aristocrat with a woman from Endeh. The Endehnese refer to themselves as Mamboru, but relations between the two peoples are said to be uneasy: e.g., in 1955 Sumbanese still made accusations that in the second world war Mananga men had falsely reported Sumbanese to the Japanese Army in an effort to get them into trouble.⁷

The burden of this information, then, is that the Endehnese in Mananga are not only of alien origin, culture, religion and language, but that they have also in fact remained a distinct and isolated community. In particular, they marry among themselves or with partners from other Endehnese settlements on Sumba. I was told, incidentally, that when a marriage was celebrated, guests would be invited from colonies as far away as Kodi, so that it was Endehnese rather than local Sumbanese social ties that were thus recognised and maintained. We may probably take it, therefore, that the descent system and the

⁶ Kindly supplied to me by the Kantor Swapradja Mamboru.

⁷ In one case, an anonymous letter (the author of which was later discovered) accused the Rajah of concealing two Dutch children; in the other, Yevangu and other men, who were talking of the impossibility of Japan being victorious, were overheard and reported to the military authorities.

marriage rules are distinctively Endehnese and not greatly affected by Sumbanese values or jural notions.

TABLE 2

ENDEH RELATIONSHIP TERMINOLOGY (MANANGA, 1955)

1. <i>ambu</i>	FF, FM, MF, MM, WPP, HPP
2. <i>baba</i>	F
<i>baba nggae</i>	FeB
<i>baba susu (basusu)</i>	FyB, MZH
3. <i>inè</i>	M
<i>inè susu</i>	MZ, FBW
<i>inè mere</i>	MBW, WM
4. <i>ka'è mere</i>	MB, WM
5. <i>no'o</i>	FZ, HM
6. <i>aki no'o</i>	FZH, HF
7. <i>ari ka'è</i>	B, FBS, MZS
8. <i>ka'è</i>	eB, WeZ, WeZH
9. <i>ari</i>	yB, WyZ, WyZH
10. <i>vàta</i>	Z, FBD, MZD, FZD
<i>vàta ana no'o</i>	FZD
11. <i>nasa</i>	MBD
12. <i>èja</i>	MBS, FZS, ZH, WB
13. <i>ipa</i>	HZ, BW (w.s.)
14. <i>aki</i>	H
15. <i>fai</i>	W
16. <i>rìnè</i>	HBW
17. <i>ana</i>	C, BC, WZC
18. <i>anè</i>	ZS, ZD
19. <i>ana ambu</i>	SS, SD, DS, DD, BCC, ZCC, WBCC, WZCC, HBCC

The relationship terms which I obtained, in the rather casual way just described, are as in Table 2. In addition to this standard list there are the following terms: *kajau*, great-grandparent; *iro*, great-great-grandparent; *aro*, great-great-great-grandparent; *pirua*, great-grand-child; *pitàru*, great-great-grandchild; *pirùtu*, great-great-great-grand-child. The suffix *atàki* means "masculine"; *ata fai*, "feminine". *Nggae* was explained by reference to elder sibling (Malay, *kakak*), with the apparent connotation of "senior"; *mere* was translated as "big" (Malay, *besar*; cf. van Suchtelen, p. 338). *Ata*, which means "man, human being"

(cf. van Suchtelen, p. 328), was explained in Malay as meaning not only *orang* but also *yang*, the relative pronoun.

When compared with van Suchtelen's list, this terminology makes an encouragingly familiar impression, but there are a few small lexical differences to be noted at this point. *Nara* is missing, and this is practically certainly the result of my failure to get a complete terminology from a woman's position. *Nasa* is defined only from a masculine standpoint (viz., as MBD, a specification not in van Suchtelen), and the denotations for a woman are lacking. *Rinè* contrasts in the medial consonant with van Suchtelen's *rimè* or *rimèh*, but I cannot so readily explain this as my own mistake (though it may well be such), for the term appears twice in one of my diagrams, drawn up as I conversed, and in the same form both times. The term *tua* (in van Suchtelen's *ana toea*) is missing, but this once again is a woman's appellation and the omission is thus presumably by my own oversight. Finally, the term *ana ambu* is recorded for "grandchild", not *ambu*, which van Suchtelen clearly reports as a simple reciprocal of the term for grandparent. In this case also, however, my notes record the term in a number of places, in response to separate questions, and there is no obvious reason why I should have got it wrong each time. In the version given to me, *ana* presumably indicates a very young person, and *ambu* is suffixed as a qualifier to indicate the genealogical level.

Traditionally, parallel cousins and the patrilineal cross-cousin might not be married, but I understand that these prohibitions are no longer strictly observed. I was even told, indeed, that all of them might be contravened, and also that a man might marry his *anè* or his *ana ambu* so long as they were classificatory relatives. The matrilineal cross-cousin, however, was still described spontaneously, in Malay, as *tunangan*, fiancée. I have no record of the exogamous groups or of the marriages contracted among them.⁸

IV

Appreciation of the Situation

Let us begin by assessing previous interpretations of the Endehnese system (section II), in order to see how much of the analytical task has already been done.

⁸ I do not need to be told that this is deplorable. My attention should not, of course, have been so confined to the Sumbanese as to miss such opportunities, but even such casual enquiries as I happened to make in Mananga can have some value, as will be seen — and the men were after all working on a boat.

Wilken's explanation of the prohibition on MZD marriage by reference to an earlier matriarchy, an idea which van Suchtelen repeats, clearly will not serve. The arguments against this kind of theory are too familiar to need repetition. All we need do, therefore, is to observe that this prohibition is in fact typical of a lineal descent system.

Neither Frazer nor Loeb makes an analysis, but each slants the ethnography a little in his narration of the facts. Frazer observes expressly that a man is "expected" to marry a cross-cousin, though Roos himself does not say so; and Loeb, by referring to "symmetrical" cross-cousin marriage, conveys the impression that marriage is not merely genealogically with either cross-cousin but is categorically with the bilateral cross-cousin.

Van Wouden's analysis presents difficulties of a more considerable nature. The first difficulty resides in his assertion that the marriage regulations apply only to traceable relatives, i.e., to those whose genealogical connexions are known, but there is nothing to this effect in the pages of van Suchtelen which he cites. Van Suchtelen in fact goes to some pains to explain that "the concept of kinship is understood in a far wider sense than among us westerners"; and he indicates that certain terms at least, viz., *ari*, *kaéh*, *baba*, and *ineh*, have an unlimited classificatory application (presumably, however, within the same line of descent in these cases) which when necessary is narrowed down by special qualifiers (p. 103). What van Wouden perhaps has in mind is the statement that the law against incest applies "in the first place" to relatives of the first, second, and third degrees (van Suchtelen, p. 114), but this does not mean that the marriage regulations apply only to traceable relatives. Van Suchtelen continues with the report that in the case of relatives in the fourth degree and further the possibility of marriage is determined according to the basic rule: "Blood which has departed from the tribe [*sc.* clan] does not come back", by comparison with water which flows from the mountains down to the sea but which does not go back to the mountains (p. 114). This rule is framed by reference to descent groups, which does not entail knowledge of genealogical connexions among individuals.

A second point is that van Wouden refers to Endeh marriage by a technical term which implies "exclusive cross-cousin marriage", i.e., with the matrilineal cross-cousin. He notes that marriage with the father's sister's daughter is forbidden, but he makes no reference to the indication in Roos (1877) that a boy may be betrothed in infancy

precisely to his father's sister's daughter. The report may be mistaken, but at least it ought to be taken into account.

Thirdly, van Wouden's belief that for a woman to call the children of her father's sister's son by the term *ana*, child, indicates MBD marriage, is not well founded. The usage accords perfectly well with a two-section terminology of symmetric alliance, and is no sure indication of asymmetric (matrilateral) alliance. The chief reason, incidentally, that van Wouden does not see this is presumably that he does not analyse or even list the terminology, even though van Suchtelen's record of it is unusually full.⁹

Fourthly, the argument from adoption cannot readily bear the interpretation that van Wouden puts upon it, viz., that the adoption of a daughter's son is a relic of a former bilineal system of marriage classes. Fundamentally, this particular issue involves the entire theoretical position which van Wouden elaborates in his monograph, and that is a large matter which cannot be gone into effectively here. It is indeed a highly arguable position, but even on its own premises the argument from Endehe adoption will not serve. In the first place, the son-in-law himself may be adopted, and in van Wouden's scheme he not only belongs to a different patriclan (2) from the adopter's but also to a matriclan (*b*) which is different from that of the adopter's wife; he thus does not possess that character — membership of matriclan *a* — which is supposed to explain the change in generation of his son if it is the latter who is adopted. This situation is even more obvious in the other possibility mentioned by van Suchtelen, namely when the man adopted is a complete stranger, even a slave. A more commonsensical, and perfectly adequate, explanation has nothing to do with bilineal descent or with marriage classes. The adopter has no son — and it is a son, after all, that he wants. No other consideration than this is required to explain why the adopted youth is assigned to his mother's genealogical level. The adopter gains an heir who is already a relative (unlike the son-in-law, perhaps, and certainly unlike the stranger), but to continue to define the adopted youth as a grandson would not supply the son whose lack is the very occasion of the whole procedure.

⁹ This fact is the more noteworthy in that elsewhere in his monograph van Wouden does resort to relationship terms — though in a rather slight fashion — in support of his argument (e.g., pp. 10, 20). The issue touches also on a general question of method in the development of the study of prescriptive alliance, but this topic will have to be gone into on another occasion.

Fig. 3. Asymmetric alliance and marriage of adoptive son's daughter

Finally, van Wouden's observations on the possible marriage of an adoptive son's daughter to her MZS are, formally speaking, quite correct; this marriage would indeed agree with an asymmetric alliance system (Fig. 3), whereas for the adoptive son's son to marry his MZD would be inconsistent with such a system. But the trouble is that van Suchtelen, although he does specify the girl's marriage to her MZS, does not say that her brother may not marry his MZD, and it may not be inferred from his silence on this point that such a prohibition exists. If it does not exist, the inference to a unilateral system has no decisive force: the girl could also marry her MZS in a symmetric alliance system — and correspondingly, in such a system, her brother could equally well marry his MZD.¹⁰

Lévi-Strauss's reference to Endeh calls for no serious notice, except perhaps the comment that, lacking any acquaintance with the evidence, he may have been induced to write of "bilateral marriage" by Loeb's report of "symmetrical" cross-cousin marriage, and thus to assign the Endeh system to the type of *échange restreint*, i.e., direct, or symmetrical, exchange.

The overall assessment of the published understanding of the Endeh system thus turns out to be fairly negative. Certainly we profit from considering these interpretations, but they are unfortunately so shallow, sometimes mutually contradictory, and demonstrably mistaken (in the

¹⁰ The situation has of course been defined in genealogical terms for the sake of the demonstration. In fact, since an adopted son belongs to his foster-father's lineage, and his son and daughter also, the latter will not be marrying individuals who are categorically MZS and MZD (viz., *ari kaéh*); their spouses will necessarily be of marriageable categories, to which parallel cousins cannot belong.

cases, that is, of those which actually examine the facts) that there is little that we can salvage from them. If we are to understand anything of the Endeh system of terminology and alliance, therefore, we have to start again from the beginning.

V

Analysis

Let us take each ethnographic report in turn, as it stands, and build up a cumulative interpretation.

There is nothing of diagnostic value in the 1855 list of terms. Similarly, the terms to be extracted from Roos (1877) are not of much use in suggesting the social forms with which they may be connected. The terminological connexion between "father" and "uncle" might or might not be significant, but the possibility that it provides the equation $F = FB$ is suggested by the distinction between "child" and "nephew, niece" ($C \neq ZC$), and these two features together would indicate a lineal descent system. The prohibitions on marriage between parallel cousins support this inference, and are themselves confirmed by the preferential marriage of cross-cousins. An extremely significant fact is that the partners in this cross-cousin marriage are not aligned by sex: the son *or* daughter of the man may marry the daughter *or* son of his sister, which means that this "frequent" form of marriage may be with a bilateral cross-cousin. Roos's statement, however, that a man might ask for his sister's daughter as future wife for his son, puts an asymmetric cast on the situation, in the form of patrilineal cross-cousin marriage.

The terminology reported by van Suchtelen bears out these preliminary indications of lineal descent. The following are some of the decisive equivalences and distinctions: $F = FB$; $M = MZ$; $B = FBS$; $FB \neq MB$; $FZ \neq MZ$; $FBS \neq FZS$; $C \neq ZC$. These features agree, of course, with the reported presence of patrilineal exogamous descent groups. In this context, however, some of the denotations of the terms are obviously inconsistent and would appear to be slips, viz., *ana*, FBDC; *anéh*, FBSC. To accord with van Suchtelen's diagram, with the other genealogical specifications for these terms, and with the structure of the system, the correct definitions must be: *ana*, FBSC; *anéh*, FBDC. Other denotations which look dubious, though less surely so, are: *ana*, FZSC (w.s.); *anéh*, FZDC (w.s.). It would seem that the specifications have been transposed. Those given might be explainable by the assim-

lation of a woman to the position of her husband, but the further specification of *ana* as FBDC (w.s.) conflicts with this possibility.

The rules of marriage may be represented in tabular form as below, where permitted and prohibited marriages are indicated by signs respectively of equation or distinction within brackets:¹¹

(i) 6 [$\neq$] 11 (FBD)	(iii) 6 [$\neq$] 8 (FZD)
10 [$\neq$] 7 (FBD)	10 [$\neq$] 13 (FZD)
(ii) 12 [$\neq$] 8 (MZD)	(iv) 9 [=] 7 (MBD)
9 [$\neq$] 13 (MZD)	12 [=] 11 (MBD)

Rule (i) reflects the exogamy of the line of descent; rule (ii) is a common classificatory concomitant of lineal descent; rule (iii) prohibits the patrilineal cross-cousin; and this leaves, by rule (iv), marriage with the matrilineal cross-cousin as the only permissible type of union among the persons represented in van Suchtelen's diagram (cf. Fig. 1).

These facts lend a special significance to the report that the terms *édja* and *ipa* are used, not only between brothers-in-law and between sisters-in-law respectively, but by individuals between whom there exists simply the possibility of affinity. The terms indicate, that is, a constant terminological relationship such as is characteristic of prescriptive alliance. The form of alliance seems to be exhibited by the equation $ZH = FZS$ (*édja*) and $FZD = Z$ (*wěta*), and by the distinctions $FZ \neq MBW$ and $FZH \neq MB$.¹² But the equation $ZH = WB$, also made under *édja*, introduces a symmetric element; this is formally inconsistent with the other diagnostic features, though it is not pragmatically out of the question.

In sum, therefore, van Suchtelen's evidence seems to reflect (with the one inconsistency noted) a system of asymmetric prescriptive alliance. These facts are by no means decisive, for the genealogical specifications reported are deficient in matrilineal denotations, and it is especially unfortunate that van Suchtelen does not supply the terms for his diagram (p. 115; cf. Fig. 1 above), but they are for the most part consistent at any rate with an asymmetric (matrilineal) ordering as in Table 3.

¹¹ The signs are in brackets in order not to permit any confusion with the conventional notation in determining the structure of a terminology.

¹² One might expect, correlatively, the equation FZD (w.s.) = BW (w.s.), under *ipa*, though only the former specification is actually reported.

TABLE 3

ENDEH CATEGORIES (VAN SUCHTELEN)

ARRANGED AS IN ASYMMETRIC PRESCRIPTIVE ALLIANCE

←		←		←		
(f.)	(m.)	(f.)	(m.)	(f.)	(m.)	(f.)
		<i>amboe</i>	<i>amboe</i>	<i>amboe</i>	<i>amboe</i>	
	<i>aki noō</i>	<i>noō</i>	<i>baba</i>	<i>inek</i>	<i>kačh mere</i>	<i>inek mere</i>
<i>wěta</i>	<i>édja</i>	<i>wěta</i>	<i>kačh dri</i>		<i>édja</i>	
<i>anéh</i>	<i>anéh</i>	<i>ana</i>	<i>ana</i>			
<i>amboe</i>	<i>amboe</i>	<i>amboe</i>	<i>amboe</i>			

This provisional characterisation of Endeh society contradicts the information supplied by Roos, for in such a system the son or daughter of a man could not marry the daughter or son of his sister; nor could anyone, prominent or not, betroth his son to his sister's daughter, i.e., in FZD marriage. These reports are mutually consistent, for there is no necessary conflict between a prescriptive symmetric system, with bilateral cross-cousin marriage, and a preference for marriage with the father's sister's daughter (cf. Needham, 1966, p. 142), but there is no means of reconciling them with the conclusion that van Suchtelen's reports describe an asymmetric prescriptive alliance system. It is evident, too, that the terms reported by Roos are in the *djao* dialect, so that it is not justifiable to infer that he and van Suchtelen are talking about different areas and about Endehnese who may have variant customs. The readiest explanation, therefore, would seem to be that Roos is mistaken: his sociological reports are extremely brief, he does not list or examine the terms but merely includes certain of them in his vocabulary, and it would be simple for him to make a slip in reporting marriage (exceptional, in any case, it appears) with the father's sister's daughter. The general contrast between his relatively slight and superficial reports and the relevant parts of van Suchtelen's

monograph is so great that, on the basis of the published information alone, we might well feel obliged to adopt the latter's account. This, then, would provisionally but quite firmly incline us to view the Endeh system as being based on asymmetric prescriptive alliance.

But this conclusion is by no means certainly correct. There is another systematic possibility which could accommodate both van Suchtelen's evidence and the apparently divergent statements by Roos. This possibility is indicated, rather unexpectedly, by the Mananga notes. In the first place, they support in all important particulars the terminology given by van Suchtelen; in the light of the primary and crucial importance of the categories, this agreement permits a most welcome confidence about the facts at issue. Secondly, and of more decisive analytical significance, the Mananga notes contain certain terms and specifications which are lacking from van Suchtelen's descriptions; these are the matrilinear and affinal denotations which furnish the grounds for the following interpretation.

Let us begin with the central genealogical level. A crucial feature is the distinct term *nasa*, MBD. Van Suchtelen reports it as denoting FZS (w.s.), and here, correlatively, it is applied to a woman who is defined as "fiancée". But this clear indication of matrilinear cross-cousin marriage is contradicted in the same level by *èja*, WB, with its reciprocal specification ZH. We have noted above the symmetric element which these specifications introduce, and this feature is now confirmed by the Mananga specification of MBS for the same term, which gives $FZS = MBS$. The set of equivalent specifications for *èja* (viz., $FZS = MBS = WB = ZH$) quite controverts the initial indication of asymmetry, even though matrilinear marriage is clearly expressed in the rules of marriage set out by van Suchtelen. Yet FZD is still clearly prohibited, by the equation $FZD = Z$ (*wěta*, *vàta*). So the masculine specifications indisputably indicate symmetry, and the feminine specifications equally unquestionably indicate asymmetry.

The sector of the terminology to which we should obviously turn next is the first ascending genealogical level. Here the asymmetric indications are just as clear in the Mananga terminology as in that recorded by van Suchtelen, viz., $FZ \neq MBW$ and $FZH \neq MB$. Moreover, the Mananga evidence adds the affinal specifications in $MB = WF$ and $MBW = WM$, giving the further asymmetric indications $FZH \neq WF$ and $FZ \neq WM$; and these are confirmed by the equations, for a woman, $FZ = HM$ and $FZH = HF$. It would appear, then, that the terms should indeed be ordered by unilateral marriages as in

Table 3, notwithstanding the bilateral import of *èja*. In this genealogical level there are no bilateral specifications, but only unilateral features.

Finally, in the first descending genealogical level — i.e., in the last remaining of the three medial genealogical levels, those which are usually of chief diagnostic value in analysing relationship terminologies — there are no decisive indications of symmetry or of asymmetry. The distinction $C \neq ZC$ is merely a common feature of lineal descent terminologies, and without further genealogical specifications, particularly affinal ones, it conveys nothing more in this case. It might be thought that the very lack of any terms for WBS and WBD (see Table 3) could be taken as a bilateral indication, but we may not resort to an argument from silence. Taken in isolation, the lack of terms for these positions is indeed consistent with symmetric alliance (with bilateral cross-cousin marriage prescribed), but the absence of report (on the part of both van Suchtelen and, more regrettably, myself) cannot be taken for an absence in fact.

If we had only these facts to go on, we might feel ourselves at this point to be inescapably in a quandary, but the results of comparative studies show us a way out of the dilemma. It has been demonstrated, namely, that a terminology of symmetric alliance can be accompanied by the regular contraction of asymmetric alliances (Needham, 1967, p. 43); and in one of the test cases adduced this combination is initially reflected in a separate term for FZD. This society is that of Manggarai, on Flores, to the west of Endeh. There is a linguistic connexion between Manggarai and Endeh, such that there is not only a structural concordance but also a similarity in some of the terms. Thus in the central genealogical level of the Manggarai terminology we find: *weta*, Z, FBD, MZD, FZD (cf. Endeh *wěta*, *vàta*); *késah*, FZS, MBS, WB, ZH (cf. Endeh *èja*); *kaé*, eB, FBS_e, MZSe (cf. Endeh *kaéh*, *ka'è*); *nara*, B (w.s.), FBS (w.s.), etc. (cf. Endeh *nara*); *ipar*, WBW, HZH (cf. Endeh *ipa*). In other levels we have: *empo*, PP, CC (cf. Endeh *ambu*); *anak*, C (cf. Endeh *ana*); *to'a*, ZD, WBD (cf. Endeh *ana tua*, BC [w.s.]). The Manggarai terminology as a whole is preponderantly symmetric in structure, and can best be represented in a two-section frame; but the contraction of alliances, ideally and in fact, is decidedly asymmetric, a unilateral feature which is marked categorically by the assimilation of FZD to Z and jurally by a prohibition on marriage with any woman of this category.

This provides us with the essential clue to the problem of symmetry and asymmetry in the Endeh terminology. Let it first be admitted that

the specifications of *èja* constrain us to posit a basically symmetric structure in the terminology. The categories can then be ordered as in Table 4.

TABLE 4
ENDEH CATEGORIES (MANANGA)
ARRANGED AS IN SYMMETRIC PRESCRIPTIVE ALLIANCE

A (m.)	←	b (f.)	a (f.)	→	B (m.)
<i>ambu</i>		<i>ambu</i>	<i>ambu</i>		<i>ambu</i>
<i>baba</i> (F, FB, MZH)		<i>inè</i> (M, MZ, FBW)	<i>inè mere</i> (MBW, WM) <i>no'o</i> (FZ)		<i>ka'è mere</i> (MB, WF) <i>aki no'o</i> (FZH)
<i>ka'è</i> (eB) <i>ari</i> (yB)		<i>nasa</i> (MBD) <i>vàta</i> (FZD)	<i>vàta</i> (Z, FBD, MZD)		<i>èja</i> (MBS, FZS, WB, ZH)
<i>ana</i> (S, BS, WZS)		<i>anè</i> (ZD)	<i>ana</i> (D, BD, WZD)		<i>anè</i> (ZS)
<i>ana ambu</i>		<i>ana ambu</i>	<i>ana ambu</i>		<i>ana ambu</i>

(In this framework it can be seen that distinct terms for WBS and WBD are indeed not necessary.) Marriage is with a woman of the category denoted by *nasa*. We do not know what the scope of application of this term may be, but given that the terminology is "classificatory in a wide sense" we can be sure that it is considerably more extensive than the individual mother's brother's daughter.¹³ A reasonable assumption is that the term denotes in general women with whom marriage is permissible. Taking the terminology to define a universe of alliance, we can say that *nasa* is the prescribed category, a fact expressed in Mananga by the explanation that such a woman (otherwise unspecified) is a "fiancée", i.e., that she is a potential wife by reason of the very appellation. By contrast, the term *vàta* calls by necessity for a situational definition: a woman of this category may be related either patrilineally, as a kind of "sister", or as a patrilateral cross-

¹³ Van Suchtelen writes as though there were indeed an expectation that the maternal uncle's daughter will be married, but he also makes it clear that this is a "preference" from which there may well be departures (p. 107).

cousin, in which case she may be specified by reference to her connexion through the father's sister, viz., as *vàta ana no'o*; as the latter, she may be defined genealogically, e.g., as father's sister's daughter, or by alliance, i.e., as the daughter (physical or classificatory) of a woman married out of Ego's patrilineage. In this light we can conceive the prescribed category as comprising all women of the opposite terminological section, and the same genealogical level, *minus* any such as are known to belong to wife-taking families or descent groups.¹⁴

Such an interpretation enables us to unravel, in a practical sense, the apparent confusion of symmetric and asymmetric features in the central genealogical level, but it leaves the unilateral cast of the first ascending level to be accounted for. The distinct terms for FZ and FZH are not logical consequences of the separate designation of FZD, as distinguished from MBD, and we know from the Manggarai case that they may not in fact accompany such a distinction (Needham, 1906, pp. 148-9; 151, Table 2). Why, then, does the Endeh terminology distinguish these statuses? The answer would appear to be that this is a convenient means of separating, in one sector of the terminology (here, in a genealogical level which is jurally decisive in any case), wife-givers from wife-takers. We do not know what are the social concomitants — in the form of prestations, comportment, etc. — of such a partition of affines, but no argument is needed to show that there may be advantages in thus defining those with jural authority over women who cannot be married.

It is worth emphasising, however, that this is a matter of social convenience, not a systematic and necessary adjustment to some other sector of the terminology. The Manggarai, for example, for whom the practical advantages of such an expedient are presumably just as real, are not constrained to have separate designations for FZ and FZH. Instead, they make a lateral differentiation in the first descending genealogical level, by the distinctions $ZD \neq SW$ and $ZS \neq DH$ (Needham, 1966, pp. 151-2). This is not a logical consequence of $FZD \neq MBD$, either, but is another form of contingent elaboration on a basically similar classification and organisation of affinal alliances.

¹⁴ This is a quite formal account, and it will be easily appreciated that in a community such as Mananga, with a population of only 244, questions of marriage may be conceived in far more individual terms. When marriages are contracted with other settlements, however, such as in Kodi or in Endeh itself, they will presumably be governed by more general considerations such as those set out here.

Even more decisively, the Garo employ a symmetric prescriptive terminology, and regularly contract asymmetric alliances, but they do not have a separate jural designation for FZD and they do not effect unilateral distinctions in either the first ascending or the first descending genealogical level (cf. Needham, 1966, pp. 143-5).

Against this formal and comparative background, we may the more readily characterise the Endeh system by the following set of features: the relationship terminology is prescriptive, and definitively symmetric; the alliance system is asymmetric; certain asymmetric indications in the terminology correspond to the unilateral (asymmetric) contraction of alliances.

VI

Concluding Observations

At this point we may think that we have come to understand better how the Endehnese order their social lives, and to the extent that we have indeed done so the undertaking has been well worth while. Technically, moreover, the system presents unusual analytical challenges, and the investigation has yielded a distinct satisfaction in this respect. Yet even if the results are conceded to be at all satisfactory, we should not conclude an analysis in social anthropology without suggesting some wider implications.

(1) A first lesson of method is provided by the relative density of the argument. Even though the investigation has not been exhaustive, let alone a total structural analysis, and although various minor problems and side-issues have been passed by, it is likely to have been found unusually taxing.

Now in other sciences it is taken for granted that a great deal of painstaking routine investigation of the sort is unavoidable, e.g., in determining molecular structure, making a spectrum analysis of stellar sources of light, carrying out an x-ray analysis in crystallography, or dissecting an organism. But in social anthropology, in spite of the increasing competence of ethnographic studies, it would be difficult to argue that the level of analytical effort is comparably impressive. Such critical investigations as the present exercise seem not to be recognised as possessing a similarly fundamental importance, and the gap between empirical observation and theoretical proposition is remarkably wide. What is surprising, too, is that this should be so especially in the sphere in which social anthropologists have been taken to be particularly

expert, namely the study of systems of descent and alliance. Rather than being in command of a body of secure knowledge about relationship terminologies and their social concomitants — as one might misguidedly believe from reading the textbooks, with their confident pronouncements about “kinship” — we are only just beginning to discern the constituent elements of such systems and how to analyse them.

The present paper, therefore, whether it is right or wrong in its procedure and its conclusions, is an attempt, at any rate, to demonstrate by example the necessity to establish terminologies and their application, in one intensive analysis after another, before any attempt at grand theory. It is only by doing so that we may hope to arrive at sound empirical generalisations and technical propositions such as will permit the enunciation of useful theoretical hypotheses.

(2) A related necessity is to make such successive analyses, not only in structurally comparable societies, but also in those that are culturally and linguistically connected. In trying to make sense of the Endeh situation we found a decisive clue in Manggarai usages, and some confidence that valid inferences were possible was supplied by certain terms common to both societies. Clearly, the more such comparisons can be made the more chance there will be of making profitable inferences, but the comparisons will be possible only when all of the distinct forms of terminology and modes of alliance in the area under study have been plotted and individually examined.

A special advantage to be expected from the structural comparison of culturally related societies is that it should help historically to resolve questions about the evolution of social forms which at present have to be answered in largely formal terms. A crucial issue of the kind, in the present context, is the significance of the combination of symmetric and asymmetric features in an alliance system. It has been suggested elsewhere that the contrast between symmetric classification and asymmetric affinal alliances, in the cases of the Garo and the Manggarai, indicates structural change (Needham, 1967, p. 44), and the same conclusion might be drawn in the Endeh case also. But this is ultimately an historical question about societies whose known histories do not provide the evidence for the postulated process. Contiguous researches might, however, provide the collateral evidence which would enable historical arguments to be framed concerning common institutions in the past and their subsequent divergent evolutions. For instance, there is little denying that the societies of Manggarai and of Endeh must be historically related; once this connexion is admitted, it becomes feasible

in principle to work out the logical possibilities present in their separate developments, and to trace a likely course of social evolution.¹⁵

(3) The Endeh system presents the issue of symmetry/asymmetry in two forms: (a) the contrast between a terminology which has been treated as symmetric and rules of marriage which are asymmetric; (b) the combination within the terminology of elements consistent with symmetric and with asymmetric prescriptive alliance. A question posed with special force by this system is whether either form of seeming inconsistency can be taken as an indication of structural change. Since condition (a) has been found among the Garo, and condition (b) in both Manggarai and Endeh, is there really any good reason to think that a combination of symmetry and asymmetry is a sign of change? Let us take the two forms of combination in turn.

(a) The work of Louis Dumont in South India has shown that unilateral marriage preferences, of varying degrees of rigour, may accompany a bilateral terminology of classical "Dravidian" form (i.e., a two-section terminology of prescriptive alliance); and the Wikmunkan case, in northeastern Australia, has clearly confirmed the operation of a comparable symmetric terminology in conjunction with a declared preference for marriage with the matrilateral cross-cousin and a prohibition on marriage with the father's sister's daughter. It has not been suggested that these are unstable systems, exemplifying stages in the development of social forms rather than satisfactory culminations, and there are no compelling reasons to do so. Why, then, should the suggestion be made that the Manggarai and Endeh systems indicate change? There is indeed no certainty to this effect, but further examination nevertheless suggests the interpretation.

The first consideration, against a world-wide background, is that the combination of symmetric terminology and strictly asymmetric (matrilateral) alliances is apparently rare.¹⁶ Even with all the familiar difficulties, taxonomic, statistical, and evidential, in making such a proportional assertion, we may still assume provisionally that such a comparatively minor incidence indicates a transitional, or even unstable, system.

¹⁵ I say that this explication is possible "in principle" because in fact there remains a great deal of work to be done, of the kind undertaken here, before it can actually be carried out convincingly.

¹⁶ In the light of conclusion (1) above, it will be appreciated that this statement is not definite, and cannot be so until more comparative studies have been made, but this seems at least to be the case.

Secondly, in the context of eastern Indonesian societies, a forceful argument is supplied by the contiguous presence of strictly asymmetric systems in which terminology and alliance are exactly congruent. Given the historical relatedness of these symmetric and asymmetric organisations, the inference is unavoidable that structural changes have been taking place. Since it is almost out of the question that initially disparate systems should have been converging upon a common social type, the inference is that the societies in the Lesser Sunda Islands formerly resembled each other more than they do now, and that they may exemplify instants in a general process of structural change. There are no indications that the asymmetric systems of Sumba (cf. Onvlee, 1930; 1949; Nooteboom, 1940), for example, are subject to any tendency towards symmetric alliance; but there are indications of some persuasiveness that the systems of Manggarai and Endeh may have been moving from symmetric alliance towards the institutional embodiment of the asymmetric tendencies which they presently exhibit (cf. Needham, 1967, pp. 44-6).

It should be made clear, however, that such an argument (even if properly developed) would not entail or imply that an Endeh-type system is inherently unstable. On the contrary, it might well persist in a steady state, for if our analysis has shown at all convincingly how the terminology is interpreted, and how it is pragmatically applied, then these are precisely its modes of operation. It is not, in a formal sense, an ideally simple and consistent way of organising social life, but there is nothing operationally self-contradictory about it. If we can see how the Endeh system works, and can give a coherent account of it, there is no hard reason to suppose that it might not in fact work as a means of ordering social affairs, generation after generation, and thus compose an integrated and enduring form of society. The argument for structural change rests on formal and historical considerations, not on any supposed internal difficulties or conflicts of an operational kind.

(b) The foregoing comments have rested on the premise that the Endeh terminology is basically symmetric, in simple contrast to the asymmetry in the regulation of marriage; but we have not yet taken into account the contrast of symmetry and asymmetry within the terminology itself. Does this also indicate the postulated evolution? Once again, comparison argues that it does.

In very many parts of the world (e.g., Guyana, Ceylon, Fiji, Australia) we find two-section terminologies which conform very closely to the simplest formal conditions of symmetric alliance. These classific-

ations are not identical in pattern, and each incorporates certain contingent features: one terminology (e.g., Akawaio) may isolate the father and mother from their respective classes; another (e.g., Lau, Fiji) may apply a reciprocal term (MB : ZS) between the constituent lines and across genealogical levels; yet another (e.g., Nambikwara) may effect lineal (vertical) terminological equations; and the Wikmunkan qualify three genealogical levels extensively by the criterion of relative age — yet, in spite of such elaborations, they maintain a constant and fundamental symmetry.

In such a comparative survey, however, the Manggarai and Endeh terminologies stand out because they introduce a classificatory element of asymmetry. In the Manggarai case this is done, as we have seen, by distinctions in the first descending genealogical level; in the Endeh case, it is the first ascending genealogical level that is thus affected. Each terminology, in its apparent singularity, and certainly by its insignificant incidence when compared with other two-section terminologies, appears to be an individual elaboration on the general scheme of symmetric prescription — and in each case the variation is in the direction of asymmetry. This, it should be noted, is not a minor or occasional jural manipulation; it is a difference in constitutive relations, i.e., in structure. It is this kind of difference, seen in the widest comparative context, which conduces to the hypothesis that the Endeh system (like that of Manggarai) exemplifies a point on an evolutionary scale.

(4) These additional considerations raise in their turn a more fundamental issue. How justifiable is it, in fact, to view the Endeh terminology as even basically or preponderantly “symmetric”? We have applied this label because of the symmetric specifications of *èja* in the central genealogical level, and these have indeed, taken in themselves, an indisputable diagnostic value. But why should even these facts count for so much when there are signs of asymmetry, equally plain, in the first ascending genealogical level? Why should not the latter be seized upon to label the system instead as asymmetric?

The genealogical level in which the asymmetry appears is not decisive. In the Manggarai case there are no asymmetric indications in the first ascending level, yet the FZD is crucially isolated from MBD in the central level, and maximum asymmetry is effected in the first descending level. In other words, while the Manggarai and Endeh terminologies are formally identical in the central genealogical level, the decisive indications of asymmetry (confirming $FZD \neq MBD$) are found in opposite levels. Moreover, the distinctions of status in the central level

do not necessarily depend upon, or entail, concordant distinctions in either of the adjacent levels. There are thus no indispensable systematic interconnexions, and hence no grounds to assign a decisive character to the features of any particular level. This conclusion means that the specifications of *èja* can claim no taxonomic priority, by the criterion of genealogical level, over those of *no'o*, *ka'è mere*, etc., in the first ascending level. We have therefore to seek some other reason to describe the Endeh terminology, on the basis of the specifications of *èja*, as symmetric.

The answer appears to lie in a fact which has already proved relevant in the analysis of the Manggarai and other systems, viz., that there is no known case of the combination of an asymmetric prescriptive terminology and a symmetric organisation of alliances (Needham, 1967, pp. 43-4). This factual circumstance supports the formal inference that this combination is structurally unfeasible. Asymmetric features can be accommodated by symmetric prescriptive terminologies, whereas the converse does not obtain. An asymmetric alliance system, such as the asymmetric Endeh terms might be taken to indicate, is inconsistent with unequivocally symmetric terms. Accordingly, in a formal sense, the co-presence of asymmetric and symmetric features in two genealogical levels of the Endeh terminology cannot be regarded as composing a structurally asymmetric classification. It is a symmetric terminology which expresses by certain distinctive features the exercise of that latitude, in the recognition of laterality, of which symmetric terminologies are typically capable (Needham, 1967, pp. 44, 46).

(5) The examination of this case has been conducted with constant reference to the distinction between symmetry and asymmetry, and the interpretation of Endeh society has concluded that it is a type of symmetric prescriptive alliance system. But this frame of exposition emphatically does not mean that the analysis is intended to contribute to a typology or to pin down the Endeh system as an example of a type or sub-type of social organisation.

Symmetry and asymmetry are formal terms, referring to principles of order which may be exemplified in a wide and unpredictable variety of institutions. They are useful in denoting logical features of modes of social classification, but their most effective employment does not consist in the construction of a sociological scheme of types. Rather, they are analytical notions which permit the determination of structure in variant social facts. But this does not mean that the systems which they define are no more than ideal types, hypothetical constructs existing

merely in the head of the social anthropologist.¹⁷ There exist prescriptive alliance systems which are in empirical reality rigorously symmetric, and there are other integral systems of the kind which are equally strictly asymmetric. These formally opposed types of social order exist, it may be postulated, because in the establishment of institutions the same logical possibilities and constraints have guided their fabricators, consciously or unconsciously, as are present to the mind of the social anthropologist. But logical requirements and categorical proclivities do not predetermine any rigidly entailed processes of social classification; even within a sphere defined by the absolute criterion of prescription, a degree of systematic variation is possible, and societies in different circumstances (historical, ecological, etc.) may adopt variant means of exploiting this latitude.

The initial theoretical difficulty in understanding Endeh society is not so much that it falls on a typological borderline, but that the conventional inclination is to approach it typologically in the first place. Yet one of the main lessons that the analysis of it teaches is precisely the defective and premature nature of empirical typologies of systems of prescriptive alliance. Not only does the Endeh system combine symmetric and asymmetric features, but the study of it has demonstrated just how exact and full the ethnographic record has to be if a valid structural determination is to be made. The very difficulty in deciding whether a slightly incomplete terminology, lacking only a very few terms or genealogical specifications, is symmetric or asymmetric, indicates, in turn, how tenuous may be the line between symmetric and asymmetric systems, and how readily the one type may be converted into the other (cf. Needham, 1967, p. 44).

In analysing a case such as the Endeh system, therefore, we should not be much concerned to show that it is symmetric or that it is asymmetric, in an endeavour to assign it to a place in a sociological typology. We should instead try to understand it by ascertaining the distinctive features of the particular arrangement by means of which it takes advantage, integrally or in limited sectors, of elementary principles of social classification.

University of Oxford, Sept. 1967

RODNEY NEEDHAM

¹⁷ Still less does it mean that they are, to cite one ignorant quip from the sidelines, the products of some "gross manipulation" of ethnographic evidence.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Anon.

- 1855 Beschrijving van het eiland Soemba of Sandelhout. Tijdschrift voor Nederlandsch-Indië, vol. 17, pp. 277-312.

Frazer, J. G.

- 1919 Folk-lore in the Old Testament: studies in comparative religion, legend and law. (3 vols.) London: Macmillan.

Kate, Herman F. C. ten

- 1894 Verslag eener reis in de Timorgroep en Polynesië. Leiden: Brill.

Lévi-Strauss, Claude

- 1949 Les Structures élémentaires de la parenté. Paris: Presses Universitaires de France.

Loeb, E. M.

- 1933 Patrilineal and matrilineal organization in Sumatra: the Batak and the Minangkabau. American Anthropologist, vol. 35, pp. 16-50.

Needham, Rodney

- 1957 Circulating connubium in eastern Sumba: a literary analysis. Bijdragen tot de Taal-, Land- en Volkenkunde, vol. 113, pp. 168-78.
 1966 Terminology and alliance, I: Garo, Manggarai. Sociologus, vol. 17, pp. 141-57.
 1967 Terminology and alliance, II: Mapuche, Conclusions. Sociologus, vol. 18, pp. 39-53.
 [1968] Gurage social classification: formal notes on an unusual system. Africa, (in press).

Nooteboom, C.

- 1940 Oost-Soemba: een volkenkundige studie. Verhandelingen van het Koninklijk Instituut voor Taal-, Land- en Volkenkunde van Nederlandsch-Indië, deel 3. 's-Gravenhage: Martinus Nijhoff.

Onvlee, L.

- 1930 Opmerkingen over verwantschapsbetrekkingen bij de Soembanezen. Tijdschrift voor Indische Taal-, Land- en Volkenkunde, vol. 70, p. 343-7.
 1949 Naar aanleiding van de stuwdam in Mangili. (Opmerkingen over de sociale structuur van Oost-Soemba). Bijdragen tot de Taal-, Land- en Volkenkunde, vol. 105, pp. 445-59.

Roo van Alderwerelt, J. de

- 1906 Historische aantekeningen over Soemba. Tijdschrift voor Indische Taal-, Land- en Volkenkunde, vol. 48, pp. 185-316.

Roos, S.

- 1872 Bijdrage tot de kennis van taal, land en volk op het eiland Soemba. Verhandelingen van het Bataviaasch Genootschap van Kunsten en Wetenschappen, deel 36, pp. 1-160. Batavia.
 1877 Iets over Endeh. Tijdschrift voor Indische Taal-, Land- en Volkenkunde, vol. 24, pp. 481-582.

Suchtelen, B. C. C. M. M. van

- 1921 Ende (Flores). Mededeelingen van het Bureau voor de Bestuurszaken der Buitengewesten, bewerkt door het Encyclopaedisch Bureau, Aflevering 26. Weltevreden.

Wielenga, D. K.

- [1926] Soemba. (Onze Zendingvelden, 5.) 's-Gravenhage: Algemeene Boekhandel voor Inwendige- en Uitwendige Zending.

Wilken, G. A.

- 1886 Plechtigheden en gebruiken bij verlovingen en huwelijken bij de volken van den Oost-Indischen Archipel. Bijdragen tot de Taal-, Land- en Volkenkunde van Nederlandsch-Indië, vol. 35, pp. 140-219.

Wouden, F. A. E. van

- 1935 Sociale Structuurtypen in de Groote Oost. Leiden: Ginsberg. [English edition, translated by Rodney Needham: Types of Social Structure in Eastern Indonesia. (Koninklijk Instituut voor Taal-, Land- en Volkenkunde, Translation Series, 11.) The Hague: Martinus Nijhoff, 1968.]