D. Eyde

On Tikopia social space

In: Bijdragen tot de Taal-, Land- en Volkenkunde 125 (1969), no: 1, Leiden, 40-63

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

ON TIKOPIA SOCIAL SPACE

The purpose of this article is to discuss recurring patterns in the way the Tikopia organize space.¹

I. THE BINARY PATTERN

One pattern, which consists of two halves, four corners, and a central position, is found in several areas of Tikopia culture.

The house. Firth (1936:75-81) describes the layout of the Tikopia house.

The house itself is termed *te paito*. The general floor space is divided into three rather amorphous sections without clearly defined boundaries. The central area is known technically as *roto a paito*, or *roto tonu*, the middle of the house. It is common ground to all the members of the household, objects brought in from outside are temporarily set down there, meals are spread out, and it is a kind of neutral area for the performance of all sorts of activity. On the one hand lies *mata paito*, on the other *tuaumu*. The former signifies literally the "face" or "eye" of the house; it is the ceremonial side, where men alone may sit, and on which food is laid out in a ritual manner. In many houses a large portion of it, that towards the eaves, remains permanently unoccupied, except during a

¹ I wish to acknowledge the courtesy of George Allen and Unwin Ltd. and the Athlone Press in giving permission for the quotations used. A preliminary draft of portions of this paper was presented at the Eighth Annual Meeting of the Kroeber Anthropological Society, held at the Claremont Hotel, Berkeley, California on April 25, 1964. That draft was published in the Papers of the Kroeber Anthropological Society (Spring 1964). This article constitutes a revised analysis of the original and additional material. It suggests considerably different conclusions. I am indebted to Mrs. N. Rosen who first suggested to me the application of alliance theory to the Tikopia and pointed out the incompatibility of sister-exchange with the organization of the Tikopia kindred. I am also indebted to Mr. Richard Lowenthal, whose unpublished paper, *Samoan Structures* (1967), brought to my attention the similarity between Samoan and Tikopia descent groups. Dr. Thomas Zuidema read an earlier version of this article and made many valuable comments. Finally, I should like to thank Dr. Raymond Firth for discussing the article with me. Dr. Firth's help is especially appreciated, for I know that he does not agree with my conclusions. Since our differences appear to result more from differences in theoretical approach than from disagreement over the ethnographic facts, I nevertheless feel that the points made here may have validity.

funeral. It is treated with respect, in that people do not turn their backs towards it, and when they lie down to sleep they orient their heads in that direction — or at least refrain from pointing their feet thither. The opposite side, *tuaumu*, signifies literally, "the back of the oven," though the expression is really figurative. Here are the household fires, close to the wall, and in their vicinity sit the women and children, facing towards *mata paito*. If the terms are not understood in too strict a sense, *tuaumu* may be called the profane side of the house, as against *mata paito*, the sacred side, with *roto a paito*, the centre, as neutral ground between them (Firth 1936: 75-77).

The use of the various doorways depends upon their position in relation to *mata paito*. This is always left blank of entrances. *Tuaumu* contains the side entrances used normally by women and children, and casually by neighbours living on that side or by men going to the cook-house. For more ceremonious purposes men go in by a doorway at the end of the house, near which the most obvious path runs. Entering by this it is usual to find one has *mata paito* on one's right hand, *tuaumu* on one's left (Firth 1936: 79).

Another feature of the house demands attention. As part of its structure four stout posts stand some distance in from the corners. ... It is a mark of some consideration to be allowed to use a house-post as a back-rest; women do not share in this privilege, held only by the senior male members of the household. ... In an old house or that of a man of rank a certain precedence is followed. One of the posts on *mata paito* is the private back-rest of the head of the house; the others may be left vacant as posts for occasional visitors of importance, or for religious reasons may never be utilized at all. The posts on *tuaumu* will serve the resident brothers or married sons of the head of the house (Firth 1936: 80).

Thus the typical house plan is based upon a pattern of a rectangle with four corners marked by posts which are ranked and used as backrests.² The rectangle is divided into halves which are, respectively, "left", "female", and relatively "profane", and, on the other hand, "right", "male", and relatively "sacred". The two halves are "merged in a central area which is a neutral ground between them."

The world around Tikopia. The Tikopia think about the world beyond their shores in a similar manner.

The Tikopia of course traditionally had no compass points, but they divided the circle of their horizon up into something very like it, in the form of wind points — the directions from which the major winds come. Each of these major wind points, of which there are four, is the home of a major deity of the Tikopia, who is a prime clan and lineage god. He controls the wind and weather from that particular direction. ... Each of these quarters, as we may call them, is in spirit terms made up of a number of *Rangi*. Names are given to these heavens, according to their various characteristics. They are arranged in layers. ... In the topmost division lives the deity who is known as the Post or Stay of the Heavens, the controller, who presides over his whole set of heavens (Firth 1955: 339).

² Large houses are constructed with a supporting post at each end to carry the weight of the ridge pole (Firth 1936: 76 and 1940: 199). They thus stand between *mata paito* and *tuaumu*. I am not certain whether these "extra" poles have any significance for the pattern I am discussing. See note 5 below.

The surrounding world, then, like the house, has four posts, each marking a quadrant associated with a particular clan deity.³ One can infer that there is also a division of the surrounding world into halves. The Tikopia divide the year into two seasons, the trade wind season when the wind blows generally from the southeast, and the monsoon season when the winds blow in general from the opposite direction (Firth 1940: 2-3). Given that each of the four quadrants of the universe is identified with a wind direction, it follows, logically at least, that two of them must be paired as sources of the trade winds and two must be paired as sources of the monsoon.

The major rituals performed by the Tikopia, called collectively the Work of the Gods, are divided into two seasonal cycles: the Work of the Monsoon and the Work of the Trade Wind (Firth 1940 *passim*). The Work of the Monsoon is devoted almost entirely to male deities. The work of the Trade Wind also involves extensive rituals which are devoted to male deities, but there is much more attention devoted to female deities.⁴ I judge that the monsoon season is symbolically male and that the trade wind season is symbolically female.

If these inferences are correct, the world that surrounds the Tikopia has, like the house, four principal posts and is divided into two halves, one being symbolically male, the other symbolically female. Since the four wind directions are reckoned from Tikopia, it follows that the island itself occupies the central position in this pattern.

The island of Tikopia. The island of Tikopia appears to be organized in the same way. It is divided into two halves: the districts of Faea

³ Dr. Firth (personal communication) points out that in fact there is a fifth wind point. The fifth point corresponds to a lesser Kafika deity and is in the Kafika quadrant. These facts seem to me to make it comparable to the "extra" slabs on Marae — discussed below — and to permit me to continue to speak of four principal posts corresponding to four quadrants.

⁴ Dr. Firth, who disagrees with the chain of inferences made here, particularly doubts that the Work of the Trade Wind places very much greater emphasis upon female deities than does the Work of the Monsoon. Even after reviewing the data, I am still struck by the following. The Rituals of the Glades (Firth 1940: 303-331), performed only during the trade wind season, deal largely with female deities: Nau Fiora, the Atua Fafine, and Pufine Ma. An important part of these rituals is the presentation of food to the chief of the clan by men who have married women of the clan during the previous year. The Ritual Extraction of Turmeric (Firth 1940: 332-369), also performed only during the trade wind season, and the central focus of the concluding half of the Work of the Trade Wind, deals primarily with female oven deities. All these rituals involve extensive participation by women, which is not the case with most of the rites of the monsoon season.

and Ravenga. The sacred center of the island lies in the area of Uta, which is special in a number of respects, although it is reckoned a part of Ravenga. The people of Faea and Ravenga have a ritually competitive relationship, but cooperate jointly in the sacred ceremonies at the dance place called Marae in Uta (Firth 1936:70-75 and 1940 *passim*). One would expect that there would be four "corners" of the island, each associated with a particular clan, but there is no evidence for this. Nor is there any evidence that the two districts are "male" and "female", respectively, unless one takes over-seriously the following remarks by Firth (1936:72).

Not long after my arrival in Tikopia I expressed the opinion that with a little effort of the imagination one could see in the inhabitants of each district characteristics corresponding to the nature of the coast on which they lived. The people of Faea appeared smoother in address, more peaceful, less boisterous, less wild in feature, conforming to their residence on a lee shore; those of Ravenga, as befitted their rougher weather coast, seemed more rugged and unkempt, louder voiced, excelling in manly sports. Later residence in Ravenga itself caused me to reject this pathetic fallacy, and to attribute the difference, where it was still evident, to the personal characteristics of a few outstanding families, notably those of the chiefly line of Tafua on the one hand, and Taumako on the other.

Marae. Just as Tikopia lies at the center of the surrounding world, so the principal dance place, Marae, lies at the approximate center of the island.

The dancing place in Uta is known as *Marae*. The term is applied descriptively to other open spaces used for religious rites, but is reserved as a proper name for this one alone, which is the chief of them all. Marae is one of the most sacred spots in Tikopia, both from its general association with religious rites, and also, more particularly, because in it stand a number of rough slabs, each of which is representative of one of the chief gods of the island. According to native ideas the slab serves as his "seat" or more strictly, back-rest, during any *kava* ceremonies performed there. These stones are not regarded as *atua* in themselves but are spoken of as the embodiment (*fakatino*), or confirmation (*fakapatonu*), of the *atua*. Each male *atua* is said to sit cross-legged with his back against his stone; the female *atua* to sit with legs straight out before her. The custom of gods thus agrees with that of men (Firth 1940:207).

The layout of Marae (Firth 1940:207-211) is fairly complex when all details are taken into account, but the following characteristics stand out. In one corner are two stones representing the back-rests of the twin brothers who are ancestors to the Kafika clan. These twins are known as Pu Ma. In the next corner, going counter-clockwise, is the stone of the Atua i Taumako, deity of the Taumako clan; in the next, the stone of the Atua i Tafua, of the Tafua clan; and in the fourth corner, the temple of Rarofiroki, for the deity of the Fangarere clan,

who does not have a stone back-rest, but uses the temple as a seat.

During most of the rites of Marae each of the four clans of Tikopia

...had its basic station; this was in the rear of its own chief, his seating-mat being near the seat of his principal god. ... Thus the chiefs and their clansmen were roughly at the four corners of a rectangle, each group facing towards the centre of Marae (Firth 1940:211).

On other occasions, the population of the island is divided in a different way on Marae. Then, when there is interaction between men and women (Firth 1940:232-238 and 246-254), the men gather at one side of Marae, called Raromiro, while the women gather at the other side, Rarofetaka. The stones of the deities of Tafua and Taumako are on the Raromiro side; Kafika and Fangarere are on the Rarofetaka side.⁵

On the Rarofetaka, female, side of Marae is a stone symbolizing the Atua Fafine, the female deity. This stone receives no ritual attention and clearly represents a sort of abstract female principle rather than a deity being actively worshipped. On the Raromiro, male, side of Marae is a stone representing the Atua i Kafika, a god of the Kafika clan, and the supreme deity of Tikopia (Firth 1961:94-108). It is important to note, however, that the Atua i Kafika is never dealt with in a ritual manner at his stone. Not even a single kava libation is poured to him in this position during the course of the ceremonies on Marae. In his position on Raromiro, the Atua i Kafika appears to represent an abstract male principle rather than a deity being actively worshipped. When the Atua i Kafika is first dealt with ritually in the ceremonies on Marae (Firth 1940:270-273), he is associated with a sacred fire at its center. Throughout the ceremonies of Marae, it is this central position which is of the utmost importance.

There are other, less important, deities represented by slabs on Marae. With one puzzling exception, the Atua i Niumanu, these are all in the corners of the clans with which they are principally associated.

Marae also reveals a pattern of a rectangle divided in half with the equivalents of posts, back-rests, at each of the four corners. Like

⁵ In my earlier discussion of this matter (Eyde 1964) I had not noted the division between Rarofetaka and Raromiro, and suggested that the two large mounds of kava refuse which are to be found on Marae corresponded to a division between male and female sides. This was clearly an error. Probably the kava mounds have something to do with the cross-cutting division of Marae and Tikopia society into two clans whose totems are tree crops and two clans whose totems are root crops. It can not be missed that the mounds are in approximately the same positions as the two "extra" posts discussed in note 2.

the house posts, the clans and their associated deities are ranked relative to one another (Firth 1961: 32). The two sides are associated with males and females respectively. The central position is associated with the supreme deity of Tikopia.

The family. Obviously, the layout of the house implies a similar conceptual division of the nuclear family, which is also termed a *paito* (Firth 1936: 346). This requires no further discussion except to note that on the female side of the house one would expect to find not only the wife of the head of the family, but also his daughters.

The "house" as complex descent group. Before discussing this aspect, it will be best to present a number of questions from Firth's writings.

The term *paito* in the most concrete sense indicates a house, a building in which people live. By a fairly obvious transference of meaning it may also refer to the family living therein. But in another sense it is the recognized designation for the kinship unit constituted by a number of households living under different roofs (Firth 1936: 346).

The influence of the patrilineal principle is extremely strong in the overt legal sphere of Tikopia social relations. Descent is patrilineal and under no circumstances can a person belong to the "house" of his mother as against that of his father. Succession is as strictly in the male line (Firth 1936: 346).

Normally, the *paito* comprises a group of brothers and first or second cousins in the male line with their children and grand-children, and also the sisters, father's sisters and daughters of these people. The children of any of these females belong primarily not to their mother's but to their father's *paito*. It would seem, however, that a Tikopia may legitimately speak of his own mother's and mother's brother's group also as "his" *paito*, but such a usage apparently implies the recognition of the importance of this type of kinship bond rather than of any actual principle of matrilineal descent (Firth 1930: 22).

Seremata, who was always desirous of explaining social forms, discussed these terms. He said "*E afu mai mai te paito te fafine, mai te tuatina. Kuou e afu mai sa Raropuka, toku tafito sa Raropuka; a kuou te Taumako; tera tukutukukunga o femua tera.*" "One springs from the family of the woman, from the mother's brother. I spring from sa Raropuka; my origin is sa Raropuka; and yet I am Taumako; that is the custom of this land." As he said again, "*E rua oku tafito; tafito foki toku mana foki.*" "My origins are two; I originate from my father too." A person usually speaks of the family group of his father as "*toku paito*," "my house," and that of his mother as "*te paito kuou ne afu mai i ei*," "the house from which I sprang."...

It might be gathered from this that *afu* is a term used to refer to the specific linkage of a person with his mother's kin. It is certainly used most commonly in this connection, but not exclusively. The following examples show that it has a wider interpretation. A man said, "*Kuou ka nofonofo lavaki, aku tama tera oku afu. E afuafu i a kuou.*" "I shall dwell on then and die, but my children, there are my descendants. They have sprung from me."...

The word *afu*, it may be noted, is not equivalent to "being born" in the ordinary sense; it is a concept of social and not physiological nativity. Though in common with *tafito*, it is used to describe the connection with either the father's or the mother's kinship group; the use of such terms of origination in respect of the latter, in a society where physiological paternity is combined with patrilineal filiation, indicates again the importance which these natives place upon the preservation of the matrilineal tie. An elaboration of *afu* is *maafuafu*, a term used mainly in ritual formulae. It signifies "to breed, to have descendants" (Firth 1936: 231-232).

Women occupy a peculiar position in regard to the holding of land in Tikopia. They have an interest in the lands of their father and this interest they pass on to their own children, but the inheritance goes no further than this. Strictly speaking, it is not inheritance, for the death of the mother obliterates the claim. It can be best described as an interest only in the land and not a clear title to it; the land is held in perpetuity in the male line. The situation is analogous to the position of the *tama fafine* (distaff line) in regard to the *tama tane* (male line) in Samoa, though it is not clear from the work of Margaret Mead and others just where in that community the interest through the female stops (Mead 1930) (Firth 1936: 391).

The main social interest of the mother's group tends to centre in the *tuatina*, the mother's brothers and her less immediate relatives of the same status. ... For convenience I shall often speak of "the mother's brother," but everyone who is a *kave* [male of same generation] of the mother comes in this category, and each of her children is a charge upon the sympathy and wealth of this whole group. A nephew or niece is known for ceremonial purposes as a *tama tapu*, sacred child, and the transmission of gifts from *tuatina* to *tama tapu* is one of the most important economic phenomena in Tikopia.

As with *tuatina*, so also with *tama tapu* — they are graded in importance according to their propinquity of relationship. In the "house" of Tafua, for instance, the principal, *te matua tama tapu*, is Pa Motuangi, son of the chief's full sister. Next in order come Tofiariki and the other children of the chief's daughter, Nau Tekaumata, with Afirua and his brethren, children of Nau Rangiriko, who is the chief's half-sister (their mothers being different). Nau Nukuarofi, another daughter of the chief, and her husband usually receive gifts too when a distribution is made to *tama tapu*. They are childless, but as the natives say, "they are not rejected" on that account; the gift is really made to the family in which the *tama tapu* are born, and is in part a recognition of the services of the son-in-law. Of lesser account are the children of the daughters of the chief's brothers and the children of the daughters of the chief's sisters, though in any large distribution they are not omitted. Strictly speaking, the former are the *tama tapu* of the chief and the latter of his sons, but this distinction is largely immaterial; the "house" normally counts its *tama tapu* as a whole. Children of more distant female cousins of the chief could be included too, but normally the tie in such case is too weak to be actively maintained in terms of economic reciprocity (Firth 1936: 202-213).

Among men the obligations of the *soko* [cooks — a position held by wife-taking men] are not entirely without recompense. Not only have they so to speak been "paid in advance" by the reception of the women in marriage, but their performance on certain occasions, as at initiation ceremonies, entitles them to gifts and food. Here as elsewhere the principle of individual distinction on the basis of primacy of kinship bonds is in operation. The principal cook is distinguished

from those of more distant connection and rewarded accordingly. Thus in anything that the Tafua family does the *rafie e mua*, literally the "foremost fire-wood" is Pa Motuangi. It will be remembered that he is also the principal *tama tapu* of these people. Here is another instance of representative status, for he is acting in this capacity of cook for his father, long since dead, who was the true brother-in-law of the chief. Seconding him come Pa Tekaumata and Pa Nukuarofi who have married the chief's daughters. Later in status come members of the family of Rangirikoi, since Nau Rangirikoi, though a *kave* of the chief, is but a half-sister, and her mother was secondary (*fakamurimuri*) to his in the polygynous household. All these people are *soko*, but the distinction between them is very clear — further proof, if need be, of the recognition of the personal factor in classificatory kinship usage. The persistence of such ties is seen in the case of Pa Motuangi, who still comes to play his part at the oven though his father and his mother, the basis of the obligation, are both dead (Firth 1936: 306).

These three men [recipients of a portion of the bride-wealth at a marriage ceremony] are the chief representatives of the branches of the house of Maniva, the members of which are the "cooks of the house of Ngatotiu" on account of a former marriage. In comment on the presentation of gifts from the house of the bridegroom to these folk whose linkage is with the house of the bride, it was said, "Cooks in this land are never rejected" (Firth 1936: 553).

By Tikopia tradition [*Te Ara o Pu* — a gift of food made by the Taumako clan to the Kafika clan during the Work of the Gods] is attributed to the act of Pu Lasi, "Great Ancestor," the progenitor of Taumako, son of Te Atafu the Tongan. The latter married a daughter of the Ariki Kafika of the time, the "chiefly woman." Their son, accompanied by his mother, brought one day a present of food to his grandfather, a token of affection not at all uncommon in Tikopia life. The old man said to his grandchild "Come you and lay it down." The gift was continued annually and after the death of the two persons concerned was perpetuated by their descendants, thus becoming symbolic of the tie of relationship between their clans. Irrespective of the individual kinship between the chiefs of Kafika and Taumako, for ceremonial purposes the Ariki Taumako behaves to the Ariki Kafika as a man does to his mother's kinsman, in virtue of this tie of many generations ago. The *Ara* is the most formal occasion on which the relationship is expressed (Firth 1940: 133-134).

An important feature of the rites of Somosomo (and of Fiora also) is the presentation of food to the chief of the clan from men who have married women of the clan during the past year. This gift is known as the *roi*. . . . At the first Somosomo celebration following the marriage the gift is of considerable proportions, and is termed the "new *roi*." For the second and possibly subsequent years the gift is much smaller, and is called the *peni roi* or "little *roi*" (Firth 1940: 393).

A presentation of the *peni roi* of particular interest is that made on behalf of the Ariki Taumako. Between chiefly families, if ancestors of note have been involved in the preliminary obligation, their descendants in subsequent generations take pride in continuing the bond. Taumako remember that the great founder of their clan was the offspring of Te Atafu the Tongan and Matapono the daughter of the Ariki Kafika of the day, hence as the fruit of that marriage, each chief of Taumako sends his contribution of food every year to Somosomo (Firth 1940: 396).

It is clear that the term *paito* is used by the Tikopia to designate patrilineages. I judge, however, that there is firm evidence that in some contexts, at least, the term refers to the entire cognatic stock descended from a particular ancestral couple. From this point of view, a minimal "house" consists of an ancestral couple, their children, and their grandchildren. Their daughters' children constitute reciprocating offshoots of the patrilineage which bears the "house" name. They receive gifts from their mothers' brothers and mothers' brothers' sons, and serve as cooks in return. I infer from the fact that such a group may be termed a "house" that the original spatial division of the family is projected on to the extended group, and that the sons and their children make up a "male" side of the "house", while the daughters and their children make up the "female" side.

Land use rights are restricted to the children of women of the patrilineage, but the men of the patrilineage term not only their sisters' and daughters' children *tama tapu* but also their sisters' childrens' children and daughters' childrens' children. These more distant kin also serve as cooks and receive and give gifts. The "house" may thus be extended to include several generations. Such a "house" must necessarily include other, subsidiary, "houses", as shown in Figure I.⁶ Obviously, such a mode of conceptualization of descent could be followed for an indefinite number of generations. At some point one would expect to find subsidiary "houses" occupying, conceptually, four corners and the center of the ancestral "house". I will return to this.

The kindred. At certain times, the personal kindred is organized spatially in a binary pattern. A named assemblage of kin, the *kano a paito*, includes the consanguineal kin of ego, traced to an indefinite degree of collaterality, and the wives of consanguineally related men (Firth 1936: 226-230). Husbands of consanguineally related women are not normally considered members of the *kano a paito*. Nevertheless,

⁶ Such a conceptualization of descent is reported for another western Polynesian group, the Samoans. In Samoa, the descent group termed a sept by Ember (1959: 574-575), is divided into two sub-septs, *fale tama*. (The "house" terminology will be noted.) One sub-sept consists of people claiming descent from the common ancestor's brother or son; the other consists of people claiming descent from his sister or daughter. The sex of more recent ancestors is irrelevant. Within each sub-sept are segments in which the descendants of a common ancestor in the male line are balanced against the descendants of the women of the family. The male side is termed *o tama tane*; the female side is termed *o tama fafine*. The *tama tane* group is localized, while the *tama fafine* group is typically dispersed in patrilocal marriage (Mead 1930: 18).

they function individually as members of ego's personal kindred (Firth 1936: 227-230; 233; and 401).

The subdivisions of an unborn child's personal kindred are already visible at the time of the marriage of the child's parents. The paternal and maternal kin of the groom assemble gifts for the bride's kin inside the house of the head of the groom's family. Aside from goods given

FIGURE I

Suggested model of the Tikopia conceptualization of the "house" as descent group.

to the chief of the bride's clan, the bride wealth is divided into two parts: *te koroa fai matua* — gifts to the bride's paternal relatives — and *te koroa fai tuatina* — gifts to the bride's maternal relatives. Two groups of men attend as cooks: the *soko fai matua* — husbands of daughters of the groom's family — and the *soko fai tuatina* — husbands of sisters' daughters of the groom's family. Probably, as in other rites of passage, which I will describe, the sons of the *soko fai matua* are grouped with their fathers, though Firth does not note this specifically in his discussion of the marriage rites. The two groups of cooks have

their principal work outside the house at the ovens, on the *tuaumu*, female, side of the house. The two groups of relatives of the bride stay at their homes, but the gifts which are carried to them are first set out on the *mata paito*, male, side of the house (Firth 1936: 550-556 and 1939: 320-324).

During the post-natal ceremonies (Firth 1956: 46-59), performed after the birth of first sons and daughters, the same subdivisions re-appear. During the early part of the ceremonies, the *fare nana*, composed of women of the child's mother's father's family and of women of the child's mother's mother's family, ceremonially "put the mother to sleep" in mats or bark-cloth. The subsequent fire ritual, or *afi*, is performed over the baby by the child's mother's brothers, who are, of course, brothers of some of the women of the *fare nana*. The *fare masikitanga*, composed of the sisters or equivalent female kin of the child's father, ceremonially "put the baby to sleep" at the same time that the mother is "put to sleep". Firth says little about the male kin of the child's father, but at least the men of the father's patrilineage take some unspecified part as patrilineal representatives, *paito te memea*. The husbands of daughters of the child's father's family and their sons and the husbands of sisters' daughters of the child's father's family serve as cooks. Just as the kin of the bride were associated with *mata paito* during the marriage celebration, so now the child's mother's brothers sit on the *mata paito* side of the house during the fire ritual. The cooks must still be associated with the oven.⁷

The same pattern is found during the initiation ceremonies carried out for boys (Firth 1936: 418-467).

⁷ Despite these general similarities between the spatial arrangement of kin during the post-natal ceremonies and the spatial arrangements in other rites of passage, the two most important rites of the post-natal ceremonies, unfortunately for the argument being presented here, differ subtly in their spatial arrangements from that encountered in the other rites of passage.

The typical arrangement of the kindred, as already observed in the discussion of the marriage ceremony, involves five groups, two on either side of the house, and ego's own group in the center. In the "putting to sleep" of the mother and baby, or *fakamenga*, and in the fire ritual, or *afi*, of the post-natal ceremonies, this arrangement is absent.

The women of the *fakamenga* started from their homes in parties of two or three carrying their mats under their arms, entered the house, and sat around the sides while their gifts were spread in the centre. At the upper end of the house opposite the door were gathered the *fare nane*, beside the mother, while at the lower end, near the infant, sat the *fare masikitanga* (Firth 1956: 46).

Normally only kindred or neighbours attend a Tikopia initiation. The *kano a paito* of the initiate assembles and the members contribute in various ways by their services and their property. There is a formal separation between the group of the father of the lad, headed by his father or father's brother, and that of his mother headed by his senior mother's brother. The divisions are known as the *fare matua* and *fare tuatina* respectively, or more simply as *fai matua* and *fai tuatina*, "those who perform" these functions. Apart from them in the formal classification are the *fai soko*, the cooks ... and their children, the *tama tapu* of the *fai matua*. For practical purposes these last two sections are grouped together, since virtually the same families are affected by the transfer of the goods (Firth 1936: 433).

A clear distinction is made between the true mother's brothers and the distant ones, known as *te kerekere*, literally "the dirty ones". At least some of *te kerekere* must be men of the mother's mother's patri-

In this instance, the paternal kin of the child are directly opposed to the maternal kin. The cooks are not involved. The central position is occupied by gifts rather than by any group of people. The opposition here is between the two ends of the house rather than between *mata paito* and *tuamu*.

Something similar seems to occur during the *afi*.

Up to this point the ceremonial has been largely a woman's affair. Now it is the turn of the men. As the evening draws near some of the immediate mother's brothers of the infant make their appearance. They have come to perform the *afi*, the ritual of the fire. One of them brings a torch of plaited dry coconut leaf ... The men seat themselves on *mata paito*, facing towards the centre of the house, and their principal lights the torch and holds it up so that the light falls in the face of the child. Then the man who is nursing it begins to recite a formula, addressed to the babe (Firth 1956: 51).

The *afi* is a picturesque ceremony. The ring of men and women seated in the darkness around the edges of the house, the chief actors in the centre ... (Firth 1956: 53).

The infant's female paternal relatives sit opposite its mother's brothers on the *tuamu* side of the house, while its male paternal relatives sit on the *mata paito* side (Firth: personal communication).

In neither of these rites is there a neat division between paternal relatives on the *tuamu* side of the house and maternal relatives on the *mata paito* side. The deviation from the pattern in the *fakamenga* may result from the fact that women are barred from *mata paito*. In the *afi*, the infant's paternal male relatives take no active part. Nevertheless, I wish the Tikopia would not sit where they do during these rites.

It is to be noted that in these rites the *kano a paito*, the personal kindred exclusive of men affinally related to ego, is simply divided into two groups: ego's paternal kin and ego's maternal kin. The central position is not occupied by any kin group, but rather by gifts or representatives of both the maternal and paternal kin. This pattern is reminiscent of the organization of Tikopia society as a whole on Marae as discussed in a later section.

lineage. Once again, there is a distinction between the *soko fai matua* and the *soko fai tuatina*.

In the initiation ceremony the initiate's mother's kin have their places outside the house on the *mata paito* side of the house. The father's kin, excluding those who act as cooks, are inside the house. The two groups of cooks work outside the house on the *tuaumu* side.

The mortuary ceremonies (Firth 1939: 325-331) are extremely complex. Firth's discussion of the gifts exchanged provides a fairly clear picture of the groups involved. They can be analyzed best by considering first the *kano a paito* of a deceased man, then the *kano a paito* of his children, and finally the *kano a paito* of his son's children. Gifts made to, or received from, "outsiders", clan chiefs, and ancestors will be ignored.

Gifts are made on behalf of the deceased by the mourners, the family of the father of the deceased who are known as the *Tau Pariki*. This group makes gifts, called *punefu* and *mori nga tangata*, to the deceased's mother's group, which performs the burial. Other gifts, the *koroa nga tama tapu*, are given to the deceased's sisters' children. Firth (1939: 327-328) says that in effect these gifts give some recompense to the cooks, who are fathers of the sisters' children. Firth says nothing about the husbands of sisters' daughters as cooks during the mortuary ceremonies, but presumably they function here as they do in all other rites of passage.

The children of the deceased man themselves make and receive presentations. The *penu te tangi soa*, "reciprocation of the spouse-lament", is a payment made by the sons of the deceased to their mother and her sisters and brothers in return for their chanting of a lament. The *kupukupu* is a gift given to the chief mourner, typically the son of the deceased, by his mother's brother. Several gifts which fall within the class called *kava* are made. Among these are a gift to the daughter of the deceased by her mother's brother and a gift to the wife of the deceased by her mother's brother. The latter is, of course, the mother's mother's brother of the children of the deceased man. *Koroka nga tama tapu* gifts are also given to the deceased man's son's sisters' sons.

Two gifts are best considered from the point of view of the deceased man's son's son. First, his mother receives a *kava* gift from her mother's brother. Second, he himself receives a gift, called *kura*, from his mother's brother.

From the point of view of the members of the deceased's patrilineage, then, participants in the mortuary ceremony are mother's mother's

brothers, mother's brothers, sisters' husbands and their children, and, probably, sisters' daughters' husbands. At least the burial group is associated with *mata paito*, for the dead are buried either within the house, or beneath the eaves just outside, on the *mata paito* side of the house (Firth 1936: 77). Once again, the cooks must be associated with the oven side of the house, *tuaumu*.

FIGURE II

Typical arrangement of the personal kindred in a Tikopia rite of passage.

In summary, as shown in Figure II, during rites of passage in Tikopia the personal kindred is repeatedly divided into three groups: the *fai tuatina*, composed of the maternal kin of ego, the *fai matua*, composed of the paternal kin of ego excluding those who act as cooks, and the *soko*, composed of the husbands and sons of ego's father's sisters and of the husbands of ego's father's sister's daughters. The *fai tuatina* are repeatedly associated with the *mata paito* side of the house; the *soko* are repeatedly associated with the *tuaumu* side of the house; the *fai matua* are repeatedly associated with the interior of the house, in a central position between the *fai tuatina* and the *soko*.

The *fai tuatina* are frequently divided into two further sub-groups which give and receive separate gifts: the paternal kin of ego's mother and the maternal kin of ego's mother. The *soko* are terminologically divided into two further sub-groups; the husbands and sons of ego's father's sisters (*soko fai matua*), and the husbands of ego's father's sisters' daughters (*soko fai tuatina*). There is no similar functional or terminological division into two sub-groups of the *fai matua*. The structure of the kindred parallels that of the house.

The society as a whole. Since the Tikopia say that all the people on the island are kin to one another (Firth 1936: 369), it is not surprising that Tikopia society as a whole is conceived to be laid out

spatially in the same way as the descent group and the kindred. In discussing the plan of Marae it has already been noted that each of the deities of the four clans of Tikopia is associated with one of the corners of Marae. The men of each clan sit in the corner associated with their clan deity. Since the Kafika clan and the Fangarere clan are paired on the "female" side of Marae as opposed to the Tafua and Taumako clans on the "male" side, it follows that Kafika and Fangarere clans ought to act as cooks for the Tafua and Taumako clans. This happens on at least one occasion, the rebuilding of Kafika temple, the premier temple on the island (Firth 1940: 236).

The rebuilding of this house is an event of the greatest interest to the whole island. People from all the clans assemble in large numbers, and those of sa Kafika and sa Fangarere collect food and prepare the ovens, while sa Tafua and sa Taumako do the actual work. The former clan has charge of the north end of the house, the latter of the south end, and their division lies at the centre post.

Here, the entire society is divided into four groups, two each of cooks and workers, in a manner similar to the pattern of organization of the kindred found in the rites of passage. As on Marae, the central position is occupied, not by a descent group, but by the principal deity of Tikopia, the Atua i Kafika, whose post stands in the center of the temple (Firth 1940: 237).

Firth (1939: 223-227) discusses another ceremony in which similar divisions of the entire society occur. This is the *moringa*, a feast of merit which marks the accession of a new chief. For this feast, or any feast of a chief, all the husbands of women of his kinship group and even of his clan assist as cooks. The chief and his clansmen sponsor a feast to which the *paito* of the other clans are invited. The people of each clan have their own seating places in the house of the host chief. Their chiefs sit in front of them. During the ceremony women enter with piles of bark-cloth, which the host chief places in front of him. The cloths are seats for the spirits of the dead chiefs whom the host chief is succeeding in office. The women are representatives of the dead chiefs' mothers' "houses".

Firth, who did not witness the *moringa*, does not provide details of the spatial arrangement of the participants. It is impossible to analyze the ceremony in detail. But it will be noted that there is *some* spatial arrangement of the society as a whole, and that both husbands of women of the chief's clan and women of "houses" which stand in *tuatina* relationship to chiefs of the host clan have special functions.

II. THE CONCENTRIC PATTERN

A concentric pattern also appears in Tikopia culture, though far less obviously and less pervasively than the binary pattern already discussed.

The temple of Nukuora. One example of a concentric arrangement of space is to be found in the Fangarere and Kafika temple of Nukuora in Uta.

There "*mata paito*" was made in the middle of the house. For this reason women if they entered sat round the wall on either side, and men when they slept in the house, lay with their heads towards the centre, no matter in what part of the building they might be (Firth 1940: 230-231).

Here, rather than an opposition of sides of the house, there is an opposition of periphery to center. But the fact that the center of the temple is termed *mata paito* indicates that there is some relationship between this concentric pattern and the binary one.

The world. The most important and striking concentric pattern has already been described. It has already been said that the surrounding world, the island of Tikopia, and Marae are conceived as organized in a binary pattern. Since Tikopia lies at the center of the surrounding world, and Marae at the center of Tikopia, this concentric arrangement is, once again, intimately related to the binary one.⁸

⁸ Perhaps the tale which presents the formation of the island as a two-stage process is an expression of such concentric dualism (Firth 1961: 38). On at least one occasion, Uta, the sacred central district of the island, must be respected in the same manner as the "*mata paito*" center of the temple. During the Rites of Somosomo of the Work of the Trade Wind, women are warned not to turn their backs to Uta, lest they show disrespect to it (Firth 1940: 389).

If the center of the island is male and sacred and the region toward the coast female, the shore and the sea beyond it appear to be male once again.

The orientation of Tikopia dwellings varies somewhat, but most of them follow the same general scheme. The house lies with the long axis parallel to the coast which is usually not far away, and *mata paito* is the side facing the beach. This arrangement is a very practical one, since the slope of the roof and not the gable is thus presented to the force of the wind from the sea, and with the *tuauumu* side to the rear, with the cook house adjacent, some shelter is obtained for carrying on with domestic affairs. On the other hand, the canoe-shed, with its yard — the scene of sacred ritual — lies in front, so that it forms almost a continuation of *mata paito*. In an abstract schematic way one may think of Tikopia as a circle of land bounded by the wastes of the ocean, and just within the land edge a circle of houses, end to end, their profane sides backed by cook houses and leading inwards to the orchards from whence food comes, their sacred sides opening out on to the beach

III. DISCUSSION

One would like to find some overall pattern from which these different spatial arrangements of architecture, geography and kin could all be derived. Perhaps Figure III provides such an over-all pattern. In terms of kinship, Figure III results when a rule which resembles matrilineal cross-cousin marriage is added to the structure of the "house" as descent group inferred earlier, and diagrammed in Figure I.

FIGURE III

Suggested model of the Tikopia conceptualization of the "house" as descent group with persisting wife-giving—wife-taking relationships between patrilineages.

whence the vessels set out for fish. It is safe to say that no Tikopia thinks of the situation in this diagrammatic way, but there is a consistency of this kind about the general arrangement (Firth 1936:79).

I do not think it is safe to say that no Tikopia thinks of the situation in such a diagrammatic way. (Though I agree that it is improbable that an informant would verbalize such a pattern.) A similar opposition between land and sea turns up in ritual contexts in Tikopia, as in the recital of the post-natal ceremony where it is customary to run through all the phrases connected with the sea first, and then to recite those of the land (Firth 1956: 52), or in the first half of the Work of the Monsoon, where two of the ceremonies devoted to male clan deities are concerned with fishing and are carried out in canoe yards (Firth 1940: 55-140), while the other two are devoted to vegetable crops and are carried out in temples in Uta. (Firth 1940: 141-254).

Since marriage with any first cousin is disapproved by the Tikopia (Firth 1936: 329-333), an explanation of the marriage rule assumed in Figure III is required. I wish Figure III to be understood only as indicating that women of a particular patrilineage marry men of any of a number of patrilineages which stand in an enduring wife-taking relationship to their patrilineage. In Tikopia this would mean that the descendants through males of men who are *soko fai matua* (wife-takers) to a particular patrilineage renew the relationship in succeeding generations by taking wives once again from that patrilineage. Marriage to mother's brother's daughter would be an example of such a marriage, of course, but that marriage can be specifically excluded without altering a pattern of enduring wife-taking or wife-giving relationships between groups of patrilineages. From the standpoint of men of a particular patrilineage, of course, marriage would be with women of one of a group of traditional wife-giving patrilineages rather than with women of a particular patrilineage. Figure III may be regarded as one side of a three dimensional "pyramid" of intermarrying lineages.

What is the evidence that the Tikopia do have a model of society involving a notion of enduring wife-taking or wife-giving relationships between patrilineages? There is no direct evidence. In several passages quoted above, Firth notes that chiefly families maintain *soko fai matua* or immediate *tama tapu* (wife-taking) relationships over several generations by continuing to perform the services and make the gifts which are involved in the role, but he says nothing about renewing the relationship by making another marriage.

One tenuous bit of evidence is to be found in the implication of Figure III that an ancestral couple's daughter's son and their son's daughter ought to be associated with the center of the "house". So far as their daughter's son is concerned, there is some evidence for this.

Tafito: I weep as I walk; I used to go
When uncle was alive and dwelling there

Kupu: I arise from the middle of Fangarere
From the middle of Vaisakiri
To go

Safe: Vetepavao has heard the news
To come
That Father may be buried in the earth.

This is a dirge composed by a man whose mother's people were of Fangarere clan. He is named Vetepavao ... and he is lamenting his uncle's [mother's brother's] death. The leitmotiv commonly found in such dirges is given in the

first stanza: one goes to the kinsman (for food, help or comfort is the implication) while he is alive; now that he is dead one can no longer do so, therefore one weeps. Vaisakiri is a well-known ancestral orchard of Fangarere clan in which stands a sacred house of the same name, and symbolizes again the kinship bond (Firth 1936:219).

This is far from overwhelming, but it does seem that in this instance at least, a male *tama tapu* thinks of himself as having been in the center of the clan and house of his *tuatina*.

More suggestive evidence is to be found by a consideration of the marriage relationships among the chiefly "stocks" of the four clans. It will be recalled that the layout of Marae and the clan functions in the rebuilding of Kafika temple indicated that the Kafika and Fangarere clans stand in a *soko* relationship to the Tafua and Taumako clans. Since the central position here is not occupied by any kin group, and since the chief of Tafua is the executive officer of the chief of Kafika on Marae, the "Worker" (Firth 1940:265), one may infer, specifically, that Kafika stands in a direct *tama tapu*, or *soko fai matua* (wife-taking) relationship to Tafua. It follows from this that Fangarere should stand in a *soko fai matua* relationship to Kafika, and that Tafua should stand in a *soko fai matua* relationship to Taumako. To close the system of alliances, one need only suppose that Taumako stands in a *soko fai matua* relationship to Fangarere. These hypothetical relationships are shown in Figure IV.

It will be noted that the suggested pattern of *soko fai matua* relationships parallels the order of rank of the chiefs and clans in Tikopia: Kafika highest, Tafua second, Taumako third, and Fangarere last (Firth 1936:361). At first it may appear surprising that the wife-taking clan outranks the wife-giving clan, but it must be remembered that, while the mother's brother is of higher status than the sister's son during ritual events, in secular life it is the mother's brother who gives gifts and assistance to the sister's son, rather than the reverse.

Fangarere, standing in a *soko fai matua* relationship to Kafika, nevertheless ranks lower. Such an anomaly is necessary if a system of circulation is to be converted into a system of absolute rank. A mythological charter is provided for the low rank of Fangarere. When the four brothers, ancestors of the four clans, were being born, the deity of the Fangarere clan impatiently made his way out from his mother's head and was born first. Thus the youngest became the eldest. For his misbehavior he was cursed by his mother. The other deities were born in the order of their rank (Firth 1961:31-32). This is most plausibly

interpreted as a mythological statement of the idea that, though Fangarere comes before Kafika, nevertheless Kafika outranks Fangarere.

In myths and legends, shading into ancient history, many of the deities and legendary chiefs of the four clans do make the marriages indicated by Figure IV. The mother of the father of Pu Ma, twin mythological

FIGURE IV

Suggested model of persisting affinal relations between chiefly stocks of Tikopia clans. (Arrows indicate the direction in which women are given as wives.)

ancestors of the chiefly stock of Kafika, was a Tafua woman. Their mother, in turn, was a woman from the canoe-shed of Suakava, the sacred canoe-yard of Tafua (Firth 1940:118 and 1961:43-45). In legendary times, the modern chiefly lineage of Fangarere was begun by a man who was *tama tapu* to the chiefly lineage of Kafika and who stood in turn in a *tuatina* relationship to the chiefly lineage of Taumako (Firth 1961:132-133).

A case in which Tafua takes a woman from Taumako is not apparent in the mythological and legendary material, but it is worth noting that the Dance of the Bamboo — a sacred dance carried out in the Work of the Monsoon in which an explicitly phallic bamboo pole is carried along the side of Marae from the Tafua corner to the Taumako corner (Firth 1940:343-348) — is plausibly interpreted as symbolizing a sexual union between a god in the Tafua clan and some female deity of Taumako.

There is only one recorded mythological or legendary marriage

which does not fit into the pattern suggested. This is the marriage between Matapona, a daughter of a chief of Kafika, and Te Atafu, a Tongan who was adopted by a chief of Taumako and who, as the father of Pu Lasi, is the ancestor of the modern Taumako chiefly line (Firth 1961: 88-89). It is from this marriage that the Taumako clan is said to stand in a *tama tapu* relationship to the Kafika clan. Note, however, that though this marriage is not in accordance with the pattern suggested, it does not contradict it. That is, it does not reverse a postulated wife-giving — wife-taking relationship; it is merely an affinal relationship between two groups which were not predicted to stand in an affinal relationship.

In historical and modern times, judging from the data presented by Firth,⁹ the chiefly lineage of Fangarere and lower ranked lineages related patrilineally to the chiefly lineage of Fangarere have given four wives to the chiefly lineage of Taumako and lower ranked lineages related patrilineally to the chiefly lineage of Taumako. One woman married in the opposite direction. Lineages of chiefly Taumako stock gave five women to lineages of chiefly Tafua stock. One woman married in the opposite direction. Lineages of chiefly Tafua stock gave one woman to lineages of chiefly Kafika stock. No women married in the opposite direction. Lineages of chiefly Kafika stock have given no women to lineages of chiefly Fangarere stock. One woman has married

⁹ This information has been garnered from *We, the Tikopia* (Firth 1936), primarily from Genealogies I, II, and III (pages 347, 348, and 356), but supplemented by other marriages and *tuatina-tama tapu* relationships mentioned by Firth in the course of the book. From the genealogies one can find from what lineages the wives of many of the men of the chiefly lineages came. But genealogies are not provided for other lineages of chiefly stock or for lineages which are not derived through males from the chiefly lines. This means that only for the four chiefly lineages is it fairly easy to determine wife-giving — wife-taking relationships. For other lineages, it is possible to determine which gave wives to chiefly lineages, but not often which took wives from chiefly lineages. As between non-chiefly lineages, the data is extremely fragmentary.

Lineages of a clan which are not clearly related patrilineally to the chiefly lineage have been excluded from consideration. Some of these are held to be of autochthonous origin, but not related patrilineally to the chiefly lineage; others are of immigrant origin. There is no reason to expect these lineages to have the same enduring affinal relationships as the chiefly lineage. Judgements as to whether a lineage was of chiefly stock were based upon the genealogies noted above and upon Firth 1961 (177-178). One exception was made. There is an unexplained break in the genealogy of the chiefly house of Kafika (Firth 1936: 347). Nevertheless, the chiefs of Kafika are certainly considered to be descended from the old lineage, and so the break was ignored.

in the opposite direction. These data are not complete, but the pattern is clear. Counting marriages made during mythological times and legendary times, I have been able to find fourteen marriages in accordance with the suggested pattern and only three which contradict it.¹⁰

¹⁰ Aside from these marriages, five women of Kafika chiefly stock have married men of Taumako chiefly stock, and five women of Taumako chiefly stock have married men of Kafika chiefly stock. There has been one parallel marriage of a Fangarere woman to a Tafua man. These marriages do not contradict the suggested pattern, but they do require some explanation. And it is possible to bring them within the marriage pattern which is being suggested.

It is clear that the chiefly stocks of Kafika and Taumako exchange women, but this can not normally be conceptualized by the Tikopia as sister-exchange. The ideal organization of the kindred during rites of passage requires that father's sister's husband be a different person from mother's brother. Firth (1936:331) notes that the practice of sister-exchange, which does occasionally occur, is accentuated where unions are incestuous, that is, between first cousins. He also notes that the Tikopia disapprove of marriage by a man with close kin because it places his children at a disadvantage; they do not have a full complement of relatives. Firth's example is of marriage with a first cousin, but the same considerations would hold for sister-exchange marriages.

The association of sister-exchange with first-cousin marriage is important. It indicates that wife-takers are expected to return a woman to the wife-giving group. Among close kin, there is no alternative but to return her to the wife's brother. But where marriage is not incestuous, she could be returned to some other member of the wife's husband's group. Where two large patrilineal groups, like the chiefly stocks of Kafika and Taumako, were involved, the pattern which would emerge would be one in which group A of Kafika would give wives to group A of Taumako; group A of Taumako would give wives to group B of Kafika; group B of Kafika would give wives to group A of Taumako. Of course, on the ground, many more than four groups might well be involved and marriage patterns may be extremely complex. Nevertheless, I suggest that probably the Tikopia do not see the affinal relations between Kafika and Taumako in terms of direct exchange but rather as indirect exchange, with distinct wife-givers and wife-takers on both sides.

The suggestion that the relations between Kafika and Taumako are conceptualized in this way is supported by other evidence. Looking again at the affinal chain which links all four chiefly stocks, it can be seen that there, too, the marital exchanges are exchanges between *two* groups. It is clear that the four deities represented on Marae are paired into two root crop deities and two tree crop deities. From this point of view the affinal relations which link the four chiefly stocks can be seen in terms of exchanges between the "tree crop" group and the "root crop" group. Precisely the same process of segmentation of a unity into two groups which are then divided, conceptually, into four sub-groups would produce the hypothesized relations between Kafika and Taumako if carried out one level lower. Repeating the process one further level lower would produce clan endogamy. Among the chiefly stocks there have been at least four cases of this: two in Taumako and one each in Tafua and Kafika.

This evidence, though far from complete, certainly suggests that the order of rank of the clans does reflect an enduring chain of wife-taking — wife-giving relationships. If this is so, then it is legitimate to hypothesize that the pattern represented in Figure III may be applicable to Tikopia conceptions of kinship and space.

On this basis it is possible to conclude by noting the ways in which the various examples of binary and concentric dualism can be derived from Figure III. On an island where all people are considered kin, and where the society as a whole is conceptualized both as a descent group and as a chain of affinal relationships, it ought to be the case that the organization of the personal kindred corresponds in some manner to the conceptualization of descent. The pattern hypothesized in Figure III yields not only the descent group pattern, but also, in the fifth generation, the pattern of organization of the kindred. The organization of the four clans of Tikopia society as a whole corresponds to the fourth generation. It is easy to see how an arrangement of four groups or classes of people could be equated with an arrangement of five groups or classes.

It is also easy to see how the male aspect of the "house", *mata paito*, could be associated with the center, from the point of view of the first generation, but with one side of the house, from the point of view of succeeding generations. Moreover, Figure III provides an explanation for the concentric arrangement of the surrounding world, the island of Tikopia, and Uta or Marae. New "houses" originate in the center of Figure III in alternate generations. If we think of the ancestral couple of the entire "house" as the progenitors of the clan gods, who are the "posts" of the world, then subsequent central couples would give birth to deities or humans whose kinship would provide the analog to the organization of space on the island and in Uta. Subsequent differentiation would, of course, provide for the organization of space everywhere in a manner parallel to the differentiation of households and new "houses" of descent.

In summary, then, the Tikopia organize space in a manner parallel to that in which they organize kinship. The two are intimately connected. The opposition between male and female, the succession of generations, and affinal ties create a social space within which the Tikopia live.

University of Hawaii

DAVID B. EYDE

REFERENCES CITED

- Ember, M.
 1959 *The Nonunilinear Descent Groups of Samoa*. *American Anthropologist* 61: 573-577.
- Eyde, D.
 1964 *Evidence for complex alliance in Tikopia*. *The Kroeber Anthropological Society Papers* 30: 39-49.
- Firth, R.
 1930-31 *Totemism in Polynesia*. *Oceania* 1: 291-321 and 377-398. Reprinted in: Firth, R., *Tikopia Ritual and Belief*. London. George Allen and Unwin Ltd., 1967, pp. 226-268. Page references are to the latter.
- 1936 *We, The Tikopia: a Sociological Study of Kinship in Primitive Polynesia*. London. George Allen & Unwin Ltd. Second edition 1957. Page references are to the second edition.
- 1939 *Primitive Polynesian Economy*. George Routledge and Sons, London. Second edition, 1965, London, Routledge and Kegan Paul. Page references are to the second edition.
- 1940 *The Work of the Gods in Tikopia*. London, London School of Economics Monographs in Social Science Nos. 1 and 2. Second edition, 1967, London, University of London, The Athlone Press. Page references are to the second edition.
- 1955 *The Fate of the Soul: an Interpretation of some Primitive Concepts*. Cambridge, at the University Press. Reprinted in: Firth, R., *Tikopia Ritual and Belief*. London, George Allen & Unwin Ltd., 1967, pp. 330-353. Page references are to the latter.
- 1956 *Ceremonies for Children and Social Frequency in Tikopia*. *Oceania* 27: 12-55. Reprinted in: Firth, R., *Tikopia Ritual and Belief*. London, George Allen & Unwin Ltd., 1967, pp. 31-78. Page references are to the latter.
- 1961 *History and Traditions of Tikopia*. Wellington, The Polynesian Society.
- Lowenthal, R.
 1967 *Samoan Structures*. Unpublished paper.
- Mead, M.
 1930 *Social Organization of Manua*. Bernice P. Bishop Museum Bulletin 76. Honolulu.