T. van Dijk

N. de Jonge

The house on the hill; Moieties and double descent in Babar

In: Bijdragen tot de Taal-, Land- en Volkenkunde 143 (1987), no: 1, Leiden, 54-104

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

TOOS VAN DIJK and NICO DE JONGE

THE HOUSE ON THE HILL; MOIETIES AND DOUBLE DESCENT IN BABAR

Introduction

In the introduction to his dissertation, *Types of Social Structure in Eastern Indonesia*, Van Wouden remarks on the group of islands extending from Timor up to and including the Arus: 'The greatest difficulty which one encounters in the study of cultural phenomena in these parts is the serious inadequacy of the ethnographical material.' (Van Wouden 1968:2). Thanks to recent anthropological research in the area mentioned above, this has now changed. Nonetheless, the number of publications on this string of islands is small. We hope that our research in the Babar archipelago will contribute to a more complete picture of the cultures of eastern Indonesia.¹

Fieldwork was done mostly in several of the smaller islands of the Babar archipelago. One of the researchers took as her field of study the island of Marsela, and more specifically the village of Ilbutung on the south-east coast of that island. The other researcher chose the islands of Dawera and Dawelor as his field, notably the village of Welora on the north-east coast of the island of Dawera (see Map 2). In addition to the main island of Babar, and the islands of Marsela, Dawera and Dawelor, the islands of Wetang and Dai are considered as belonging to the Babar archipelago. (For the purpose of this article the Babar *archipelago* is the

Editorial Note: By way of exception the editors have granted the authors extra space in excess of the 30-page maximum for this article, as it actually represents a combination of two separate articles making a comparative study of two different, hitherto little-known, areas in the same archipelago possessing the same principle of organization each with different manifestations.

TOOS VAN DIJK, an M.A. graduate in anthropology from the Free University in Amsterdam, is specialized in symbolic anthropology and interested in Indonesia in general and eastern Indonesia with the Moluccas in particular. She may be contacted at Manegestr. 24, 7413 VC Deventer, The Netherlands.

NICO DE JONGE is also an M.A. graduate in anthropology from the Free University at Amsterdam who is interested in symbolic anthropology in Indonesia, especially eastern Indonesia. His address is: Luttk Oudorp 66, 1811 MZ Alkmaar, The Netherlands.

They are writing a joint dissertation on the symbolic system of the population of the Babar archipelago and are also the joint authors of 'Bastas in Babar. Imported Asian Textiles in a South-East Moluccan Culture', forthcoming, Cologne.

Map 1. South-east Moluccas.

Map 2. Babar archipelago.

defined research area; geographically it constitutes a more restricted area than the present administrative unit of the *Kecamatan* Pulau-Pulau Babar, which includes the islands of Luang and Sermata.) The archipelago is situated at a distance of about 250 kilometres south-west of Banda, and under the Dutch administration it was therefore considered part of the so-called South-Western Islands.

Recent statistics show that at the end of 1982 the archipelago had a population of 13,271, spread over 46 villages, 1,903 of whom lived in 12 villages in Marsela, and 1,269 in 6 villages in Dawera and Dawelor (information provided by the Statistics Office of the Kantor Camat at Tepa, the capital of the archipelago; see map 2). However, these figures overstate the true population of the archipelago. Actually, a large number of Babarese are semi-permanent residents of, mainly, Ambon and Seram (the exact figures are not known).

Information on the situation in the past, gleaned from those sources considered most reliable, reveals that the population of the archipelago doubled in the course of the second half of the nineteenth century and has remained stable ever since (Bosscher 1854:455-458 mentions a population of 6,050; Van Hoëvell 1890:189-191 found 12,919; Sneeuwjagt 1935:43 arrived at 11,712). This marked increase is probably the result of a change of policy on the part of the Dutch colonial administration, which resulted in greater interference in the affairs of the archipelago from c. 1850 onwards.²

Assuming that the number of people resident in the Babar archipelago has not increased significantly for nearly a hundred years, it would follow that the distribution of the population over the various age-groups has changed dramatically in this period. Children under 15 now make up 42.5% of the total population. But a hundred years ago there were no medical facilities at all, consequently the mortality among children must have been high, and the percentage of children small. The number of marriageable people, therefore, must have been relatively higher then than it is today. This observation will prove essential to the rest of our argumentation (see I.B. and II.B.).

Passing on to the internal economic situation in these islands, it is useful to distinguish between the main island, Babar, which has a relatively fertile soil, and the smaller islands that surround it, which are extremely arid and barren. Agriculture and fishery are the main means of support throughout the archipelago. As a result of the poor condition of the soil, the smaller islands usually have a shortage of maize, the staple food. For this reason the inhabitants of these islands concentrate on fishery and barter their products for maize from the island of Babar.

Linguistically, the Babar islands belong to the Austronesian language-group. Within the archipelago we can distinguish at least six separate linguistic units. The islands of Marsela on the one hand, and of Dawera and Dawelor on the other, differ so much in this respect, that the

inhabitants of these islands often have to avail themselves of Moluccan Malay for purposes of communication.

Since c. 1910, Christianity has found a firm footing in the Babar islands. An unsuccessful first attempt had already been made in the V.O.C. period (Breeman 1928:41). Nowadays the entire population of the Babar islands belongs to the Gereja Protestan Maluku, with the exception of a few immigrants at Tapa. In addition to this, ancestor worship still plays an important role.

Though not crucial to the argument, a note now has to be made on the relationship terminology as adopted for this article. At both research locations we find a Hawaiian-type terminology. As such a terminology expressly identifies the generation to which individuals belong, it is commonly referred to as generational (R. Fox 1967:256-258). One term identifies ego's male, another term his female relatives within the same generation. Likewise, all male relatives of generation +1 are referred to by the same term, as are all his female relatives of that generation. Relatives of generations +2 and -2, however, as those of generations +3 and -3, are each always referred to by the one term, sex being ignored in these cases.

The various descent groups in the Babar archipelago are referred to by the Moluccan-Malay term *soa*. In the Moluccas this term can have a number of different (e.g. geographic) referents, so we shall adhere to the terms used locally, i.e. *em* in Marsela, and *umol* in Dawera and Dawelor. According to local history, only a very small number of *em* and *umol* has its origin in the islands proper, most having immigrated from other islands which lie more to the west or to the east, such as Luang, Leti or Tanimbar (see I.C. and II.C.).

Descent groups can be housed either patri- or matrilocally. In the islands of Dai, Dawera and Dawelor and a part of Babar the residence pattern is matrilocal; in the islands of Marsela, and in part of Babar and Wetang (with one exception) it is patrilocal. Both patterns of residence therefore coexist. In addition to this we came across systems in which inheritance has a patrilineal (e.g. in Marsela), a matrilineal (some parts of Babar), or a cognatic basis (e.g. Dawelor and Dawera). Besides these differences in residence and inheritance, the ethnographer Müller-Wismar, in an itinerary published in 1914, noted differences in descent as well:

'In places, the ancient patrilineal women-buying clan system was pushed aside by the later matriarchal system which spread from Luang. It resulted in some very interesting confrontations in Babar, where both systems occur side by side, not only in their pure form, but also in various mixtures' (Müller-Wismar 1914:914).³

How the development into these various forms of social organization may have occurred will be shown by our analysis of the descent and marriage systems of Marsela (in part I) and of Dawera and Dawelor (in part

II). At the same time it will be demonstrated how divergent systems of this kind may coexist without causing any problems. Our conclusions show how an alternative perspective might be considered in the study of kinship systems in Indonesia as a Field of Anthropological Study.

I. Marsela

A. Present Situation

In order to enable a correct evaluation of the following discussion, a survey will first be given of the present status and situation of the dwelling-place, village, kinship and marriage.

In Marsela, the large house in which the patrilineal relatives live together is called *em*, 'house'. The patrilineal group of relatives itself which lives in the house is also referred to as *em*. In actual practice not one, but several houses are occupied: the house of origin (*em lululy*, the sacred house) with one or two 'branches'. In the house of origin two or three extended families, totalling 16 to 31 persons, live together. The later additions are commonly occupied by one or two extended families comprising an additional 8 to 16 persons (excluding those residing more or less permanently in e.g. Ambon or Seram).

Modern houses are usually built of stone, at ground level. The lay-out, however, is often still the same as that of the older wooden pile-dwellings (see I.B. below). All houses used to be situated with their long sides parallel to the coast of the island, i.e. north-east to south-west. The Marselan terms for these points are, respectively, *eiru* and *eiwirik*. These

Plate 1. Traditional house in Marsela (photograph by Toos van Dijk and Wim Wolters, 1981).

points of orientation also have a deeper meaning within the house itself (see I.B.) and in the village. The *em* exhibit a patrilocal pattern of settlement and are patrilineal with respect to descent and inheritance. To use Lévi-Strauss' term, they form a 'harmonic' regime. (The terms harmonic and disharmonic will be discussed in more depth later on, in part II.) Every house is divided into four living-quarters, each of which the Marselans call *priwyèn pnyèrwèn*, i.e. literally 'place to stand, place to sit'. In everyday usage the Indonesian term *tempat duduk*, 'place to sit', is also common: henceforth we shall render this as 'seat'. It should be noted that this term refers to the living-quarters of a group, not of just one person; for originally it housed the line of descent of a single ancestor to the house (see I.B. and I.C.). Nowadays a seat is often called a room.

Today, several *em* live together in villages scattered along the coast. (Around the turn of the century the Dutch administration compelled the *em* to abandon their villages, located in steep, high places, and resettle in new villages along the coast.)

Every village is divided into two halves, *eiru* and *eiwirik*. Each half operates as a unit within which several *em* are organized. The two halves function as ceremonial groups and present themselves as such on the occasion of great feasts in which the whole village participates.

Fig. 1. Location of villages in Marsela.

In many islands in the south-east Moluccas, a distinction is usually maintained between the descendants of the original inhabitants of a village on the one hand, the eldest of whom is the lord of the land, and the descendants of migrants on the other. The relation between the two parties is usually expressed symbolically as one between elder and younger brothers. Scholz gives an example from the island of Kisar, where representatives of the lord of the land entered into a pact with the inhabitants who arrived later, agreeing that their mutual relationship,

from that moment onwards, should be one as between elder and younger brothers (Scholz 1962: 106, 107. See also section I.B.). In these islands, the lord of the land was (and in some cases still is) the leader of the communal religious ceremonies at the village altar.

In Marsela, in most villages the eldest descendant of the founder of the village lives in the *eiru* part of the village. This person has always been the expert on prayers and the performer of sacrifices on occasions that concern the whole village community, and invariably take place in the centre of the village, at the *lekeoryei* (literally: the 'navel of the village'). He is the lord of the land, here called *mernorno wuro ray*, i.e. 'he who first possessed this land'. On the other hand it used to be common practice in many Marselan villages that the *em* who lived in the *eiwirk* part of the village, as descendants of migrants who had arrived at some later date, had to supply the war-leader, i.e. the man who was to head the army.

In the Marselan context, on the village level, *eiru* is commonly associated with elder and lord of the land, and *eiwirk* with younger and war-leader. This classification is of course an elaboration of a theme common throughout eastern Indonesia, intended to express the relation between the lord of the land and the war-leader symbolically as elder vs. younger.

We shall now pass to a more detailed discussion of the present system of descent and marriage in Marsela. Today, the *em* are exogamous. Most marriages are now contracted between the members of different *em* within one village, but marriages between persons born in different villages in the island are not uncommon. Once a woman has married out of her native *em*, she belongs to the group of *pyamyoyo*, i.e. women who have descended (from the house). This group comprises the women who have married out, and their children, grandchildren and great-grandchildren. Though the husbands of these women do not actually belong in this category, they are often ranked with them. As opposed to the *pyamyoyo*, the members of one's own patrilineal *em* as a group are referred to as *emteoni*, literally 'the contents of the house'. The relation between these two categories of relatives is one as between superiors and inferiors, much like the relation between parents (the *emteoni*) and children (the *pyamyoyo*). On certain occasions, such as the building of houses, the organizing of feasts, or the payment of bride-prices, the 'children' are under an obligation to assist their 'parents'. On the other hand, in these cases the latter may also help the former, as 'parents' will.

The *em* of the groom, if necessary assisted by its *pyamyoyo*, pays the bride-price in gold and imported cotton cloths (called *kok*, in Moluccan Malay *basta*) to the *em* of the bride, which, after the wedding, brings the *em* of the bridegroom several fabrics in turn.

In Marsela the mother's father holds a key position. As a wife-giver he is a source of life, *onne* – which also means 'stem' or 'trunk' –, to the

wife-receiver. At the individual level, in the relation between brothers-in-law, the wife-receiver occupies a position inferior to that of his wife's brothers and his classificatory brothers-in-law in his wife's native *em*. This asymmetrical relation between brothers-in-law may eventually develop into an asymmetrical relation between the two groups involved in the marriage (cf. the situation in Mentawai, Schefold 1986:75, 82).

At present, it is not only customary not to marry within one's *em*, but marriages between first cousins are also forbidden. The relationship with them is felt to be too 'close', which makes it impossible to enter into matrimony with them. All other relatives and non-relatives are marriage candidates, provided they are of the same generation as ego. It is neither encouraged nor forbidden to marry members of one's own or of the other half of the village (we will return to this matter below, I.C.). Of all of the possible marriages, the people of Marsela themselves consider some to be ideal, and these have special names. They are the following marriages, which today no longer occur systematically (the terms presuppose ego to be female):

1. *Irwekantekawen*, i.e. 'to change places'. This marriage amounts to sister exchange, or a man marrying his ZHZ.
2. *Inwayle memne*, i.e. 'replacing your grandmother'. Marselans describe this marriage as one between a man and his (classificatory) FFZSD.
- 2a. *Inwayle renne*, i.e. 'replacing your mother'. It is a variant form of type 2. In terms of kinship, the Marselans do not use any single term consistently in referring to this marriage type.
3. *Inwotya memne*, i.e. 'to follow your grandmother'. Marselans define it as a marriage between a man and his (classificatory) FMBSD.
- 3a. *Inwotya renne*, i.e. 'to follow your mother'. This is a variant of type 3. For this marriage, neither, do the Marselans consistently use one single kinship term.

The marriages mentioned above are contracted; as it is said in Marsela, 'to perpetuate the bond between two *em*', or, as it is sometimes also expressed, 'to prevent history from disappearing' (i.e., the historic relationship between the two *em*).

We will now discuss the marriages of types 1, 2 and 3 in more detail. Types 2a and 3a will be discussed later.

1. Sister exchange is the simplest way of exchanging women. The exchange is direct, or symmetrical:

Fig. 2. Sister exchange.

In the Marselan context this amounts to two *em* or patrilineages within the same generation exchanging women directly (the women may be either real or classificatory sisters of the men). Lévi-Strauss classifies this type of marriage as 'restricted exchange' (Lévi-Strauss 1963:122; 1969, e.g. Ch. 13, 26).

2. Another form of direct exchange between, for example, patrilineages occurs where women are not exchanged within the same generation (as in sister exchange), but in consecutive generations: patrilineage A gives a woman to patrilineage B in one generation, the daughter of whom marries back into A in the next. Therefore this is the FZD marriage, also called the patrilateral cross-cousin marriage. Note that whereas sister exchange in theory, in order to make the exchange of women possible, presupposes only two parties, the patrilateral cross-cousin marriage requires at least three parties. This type of marriage is sometimes referred to as 'delayed direct exchange' (R. Fox 1967:204), and if the exchanges are taken into account its nature is symmetrical, because there is no permanent subordination and superordination in the relation between the two groups. But in Fox's opinion, according to the rule of marriage it is an asymmetrical marriage form: in one generation the women marry in one direction, in the next they marry 'back'. However, Lévi-Strauss, for the same reason, classifies this type of marriage as belonging wholly under 'generalized exchange', along with the type to be discussed under 3 (Lévi-Strauss 1963:122; 1969: Ch. 13, 26).

The FFZSD marriage is a marriage between a man and his *classificatory* FZD and it can therefore be considered as a derivative form of the FZD marriage. This can also be seen from the comparable implications of the two types of marriage. There are several aspects to be considered. Taking only a single generation into account, the patrilateral cross-cousin marriage is asymmetrical, but from the perspective of several generations it is symmetrical. In this context, Schmitz uses the terms long, or concurrent, exchange cycle, and short, or deferred, exchange cycle. According to him, a culture may prefer to stress one aspect or the other (Schmitz 1964:68, 69). The term 'to replace your grandmother' indicates that to the Marselans the symmetrical aspect is the more important of the two.

Whereas in the FZD marriage the exchange of women is spread over two consecutive generations, in the FFZSD marriage the exchange takes place with one generation interposed, e.g. between two patrilineages. For example, in the first generation a woman would marry from A into E, in the third generation from E into A, in the fifth generation from A back to E, etc. Generations one and five result in identical types of marriage: ego marries in the same way as his FFFF (see figure 3).

3. In the same way as we proceeded under 2 from the FZD to the

FFZSD marriage, it is possible to make a comparison between the type we shall discuss now, the FMBSD marriage, and the matrilinear cross-cousin marriage, or the marriage between a man and his MBD, of which it is a classificatory variant.

The MBD marriage is completely asymmetrical, as opposed to the marriages discussed under 1 and 2. Whereas in the MBD marriage ego always marries in the same way as his father, in the FMBSD marriage ego always marries in the same way as his FF. Therefore generations one, three, five etc. all result in the same type of marriage (see figure 4). In both the FFZSD and the FMBSD marriages more parties participate than in the FZD- and MBD-types of marriage, because the intervening generations also have to marry. Theoretically, in the former two types a minimum of five parties is necessary.

In Marsela the FFZSD marriage is greatly preferred to the asymmetrical FMBSD marriage. Statements made by informants on this issue are corroborated by actual figures.⁴ How can we account for the co-existence of these two opposed types of marriage within one and the same culture? The answer to this question is to be found by taking a look at the other preferred marriages.

2a, 3a. As was pointed out above, in Marsela it is forbidden to marry a first cousin, hence for a man to marry his FZD and MBD, because the relationship with them is felt to be too close. This would seem to

Fig. 3a. The FFZSD marriage.

Fig. 3b. Circulation of women in the FFZSD marriage.

Fig. 4a. The FMBSD marriage.

Fig. 4b. Circulation of women in the FMBSD marriage.

contradict directly the occurrence of marriages 2a and 3a. For if taken literally, they amount to an FZD and MBD marriage respectively. (In a patrilocal society like that of Marsela, the marriage form 'to follow your mother' would mean, if taken literally, that a woman marries into the

same patrilineage as the one into which, one generation before, a woman of her own patrilineage had married.)

In Telalora, a village on the south-eastern coast of Marsela, we were presented with the following explanation: when the 'replacing your mother' marriage (2a) is contracted, once the woman has left her seat, she (i.e. her daughter, in the next generation) is not allowed to return immediately to that same seat. She must return to a different seat from the one her mother came from and replace her mother there. It was added that this was considered to be a fine marriage, frequent in the form described above since the old days, from even before the advent of the missionaries (c. 1900). If this preferred marriage is to retain its original meaning ('to replace your mother') in this interpretation, as informants state it does, then the seat the daughter comes to belong to by marriage has to be declared equal to the seat the mother has left. The same applies to marriage type 3a. Therefore we will have to establish through what means the two seats can be made equal. In so doing, we shall also answer our earlier question, namely how marriage types 2 and 3 can co-exist within the same culture. First, however, we must take a look at the position of the house as it formerly existed in Marselan society. It will serve as a starting-point for our further discussion of today's preferred marriages. At the same time we shall attempt to reconstruct the earlier kinship and marriage system.

B. Earlier Situation

Before different *em* went to live together in one high village, every *em* lived isolated on the top of some hill in a single large house. It is possible that next to the original house one or more branches were built to accommodate the sons. The houses were approximately 15 metres long. Today, the Marselans can still point out the hilltops belonging to the respective *em*. Every hilltop has a name of its own. Informants tell us that in Marsela the dwellings used to be situated with their long sides parallel to the coast of the island, i.e. running north-east – south-west, or *eiru* – *eiwirik* (see also I.A.).

Fig. 5. Orientation of houses on the south-east coast of Marsela.

In addition to these points of orientation, *eiru* and *eiwirk* are also associated with life and death, above and under, and older and younger respectively (see also I.C.).

The traditional house is laid out according to the dual partition *eiru* and *eiwirk*, and these two parts of the house were separated by a middle part called *ipramna*, i.e. the 'innermost part'. Here all mature men partook of their meals together and entertained their guests.

Fig. 6. Lay-out and orientation of the traditional house.

Both the *eiru* and *eiwirk* parts of the house are further subdivided into two areas, the seats, which are separated by cooking-places. The four seats point exactly to the four points of the compass, north, east, south and west. The two cooking-places are each shared by the adjacent seats.

Fig. 7. Lay-out and orientation of the traditional house.

When referring to one of the four seats, it is not customary to use the name of one of the four cardinal points (an exception being the eastern seat, see below). Reference is made to it either by mentioning the name of the ancestor who first occupied the seat, or by a combination of *eiru* or *eiwirk* with *elor*, 'seaside', or *era*, 'land-side'. For example, *eiru-elor* is the seat in *eiru* which lies nearest to the sea, and *eiwirk-era* is the seat in *eiwirk* on the side of the house facing the land. It will be noted that *eiru/eiwirk* are always mentioned before the *elor/era* points of orientation.

On the basis of the preceding discussion it seems plausible to assume that the division of the house into four (i.e. the seats) is a secondary one, and that the division into two (*eiru-eiwirk*) is the primary one. There are further arguments in favour of this assumption. Each of the seats was occupied, in the manner described above, by the descendants of one

Fig. 8. Orientation of the house on the south-east coast of Marsela.

ancestor by patrilineal descent. Originally, an *em* may have been occupied by one or two different patrilineal groups. In the latter case each group lived in one of the two parts of the house, *eiru* or *eiwirk*. The subdivision of each half of the house into two seats may have been made by two brothers occupying one half of the house together (we will return to this matter below, I.C.). The seat in the eastern corner of the house is called the 'eldest', the one diagonally opposite, the western seat, is the 'youngest'. Several tasks in the various stages of building a house must be started from the east, 'the place where the sun and the Pleiades rise'. An example is erecting the first post of the house (also called the 'eldest' post), which is always done in the easternmost corner. With his patrilineal relatives, the 'eldest man' of the house occupies the eldest seat. He is the descendant of the eldest branch of the group of patrilineal relatives who originally lived together in the one house, or, in the case of two different groups of patrilineal relatives sharing one house, the descendant of the group which first settled in a given place. The opposite applies to the seat in the western quarter of the house. It is occupied by the 'youngest man'. In the villages on the south-eastern side of the island this means that the 'eldest man' occupies the seat called *eiru-elor*, and the 'youngest man' the seat *eiwirk-era*.

The fact that a distinction is maintained between eldest and youngest seats may reflect some distribution of functions between the heads of the two seats which is comparable to the distribution of offices today among the representatives of the *eiru* and *eiwirk* halves of the village (see I.A.). We do know that of old the 'eldest man' of the house has looked after the spiritual well-being of the entire *em*. In the old days he maintained contact between the *em* and the deity, Upler, and the ancestors. This is

equivalent to the function which the lord of the land, who belongs to the *eiru* part of the village, today fulfils on behalf of the whole village. However, we were not able to establish any special function for the representative of the western seat analogous to that of the war-leader from the *eiwirik* part of the village. In Dawelor and Dawera, on the other hand, such an arrangement was seen to be the rule (see part II).

In this context, there is an interesting building rule pertinent to the roof of a house. It is common practice in Marsela, when working up parts of a tree, for instance in building a house, for the 'trunk' end (*onnie*) of a beam or stem to alternate regularly with the 'treetop' end (*kunye*). For example, the horizontal beams of a house are laid in the following manner:

Fig. 9. Disposition of top and trunk ends in series of horizontal beams of the house.

This rule is also observed in roofing, which is done with coconut leaves, laid horizontally. The lower ends of the midribs must come next to the tops of the ribs that follow. There is one place, however, where an exception to this rule is made. In the middle of one of the two large adjoining planes forming the roof, a small opening must remain between the ribs of the coconut leaves. Here, a few leaves which have been tied together are laid opposite a second bundle in such a way that their 'trunk' ends are opposite each other, and a small hole is left open:

Fig. 10. Disposition of ribs of coconut leaves at roof opening.

In Marsela, the opening is called *ora*, that is, 'navel'. The Marselans say that it is necessary 'so that the house may breathe'. If the navel is omitted from the house, in due time its inhabitants will surely be struck down by some disease.

Thus at the navel the regular pattern of 'trunk' being followed by 'top' is abruptly broken. The navel also constitutes a point of inversion, for to either side of it the direction in which the leaves are laid to form the roof is inverted. It is precisely below this opening that the boundary lies between the *eiru* and *eiwirk* parts of the house.

The interior partition of the house by the cooking-places; the mode of referring to the different seats; the existence of an 'elder' and a 'younger' seat; and the location of the navel of the house, in our opinion all warrant the conclusion that the *eiru-eiwirk* division is the basic one, and the division into four seats only secondary. This is an important conclusion, as it is of help in reconstructing the earlier kinship and marriage situation. In Marsela we were told that in earlier times marriages were contracted mainly between members of the same house, in order to keep the bride-price in the house. (The object was *not* to avoid the payment of bride-prices.) There was also some reluctance to give a woman to another *em* because that would 'add souls' to that *em*. It was preferred to keep the marriage within the house and 'add souls' to one's own *em*. In addition it was preferred to marry a relative (*pyamo*) rather than 'another woman' (*opyakonti soè*), i.e. a non-relative.

The preceding discussion strongly suggests that originally there were two exogamous halves within the house, which adopted the names *eiru* and *eiwirk* (supplementary findings, which will be discussed in I.C., also corroborate this view). In order to be able to reconstruct the earlier marriage type, we will work from the assumption that in the (ideal) original situation there were indeed two exogamous halves, *eiru* and *eiwirk*, within an endogamous house.

We can now return to the preferred marriages and try to answer the questions that arose earlier, namely how compatibility can be achieved between symmetrical and asymmetrical marriage forms, and how two seats can be declared equal, this being the condition for preferred marriages 2a and 3a. We will assume a typical endogamous *em* with two exogamous halves in one house, each with two seats, A1 and A2 in one half, B1 and B2 in the other half of the house.

If the rule for preferred marriage 2a is observed to the letter, the daughter of a woman from B1 (married to a man from A1), would have to marry a man from B1. But the additional prerequisite that a woman 'should replace her mother without returning to her mother's seat' leaves her no other option but to marry a man from B2. The daughter now replaces her mother in B2 instead of in B1. Apparently this is not felt to be a violation of the rule that a woman should replace her mother, as B1 and B2 belong to the *same* exogamous half, and can therefore be attributed equal status; B1 and B2 taken together form an entity opposite the half A1 and A2. If the marriage is contracted in the manner set out above, the other preferred marriage types are, as it were, inherent in it:

- there is sister exchange within the same generation;
- this marriage form combines the FFZSD and the FMBSD marriage;
- at the same time preferred marriage 2a, as discussed above, is the preferred marriage of type 3a, 'to follow your mother'.

Fig. 11a. The bilateral second cross-cousin marriage type in Marsela (adapted from fig. 48 in R. Fox 1967:196).

Fig. 11b. The same marriage as contracted within the endogamous house in Marsela.

In figure 11a all five types of today's preferred marriages in Marsela are brought together, illustrating how they are related. As a working hypothesis, we shall assume that the marriage of the type we have been discussing, which is a form of bilateral cross-cousin marriage, was the typical ideal in Marsela. The bilateral nature of the marriage implies that it may also be described from the female line, namely as a marriage of a man with his MMBDD. Today the typical ideal marriage is not contracted systematically. In our opinion, the five preferred marriages which now exist as marriage types in their own right are forms derived from a marriage typical of an earlier system, notably the bilateral second cross-cousin marriage. We therefore assume that the names given to the five preferred marriage types discussed are relatively recent coinages, referring to marriages which emerged in consequence of the typical ideal marriage.

On the basis of the various labels which the Marselans have for marriages of types 2 and 3, 2a and 3a, we postulate a marriage system of extreme complexity. The reader will undoubtedly wonder whether all this is not rather far-fetched, and whether systems such as these really exist. It is for this reason that we now take a jump to northern Australia, where the Mara, living on the Gulf of Carpentaria, have a marriage system very similar to the typical ideal marriage of Marsela. We wish to stress that the similarity of systems in the two areas need not mean that these systems are in any way related to each other.

With minor differences, the Mara tribe has the same kinship and marriage system as the well-known Aranda of central Australia. Radcliffe-Brown presented the Aranda as typical of Type II of the two main types of Australian kinship and marriage systems he distinguished, Type I being known as the Kariara type (see also II.A.). The Kariara prefer a marriage with MBD, who is usually also FZD (bilateral first cousin), as the Kariara also practise sister exchange (see also R. Fox 1967:185, 186). Among the Aranda a man is not allowed to marry one of his first cousins, the preferred match being one of his second cousins, notably his MMBDD, FMBSD, FFZSD and MFZDD (Radcliffe-Brown 1931:48, 51, 52; Elkin 1979:92-96, 99-103; Spencer and Gillen 1968:76, 80, 81).⁵ Whereas the Kariara type is typical of the four-section system, the Aranda type is typical of the eight-section system. In the latter case, Radcliffe-Brown prefers the term sub-sections (Radcliffe-Brown 1931: 53-58, 322). This type is often regarded as a variation of the Kariara type, see R. Fox (1967:197, 198) and others. In Fox's view, the Aranda type may be the reaction to an increase in population, or to a merging of a number of groups, in any case to some factor which led to an increase in the number of 'alliance units'. For in this type of marriage, the number of possible marriage candidates is more limited than it is in the Kariara type (we will return to this matter below, II.B.).

Among the Mara, the four patrilineal descent lines which emerge

from the Aranda type of marriage (i.e. those of FF, MF, FMB and MMB) exist as absolute divisions within the tribe. Radcliffe-Brown terms them semi-moieties. The son remains in one division with his father. This gives the four descent groups the same characteristics as patrilineal lines. The Mara have a different name for each of them, just as in Marsela (Radcliffe-Brown 1931:58). Various authors have pointed out that every Mara semi-moiety can be looked upon as the equivalent of each 'couple' of sub-sections in, e.g. the Aranda type.⁶ Therefore, like the Marselan type, the Mara type merely is an eight-section system which uses only four names (for example Kroeber 1938:303, 307). Of course any system may be realized with or without section recognition as such: it is the rules of marriage, not the sections, which define the system of kinship and marriage (Lévi-Strauss 1969:146, 151, 152, 159, 164, 165; J. P. B. de Josselin de Jong 1977:269; and others). In Fox's view, what it all boils down to is the mere situation that two bands at one time agreed to exchange their sisters and become one group: the two halves of a moiety system joined into one tribe (R. Fox 1967:194). An important difference between Marsela and Australia is, however, that the four patrilineal lines as they emerge from the Aranda situation may include various clans, whereas in Marsela they exist as single patrilineages. The moieties, in this case, are not halves of the tribe, but merely halves of one house.

Let us now compare the rules of marriage in Marsela with those of the Mara. The Mara clans are divided into four groups, each representing one of the four semi-moieties. As a rule, a man is not allowed to marry a woman who belongs to the same semi-moiety as the one his mother came from. He should marry a woman from the other semi-moiety within his mother's moiety (Spencer 1966:60, 61; Radcliffe-Brown 1931:332, 333). This situation is therefore identical to the typical ideal marriage of Marsela as we have reconstructed it: within the one house there are two exogamous patrilineal halves, subdivided into two exogamous patrilineal groups, which the Marselans refer to as 'seats'.⁷

Like other tribes with a kinship system that may be defined as an Aranda type, the Mara occasionally have so-called 'alternative' marriages, the 'normal' type being a marriage to a second cross-cousin. For in some cases a man will marry a girl classified as the daughter of his mother's brother (Radcliffe-Brown 1931:333; Sharp 1935-36: 158, 165). In such cases he is marrying a woman not only from the same moiety, but also from the same semi-moiety as his mother. In Marsela apparently on occasion similar alternative marriages were contracted. It was not possible, however, to establish in what manner the Marselans managed to integrate these cases into their kinship system.

Lévi-Strauss concerns himself with the question of whether the Mara type may be classified as an Aranda type in view of this alternative

marriage form. We shall not go into this matter here (for a discussion of this point see Lévi-Strauss 1969:199-201).

The typical ideal marriage in its original form may well have been regularly contracted in Marsela, as in all probability the *em* had enough members for such a scheme to be practicable. Itineraries from the end of the last century show that there were houses in Dawelor in which some eighty people lived together (*Notulen* 1880:XLIV). (Itineraries containing comparable information on Marsela could not be found – Marsela was situated off the shipping route between the South-Western and the South-Eastern Islands.) It should be taken into consideration here that in the past the population composition was different; there were relatively more marriageable persons than there are now (see Introduction), and many *em* had several branches built next to the original house.

According to Marselan informants, under the conditions of the endogamous house it still was the rule to pay a bride-price. In the case of the typical ideal marriage, it passed from one half of the house to the other and back. Nowadays, a bride-price is also paid at the exchange of sisters, even though there is a direct exchange of women here. Apparently in this case a payment is made for the father's rights to his future children.

C. Transitional Period

The Marselans maintain that in the old days exogamous *em* existed in addition to the endogamous *em* discussed above. We shall now try to reconstruct this situation.

The histories of the *em* show that the majority settled in Marsela as immigrants from other islands in the vicinity. Often the newly arrived *em* was invited to come and live in or near the house of an *em* which had already settled in the same place. In the histories this is often metaphorically represented as a bow-net (the *em* already present) which has made a catch (i.e. the newly arrived *em*).

From early times to the present day many *em* are known for their close association with one particular other *em* (the Marselans say these form a pair), the two living close to each other and exchanging their women on a regular basis. This association may have come about in a number of ways:

1. as was just described, an *em* which had already settled in a given place invited a newly arrived *em* to come and live with it. This *em* in time split up into two houses, for reasons to be given below;
2. two separate *em* which lived close to each other made a pact together, but went on living in two separate houses;
3. an *em* which was already composed of two parts on arrival went to live in one house. After a while, this *em* also split up into two separate houses, for reasons also to be given further on.

1. As a reason for split-ups, Marselans sometimes mention the fact that

the number of inhabitants of a particular house became too large, or that it occurred in reaction to measures taken by the Dutch administration. The history of a certain *em* from the village of Latalola Besar on the north-west coast of Marsela may serve to illustrate this. This *em* had come into being in the manner set out under 1 above. The house was endogamous. Then, as members of this particular *em* tell us today, the Dutch administration prohibited marriage within the house, as it considered such marriage identical to incest. Thereupon, we were told, the *em* went to live in two separate houses, each adopting a name of its own, and continued the old marriage tie.

Probably there were also other causes, unknown to us, which occasionally led to the splitting up of an *em*. This may be deduced from the fact that split-ups also took place before Marsela came to be supervised more intensively by the Dutch, from 1881 onwards. (This appears from maps made in the course of the field work. See also 3.) It is interesting to see along what dividing-line in the house the splitting of the above *em* took place. The *em* now called Juley originally lived in the *eiru* part and the *em* now called Wakole in the *eiwirk* part of the endogamous house. When the two went to live in separate houses a comparable arrangement was made: the house of Juley was built on the *eiru* side of the house of Wakole, near to it and separated from it by a low wall. This case supports our hypothesis that the division between the two exogamous house halves could only have run along the line between *eiru* and *eiwirk*.

2. Of some pairs of *em* it is known that they initiated marriage ties but continued to live near each other, in separate houses, each on its own hilltop. In Marsela, the tie between them is called *heya*, as is the tie between brothers-in-law. To give an example, we encountered a pair of *em* of which the one calls itself *orno*, 'original', here rather 'earlier', and the other *penyè*, 'stranger, newcomer'. The former came from Luang to Marsela before the latter. Nowadays there still is a strong tradition of intermarriage between the two *em*.

3. In Marsela, there are many examples of *em* which, according to their own history, already were a twofold *em* when they arrived there. To give an example from the village of Marsela: two separate parties reached the island in one prahu: astern was the group referred to as 'large', and at the bow sat the group referred to as 'small', or, in this case, Enmoplawna and Enmopyana respectively. (The names of many *em* end in *-lawna*, 'large', or *-yana(n)*, also *-ola*, 'small'.) The two halves either initially lived together in one large house and split up after a while, or started off living in two houses. Originally endogamous, they went on intermarrying after the split-up. And sometimes two different *em* which became a pair only after meeting in Marsela, and subsequently went to live each in a house

of its own, then adopted the terms 'large' and 'small' when referring to themselves (see 2).

The custom of the 'large' *em* half occupying the *relative* position of *eiru* and the 'small' half that of *eiwirk* – i.e., regardless of their absolute positions in the village, see below, I.C. – was not observed. If either was 'older', i.e., had lived in the island longer, this 'older' half usually went to live to the *eiru* side of the 'younger'.

The development of the systems of both kinship and the distribution of the bride-price as they exist today probably dates from after the splitting up of a large number of *em*. As was explained in I.A., the Marselans today classify their relatives in two main categories, namely *emteoni* and *pyamyoyo*. It is from these groups that the individual seeks help, if necessary, and to whom he, too, is under an obligation to help if need be. The former group comprises the patrilineal and patrilocal group of relatives, and the latter consists of all the women who at any time left their patrilineage through marriage, together with their children, grandchildren and great-grandchildren. *Pyamyoyo* means 'the women who have descended' (i.e., from the house). This division into two groups cannot have existed when marriages were endogamous within the same house. (The terms used for referring to the group of women who married out in this earlier period are not known.) These groups become manifest on many occasions. They present themselves in a most dominant fashion, however, when a marriage is contracted. In raising the bride-price, which the husband is to present to the relatives of the bride, *emteoni* and *pyamyoyo* assist each other. The distribution of the bride-price among the relatives, as is practised today, must be a more recent development (see van Dijk and de Jonge, forthcoming 1987).

From maps drawn in the field it becomes evident that those pairs of *em* which had a regular marriage tie and occupied a common house continued to live near each other after they split up. According to informants, this was precisely because there was a marriage tie between them.

These residence and marriage customs remained when several *em* began living together in one place, atop some steep hill, perhaps compelled to do so by the frequent wars. The locations of these earliest villages can be pointed out even today. Ringed by thick walls, they were true fortresses. Like the houses, the villages were built parallel to the coast of the island. There were two exits from the village, each with its own flight of stairs: one in *eiru* and one in *eiwirk*. The *em* spread out over the *eiru* and *eiwirk* parts of the village. As a rule, they took up residence in accordance with their previous positions relative to each other in the period when the *em* still lived isolated on separate hilltops. Besides, in the village the former *eiru* and *eiwirk* halves of a house continued to live near each other in separate houses which were built in *eiru* and *eiwirk* locations relative to each other, thus perpetuating their former arrangement. This means that people who had previously lived in *eiru* and *eiwirk*

halves of a house now still lived together, in either half of the village. (This pattern of settlement in the first villages has continued almost unchanged, and is still found today in the villages along the coast.)

The development as sketched above is quite the opposite of what would be expected on the basis of a moiety system. For in that case all former *eiru* house halves would have taken up residence in the *eiru* half of the village, and all *eiwirk* house halves in the *eiwirk* half, with an exchange of women between the two village halves. But in Marsela this is not so, and according to informants it never was. The above discussion shows why the situation developed in a different direction here. The pairs of *em* which intermarried gradually extended their marriage ties to include the other *em* within their own village half. Informants tell us that formerly, in the days of the first villages, all the *em* in e.g. *eiru* were related to each other, as were all the *em* in *eiwirk*. This resulted in two more or less endogamous village halves, each consisting of several *em*. In the course of time, an increasing number of marriages came to be contracted between members of the different village halves, thereby preventing the village from actually falling apart. It should be remembered that there never had been any ban on marrying someone from the other half of the village.

It is conceivable that the typical ideal marriage ceased to be contracted systematically, leaving only the 'loose' forms as they occur in Marsela today, because the *em* started marrying into more than one other *em*, and even into *em* from the other half of the village. (Cf. the difference of opinion between Lévi-Strauss and De Josselin de Jong on comparable forms of marriage in southern India: Lévi-Strauss 1969: 424, 443, 445, 448; J. P. B. de Josselin de Jong 1977:310.)

Nowadays, preferred marriages are also contracted beyond one's own village. There is a marked preference for the 'to replace your mother/grandmother' marriage form: if a woman from village X, *em* A, is married to a man from village Y, *em* B, then, in one of the next generations, a woman from village Y, *em* B, will be required to return to village X, *em* A. Now the *em* has become the operational unit, instead of the exogamous half of the house. This development has been favoured by the reshufflings that have taken place at the seats: as a result of the population decline and, in many *em*, the subsequent vacation of some seats, the members of a single seat spread over all of the four seats of the house, thereby creating once more four patrilineal groups. For this reason all the seats within the majority of the *em* are now closely related to each other, and this is yet another reason for not marrying members of the same house any longer.

We can therefore establish as a fact that, as far as the rules of marriage are concerned, the two halves of the village, *eiru* and *eiwirk*, must not be regarded as moieties. The only aspect that has been transferred directly from the house level to the village level is the function of the *eiru* and

eiwirk parts of the village as ceremonial groups, which, even today, in the modern villages along the coast, are very important. These two groups, made up of several *em*, clearly present themselves as two separate units, for example when mutual aid is needed or at ceremonies such as the New Year's feast (see below). The *eiru* half usually also is the place of residence of the lord of the land, whereas the descendants of the man who formerly was the war-leader live in the *eiwirk* half.

As ceremonial groups, the village halves have therefore acquired the characteristics of moieties. Their development as such probably was necessary in order to make the village function as an entity. The more so as the Marselans had no other all-inclusive symbolic unit for the village. (Unlike the people of Dawera and Dawelor, who had the *prahu*. See part II.) The so-called 'navel' of the house recurs on the village level, but takes on a new meaning here, namely as the common altar in the village centre.

In the ceremonial functions of the two village halves, too, however, certain recent shifts can be observed. In some villages these functions have now been partly taken over by two neighbouring villages. The New Year's feast, for instance, can be made into a common affair. The Marselans often refer to certain pairs of villages by a single name: Eirili-Lekalol (i.e. Serili and Latalola), or Ilbuni-Metel (i.e., Ilbutung and Marsela). One of the pair is referred to as the 'elder' of the other, e.g. the village of Marsela, which is in an *eiru* location with respect to Ilbutung (*eiwirk*). The New Year's feast (at which the dead are also thought to be present) opens in *eiru*/Marsela, with the inhabitants of Ilbutung also attending, and afterwards the inhabitants of both villages leave for *eiwirk*/Ilbutung in order to conclude it there. (Formerly, this meant bidding farewell to the dead in the *eiwirk* part of Ilbutung.) There is a markedly higher rate of intermarriage between two villages that are paired in this way than there is between villages with no such tie.

II. Dawera and Dawelor

A. Present Situation

Like the Marselans, the inhabitants of Dawera and Dawelor organize their society by distinguishing several descent groups. As was noted in the Introduction, in Moluccan Malay these groups are referred to by the term *soa*. Because of the ambiguous nature of this term, we prefer the terms used locally: *luwyol*, *alkol* or *umol*. We have chosen the latter term because it is current in everyday usage.

Literally *umol* means 'house'. Considering that comparable societies in eastern Indonesia, such as that of Marsela, also use the word 'house' to refer to a descent group, the expectation would seem justified that the members of the social category which it denotes (clan, lineage: see J. Fox

1980:331) form a residential group. In Dawera and Dawelor, however, this is not the case.

It is the application of different principles of descent in the social organization that underlies this deviation. The *umol* is defined by descent through men. This becomes apparent from, for instance, the fact that the children of a marriage bear the family name of the father. (A group of family names is connected with one specific *umol*, the names commonly being those of male ancestors.) Groups formed for ceremonial purposes, too, are patrilineally organized.

This patrilineal principle coincides with a decidedly matrilineal pattern of residence. The logical consequence is that the term *umol* cannot refer to a descent group and a residential group at the same time.

Every *umol*, however, does have some kind of residential basis in what we shall call a house of origin, namely the *umlawlol*, 'large house'. A number of these houses, each with a name of its own, together with the branches arranged around them, make up a village.

As appears from figure 12, in the *umlawlol* the successive generations of women have residence. They are related by patrilineal descent to several *umol* in the village. The coincidence of patrilineal descent and matrilineal residence also gives rise to a curious situation in relation to the place of residence of the *umol*'s two most important office holders. These are the man who heads the *umol*, the *emtukumol*, and the woman

Plate 2. 'Pilot' compartments, separated by the cooking-place, in a house of origin in Dawelor (39 inhabitants; photograph by Nico de Jonge, 1981).

Fig. 12. Distribution of *umol* members.

who is in charge of the *umol*'s heirlooms, the *watemtukol*. She always lives in the house of origin, he rarely does.

With regard to these offices, succession is again based on the different principles of descent: whereas the office of *emtukumol* passes from the father to the son, the *watemtukol* hands her title down matrilineally to her eldest daughter.

As a result of the interwoven principles of descent, *umol*-consciousness is rather weak. Informants often refer to both the father's and the mother's line. This is also a result of the pattern of inheritance, which is cognatic: land at the disposal of both parents is equally distributed among all the children. Thus we see that in Dawera and Dawelor the two unilineal principles as well as the cognatic principle play a role, in contrast to the situation in Marsela, where patrilineal descent and patrilocality coincide with patrilineal inheritance.

For the house of origin of an *umol* there is believed to be an ideal external orientation. The leading principle is the ancestral precept *lerlud leyol lemmla*, 'follow the sun's course'. The house is represented as a sailing prahu bound for the setting sun. The traditional terms pertaining to the lay-out of the house follow this comparison through to a remarkable extent. The house of origin is divided into an eastern and a western half, called the 'helmsman' part (*mekamulol*) and the 'pilot' part (*mekakweruwrol*) respectively. These names play a similar role on the village level. The *umol* owning the easternmost house of origin is referred to as helmsman. The pilot possesses the westernmost house of origin. Any other *umol* which may reside within the boundaries of the village are similarly referred to as crew members of a ship:

Fig. 13. Orientation of *umlawlol* within the village.

Related by patrilineal descent to the *umol* which first settled on the site where, after the arrival of a few other *umol* (see II.C.), a village arose, is the *warawluol*, 'lord of the island'. In religious matters on the village level, especially before the advent of Christianity, he was responsible for the (spiritual) well-being of the village community. Reference was already made to this official in part I. In Dawera and Dawelor he was commonly a member of the helmsman *umol*. The pilot *umol* of the village usually was required to supply the war-leader, i.e., the man who was responsible, among other things, for matters concerned with warfare.

Let us now take a look at the present marriage system in Dawera and Dawelor. It is considered of great importance to look for a marriage partner in the village where one was raised. This is not necessarily the village of birth, because one may have left that place at an early age through adoption. We will return to this matter in II.C.

Within the village, ego looks for someone of his own generation. Persons from the generation prior to ego (*tuwkwemol*) and that after him (*tuwkwikol*) are not eligible. Marriages between members of the same *umol* are preferred. This is called *lewdaw milamed*, 'to marry within one'. Sister exchange (marriage to ZHZ) is allowed. Within ego's generation a marriage to a first cousin is considered preferable to a marriage to a second cousin. Contrary to the state of affairs in Marsela, the relationship to a first cousin is not felt to be too close. A marriage between ego and a first cross-cousin (MBD/FZD) is considered most preferable. Occasionally this type does occur. Marriages to parallel cousins are allowed, however, and on occasion they are encouraged in order to slow down a further cutting up of *umol* land. In this case a marriage between patrilineal parallel cousins is an exception, as the mission, in its zeal to stamp out endogamy, banned any marriage ties between partners who bore the same family names. Bride-prices are not paid.

In the case of an intended marriage between partners from different villages, however, a payment from the man to the village community to which his future wife belongs is occasionally demanded. On handing over a pair of golden ear-drops to the head of the village involved, 'the doors of the village are opened' to him. Although any children will become members of the father's descent group, they are raised in the mother's village. Therefore, the presentation of the ear-drops to the chief of that village seems a curiously one-sided arrangement. In addition, the groom has to pay for all the food for the marriage feast, whereas for a marriage between partners from the same village these expenses are shared by both parties. Below, in II.C., we will return both to the payments for food and to the presentation of the ear-drops.

Of course we must now ask how the most salient feature of the social context in which these marriages are contracted, the concurrence of

patrilineal descent and matrilocal residence, can be related to ego's choice of a partner. To that end we shall first look into this combination, which for Indonesia is a remarkable one.

Of those authors who have published on the subject of the relation between the rule of descent and the rule of residence, it is Lévi-Strauss who is most prominent. The terms he devised for use in this context are 'harmonic' and 'disharmonic'. A *harmonic* regime is one in which the rule of residence is similar to the rule of descent, and a *disharmonic* regime is one in which they are opposed. Accordingly, there are two types of harmonic regime, matrilineal and matrilocal, and patrilineal and patrilocal; and two types of disharmonic regime, patrilineal and matrilocal, and matrilineal and patrilocal (Lévi-Strauss 1969:215). In Lévi-Strauss' view, the distinction between harmonic and disharmonic is of fundamental importance, and he relies on it as one of the cornerstones of his theory on 'generalized exchange' and 'restricted exchange' (see I.A.).

It now must be established to what extent the disharmonic regime as found in Dawera and Dawelor corresponds to the types of exchange that Lévi-Strauss distinguishes (cf. Marsela: harmonic regime and restricted exchange). A definite answer to this question cannot be given without reference to Lévi-Strauss' original theory. We shall therefore point out its main themes, mention briefly the main points of criticism, and on that basis state our own position.

Lévi-Strauss works from the assumption that society is integrated by means of marriage ties. In his view, there is a functional relation between a harmonic regime and asymmetrical ('generalized') exchange on the one hand, and disharmony and symmetry ('restricted exchange') on the other. The regime in Dawera and Dawelor being disharmonic, we shall first discuss the latter relation.

Lévi-Strauss' point of departure is a reciprocal exchange of women. He takes the view that this type of exchange results in a primitive stage of group integration represented by moiety systems, for the further integration of which only one of two options remains: either a change is made towards a more open system of marriage, that is, the unilateral instead of the bilateral cross-cousin marriage, or they develop further under a disharmonic regime. Using material compiled by Radcliffe-Brown (1931) on Australian moiety systems, Lévi-Strauss discusses the consequences of the latter option, demonstrating that a disharmonic relation between descent and residence results in the emergence of *two pairs* of moieties – two patrimoieties and two matrimoieties. The disharmonic regime causes one pair of moieties to be added to the existing pair. He demonstrates this with an example which leads him to conclude that the four sections thus formed in fact represent merely two dichotomies brought together in one system and related through the principle of disharmony, as follows:

Fig. 14. Integration of two pairs of moieties.

Let us assume a patrilineal descent, and designate the two patrimoieties A and B. Now the matrilineal dichotomy, based on residence, gives rise to the matrimoieties I and II. Ego belongs to a patrimoiety *and* a matrimoiety, both of which are exogamous. He must therefore look for a wife who belongs neither to his patri- nor to his matrimoiety. If ego, in our example, belongs to A.I., he must marry a woman belonging to B.II. Therefore, the integration of two pairs of moieties into four sections, labelled 'marriage classes' by Lévi-Strauss (1969:156), brings about the same rule of marriage that applies to an elementary moiety system: ego still marries a bilateral first cross-cousin.⁸ To which section a given individual belongs may be seen from the following diagram:

In this view, under a harmonic regime, residence is not a productive factor. In order to achieve a further integration, moiety systems with the same rule of descent and of residence will therefore have to shift to disharmony or to a system of asymmetric connubium.

To resume the above:

Fox, on the other hand (R. Fox 1967:193), pursuing a line of thought developed by others (e.g. Schmitz 1964:73), demonstrates that a disharmonic regime by no means is a prerequisite to further integration of a primitive moiety system. He takes the position that the alternating generations of one patrimoiety *are in fact related by matrilineal descent*. Therefore, a society organized on the basis of two patrimoieties always has two potential matrimoieties at its disposal that can be activated if necessary, e.g. for purposes of organizing residence.

Fig. 15. Implicit and explicit moieties.

So the recognition of both descent principles does not belong exclusively to a disharmonic regime. In Fox's approach, the factor which Lévi-Strauss sees as a cause becomes a possible result of the moiety system. As we have seen in part I, under a harmonic regime, as in Marsela, integration by means of semi-moieties no longer causes any problems of a theoretical nature, provided we recognize both the implicit matrilineal and the explicit patrilineal groups (cf. Lévi-Strauss' remarks on the similarly organized Mara, 1969:198/218).

In addition, as Van Wouden (1968) has demonstrated, like symmetrical marriage systems, asymmetrical systems, too, have a (latent) alternative line available. For this reason J. P. B. de Josselin de Jong, in his criticism of the theory of Lévi-Strauss, reaches the general conclusion that 'When there are e.g. n patrilineal clans with positive rules of marriage there are also n latent matrilineal groups intersecting the former' (J. P. B. de Josselin de Jong 1977:309).

However, in the case of double descent as it is defined in Lévi-Strauss' theory, i.e. that both descent principles are not just recognized but are given an equal functional application, one for descent and one for residence, a coincidence of double descent and 'generalized exchange' not only is redundant, but of course becomes most unlikely. The open, integrating character of the MBD marriage (as the most important exponent of the asymmetric connubium), which sets no limits to the number of clans participating in the system of exchange, renders cohabitation of 'the other line' hardly viable.

But even if the 'generalized exchange' were to be limited to apply to

no more than three patrilans, people would tend to avoid the perpetual confrontation between superior and inferior groups (wife-givers and wife-receivers respectively) in cohabiting matrilineages. The exogamous 'house' would no longer be able to function as an operational unit. It is revealing that in the anthropological literature disharmonic regimes tend to be found only among societies that have a marked division into moieties.

If, on the other hand, in the case of asymmetric connubium, a community feels a desire to make some use of the fact that the 'other line' has a scattered residence pattern, some form of double descent will emerge. Van Wouden's analysis of the *wala* in Kodi (Sumba), where sister exchange is (was) prohibited in favour of 'generalized exchange' (see also Needham 1980:36), takes this into account: 'The *wala* are in fact distributed over the whole territory and the same *wala* may even have members in neighbouring districts. In former times of unrest and incessant warfare, this ability to call on fellow *wala* members afforded the only possibility to travel in safety and to find hospitality' (Van Wouden 1977:201).

Therefore double descent as a 'consequence of the unilateral system' (Van Wouden 1968:92; see also Schefold 1986:71) is only double in a limited sense, as the two lines do not have equal opportunities to assert themselves. (For example, rules of inheritance may develop for passing on real estate and movables which inevitably lead to the situation in which the movables are passed on in the 'weak' line; see also Niessen 1984:63-83.)

To resume the above, we can say that disharmony is only found in societies with 'restricted exchange', although it is not a *sine qua non*, as Lévi-Strauss maintains, and only occurs occasionally. Hence in Dawera and Dawelor we may expect to find a division into moieties. In the present situation, however, none were found. But from our reconstruction of the social structure, based on the house of origin, it will become clear how direct exchange could have taken place.

B. Earlier Situation

The emergence of the villages as they exist today can be viewed as the third phase in a development which, according to historical information, started with the *umol* living isolated on a *watkulol* ('trunk of stone'), or elevated rocky plateau. Every plateau on which an *umol* ever settled bears a name of its own. On many of these plateaus members of the one *umol* must have lived in a number of houses built close together. The large house of origin, as a 'mother' ship, was surrounded by branches regarded as ships in tow or outriggers, depending on their location relative to the *umlawlol*. About the village of Watuwei, in Dawelor, an itinerary dating from 1880 remarks that 'around 80 persons of the one family' inhabited a single house (*Notulen* 1880:XLIV). If correct, this

means that *umol* living in isolation must have had a few hundred members.

In Dawera and Dawelor the house is associated with a prahu sailing from the rising sun towards the setting sun (see II.A.). Within the house these opposed points of orientation correspond with a pilot and a helmsman half. The two parts of the house are separated by the *ottuwlesol*, literally the 'sleeping-quarters of the unmarried men'. In addition, it is the place where visitors are received. Besides, it is the traditional place for the communal meals of the mature men.

Indoors, people refer all directions to the sailing direction, generally standing with their back to the east. Therefore the north coincides with the right (*melwal*) and the south with the left (*merurs*). Accordingly, the pilot and helmsman halves of the house are divided by means of two cooking-places, one in each half of the house, thus creating four 'rooms', to which people refer either by mentioning the name of the ancestor who first occupied that specific part of the house, or, more commonly, by using the nautical terms to be mentioned below. The right and left helmsmen share a cooking-place, as do the right and left pilots:

Fig. 16. Orientation and lay-out of the traditional house.

As the opposition left:right is to be viewed as being derived from the opposition pilot:helmsman, which centres on the sailing direction, the division of the house into four parts is secondary to the division into two halves. This is of great importance, as we are looking for the two halves of a moiety system. Helmsman and pilot have become integral parts of the symbolic system and as such pervade other aspects of everyday life, viz.:

– The relation between pilot and helmsman is associated with that between 'tip' and 'trunk'. In Dawera and Dawelor, the latter opposition, which is frequent in eastern Indonesia (see Barnes 1974:Ch. 13, and Forth 1981:32), is prominent in many different areas of life. Generally speaking, 'trunk' stands for that which gives life, the origin, or source. In

Dawera and Dawelor helmsman is associated with this principle. A point in evidence is the word *ulol*, which means both 'trunk' and 'helm'.

– In each room, the matrilineal relatives of one particular *umol* ancestor reside. Right helmsman is occupied by the lineage tracing its descent from the first ancestor to the house (called the 'eldest'), left pilot by the lineage descending from the ancestor who arrived last (the 'youngest').

– When building a house, which is done in prescribed phases, the first action of each new phase must take place in right helmsman. Erecting the first post (*mekamulol*, 'he who wields the helm'), orientating the 'trunk' end of the first horizontal roof beam, positioning the first coconut leaf of the roof, all these actions which signify the start of a new phase should originate in right helmsman. The so-called 'second-post' (*ruwkelol*) is erected diagonally opposite the first in the 'youngest' compartment, left pilot:

Fig. 17. Situation of the first and second house posts.

– Right helmsman houses the above-mentioned *watemtukol* (see II.A.), the female keeper of the *umol*'s heirlooms. Related by patrilineal descent to the ancestor of that same room is the head of the house, the *emtukumol*. Formerly he was responsible for the well-being of the entire *umol*, and for this reason he has to all intents evolved into the *umol*'s specialist in religious matters. Related to one of the pilots – we were not able to establish which – was the war-leader. This can be concluded from information received on the later situation in the village, where the pilot *umol* had to supply this village official.

The partition of the traditional house into two halves therefore embodies several binary oppositions:

sunrise:sunset
trunk:tip
helmsman:pilot
elder:younger
first:last

From this it could be inferred that two groups settled in the same place, one after the other, and that they afterwards went to live in one house, taking as the classification principle the means of transportation by which the place of residence was reached. The subdivision into left and right, right being superior to left, could then point to a subdivision of authority ('age' – elder:younger) within the one kin group.

From the names given to the quarters it appears at once that in

Dawera and Dawelor the dual division is primary, and the division into four parts secondary. We can therefore establish a relation between pilot and helmsman (Dawera and Dawelor) that is comparable to the one between *eiwirk* and *eiru* (Marsela). We will discuss one aspect of the relation between pilot and helmsman in slightly more detail, as it presented the bipartite house with a common centre of worship: the 'navel' of the house. This has the advantage that, on proceeding to a discussion of the 'navel' of the later village, we will be able to introduce an element of hierarchy into the social dualism (see II.C.).

In the classificatory system of Dawera and Dawelor the opposition 'tip': 'trunk' is of fundamental importance. Associations with this opposition can be found in the spatial as well as in the social order. To put it simply, prosperity is gained by integrating 'trunk' and 'tip'. In this respect, the rules for roofing a house resemble those in Marsela: the same general principle that 'tip' should always follow 'trunk' is observed, and into the roof a symbolic construction is integrated which breaks the regular pattern thus formed. A few (2 or 3) coconut leaves are bound together in such a way that the *lower* ends of the midribs meet: it is the 'navel' (*luurol*) of the house (see plate 3). Perhaps it symbolizes two entities meeting and combining into one (i.e. two connecting houses; see also part I, fig. 10).

Plate 3. 'Navel' of house in Dawera and Dawelor (photograph by Nico de Jonge).

It is in this spot, which in Dawera and Dawelor is found in the *centre* of the right side of the roof, that the ancestors might enter the house. Around the 'navel' four baskets were hung (one for each room), in which the people living in the house placed small amounts of food for the ancestors. On the village level we shall again encounter this theme of a single place of worship for all the people living in a 'prahu' (in II.C.).

Resuming our search for an earlier moiety system (based on the disharmony that we established), we now feel it to be safe to conclude that in pilot and helmsman we have found the names of the two halves. This conclusion leads to the recognition that when the *umol* community lived in the isolated house of origin, it must have been endogamous.

Informants confirm this point of view. According to them, the maxim 'eat from one plate, sleep in one place' expressed the prohibition against marrying outside the *umol*. A less frequently used term referring to the *umol* community, *alkol*, is also believed to point in this direction. *Alkol* means literally 'leaf from the *koli* palmtree' (Moluccan Malay for *Borassus sundaicus*), though the *sirih* basket made from this plant is also designated *alkol*. This basket plays an important role in the marriage ceremony. Eating *sirih* together unites the two parties. Representing the *umol* as a *sirih* basket expresses the endogamic principle at the same time. (It is revealing that a *koli*-leaf is torn in two when a divorce is pronounced.)

One reason for marrying a partner from the same *umol* is given in the diary entries of Müller-Wismar: 'For fear that the *harta* may become lost, marriages of members of the same *luvi* are a common practice, while the right to the children belongs to the father' (Müller-Wismar 1913a:74/26-Dawelor).⁹ This is an interesting observation, as the reason given centres on the bride-price (designated by the Moluccan Malay word *harta* in the above quotation, where *luvi* is the term used for *umol* – see II.A.), the payment of which was discontinued c. 1920. This stresses the patrilineal descent principle in this matrilocal society even more. As in the other Babar islands, in Dawera and Dawelor the bride-price consisted of gold ear-drops and imported cotton textiles (*basta*; see Van Dijk and De Jonge, forthcoming 1987).

However, before proceeding to an exact reconstruction of the earlier system of endogamous marriage, it will be necessary to introduce into our analysis some changes in the rules of inheritance. Considering the age of several of our informants at the time, the present cognatic system must have come about c. 1925. Before that time the *umol*'s lands were at the exclusive disposal of the women. Each room was occupied by women who worked and supervised the gardens belonging to that particular room. When a son married out, he did receive a garden plot, but this was merely added on to that of his wife, and was therefore returned to a female line. Double descent in Dawera and Dawelor as it existed around the turn of the century, now is seen to have possessed the following characteristics:

Although the double descent system in its earlier form no longer is operative in Dawera and Dawelor, it still is in several villages on the east coast of Babar. In this connection Sneeuwjagt (1935:115) mentions the area extending from Nakarhamto to Analutur (see map 2). Informants from villages in this coastal region confirm both matrilineal residence, which locally is still tied in with matrilineal inheritance, and various forms of patrilineal descent (usually the eldest child belongs to the father's group) with bride-price payments (which continue to the present day). As in Dawera and Dawelor, there is a preference for marriage within one's own kin group. However, when marrying 'within one' a bride-price must also be paid. This practice, mentioned in the Müller-Wismar passage quoted above as occurring in Dawera and Dawelor, too, in our opinion strongly suggests that the house formerly consisted of two exogamous groups which decided to go and live together.

Keeping in mind the marriage type most preferred at this moment (first cross-cousin, see II.A.), we now move on to the question of how this type fits in with the assumed partition of the *umol* into two exogamous halves, pilot and helmsman. The answer must not be in conflict with the occurrence of a disharmonic regime and the subdivision of the two halves of the house into a left and a right compartment.

It should be clear that a marriage to a parallel cousin was impossible. It is only after the introduction of cognatic inheritance that the MZD marriage can have gained any popularity (see II.A.). The cross-cousin marriage which is preferred today (MBD/FZD) is bilateral. Only sister exchange (involving women of the same generation) yields marriages between bilateral cross-cousins. The relationship terminology offers evidence for this type of exchange, as we will presently demonstrate.

Typical in eastern Indonesia for the relationship between groups having an asymmetric connubium is the use of the term 'trunk' for MB: the mother's brother is the 'source' of his sister's children. For example, in the islands of Lomblen (*epu puén* – Barnes 1974:248) and Sumba (*pola pu* – Onvlee 1973:48-49) 'trunk' thus symbolizes the life-giving principle. This leads J. Fox to remark that 'the relationship between mother's brother and sister's child which in this area is invariably marked by cognates of the Austronesian term for "trunk", "root", "base", "origin" stresses the status differences involved in the continuity of alliance' (J. Fox 1980:331). Hence the use of the term 'trunk' for MB indicates that the status of wife-givers is superior to that of wife-receivers.

In Dawera and Dawelor 'trunk' (*ulol*) also refers to the life-giving source. We already commented on this in our discussion of the house of origin. *Ulol*, if used as a relationship term, however, indicates that there is no difference in status between the two groups:

Fig. 18. *Ulol* as a relationship term.

In the matrilineal situation both HZ and BW are referred to as *ulol*. No distinction is made between 'husband-receivers' and 'husband-givers'; the symmetry of the marriage system is expressed symbolically by the use of the term *ulol*: each group is the life-giving source of the other.

However, direct exchange by means of marriages between *first* cross-cousins does not account for the four local units that constitute an *umol*; it only accounts for two. But four units, say the four *umol* rooms, are the minimum number necessary if eventually marriages with bilateral *second* cross-cousins are to be preferred: MMBDD/FMBSD/FFZSD. In that case the same diagram could be drawn which was also used to demonstrate the integration of the five preferred marriages of Marsela. In contrast to this island, however, the four ever-present latent matri-

Fig. 19. Disharmonic relation between descent (A) and residence (B).

lineal semi-moieties in the arrangement, in Dawera and Dawelor have become manifest and are employed for purposes of organizing residence.

Figure 19 A shows the patrilineal descent lines, while the matrilineal lines in the *umol* (i.e. the rooms) are mapped out in figure 19 B. If our analysis is correct, the present preferred bilateral first cross-cousin marriage must have been preceded by a preference for marriage with a bilateral second cross-cousin.

In publications on the subject, both forms of marriage are usually discussed together (R. Fox 1967; Lévi-Strauss 1969; Radcliffe-Brown 1931), as they are regarded as variations on a single theme, i.e. direct exchange. The main difference between the two consists in the reduction by half of the number of potential marriage candidates as soon as the so-called Kariera-marriage rule (bilateral first cross-cousin) is replaced by the Aranda rule (bilateral second cross-cousin). It is therefore demographic circumstances, as pointed out in part I, which according to R. Fox (1967:198) provide the motivation for the introduction or discontinuation of the Aranda rule. If, because of a diminishing population, ego cannot find a wife among his second cross-cousins, he will try and find himself a wife in the other moiety and marry a first cross-cousin (i.e. 'wrong'). Ego then does not follow his grandfather, but his father. The frequent occurrence of alternative marriages among other societies having an Aranda-type system (see I.B.) indicates that, in practice, the two rules typically occur together.

Lévi-Strauss' approach to this flexibility centres on a change in the number of 'marriage classes' (*sections*, see II.A.): 'There are cases in which tribes with eight classes have reverted to a four-class system, tribes with four classes have reverted to a two-class system, and tribes with two classes have adopted a new regulation of marriage between clans of the same moiety' (Lévi-Strauss 1969:152).

In theory, in Dawera and Dawelor, with their four lineages, there is a total of eight implicit sections in the system (two generations within each semi-moiety). But they are not recognized there, nor in Marsela.

Postulating an earlier Kariera phase which preceded the Aranda system, the emergence of four 'rooms' must have given rise to the Aranda rule of marriage. Following Fox's line of thought (R. Fox 1967: 198), we assume that as time went by the number of marriageable people within the *umol* must have dwindled to such an extent that marriages with first cross-cousins came to be contracted. This was already mentioned in the Introduction. After the endogamous system was disrupted, the disharmonic regime may have played a decisive role in this process (see below).

C. Transitional Period

It is conceivable that a type of society built on self-sufficient nuclei (as is

sketched in II.B.) was preceded by a more open system in which *umol* living in isolation exchanged sisters. It is possible that in time such a relationship developed into a more or less permanent tie between them, and that it was decided that they might as well go and live in one house. For, in addition to the isolated house with marriage arrangements 'within one', informants also mentioned a more 'open' variety: two independent *umol* which did not live far apart exchanging sisters. In this context reference is commonly made to the 'common garden' (i.e. the common supply of women) of two *umol* having such a tie.

Apart from this, when analysing the isolated house, we found a spatial and social structure based on the *prahu*. In the case of endogamous *umol*, the disharmonic regime did not cause any problems. The coresidence of *umol* in villages, however, has created a certain tension between descent and residence which has influenced social organization. We will look into this matter in somewhat more detail by explaining how the present villages developed.

Taking the house of origin as our point of departure, the following phases can be discerned in the development which led to the formation of villages:

- I. the development on rocky plateaus of what we shall call *prahu configurations*;
- II. the subsequent removal of these, in some instances several at a time, to the coastal area.

Phase I

It is known of several *umol* having marriage arrangements 'within one' that at a later stage the two halves of the house, pilot and helmsman, came to be established in separate dwellings. The cause of a separation of this kind is somewhat uncertain. It is possible that measures taken by the colonial administration which were intended to put a halt to endogamy had some influence on this, but it does not seem very likely. There must have been split-ups even before the arrival in 1881 of the first colonial officer in the Babar archipelago, in Tapa (Kromme 1921: 254).

As a result of the accommodation of pilot and helmsman in two dwellings, sister exchange came to be established between separate houses, giving rise to a situation which closely resembled the 'open' variety mentioned above. But the location of their houses remained a point of difference between two *umol* which had lived separately to begin with, and a split-up *umol*. In the former case each *umol* possessed a house on a separate plateau. In the latter case both houses stood together on the one rocky plateau: the helmsman house on the side where the sun rises, the pilot house to the west of it. According to the division into helmsman and pilot, an *umol* half was now referred to by placing either *lawl* ('large') or *kokl* ('small') after the name of the *umol*. Each

house was given a name of its own. In addition, the configuration thus formed on the model of a prahu was also named.

This kind of split-up makes clear how the prahu configuration in Dawera and Dawelor may have developed, i.e. from several houses standing together, whose inhabitants married within the *endogamous* symbolic prahu structure. But it seems likely that prahu configurations also developed in other ways. It is possible, for instance, that the incessant wars promoted some form of cooperation between isolated *umol*, which led to the building of villages that could be defended by a larger number of people. These prahu configurations appeared on the larger plateaus. They consisted of up to four *umol*.

It has been established with certainty, however, that in several cases *umol* that split up into two houses were the basis of prahu configurations. A case in point is the widespread type of which a plan is given below.

Fig. 20. Orientation and lay-out of a prahu configuration.

This is the prahu configuration of Loylewla in Dawera, which is now part of the village of Welora. Walls which totally surrounded it provided a reasonable degree of security. Two lockable doors were fitted in the east and the west, where the sun rises and sets. The *umol* to which the first settlers belonged, *umol* Werwur, is divided into pilot (Werwur-kokl) and helmsman (Werwur-lawl). Of the later arrivals in Loylewla, *umol* Tomreli and *umol* Laleat, it is not known whether they formerly had any regular marriage tie. But it is certain that they have always lived in separate houses. Werwur-lawl and Werwur-kokl did have a marriage tie.

Within the prahu configuration Werwur-lawl and Laleat were helmsmen. Werwur-lawl became right helmsman, as there was a relationship with the 'lord of the island'. Werwur-kokl, which boasted a relationship with the man who led the village army, continued as the pilot. Tomreli was given the position of the man who scoops out the prahu's bilge (henceforth, we shall label this position 'water scooper'; see also figure 13). In the centre stood the *larol* tree (*Ficus Benjamina*), the 'sail' of the prahu (A in figure 20). In the shade of this tree was the 'navel' of the village (*luurol*), a pole driven into the earth (B in figure 20). To its right stood the *lakpolol*, a communal, sheltered eating-place for the men of the village (C in figure 20).

A comparison between the orientation and lay-out of the individual house and the prahu configuration reveals that,

1. the exogamous halves within the house possibly manifested themselves as 'village halves' in an endogamous prahu configuration, comprising an even number of houses;
2. the 'navel' and the central eating-place of the house are seen to re-emerge in the centre of the prahu configuration.

1. When taken together, all the genealogies we collected suggest that exogamous halves within a prahu configuration probably did not exist. It is true that the *umol* halves in the two parts of the village continued their marriage tie, but the marriage system of the other *umol* does not support the theory that this had any connection with an exogamous principle based on village halves. Rather, our findings warrant the conclusion that to a large extent within the prahu configuration, too, the earlier system was continued: to marry 'within one' ('s own *umol*). The existence of prahu configurations made up of an odd number of houses also points in this direction.

It would seem that somehow disharmony was involved, because after the disruption of the *umol* endogamy within the prahu configuration the endogamous principle was transferred from the *umol* to the level of the prahu configuration. In response to the vulnerability of the disharmonic organization, the payment of the 'bride-price' must have come to be integrated on this level ('to open the doors of the village', see II.A.). If a man were to marry a woman from another prahu configuration, the concurrence of descent and residence would cease to exist, the *umol* as a descent group would scatter, and the patrilineages would all but lose their significance as operational groups (e.g. in case of war).

Placing the present social structure against this background (i.e., an attempt to prevent a loss of men), some other rules become transparent:

- If adultery is committed between members of the same village, the fine is markedly lower than if the adulterers live in different villages. What the latter arrangement really amounts to is that beyond what is

usual in the first case, a fine to the value of the bride-price (which as a rule no longer is paid) is demanded from the offender.

- If a marriage is contracted with a woman from another village, the expenses for the wedding festivities must be borne by the groom, and are not shared by both parties, as is the case if the couple originates from the same village.
- The husband is expected to return one child born of a marriage with a woman from another village to the matrilineage in his native village. Usually one of his sisters adopts the child (*lewkal*, 'the child that is called (for)'), occasionally his mother does so. Sometimes, although not as a rule, a man will send one of his children back to the house where he was born to replace the father even if he has married a girl from his own village.¹⁰

In the social order of Dawera and Dawelor the tension between patrilineal descent and matrilocality becomes manifest in, among other things, rules of this kind. Beyond Indonesia a similar dilemma can be found among, for example, the Ndembu of Zambia, where the Nkang'a ritual is expressive of the desire to retain the women who are at risk of being lost to the village (as a result of the disharmonic regime) (Turner 1974:24-25).

2. In Indonesia, dual organization, together with the asymmetric conubium is usually associated with a sexual dichotomy. In Lévi-Strauss' view, the Indonesian moieties which are conceived of as being the one male and the other female even constitute 'a remarkable property of asymmetric marriage' (Lévi-Strauss 1963:156-157). We therefore cannot avoid discussing, however briefly, a system which deviates from this model, e.g. the one found in Dawera and Dawelor. We will do so by referring to the 'navel' and eating-quarters in both the house and the prahu configuration.

To the members of the *umol* the 'navel' of the house represented a single centre of worship (see II.B.). If we simply assumed a relation of analogy between the structure of the microcosm and macrocosm, holding the bipartite house to be a model of the cosmos (see Cunningham 1973:220, 234; see also Ellen 1986:4), the symbolic meaning of the 'navel' of the *village* could provide a clue as to both *umol* halves reflecting the opposition male:female. The 'navel' of the prahu configuration, a wooden pole driven into the earth, is symbolic for Leyol-Wulol: Sun-Moon, a bisexual unity, representing heaven as opposed to earth.¹¹ In prayers, the earth is commonly referred to as 'land' and 'sea', land being associated with the feminine and sea with the masculine. So the Sun-Moon distinction may be supplemented by a second one, resulting in the following field of contrasts:

In this model there is a division into four parts, i.e., an implicit subdivision of heaven and earth into male and female. We shall not go into this matter any further here; however, careful investigation of the implications of the model has yielded the relevant conclusion that the relation between the two moieties cannot be regarded simply as an opposition between the masculine and the feminine. Perhaps an analysis of the status of the eating-quarters will help to solve the issue. For this area, located in the centre of both the house and the prahu configuration, is pre-eminently associated with the masculine principle: it is in the centre that the men, and they alone, partake of their meals, the women having their meals sitting at the two far ends of the house, near the cooking-places. It is also in the centre (of both the house and the village) that acts of worship, led by the men, were formerly performed. In addition, the name given the central place of the house in Dawera and Dawelor ('sleeping-place of the unmarried men') brings to mind the Trobriand culture (notably the opposition between raw and cooked food), with its opposition between centre and periphery (Malinowski 1929). Hence a strong case can be made for the theory that the opposition male:female in Dawera and Dawelor takes the form of a concentric dualism or, in other words, for the absence of moieties which are either male or female.

Phase II

C. 1900 the Dutch administration compelled the scattered prahu configurations to resettle along the coast. In doing so, they sometimes combined several configurations to form one large village. For instance, the village of Wiratan, in Dawelor, consists of three prahu configurations alongside each other (see figure 21). The result was that marriage relations came to be established between the members of the various prahu configurations within one village, and that the patrilineal relatives of one *umol* spread over several prahu configurations.

Cognatic inheritance may have been adopted in order to safeguard the connection between the patrilineages and the *umol*'s lands: under an open disharmonic regime the land which the daughter inherits from her mother alternates between the patrilineages in the village, whereas the land which the son inherits from his father remains in his own patrilineage.

The unity of a prahu configuration nowadays only becomes explicit in

Fig. 21. The village of Wiratan in Dawelor.

the New Year feast. Then the *umol* come to the fore as ceremonial groups in an order reflecting their symbolic positions in the prahu configuration. Right helmsman opens the ceremony, pilot concludes it. In the same way as in Marsela the village halves *eiru* and *eiwirk* only function as ceremonial groups, in Dawera and Dawelor the all-inclusive symbolic unit, the prahu, only presents itself in a ceremonial context.

The number of matrilineages within an *umol* today frequently is less than four. No care has been taken to ensure that all four rooms remain permanently occupied. An exception is the room of right helmsman. The matrilineage of the *watemtukol* and the patrilineage of the *emtukumol* were supplemented by adoption whenever necessary. To all intents, in many villages the room of right helmsman constitutes the present house of origin: it is here that the *watemtukol* keeps the *umol*'s heirlooms.

The preferred marriage, *lewdaw milamed* ('to marry within one'), still stresses the endogamous nature of the *umol*. On disrupting this endogamy, the disharmonic regime has continually presented the *umol* community with the problem of how to keep its members together. First it was the prahu configuration which as an integrating principle bound the autonomous *umol* together into a larger, endogamous whole. It is possible that the practice of 'to replace your father' by giving up one child for adoption was introduced in this period. Nowadays it is only observed on the village level.

After the house of origin and the prahu configuration, it is now the village which determines the boundaries, its integration becoming apparent not merely in the rules already mentioned, but also in activities requiring mutual aid (e.g. fishery and boat-building), and, more recently, in matters such as migration: if a household desires to move to Ambon, this is not a matter to be settled only within the *umol* involved, but is one in which all the mature men of the village must have their say.

Conclusions

We have seen that the same principle of organization underlies the

culture of all three small islands of the Babar archipelago which were the object of our research. In spite of this, they differ markedly in the manifestations of this principle. Now that we can account for these differences, we can supplement Müller-Wismar's observation quoted in the Introduction. For we found societies with a harmonic regime (Marsela) as well as societies with a disharmonic regime (Dawera and Dawelor). In the present situation there are, however, more differences between these islands. To resume, the above:

Marsela

- patrilineal inheritance
- payment of bride-price
- marrying out of the village is not sanctioned negatively
- relatively few adoptions
- preference for marriages between second cross-cousins

Dawera and Dawelor

- cognatic inheritance
- no bride-price paid
- marrying out of the village is sanctioned negatively
- extremely high number of adopted children
- preference for marriages between first cross-cousins

In the light of the preceding discussion it is not too difficult to account for these differences. However, we have not yet concerned ourselves with the question of how the difference in regime may have arisen. For this purpose we shall have to return to Müller-Wismar's remarks. He postulates an older, patrilineal system, which he claims was subsequently pushed aside by a matrilineal system from Luang (see map 1) – a remarkable position to take in his days, for the evolutionist theories then current presupposed the reverse. Although this is not apparent from his diaries, in the course of his research Müller-Wismar's attention must have been drawn – as ours was – to the unmistakably strong influence of Luang on the islands that surrounded it.

In Luang itself we did indeed find matrilocal residence, matrilineal descent and matrilineal inheritance (see also Riedel 1886:320). What strikes us here is that Müller-Wismar's diary entries pertaining to Luang (Müller-Wismar 1913b:passim) point in the direction of marriage arrangements as reconstructed in our model (see parts I and II), but here under a harmonic matrilineal regime. Various myths collected in the field provide further evidence that the culture of Luang spread to the Babar archipelago. In addition, Müller-Wismar (1914:914) and Van Hoëvell (1890:196) assume that the *literi lagona*, the 'tongue of Luang', spread from Luang to the isles in the vicinity, both in an eastern direction (e.g. to the Babar archipelago) and a western one.

A case in point is also the different spatial orientation in Marsela on the one hand, and Dawera and Dawelor on the other. As we have seen, the Marselans have an 'internal' system of orientation, based on the geography of the island, whereas the inhabitants of Dawera and Dawe-

lor, as well as Luang (Müller-Wismar 1913b:72, 79), take some 'external' object as their basic principle of orientation in space: the prahu that follows the sun. In the respective myths of creation of Marsela, and of Dawera and Dawelor, too, this difference becomes apparent. The themes of the myths of creation of Luang and of Dawera and Dawelor are almost identical. It would take us too far to pursue this matter in detail here, however.

Therefore, to us Müller-Wismar's hypothesis seems reasonable: an originally patrilineal and patrilocal situation existed in both research locations. Our conclusion must then be that this state of affairs has not changed in Marsela, but that in Dawera and Dawelor the culture of Luang left its traces. The result is a complicated form in Müller-Wismar's sense. In parts I and II we pointed out that in moiety systems having bilateral marriage arrangements there is always a possibility to exploit the 'other line' for purposes of, for example, locality, without consequences for the system itself. This explains why it was possible for the influence of the culture of Luang on Dawera and Dawelor to produce a disharmonic regime.

The difference in preferred marriages between Marsela and Dawera and Dawelor (those to second and first bilateral cross-cousins respectively) may be explained, as was demonstrated above, as being the result of a shift in the distribution of the population over the various age groups. As Lévi-Strauss, too, remarks, the former marriage form may be replaced by the latter, and vice versa, depending on whether a given situation demands the one marriage arrangement or the other.

The difference may also be accounted for by a difference in regime: the disharmony in Dawera and Dawelor curbed the tendency to marry out, even after the disruption of endogamy. Therefore, the number of potential marriage candidates remained small. In the harmonic regime of Marsela, however, no such impediment existed after endogamy. Marriages outside the village are common enough – as Müller-Wismar already remarked in 1913 (Müller-Wismar 1913a:65) – hence the number of potential marriage candidates is considerably larger than in Dawera and Dawelor. If a man from one of the latter islands does not marry within his own village, he should be replaced by means of adoption. Here adoption has become a means to compensate for the loss of men who have married out. In Marsela, however, adoption is practised predominantly with a view to keeping the four seats of the house occupied.

Under the open harmonic regime of Marsela a further integration of the entire island population may easily come about, whereas in Dawera and Dawelor integration on an insular scale is impeded by the continuation of disharmony: the very thing which Lévi-Strauss considers to be one of the major integrating factors in a closed system has quite the opposite effect in an open system. Another result of the disharmonic

regime after the disruption of *umol* endogamy in Dawera and Dawelor is the rapidly waning *umol* consciousness of the scattered members thereof. As far as inheritance is concerned, a transition to cognatic inheritance became necessary in order to safeguard the connection between the patrilineages and the *umol* lands.

The relationship between disharmony and double descent is not always represented altogether unambiguously by those writing on the subject. Therefore, it seems feasible to stress once more that disharmony is a much more limited notion than is double descent. Although double descent *per se* is compatible with both asymmetrical and symmetrical marriage types, disharmony represents a form of double descent which rules out a conjunction with asymmetrical systems, as follows:

Within a given social organization the possibilities for the 'other line' to assert itself become greater if the system shifts from the asymmetrical to the symmetrical. In societies in which the MBD marriage is preferred, double descent will therefore hardly get a chance to develop; moiety systems with bilateral marriage arrangements may exhibit double descent in its most highly developed form, i.e. disharmony. Societies preferring a delayed exchange, whose manifestation is the FZD marriage, occupy a middle position (here there is a reasonable possibility for both lines to assert themselves, and no disharmony).

In our view it is only when the extreme form of double descent, disharmony, is prominent within a society that an asymmetrical marriage form and double descent come to have an antithetical relation, i.e. become mutually exclusive. The non-existence of the asymmetrical marriage type can therefore only be explained by the presence of a disharmonic regime and not, as P. E. de Josselin de Jong assumes, from an 'exceptionally strong ideology of double descent' phrased in the most general terms (P. E. de Josselin de Jong 1984:261). Furthermore, it is our conviction that analyses of social systems in Indonesia should no longer focus exclusively on the relation between indirect exchange and double descent, but should also pay attention to social systems in which both direct exchange and double descent are developed to the same degree.

As for the social organization in the Babar archipelago, it seems reasonable to approach the matter starting, as Lévi-Strauss and R. Fox have done, from the simple situation of 'two bands that agree[d] to exchange their sisters and become one people' (R. Fox 1967:194). This symmetrical relationship may then develop into an asymmetrical marriage system. We endorse this view, for which we have found ample evidence in our analysis of the social structure of Marsela. In this island

we found asymmetrical tendencies on the individual level, for instance in the relation between brothers-in-law, within the overall symmetrical pattern of marriage. This asymmetrical tendency was able to spread and come to include not just *personal* relationships, but relationships between alliance *groups*. But, as we have seen, symmetrical systems may also evolve in another direction, namely cognatically. This is what happened in Dawera and Dawelor. However, we should bear in mind that the views expressed by R. Fox and Lévi-Strauss do not constitute a universal principle. For a moiety system is not necessarily a condition for the development of an asymmetrical system, as Lévi-Strauss assumes (in this context see, e.g., Schefold on Mentawai, 1985 and 1986).

However, in the Babar archipelago symmetry does seem to be the basis of the kinship system, as it is for the spatial and cosmic order. Our comparative research in the Babar archipelago demonstrates that this small group of islands may serve as an excellent *regional* field of study: here the opportunity presents itself to explain both asymmetrical and cognatic systems on the basis of a simple symmetrical organization.

NOTES

- 1 The fieldwork was done from January 1981 through April 1982, and from March through July 1983. The research, entitled 'Anthropological Exploration of the Symbolic System of the Population of the Babar Archipelago', has been made possible by a grant from ZWO/WOTRO in The Hague. Counterparts are the Universitas Pattimura in Ambon (Indonesia) and the Free University in Amsterdam (the Netherlands). The research was carried out under the auspices of the Lembaga Ilmu Pengetahuan Indonesia (LIPI) in Jakarta. We wish to express our gratitude to our informants, and should like to single out Bp. Nathan Eipepa of Ilbutung (Marsela) and Bp. Tomas Talle of Welora (Dawera) for our special thanks. We also wish to thank Prof. H. G. Schulte Nordholt, Dr. R. Schefold and the participants in the graduate seminar on Symbolic Anthropology at the Free University for their critical comments, as well as Jeff van Exel and Paul de Vos for translating the text into English.
- 2 There is always the possibility that the statistical population increase mentioned here is merely the effect of an increasingly accurate population registration as a result of greater interest taken by the administration. However, this has no consequences for the argument that follows.
- 3 Our literal translation of the German text.
- 4 Percentages of preferred marriages out of 200 marriages in the village of Ilbutung:
 sister exchange – 6.5%
 'replacing your grandmother' – 6%
 'replacing your mother' – 5.5%
 'to follow your grandmother' – 3.5%
 'to follow your mother' – 7%.
- 5 Only the formal similarities between the relationship systems of the Aranda and Kariëra on the one hand, and Marsela and Dawera and Dawelor on the other, are relevant to this article. Hence we did not incorporate Rose's criticism concerning the Aranda (Rose 1960) into the body of our argument. Rose bases his criticism on fieldwork which he did among the inhabitants of Groote Eylandt in northern Australia (1941). He supposes that the 'gerontocracy' found among them (i.e. young girls marrying men considerably older than themselves) is perhaps typical of Australia as a

whole. On the strength of information from, notably, Spencer and Gillen, he is of the opinion that the Aranda, too, have a gerontocratic society (Rose 1960:139). According to Rose the gerontocracy imposed on the system at some later stage probably caused the (original) symmetrical bilateral marriage, as found among the Kariera, to change in the direction of the matrilateral cross-cousin marriage. For in practice gerontocracy does not combine easily with the bilateral and the patrilateral types of cross-cousin marriage (Rose 1960:8, 9, 123). Rose draws the conclusion that earlier descriptions of the Aranda (like those by Radcliffe-Brown et al.) are misrepresentations, as they wrongly ascribe a symmetrical structure to the Aranda kinship system (Rose 1960:181).

- 6 According to Spencer every semi-moiety is actually subdivided into what he calls subclasses, even though they are not labelled (Spencer 1966:60, 61). Sharp also demonstrated this in an indirect way in his description of the Laierdila system. The Laierdila of Mornington Island have eight labelled sub-sections, which are, however, organized in such a manner that they function as a semi-moiety system comparable to that of the Mara (Sharp 1935-1936:169).
- 7 If the system is rigidly followed through, the eight sections are implicit. In Marsela, however, people are not conscious of sections.
- 8 Lévi-Strauss prefers the term 'marriage classes', as the units he distinguishes are regarded as alliance groups. (Later it was demonstrated that these groups function within a division of society into ceremonial units.)
- 9 Our literal translation of the German text.
- 10 In 1981 the percentage of adopted inhabitants of the village of Welora in Dawera was 22%.
- 11 We are concentrating on the 'navel' of the house and the village in the discussion, and shall not refer to the deity Upler, who, as we were told in Dawera and Dawelor, is considered a later addition in Babarese religion originating from Luang; nowadays, Upler is commonly equated in everyday usage in the Christian religion with Tuhan Allah.

REFERENCES

- Barnes, R. H., 1974, *Kédang: A Study of the Collective Thought of an Eastern Indonesian People*, Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Bosscher, C. F., 1854, 'Statistieke schets der zuidwester eilanden', *Tijdschrift voor Indische Taal-, Land- en Volkenkunde* 2, pp. 419-458.
- Breeman, N. E., 1928, 'De Babar-eilanden', *De Zendingsbode* 3, no. 5, p. 41.
- Cunningham, C. E., 1973, 'Order in the Atoni House', in: Rodney Needham (ed.), *Right & Left: Essays on Dual Symbolic Classification*, pp. 204-238, Chicago and London: The University of Chicago Press.
- Dijk, T. van, and N. de Jonge, 1987, 'Bastas in Babar: Imported Asian Textiles in a South-East Moluccan Culture', *Ethnologica NF.*, Band 12, Cologne. [Forthcoming.]
- Elkin, A. P., 1979, *The Australian Aborigines*, London and Sydney: Angus and Robertson. [Orig. printed in 1938.]
- Ellen, R. F., 1986, 'Microcosm, Macrocosm and the Nuauulu House: Concerning the Reductionist Fallacy as Applied to Metaphorical Levels', *Bijdragen tot de Taal-, Land- en Volkenkunde* 142, pp. 1-30.
- Forth, G. L., 1981, *Rindi: An Ethnographic Study of a Traditional Domain in Eastern Sumba*, Verhandelingen van het Koninklijk Instituut voor Taal-, Land- en Volkenkunde 93, The Hague: Martinus Nijhoff.
- Fox, J. J., 1980, 'Models and Metaphors; Comparative Research in Eastern Indonesia', in: James J. Fox (ed.), *The Flow of Life: Essays on Eastern Indonesia*, pp. 327-333, Cambridge (Mass.) and London: Harvard University Press.
- Fox, R., 1967, *Kinship and Marriage*, Harmondsworth: Penguin Books.

- Hoëvell, G. W. W. C. van, 1890, 'De afdeeling Babar', *Tijdschrift voor Indische Taal-, Land- en Volkenkunde* 33, pp. 187-199.
- Josselin de Jong, J. P. B. de, 1977, 'Lévi-Strauss's Theory on Kinship and Marriage', in: P. E. de Josselin de Jong (ed.), *Structural Anthropology in the Netherlands; A Reader*, pp. 254-319, The Hague: Martinus Nijhoff.
- Josselin de Jong, P. E. de, 1984, 'A Field of Anthropological Study in Transformation', in: P. E. de Josselin de Jong (ed.), *Unity in Diversity; Indonesia as a Field of Anthropological Study*, pp. 1-10, Dordrecht: Foris Publications.
- Kroeber, A. L., 1938, 'Basic and Secondary Patterns of Social Structure', *The Journal of the Royal Anthropological Institute of Great Britain and Ireland* LXVIII, pp. 299-310.
- Kromme, W. E., 1921, *Beschrijving der Tanimbar- en Babareilanden*, Unpublished Colonial Document, The Hague: Algemeen Rijksarchief.
- Lévi-Strauss, C., 1963, *Structural Anthropology*, Harmondsworth: Penguin Books.
- , 1969, *The Elementary Structures of Kinship*, Boston: Beacon Press.
- Malinowski, B., 1929, *The Sexual Life of Savages in North-Western Melanesia*, London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.
- Müller-Wismar, W., 1913a, Diary on the Babar Archipelago, unpublished manuscript, Hamburgisches Museum für Völkerkunde und Vorgeschichte, Hamburg.
- , 1913b, Diary on the islands of Luang and Sermata, unpublished manuscript, Hamburgisches Museum für Völkerkunde und Vorgeschichte, Hamburg.
- , 1914, Letters to the Rudolf-Virchow-Stiftung, *Zeitschrift für Ethnologie* 46, pp. 913-915.
- Needham, R., 1980, 'Principles and Variations in the Structure of Sumbanese Society', in: James J. Fox (ed.), *The Flow of Life: Essays on Eastern Indonesia*, pp. 21-47, Cambridge (Mass.) and London: Harvard University Press.
- Niessen, S., 1984, 'Textiles are Female . . . but what is Femaleness? Toba Batak Textiles in the Indonesian Field of Ethnological Study', in: P. E. de Josselin de Jong (ed.), *Unity in Diversity; Indonesia as a Field of Anthropological Study*, pp. 63-83, Dordrecht: Foris Publications.
- Notulen, 1880, 'Reisrapport van Zr. Ms. Stoomschip "Batavia"', *Notulen van het Bataviaasch Genootschap* 18, Bijlage VI, pp. XLIII-XLV.
- Onvlee, L., 1973, *Cultuur als Antwoord*, Verhandelingen van het Koninklijk Instituut voor Taal-, Land- en Volkenkunde 66, The Hague: Martinus Nijhoff.
- Projektgroep Ondersteuning Onderwijs Molukkers (pgOOM), 1983, *Atlas Molukkers*, Hoevelaken: Christelijk Pedagogisch Studiecentrum.
- Radcliffe-Brown, A. R., 1931, 'The Social Organization of Australian Tribes', *Oceania Monographs* 1, pp. 34-63, 206-246, 322-341, 426-456.
- Riedel, J. G. F., 1886, *De sluik- en kroesharige rassen tusschen Selebes en Papua*, Den Haag. [Uitgave door tussenkomst van het Koninklijk Nederlandsch Aardrijkskundig Genootschap.]
- Rose, F. G. G., 1960, 'Classification of Kin, Age Structure and Marriage amongst the Grootte Eylandt Aborigines; A Study in Method and a Theory of Australian Kinship', *Völkerkundliche Forschungen Deutsche Akademie der Wissenschaften Berlin* 3, pp. 1-493.
- Schefold, R., 1985, 'Der Segen der Braut: Heiratsformen in Indonesien', in: G. Völger and K. von Welck (eds), *Die Braut - Geliebt - verkauft - getauscht - geraubt. Zur Rolle der Frau im Kulturvergleich*, 2 vols., pp. 494-503, Cologne: Wienand.
- , 1986, 'The Unequal Brothers-in-Law; Indonesia as a "Field of Anthropological Study" and the Case of Mentawai', *Bijdragen tot de Taal-, Land- en Volkenkunde* 142, pp. 69-86.
- Schmitz, C. A., 1964, 'Grundformen der Verwandtschaft', *Basler Beiträge zur Geographie und Ethnologie, Ethnologische Reihe* 1, pp. 1-134.
- Scholz, F., 1962, *Der Herr des Bodens in Ostindonesien*, Doctoral Dissertation, Cologne, Universität Köln [publisher not mentioned].

- Sharp, L., 1935-1936, 'Semi-Moieties in North-Western Queensland', *Oceania* 6, pp. 158-174.
- Sneeuwjagt, R. J. C. S., 1935, *Memorie van Overgave van de onderafdeeling Zuid-Wester-Eilanden*, Unpublished Colonial Document, The Hague: Algemeen Rijksarchief.
- Spencer, B., 1966, *Native Tribes of the Northern Territory of Australia*, Oosterhout N.B., The Netherlands: Anthropological Publications. [Orig. printed in 1914.]
- Spencer, B., and F. J. Gillen, 1968, *Native Tribes of Central Australia*, New York: Dover Publications. [Orig. printed in 1899.]
- Statistik Tahunan Kecamatan Pulau-pulau Babar dalam Angka*, 1982, Tepa.
- Turner, V., 1974, *The Forest of Symbols*, Ithaca and London: Cornell University Press. [Orig. printed in 1967.]
- Wouden, F. A. E. van, 1968, *Types of Social Structure in Eastern Indonesia*, The Hague: Martinus Nijhoff. [English translation of F. A. E. van Wouden, *Sociale Structuurtypen in de Groote Oost*, Leiden: J. Ginsberg, 1935.]
- , 1977, 'Local Groups and Double Descent in Kodi, West Sumba', in: P. E. de Josselin de Jong (ed.), *Structural Anthropology in the Netherlands; A Reader*, pp. 184-222, The Hague: Martinus Nijhoff.