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ABSTRACT

This dissertation, which is concerned with the Endenese language system, focuses on the classification of human beings. For convenience, I call this particular language system the "Endenese kinship language system."

Primitives in the Endenese kinship language system consist of two kinds: 1) concepts defined in terms of culturally conceptualized human reproduction and 2) concepts defined in terms of prestation.

In Endenese cultural dogma, as typically exemplified in Endenese answers to the anthropologist's general questions, every significant relationship is defined in terms of the domain of human reproduction (in other words, "genealogically") while relationships defined in terms of prestation are claimed to be mere "consequences" of the first kind: "affines make gifts."

In the praxis of the Endenese cultural explanation, as typically exemplified in their spontaneous explanation of specific events, the two kinds of relationship definitions stand at the same level; sometimes an explanatory statement is made such that the second kind of relationship is said to give rise to the first kind of relationship: "gifts make affines."

Every explanatory statement of classification consists of two kinds of relationship: (1) identity (I) and (2) difference (D). If a statement is made such that identity "explains" difference, I call such an explanatory statement an "attributive" classification; if otherwise, a "relational" classification.

The most important identity relationship (I) in the Endenese kinship
language system is "belong to the same group" (OG/OG) which is defined as a) a
genealogical relationship, F/S (and B/B as its logical extension) and b) sharing
property.

There are three kinds of difference relationship (D): 1) WG/WT (wife-giver
to wife-taker) which is defined as a) a genealogical relationship typically
that between MB and ZS, and b) that between a beneficiary of bridewealth and a
contributor to bridewealth; 2) WT/WG, which is exactly a converse of WG/WT and
3) relationship between non-relatives (NR/NR). This non-relative relationship
is defined as a) that between those who have no genealogical connection and b) that between "buyers" and "sellers."

The relationship of "not I" (i.e. not OG/OG) can "explain" the relationship
of D. This is a weak explanatory device, in the sense that the employment of
this device is optional and thus up to the explainer.

Among the three D relationships (WG/WT, WT/WG and NR/NR), the second one
(WT/WG), especially when couched as a) MZS/MZS or b) sharing the "head"
death-payment) taker, can explain an I relationship. The explanatory strength
of this device depends upon past kinship history concerning some key
alliances.

All the significant "kinship" relationships and explanatory devices so far
discussed are combined in two Endenese cultural dogma about: 1) agnation and
2) matrilateral cross cousin marriage. However because of 1) a relative
weakness of the first principle as an explanatory device (especially, the
weakness of the waja, the patrilineal "group") and 2) the low ratio of
matrilateral cross cousin marriages, an Endenese kinship world does not
represent itself as a logical whole.

To accord the logic of the language system with the world, there is a pragmatics of 'saying.' 'Saying' redefines the world so as to be compatible with the language system.
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Chapter 1 Theoretical Setting

1.1 Introduction

An ability to understand something is an ability to explain or recognize that something and describe it properly. Descriptions which are based on some constitutional rules/definitions can be treated as a closed system. Such a set of descriptions we call a "language system."

Statements which describe something social are based on constitutional rules/definitions, and, thus, form a language system. This thesis is a study of a particular language system of a particular society.

Among the people of Ende of central Flores, eastern Indonesia (who will be hereafter called the Endenese), there is recognized a language system which I shall call, conventionally, "kinship" throughout this dissertation. Primitives which constitute the Endenese kinship language system are of two kinds: (1) concepts related to culturally conceptualized human reproduction and (2) concepts related to specific kinds of prestation. Thus, it should be understood that the word kinship is not an analytical notion but
rather a conventional labeling, in the sense that the whole argument, if ever the argument is to be used in the future for any kind of comparison, would not at all contribute to a "comparative study of kinship," but only to a "comparative study of ethno-sociology."

1.2 On Classification

In what follows, I will refine a theory of classification in terms of a language system, that is, a theory of classification as explanation and description. Let me introduce two symbols for describing an explanation. An explanation consists of two sentences, a sentence which is to be explained and another which is to explain. The former is termed ED (from "ExplanED," equivalent to Hempel's explanandum (Hempel, G. 1942)) and EG (from "ExplaininG," equivalent to explanans).

1.2.1 Dust Bin and Cobwebs

Suppose that we are asked to sort a deck of cards. One way, the simpler way, is just to prepare 13 buckets or dust bins and pick one card from the deck and throw it into an appropriate bucket (then afterwards, if more sorting is needed, one can sort again each bucket of cards according to their suits). Another way is: pick one card, put it on a table and pick another, compare it with the previous one, and if this one is higher, put it to the right of the previous card, if lower, to the left, like a spider making its cobweb.

The former way of sorting I call 'attributive,' because we sort each card in its own attribute (its being the ace of the spades
etc.), without regard to its relations to the others. The latter way of sorting I call 'relational,' because we sort each card according to its relations to others (high-er or low-er).

A classification consists of 2 sub-aims: (1) identifying and (2) differentiating. Whereas in attributive classification, identification comes first and is followed by differentiation, in relational classification, the order is reversed. We could say that in the former system of explanation, difference (relation) is an EG and oneness is an ED, whereas in the latter system, oneness (attribute) is an EG and difference is the ED.

There are several points concerning this distinction that should be made clearer. First, the attributive classification depends for its checking function on a unary function and the relational classification on a binary function. An example of the former might be $\text{belongs-to-a-group-A}(a)$ and that of the latter might be $\text{is-different}(a, b)$.

Secondly, the distinction almost corresponds with that between a rulebased inference and a databased one. If our aim is to make a group of items which belong together, in the former, we should, after consulting a database (which might contain such data as "a is different from b," "b is different from c"), use a rulebase (which might contain such rules as "if X is different from Y and Z from Y, then X and Z belong together"), whereas in the latter case, what we have to do is just look at the database (where there is already defined a group in the sense that there is such datum as
It is worth noting even at this early stage that the two ways of classification are applied, at least in the example above, to one and the same "thing," i.e. the deck of cards. It is the subject, or the sorter (the classifier), that chooses either way.

The above paragraphs showed in a practical way what I want to argue in this section: (1) there are two ('attributive' and 'relational') ways of classification of things and (2) that one thing can be classified in either way, according to the sorter's choice. The main point I wish to make in this argument is that both principles are important. It so often happens that whenever one theorist emphasizes one principle, he or she tends to neglect the other. Because, recently, the general tendency is to emphasize the relational classification, the following arguments will be directed more against the (over-)emphasis on relational classification. To avoid unnecessary misunderstanding, I think I have to repeat my standpoint clearly: I argue against one-or-the-other-principle-argument.

From here on, let me take some examples to confirm the above suppositions.

In some societies, in their symbolic classification, one item, for example, 'night,' may have its own attributes (say 'blackness') and be thus categorized. In others, 'night' may be just an opposite of the 'day,' and thus paired with the 'day.' In the former case,
there is a bucket, prepared by the culture concerned to contain items, such as 'night,' 'women' and 'witches,' which does not have to be contrasted against any other container. Each container stands on its own. On the other hand, in the latter case, the 'night' is, in the culture's symbolic system, always contrasted with the 'day': in other words, the 'night' can have (symbolic) meaning only in contrast with the 'day,' and the 'day' as well only in contrast with the 'night.'

Structuralists have opposed attributive ways from being included in their field of 'symbolic classification':

It is more readily understandable, furthermore, that the terms in one column of a binary table should not be assumed to share any attribute or to belong to a single category. (Needham 1973a: xxvii).

... it has to be kept in mind that the ascription of terms to one series in the scheme does not entail that they all share the particular attributes of any one term. The association of these terms rest on an analogy, and is derived from a mode of categorization which orders the scheme, not from the possession of a specific property by means of which the character or presence of other terms may be deduced. (Needham 1973b: 117).

Put formally, a:b::c:d does not entail that a=c or b=d. (Needham 1973a: xxviii).

Such reluctance of the structuralists to accept attributive classification in their anthropological discourse can simply be explained historically, that is, in terms of an inheritance from the structural linguistics, one of whose emphasized positions is the notion that phonemes form bundles of distinctive features, a notion extremely relational, established in antithesis to the traditional attributive view of language(4).
Whether we take a structuralist standpoint or not, we should admit that at least in conscious models or ethno-models, there are two ways of classification; even Needham could not deny that his 'critic' is a human being, thus, Needham's own model is one such ethno-model as well as his critic's, which, if anthropology is to be anthropo-logy, should be taken into account in the anthropological discourse.

Now let me return to the main track of the argument.

The following examples we are going to examine are different in nature from the examples above in that the classified things themselves know how they are classified: classification of human beings. Dealing with classification of human beings does not, however, directly lead to theories of social organization, or 'sociology,' but, instead, ethno-sociology, the way people conceive how they organize themselves. We may call this subject 'ethno-sociology' in the same way as the classification of plants has been called ethno-botany and that of animals ethno-zoology.

In this field, the best example to show the distinction between the two forms ('attributive' and 'relational') of classification is to be found in the contrast between a moiety system and a bilateral cross-cousin marriage system. In the former, the culture prepares two buckets, say moiety A and moiety B, and puts an individual into one of them. In the latter, one person is contrasted to one's cross cousins and classified differently from the latter. It is always his relationship with others, especially with his cross cousins, that
matters. A bilateral cross cousin marriage system does not need nor result in a moiety system, nor does a moiety system need bilateral cross cousin marriage.

If one reads a passage or two from Levi-Strauss's Elementary Structures of Kinship, especially chapters of 6, 8 and 9, keeping in mind the distinction between the two ways of classification, one will much more easily understand what the author is saying.

Dual organization, therefore, defines a very general class within which it is permissible to choose a spouse, while in certain cases at least, the system of cross-cousin marriage determines very precisely the individual whom one is obliged to marry. But the difference is not exactly this, for dual organization defines a class with very strictly fixed boundaries, while the cross-cousin system attaches importance to a relationship between individuals, which is capable of being reinterpreted again and again. (Levi-Strauss 1969: 102).

Read 'class' as a 'dust bin' and also underline the word 'relationship.'

Dual organization is a global system, binding the group in its totality. Marriage between cross-cousins, on the contrary, seems a very much more special process; it is a tendency rather than a system. (op cit).

The two institutions are in contrast, one being crystallized, the other flexible. (ibid 102-3).

For a better understanding of these two contrastive forms, a reference shall be made to graph theory, especially of 'colouring' problems.
A 'coloring of a graph' is an assignment of colors to its points so that no two adjacent points have the same color.

The set of all points with any one color is independent and is called a 'color class.' (Hage and Harary 1983: 174)

The minimum number of the necessary colors is called the 'chromatic number.' In bilateral cross-cousin marriage systems, bilateral cross cousins represent two points adjacent to each other (and the connecting line is represented by a woman who is one's sister and the other's wife). Thus, bilateral cross cousins should always be painted in different colors. In a theoretical model at least, one's cross cousins of both sides (that is, his patrilateral and matrilateral cross cousins) are one and the same group because, in the ideal representation of the system, a person's father's sister and his mother's brother must have married each other. Thus the system is 2-chromatic.

On the other hand, in a moiety system, the system is already bi-coloured, so to speak, at the beginning. If one needs a line, that is, a relation (marriageability connection), then one only has to draw a line from one to the other of the two differently coloured points.

Thus, the two possible 'completed' systems, that is, in the former (bilateral cross cousin marriage system), having been 'painted' in the smallest number possible ways, and in the latter (moiety system), having been 'tied' as much as possible, present the same structure, and are different only in terms of their history of existence.
If one is present in a society with the complete system (of either type), one will not, if he is, say, a functionalist, be interested to know to which type the society under question belongs, because in either way the end-product is the same (and it functions the same way); however, we, who are interested in explanations, will want to know which, because the answer to certain questions (for example "why one should marry such and such category of women?") must vary according to the type of the system.

In other words, since neither system needs the above-mentioned 'completion' as its logical necessity, the former (bilateral cross cousin marriage system) can be 3- (or more) coloured and the latter (moiety system) can have smaller number of lines than the former. The argument would be easier to understand if one refers to the visualized representation of the models below: (P for "point" and C for "colour" and the different number showing the different points (or colours)).
In the above examples, we have shown that people under study have two kinds of classification; in the following paragraphs, I would like to demonstrate that we, anthropologists, also have had the same two ways of classification.
The most striking example would be found in the domain of the theories of kinship, i.e. descent theories and alliance theories. In short, descent theory has it that some people belong together because they have something in common (in this case, descent, which might be expressed as clanship or section-ship according to societies). If one belongs to one descent group and another to another, then the two are different. One-ness comes first and the difference follows.

On the contrary, alliance theory has it that one is 'different' from one's marriage partner. If one is different from, say, a group called A, and another is so also from the same group, then the two belong together (the extreme cases can be found in such ethnographies as Daribi, studied by Wagner (Wagner 1967) and Etoro, studied by Kelly (Kelly 1980)). Thus, in this case, the difference comes first, and is followed by the oneness.

An extreme example of the latter view might be taken from a network analysis, which is purely relational.

In a mathematical treatise on network analysis, Lorrain and White represent a network system as a graph of linked nodes, and define nodes as follows:

... Let us represent individuals as nodes which are not distinguished by intrinsic attributes such as sex;... Let us draw an arrow with a label from one person to another to represent a type of role relation. (Lorrain and White 1971: 68).

Note that there are no attributes attached to a node. Thus an
individual (or a node) is significant only in its relations to
others. In that way, concerning a grouping, it is natural for them to
draw such a conclusion as(5):

Objects a, b of a category C are structurally equivalent if,
for any morphism M and any object x of C, aMx if and only if bMx,
and xMa if and only if xMb. In other words, a is structurally
equivalent to b if a relates to every object x of C in exactly
the same ways as b does. From the point of view of the logic of
the structure, then, a and b are absolutely equivalent, they are
substitutable.

Indeed in such a case there is no reason not to identify a
and b. Clearly, the relation of structural equivalence among
objects of C is an equivalence relation, so that CObj {class of
objects in C} can be partitioned into classes of structurally
equivalent objects. We can then define in an obvious way a
reduced category Csk, the skeleton of C, whose objects are those
equivalence classes and whose morphism and their composition
operation exactly the same as in C. (Lorrain and White 1971:
81)(6).

Note that structural equivalence is defined more narrowly than is
mostly the case in ordinary anthropological analyses, where a similar
kind of relation is defined by the two nodes' relations to one
specific node (rather than to every node)(7).

After a discussion of ways of double mapping which produce a
relevant reduced image (Csk), in the conclusion, the authors write:

However around visible attributes such as age, race, or sex
there often crystallize crucial ideologies of role
differentiation, of inferiorization, or of exploitation. There
seems to be no obvious general way to integrate attributes to a
network representation. This is a real and difficult problem,
even though we have argued that social differentiation is
essentially a function of the interweaving of social
relationships. (Lorrain and White 1971: 96).
What is wrong is that they do not recognize even the possibility that "social differentiation" can be a cause of the "interweaving of social relationships." In some societies, structural equivalence is 'given' as an attribute to some nodes in the native explanations\(^8\).

Furthermore, the authors employ the two kinds of descriptions which do not belong together to the same language system: actor's and viewer's descriptions. I am not sure which kind of description they want to explain\(^9\). If they want to explain the description in native terms, then, they should know what is given and what is there to be explained.

1.2.2 Appearance and Contents

In this sub-section I want to argue about what seems an attributive category (in my view) but which is actually (in the culture concerned) relational and vice versa. In brief, I will argue that no specific one category is universally fixed as attributive or relational -- one category might be relational in one culture but the same category might be attributive in another culture. More strikingly and more importantly, one category which is 'relational' in one context can be attributive in another context in the same culture, and vice versa.

Let us take an example of 'age.'

At the beginning of his paper on 'age,' Needham defines the issue he is going to discuss as follows:
Given a disparity of ages between siblings, between the dates at which they marry, and between the ages of their spouses, the possibility is entailed that (1) individuals of the same age will belong to different categories, and (2) individuals of different ages will belong to the same category.

Social relations may therefore be ordered either by category or by relative age. If age is sometimes the dominant criterion of classification, then in such instances it is to some extent incorrect to regard the relationship terms as denoting distinct classes of persons. Any society has to choose, as it were, in the course of its evolution, which of the two logically possible criteria of classification it is to employ: category or relative age. (Needham 1974 (1966): 74).

Here, clearly, Needham thinks of 'relative age' as 'relational' and 'category' as 'attributive,' thus ignoring the possibility of the potential interrelations of the two: relative kinship categories or attributive ages<10>.

The three examples (Penan, Siwang and Kodi), whose relationship terms are listed in the article, have only relative age category (eB, yB, and so on) which is 'relational.' But, in other societies, for example, in the omitted case of Wigmunkan (op cit), the relative age category is substantialized: that is to say, the 'elder brother' category contains not FBSe but FeBS.

To make my contention more intelligible, let me introduce a new pair of analytic notions, "descriptive" vs "classificatory" (categories)<11>.

Suppose a system has an identity relation<12> (let us represent the relationship by the character I such that I(x, y), means "x and y are identical or equivalent"). If a relation (say, r()) is extended through the identity relation<13> in such ways as
(1) if \( r(x, y) \) & \( l(y, z) \) then \( r(x, z) \)
(2) if \( r(x) \) & \( l(x, y) \) then \( r(y) \)
(3) if \( r(x, y) \) & \( l(x, x') \) & \( l(y, y') \) then \( r(x', y') \)

etc.

then the relation as defined by the symbol \( r() \) is called "classificatory," or else "descriptive."

Thus, in Wikmunkan, an identity relation such as \( F/S \) must be used to extend (in the sense above) the relation \( yB/eB \):

\[
\text{if } is\_elder\_brother(x, y) \\
& l(x, x's\ son) \& l(y, y's\ son) \\
\text{then } is\_elder\_brother(x's\ son, y's\ son)
\]

Sometimes, the culture under study might distinguish the two \( r \)'s such that the resultant \( r \) is designated "a kind of" \( r \) and not a genuine \( r \). In such a case, we will use the words "cooked" relation (represented as \( \langle r \rangle \)) and "raw" relation (represented as \( 'r' \)) to the former and the latter respectively. In distinguishing them, we always have to warn ourselves against the ethno-centrism, in the sense that, to cite the same example above, we should not apply the distinction simply because in our culture we have a "is-elder-brother" relation and do not have any extended or cooked "is-elder-brother" relation; the people under study might not distinguish them. In that case, the term 'extension' becomes just conventional, since there is no fixed frame of reference; if \( a \) is an extension of \( b \), it always holds that \( b \) is an extension of \( a \) in the terminology.

In the 3 examples cited by Needham, function "is-elder-brother" is never extended through any identity relationship. In a culture with the "categorized relative age" orderings, \( A \) is \( \langle \text{older} \rangle \) than \( B \)
not because A is 'older' than B but, for instance, because A's father is 'older' than B's father (14).

Thus, 'age,' assumed by Needham at the starting point as a relational device in contrast to 'category,' is, at least in some societies (from eastern Indonesia, we can take another example of Kei (Barraud 1979: 130)) "categorized."

In the same way, wife-giver and wife-taker relations which, we have assumed, are 'relational'(15), may, in some societies, occasionally be 'substantialized': a descent group has its 'legendary' (and thus fixed) wife-givers or wife-takers with whom there may be no more actual relations now(16). In that way, relations are 'frozen,' and come to take on 'attributive' characters(17). Tanevar Evav (Barraud 1979) and Lio (the neighbouring people of Ende) are among those societies(18).

Those are the examples of categories, seemingly relational but conceived by people, contextually, in terms of their attributes.

There are contrastive examples of categories seemingly attributive but conceived in terms of relations to others. We have lots of examples of this reversion, simply because this viewpoint is the structuralist 'Copernican revolution.' Let us take the most drastic example.

Caste would be mentioned as a typical example of attributive classification but for Dumont's book on this subject.
First, historically speaking, in a more timid way, Leach took the first step:

Most conventional Indian ethnographies are written in a way which suggests that individual caste can usefully be considered in isolation. This is deceptive. In fact, a caste does not exist by itself. A caste can only be recognized in contrast to other castes with which its members are closely involved in a network of economic, political and ritual relationships (Leach 1960: 5).

This is a 'timid' way, because it still took on a sociological appearance, but is a firm step towards the Copernican revolution. Dumont began the revolution by depriving the caste of its sociological connotation:

... far more than a 'group' in the ordinary sense, the caste is a state of mind, a state of mind which is expressed by the emergence, in a various situations, of groups of various orders generally called 'castes.' (Dumont 1970: 34).

Now it is easy for a structuralist to pour a new idea into an old container:

A phoneme has only the characteristics which oppose it to other phonemes, it is not something but only the other of others, thanks to which it signifies something. We shall speak of structure exclusively in this case, when the interdependence of the elements of a system is so great that they disappear without residue if an inventory is made of the relations between them: a system of relations, in short, not a system of elements. (Dumont 1970: 40).

Then Dumont concludes:
The whole is founded on the necessary and hierarchical coexistence of the two opposites. One could speak of a 'synthetic a priori' opposition: it is unprofitable to atomize it into simple elements just to gratify our logic, and in any case it should not be analyzed without being subsequently recomposed. (Dumont 1970: 43).

In short, he describes how one caste is only meaningful in terms of the other castes, the underlying opposition being that between 'pure' and 'impure.'

1.3 Concluding Remarks

I do not think I am in the wrong if I state that, still, people in India might explain, in some contexts, a caste in terms of its attributes. For that matter, people in a society with a typical unilineal lineage system(19) might explain the identity of the members of a minimal lineage in terms of its relations.

If we are interested in an explanatory system, and choose as a special topic, say, caste, then what we should do is not "try to explain caste system," but "try to explain the native explanations of the caste system," which may accommodate the two ways of classification contextually.

In what follows, I am concerned with the social organization of a certain society (the Endenese). My main aim does not consist in explaining how a society functions, but in explaining how the people explain how the society functions.
Chapter 2 Ethnographic Setting

2.1 Geography, Climate and Subsistence

2.1.1 Geography

(1) Natural Geography

The Endenese live in the central part of the island of Flores in eastern Indonesia. Flores is one of the three biggest islands in Nusa Tenggara Timur (the East South-East Archipelago), Sumba and Timor being the other two. Flores is a mountainous island. A recent government report describes this fact, rather impressionistically, by saying that even a hundred meter rise in the sea level would not change the present shape of Flores much.

Roughly speaking, the mountain area which runs along an east-west axis through Flores divides central Flores into two parts: north coast and south coast, a division which is also pertinent to the cultural geography of the people there. There are seven high mountains in Kabupaten Ende, all of which are higher than 1,000m, the highest being 1,771m (Lepe Mbusu). Two series of low flat land are found along the north coast, Kabu Rea around the border with Kabupaten Ngada and Ma'u Tenda in the eastern Lio region. The area around the city of Ende, Nanga Baa valley and Mbuli valley can be added to this list. Except those low flat areas, which do not, however, occupy much territory, most of central Flores is mountainous, the west area being, generally, higher than the east.
(2) Cultural Geography

The people are divided into various domains (tana, "land"), whose identity is couched in terms of ritual (negua); those who belong to one "land" are said to share one ritual. In the area I studied, there are two tana: Tana Rhorho (where my village was situated) and Tana Dēa, to the west of Tana Rhorho, stretching into Kabupaten Ngada. A conceptual scheme of the geography around the area is shown below.

---

The village Keka Dori, where I did most of my field work, is situated on one of the ridges (worho) running north south. Between ridges run several creeks ('ae) which eventually dry up in the dry season. There is only one river (rhowo), which bears no name (it is sometimes called rhowo Nanga Panda). This river serves as the boundary between the two lands (Tana Rhorho and Tana Dēa).
Upstream, the river runs through a larger valley where not many villages are found. Those inhabitants around the river are mostly immigrants from nearby ridges. If one is to go northward from around Keka Dori, one has to climb down and cross the river and then climb the mountains (kerhi) to reach the north coast (rirhi rhonggo, "down behind"). Most of the mountain part is occupied by a protected forest. There are no villages in the area. Nor does any legend refer to the mountain as a former habitation of the people.

The social world of the people of Tana Rhorho is mainly limited to the domain. Outside is a world where they can make "money." People go to the north coast where they can buy salt cheaply and thus can make a good profit by selling it; sometimes people go westward to buy seedlings of clove, a newly introduced cash crop; people go to the town of Ende to work as daily labourers to acquire some cash income. For the Enendes, a world where transactions of "buying" and "selling" occur is a world of non-kin. In this regard, their social world can also be defined as the world of kin, surrounded by the world of non-kin, where one can make a profit.

2.1.2 Climate

(1) Natural Climatology

Flores is located in one of the typical monsoon regions. The wet west monsoon (north-west wind) begins around December or January and ends in March or April. The dry east monsoon (south-east wind) begins in May or June and ends in October or November. The west monsoon brings rain, which, however, rarely amounts to more than 2,000 mm
annually, in the central part of Flores. The dry season is also marked with the relatively few clouds, yet in the transitional period from the west to the east monsoon, i.e. between May, June and July, there are abundant clouds (*kubhu kuy*).

Besides the wet western part (*Manggarai, Ngada*), the north coast of Flores tends to be drier than the south coast. The average annual rainfall in Ende (on the south coast) in the years from 1879 to 1928 is 1,138 mm (91 rainy days) and the average rainfall in Maumere (on the north coast) in the same years was only 954 mm (67 rainy days).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 2-1 annual rainfall in Flores</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>--+------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ende 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ende 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maumere 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maumere 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wologai 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Magekoba 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nangahale 7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 Ende in 1917 (after van Suchtelen)
2 Ende during 1910-1941 (after Berlage 1970)
3 Maumere in 1917 (after van Suchtelen)
4 The following figures all from Berlage 1970
   Maumere during 1905-1941
5 Wologai is in the inland Lio region.
6 Magekoba is in the north coast Lio region.
7 Nangahale is in the north coast in the Maumere region.
(2) Cultural Climatology

The west monsoon is full of native terms. The first wind is called *'angi reku rara* ("wind of falling old leaves") which occurs in August and September. In October, a wind comes from the west, called *'angi rupi nutu* ("wind of blowing over the burned fields") which announces the coming rain. *'Angi weju bhoka* ("wind of blowing down bamboo shoots") and *'angi ringgo* are heavy winds occurring from November to February.

In contrast with this diversity of names for the west monsoon, the east monsoon is called just *'angi koo manu* ("wind of touching chickens"). This period is the same as the cloudy period (*kubhu kuu*) mentioned above. This period (*kubhu kuu*) is full of significance to the people. First of all, this is the time when the harvest is done. People call this *mera merė* "to live big," emphasizing the slack aspect of the season in terms of labour. Wedding ceremonies are usually held at this time of the year. This period is also called *wurha nderhe*, "month of fear," when it is believed that foreign head hunters (*'ata morhu nggerhe*) roam around.

2.1.3 Subsistence

People in central Flores are mostly slash and burn agriculturalists. Wet rice fields, which were introduced in the 1930's, are now popular in the central Lio zone, where much water is available. In 1946 there were 200 ha of sawah in Lio (landschap) and none in Ende. In 1979, Kabupaten Ende had 2,121 ha of sawah. Almost all the sawah are scattered in the kecamatan of Detu Soko and Ndona.
of the central Lio zone.

Generally speaking, the staple is a combination of cassava ('uwi 'ai (J(1)) (N) or 'uwi kaju(A)), rice ('are(J), parc (A) or 'etu (N)) and maize (jawa). Among the wet rice growing population of the Lionese, rice is the staple, the other two being only supplementary. In the coastal Endenese region, because of the poor soil, rice is not grown. Yet, thanks to earnings from selling fish, rice is included in the diet as one of the staples.

Other cereals are: ke'o (Job's tears), welé (millet), pēnqga (millet), orho(J) (lolo(A), lodo(N)) (sorghum)<2> and rhenqa (sesame).

Various kinds of tuber crops are planted: 'uwi (yam), sura (a kind of yam), rosē (taro), 'uwi jawa (sweet potato). Potatoes are planted in the cool central Lio zone. Wild yams such as nderho or rhowe (J) ('ondo(N)(L)) are collected, especially in years of famine.

Among the vegetables are: besi (pumpkin), ēa (J) (lēa (L), kea (N), a big kind of melon), daka (a kind of cucumber), ghejē (watermelon), waro, timu (a kind of cucumber).

Spices such as nawē (lemon grass), ora (basil), rēa (ginger) or kunē (turmeric) are planted in small amounts. They are, sometimes, planted in a yard around a house.
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The most important cash crop has been coconut palm (nig). At present prices, someone with 100 coconut palm trees can earn about Rp 12,000 (roughly 12.00 US dollars around 1979) income annually, providing he has four harvests in a year. Coffee is planted (145.5 tons production from the whole Kabupaten Ende in 1979), but it is usually for domestic consumption, at least in the areas which I am going to discuss. Clove has been introduced lately, and especially in the high central Lio zone, where water is abundant, it is becoming successful; the present Kabupaten production of clove was, however, no more than 0.87 ton in 1979. Palm wine is taken from a sugar palm (moke, arenga pinnata) and occasionally fermented. In no place in central Flores, do people use the lontar palm for this purpose, although they know that the lontar palm can yield juice to be fermented.

Livestock is reared only for consumption and gift exchange. Waterbuffaloes are not used for tilling wet rice fields; horses are seldom used for carrying things. In a village in Tana Khorho where I made an intensive village census, each household has an average of three pigs and some chickens. Goat population is much smaller than the pig population. Only a few households in the village had cattle or waterbuffaloes. Horses were kept by only one household among the 30 households in the village. The Kabupaten population of livestock and number of livestock per household in 1979 were as follows:
2.2 Language

The language of central Flores belongs to Bima-Sumba group of western Austronesian. Roughly speaking, there are three dialects there: in Lio they speak a dialect called sera 'Aku (sera means a "language") after its first person singular pronoun. In Ende and the district of Nanga Panda, they speak the sera Ja’o dialect. In the remaining part of Tanah Rea, they speak the sera Nga’o dialect.

A little difference can be found in each of the three dialects. Sera 'Aku can be divided into two sub dialects: one spoken around the area Leke Ba’i or Paga (in Kabupaten Sikka), which has been much influenced by Sikkanese, and the other sub-dialect spoken by the rest of the Lionese population. The latter is further divided into two again: one is spoken in the eastern part of the Lionese region (not exactly but almost the area covered by the former rajadom of Tanah Kunu Lima), and the other spoken by the western population (i.e., about the area of rajadom of Ndona). The basic difference is only that the phoneme /k/ in the western part is replaced with /h/ in the eastern part.
The Ja'o dialect has little diversity within it. There are some lexicographical differences between the coastal dwellers' and the mountain dwellers' language. No change is, however, recognized at the phonetic level.

The Nga'o dialect is rather an artificial construct than a natural one. It seems that there is no clearcut boundary between Nga'o-nese and the Nagê-Keo language. In Kabupaten Ende, we can recognize two sub-dialects of Nga'o-nese (the southern and northern dialects). The part of Tanah Rea, which now belongs to Kabupaten Ngada, i.e. the former district of Wolo Wae, or 'Ute Toto as the people call the region, has its own dialect, which is, according to the Nga'o-nese people in Kabupaten Ende, not difficult to follow. There seems to be almost no difference between the proper Nagê Keo language and the Nga'o-nese sub-dialect spoken in 'Ute Toto.<3>

A proposed taxonomy of the dialects spoken in the central part of Flores is shown in the figure below.
Figure 2-2 Typology of Languages in Central Flores

Language spoken in the central part of Flores

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(west)</th>
<th>(east)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+-------+</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nga'o</td>
<td>Ja'o</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+-------+</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'Ute</td>
<td>+------mountain coastal +----- Leke</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toto</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| (Nage north) south western eastern Keo)

The correspondence of their basic vocabularies are as follows:
86% between sera 'Aku and sera Ja'o; 92% between sera Ja'o and sera Nga'o; 84% between sera 'Aku and sera Nga'o.

Mutual intelligibility reflects more history, geography and demography than the difference in terms of the linguistic distance between the dialects concerned. Ja'o-nese speakers (both mountain and coastal) understand 'Aku-nese, because there are many occasions for contact, especially in the city of Ende. The western 'Aku-nese speakers understand Ja'o-nese, for the same reason above. But, because of the physical distance from the town of Ende, the eastern 'Aku-nese speakers seldom go to the town; hence they cannot understand Ja'o-nese so well as the western 'Aku-nese do. Nga'o-nese speakers are a minority in the present Kabupaten; thus, neither Ja'o-nese nor 'Aku-nese speakers understand Nga'o-nese well, while, on the other hand, the Nga'o-nese speakers have fair knowledge of both Ja'o-nese and 'Aku-nese.
2.3 Identity

Endé ndonde ndu'a When the Muslim people imitate the mountain people,
ngere teka tora ngura It is like chiseling a young gourd.
ndu'a ndonde Endé When the mountain people imitate the Muslim people,
ngere bhaa rasi masa It is like a cleanly washed dish.

The most popular word for referring to the people around the central part of Flores in the literature has been the "Endenese" or "orang Ende" (in Indonesian). But for the people themselves, 'ata Endè ('ata means "people") means, as is indicated in the above saying, "the coastal dwellers" or "the Muslim people." This is but one example of the different usage of people's names. A term can refer to different people according to the place where the term is used. In order to avoid an unnecessary confusion, I will define some terms first (an "objective terminology," which is to be used throughout this dissertation), and then use them without any qualification. In the remaining part of this section, I will go on to discuss the various usages of terms (both exonyms (i.e. names for someone else) and endonyms (i.e. names for speakers themselves)) of identity used by people in various regions.

2.3.1 Basic Setting

Four terms for labelling people (besides the linguistic distinction of Ja'o-nese, 'Aku-nese and Nga'o-nese speakers) are used in this dissertation: (1) the coastal Endenese, (2) the mountain
Endenese, (3) the Lionese, and (4) Tana Dēa people.

(1) Coastal Endenese

By this term, I mean coastal Ja'o-nese speakers who are Muslims. These people have been under the influence of Islam and the rajadom of Ende for a long time. Thus, their culture is an amalgam of traditional features and foreign elements. Physically they are descendants of outsiders (such as Makasarese) and native people there.

Compared with the small area they occupy (along the south coast, on some parts of the north coast, in the city of Ende and on Pulau Ende), they are relatively numerous. An approximate estimation of their population is around 43,000.

Their identity is not based on any traditional devices. They identify themselves as "Muslim people" or "people from such-and-such administrative region."

The contrasting category to 'ata Ende ("the Muslim people") is 'ata ndu'a, "the mountain people," according to indigenous classification. I will divide the category 'ata ndu'a into two: that is "the mountain Endenese" and "the Lionese."

(2) Mountain Endenese

"Mountain Endenese" is a residual category. They are Ja'o-nese speakers who are not Muslim and do not belong to "Tana Dēa people."
Because their distribution does not accord with any administrative division, it is almost impossible to work out the number of their population. A very rough estimation would be about 20,000.

The mountain Endenese are a most interesting people. Neither the Portuguese, the Muslims, nor the Dutch paid much attention to the area; nonetheless, the population is not what an anthropologist would call a "traditional" society. These Endenese do not retain their traditional political organization to the same extent as the Lionese; they are, for example, completely dependent upon the present Indonesian administrative system for settlement of legal disputes. Some traditional units (tana), however, still retain the ritual way of expressing their unity.

Some of those traditional units include, at least nominally, both mountain and coastal Endenese villages. But mainly because of the neglect on the side of the coastal people and also the lack of agricultural rituals in the coastal regions, which is the symbol of the unity of the unit, there is no relevance in the coastal region talking about the ritual unit.

Because of the custom of transferring a parcel of land with the ritual authority on it from a wife-giving group to its wife-taking group, the whole system tends to lose its system of overarching authority and rigid outer boundary.
(3) Lionese

The word "Lionese" refers to an 'Aku-nese speaking population. This usage agrees more or less with the common usage by the people themselves.

The Lionese occupy about two thirds of Kabupaten Ende. A whole kecamatan in Kabupaten Sikka, Paga, is also occupied by the Lionese population. There are supposedly quite a number of Lionese population in Nita, another kecamatan in Kabupaten Sikka. An approximate figure for the Lionese population in Kabupaten Ende (Ende regency) is 117,000<5>.

Political systems vary in the Lionese region from one village to another. Basically, one village forms one (more or less) self-contained political and ritual unit (lana). The existence of the rajadoms does not seem to have affected much the indigenous political organization.

A rough sketch of the social organization in a Lionese lana in the eastern part will provide a background to this thesis.

Generally speaking, a lana is composed of several named clans ('ala, "people"), each of which is represented by a clan house or a ritual house (sa'o ria, "big house"). Some clans are further segmented into named lineages (sa'o, "house"). Each of the clans holds a parcel of land, which is ritually taken care of by clan priests called mosa laki. Ideally, mosa laki is a ritual authority and does not deal with any legal business. Jurisprudential and

-32-
legislative functions are carried out by an office called ria béwa ("great and long"), who is appointed by mosa laki. Thus, clans are mutually independent of each other in political as well as ritual terms. The concept of lana functions as the framework within which clans interact (several clans have their name-sake clans outside the lana, to which they usually do not claim any tie). Beside that, the concept of lana becomes apparent only once a year, when an annual ritual called nggúa ria ("great ritual") is held, the scenario of which encompasses all the clans in one lana.

(4) Tana Dēa People

Tana Dēa people stand on their own: this category of people is defined without referring to the other categories. They are the people who claim to belong to a ritual/political community called Tana Dēa (the former landschap Tanah Rea). (I will use only Nga'o-nese names for the terms used in Tana Dēa.) They number probably about 9,000 in Kabupaten Ende. The area near the south coast is occupied by Ja'o-nese speakers, and the rest is occupied by Nga'o-nese speakers. Tana Dēa is divided into a number of (ritually and politically) autonomous sub-units called pu'u muku // doka dēa ("banana trunks and ginger lumps"), each of which corresponds roughly to one lana of the mountain Endeinese or the Lionese region in physical size.

The first raja Kaka Dupa is considered as a "hero." He is said to have been clever enough to persuade the Dutch to choose him as the raja of Tanah Rea, but he was not a legitimate person, in the genealogical sense of the word. The second raja's name (Hadji Abdul
Madjid) is not even remembered by people. The two other district heads, Nipa Do in Wolo Wae and Pesa Papu in Tanah Djēa, are regarded as proper headmen(7). The descendants of the two men are still recognized as proper headmen (teke tana // dēo watu, "(he who) holds the land and grasps the stones"). One pu'u muku (a sub-unit) called Jawa Kisa serves the function of mediator: that is, this sub-unit is supposed to handle all the legal affairs within Tana Dēa, like the ria bēwa in the Lionese regions, though the latter is an individual.

Although there is not yet any thorough anthropological study of the Nage Keo regions, it seems from fragmentary information I gathered during my field work that the culture of Tana Dēa is closer to Nage Keo than to the mountain Endenese culture.

In the Dutch Colonial administration, the land of Tana Dēa was divided between two Onderafdeelings (Wolo Wae in Nage/Keo and Tanah Djea and Nanga Panda in Ende). The present Indonesian division still maintains this separation, although the communication across the administrative boundary continues.

In this thesis, except for brief but necessary references to Tana Dēa people and the Lionese, I will concentrate upon the mountain Endenese culture and society.

2.3.2 Who Are the Endenese?

Local terminology for identity and differentiation of peoples varies one place to another. One specific term, thus, can be used in different ways. Even a specific place or a group of people has
different levels of identity and differentiation.

The Lionese people in most cases identify themselves as 'ata Lio as against 'ata Endē, which includes both the mountain and coastal Endenese. They have little knowledge of Tana Dēa people. They sometimes employ a term, 'ata ndu'a for their identity as against 'ata Endē; in this case, however, they do not include the mountain Endenese as 'ata ndu'a. Thus the two pairs of opposition have exactly the same referents.

An eastern 'Aku-nese speaker calls a western 'Aku-nese speaker 'ata Lisē, thus representing Tanah Kunu Lima by Lisē. As far as I know, there is no special reference from the eastern to the western 'Aku-nese.

The Lionese on the north coast sometimes refer to the south coast Lionese as 'ala Lio; in this context, there are no special terms for their own identity.

The mountain and the coastal Endenese usually distinguish clearly the two categories, 'ata ndu'a and 'ata Endē. When these people want to classify the two into one as opposed to the Lionese, they employ the word 'ata Ja'o, "Ja'o-nese speakers" as against 'ata 'Aku or 'ata Lio. They never pronounce Lio as Rhio, though the phoneme /l/ has comparatively rare occurrences in the Ja'o-nese language and the phoneme /r/ in 'Aku-nese is in most cases replaced with the phoneme /rh/. 'Ada Rhio in Ja'o-nese, used on the south coast means "people on the north coast" whether the referenced people are Lionese or
Endenese.

For the Nga'o-nese, the mountain and coastal Endenese employ the word 'ata Nga'o or sometimes 'ata Kēo, even though the referenced people have never belonged to the rajadom of Kēo (nor do the referenced people use 'ata Kēo for their own identity.)

Tana, for example Tana Rhorho, can be used as an identifying mark. 'Ata Tana Rhorho can be an example. Or sometimes, referring to an original village, they call themselves 'ata mai Kepi ("people from the village Kepi"). Such expressions are, however, rarely used, because there are no opposing tana's around there in the mountain Endenese region. Tana Rhorho seems to be the only one left, except some Ja'o-nese speaking villages which belonged to the former rajadom of Lio (Ndona), which does not enter into the Tana Rhorho people's social world.

As to the terms 'ata Ja'o, 'ata 'Aku and 'ata Nga'o, the Tana Dea people do not show any derivation from the usage in the other parts. 'Ata Endē or 'ata ma'u ("coastal people") is used for the coastal Muslim people. Within Tana Dea, they use as their identification either their sub-unit (pu'u muku) name or their clan name. A clan spreads, unlike the Lionese, through Tana Dea, crossing the sub-unit boundaries and clan members of two different sub-units recognize patrilineal relatedness, even when it is not traceable.

The Tana Dea people refer to the inhabitants of Tana Dea in Kabupaten Ngada as 'ata 'Ute or 'Ute Toto.
Most interesting is their way of referring to the people of Tana Rhorho (which is pronounced as Tana Dodo in Nga'o-nese). The Tana Déa people refer to the people of Tana Rhorho as 'ata Dodo mena ("the western Dodo people"). They do not use the word tana. On the other hand, people in Tana Rhorho would never use 'ata Rhorho for their identity, but 'ata Tana Rhorho. What is at stake here is the difference between the Tana Déa people's way of conceptualizing the Tana Rhorho people, as a "clan," a group articulated in kinship terms, and the Tana Rhorho people's way of conceptualizing themselves, as a "tana," a group articulated in terms of land and the rituals on it, claiming themselves to stand at the same level as the Tana Déa people.

2.4 History

Like other islands in the area, Flores has been long under the influence of various outside forces back since the 13th century as historical documents<8> go. However, except for occasional references found in Javanese and Chinese sources, the islands in Nusa Tenggara Timur were not mentioned in historical documents in any detail until the 16th century, when the Portuguese arrived in this area of Indonesia.

Between the 16th century and the 17th century, Islam is said to have come to Ende<9>. The Portuguese arrived at Malaka in 1511. The Dutch East India Company was established in 1602. Thus the history of Ende in the 16th century deals mostly with the struggle between Muslims and Portuguese and that in the 17th century should deal with these two forces plus the Dutch East India Company.
After their arrival in the area, the Portuguese made Solor (an eastern island off the mainland Flores) the centre of their trade. Repeated attacks on Solor by the Javanese seafaring traders suggest that the island had already been used as a trading port by the Javanese (especially for the sandalwood derived from Timor) (Houfkaer 1922: 40). The Nagarakertagama mentioned that Solot (Solor-Flores) belonged to Majapahit. The small island called Pulau Ende in the Bay of Ende seems to have served the same purpose for the Javanese.

2.4.1 The Portuguese and the Muslims

In 1561, the first Bishop in Malaka sent three missionaries to Solor, where, after an attack by Javanese Muslims, they constructed a fortress (Houfkaer 1922: 40). Also, on Pulau Ende, the Portuguese constructed a fortress there. The two fortresses are the main scenes of the struggle among the Portuguese, Muslims and, later on, the Dutch.

A tale of struggle between the Christians and the Muslims on Pulau Ende is told in a legend about a beautiful woman, Rendo, the daughter of the commander of the fortress. That tale is usually referred to as Rendo Hali Rua, or "Rendo of the Two Tombs." The story is as follows:

Rendo was the daughter of a Portuguese commander of the fortress and a Numba woman. She had a long hair which was repa rhima rua (seven yards), siku rhima rua (seven elbows), pangga rhima rua (seven hands), fate rhima rua (seven cubits) long. And her throat was so white that one could see the water going down through it.

When her father was away from the fortress, a troop of
[Javanese] pirates attacked the fortress. Rendo's lover Jебe Jawa, a Javanese working in the fortress, was killed at that time.

The leader of the pirates, Ndoke Rua, was going to take Rendo away; but she and her slave, Tonjo, managed to escape from him. They ran to a place called 'Eko Reko bringing a golden tray with them.

The two women threatened the pirates by making papaya leaves look like a cannon. This trick, however, did not work for long. Then Rendo and Tonjo were about to jump into the sea, when they found a fisherman. They asked him a favour and borrowed his boat.

When Ndoke Rua, with his pirates, arrived at 'Eko Reko, Rendo and Tonjo were already in the middle of the sea. Ndoke Rua, finding no boats available there, prayed for rain and wind. There came big waves and their boat sank.

Rendo and Tonjo died. Rendo's father moved to Royo Hayon(11). Rendo has two tombs: one on the island; and another in Numba, which now serves as a boundary between two ritual domains called Tana Rhorho and Tana Dea. The slave, Tonjo, turned into a flower, which is now called by the name of Tonjo.

Accompanying this story is the song of Rendo:

Jo Solo gеbo_ Jo Solo (=Ndoke Rua) attacked
ma'е pani Rendo Don't take away Rendo
Rendo rate rua Rendo of the two tombs
tau nggera nusa He destroyed the island
nusa 'ata Ende_ The island of the Endenese
Bima orho 'ese Bima wanted to occupy
Bima ramu_rarhe Bima to the west
'orho 'ese Sape_ Wanted to occupy Sape (the
- eastern coast of Bima)
Sape jedho Kemo Sape felt sorry for Kemo (a
place on the Pulau Ende)
wua mesu Mando Felt pity for Mando (also
a place name on the island)
'ерu nandе tаrho They (the Endenese) could not
sleep well.

This song is difficult to understand not only for the anthropologist but also for the people themselves; yet every one knows a bit of this poem (the above example is a patchwork of several different versions)(12).
The struggle between the Portuguese and the Muslims (not only Javanese, but also native people who had been converted to Islam) continued on the island of Flores\(^{13}\). After some years of peace\(^{14}\), in 1605, the Portuguese on Pulau Ende were driven out by the natives to a village on the mainland Flores, called Numba\(^{15}\). The fortress on Pulau Ende was burned down. Since this time until its recovery in 1613 Pulau Ende was abandoned by the Christians.

2.4.2 Dutch East India Company

1613 is a significant year in the history of eastern Indonesia. A Dutch fleet under the command of Apollonius Scotte (or Scot) sailed through the islands. Before arriving at Kupang\(^{16}\), Scotte went to Solor and attacked the fortress there and took it from the Portuguese. The Portuguese, or more precisely, the "black Portuguese"\(^{17}\) fled to Larantuka\(^{18}\), which, from that time, became the centre of the black Portuguese. The Dutch attacked Larantuka also, but failed to take it. Adrian van der Velden, Scotte\'s deputy commander, went to Ende, and found the ruin of the fortress there\(^{19}\) (van Suchtelen 1921:9) (Rouffaer 1922: 45).

In the decades between 1610 and 1640, the Portuguese in Larantuka and the Dutch on Solor played a kind of see-saw game, which, in the long run, turned in favour of the Dutch\(^{20}\). The fortress on Solor was occupied by the Dutch in 1646 (Rouffaer 1922: 48-50) (van Suchtelen 1921: 10).

The fortress on Pulau Ende had been destroyed earlier in 1620\'s (the exact date is unknown). Unlike Solor, which remained significant
in the Dutch Company/Colonial Rule context, Pulau Ende ceased to play any important role. The city of Ende, where the rajadom of Ende may already have formed, replaced Pulau Ende as a focus point in central Flores. Around this time, the Portuguese influence over the area waned.

Through the 17th and 18th centuries, there are occasional references to the relations concluded between the Dutch East India Company and some Endenese headmen. The Company selected Ende as a rajadom and concluded a formal contract in 1793; a "tink" (an interpreter) was sent to Ende (van Suchtelen 1921: 11).

2.4.3 The Dutch Colonial Rule before 1907

The Dutch East India Company's involvement in eastern Indonesia ended in 1799 when the Company's charter expired. Then came a new era of the Dutch Colonial rule in Indonesia.

This era can be divided, in central Flores, into two periods, 1907 marking the transition between the two. During the earlier period, there was no serious intervention by the Dutch Government in Flores. This period can be further divided into two: (1) the period before 1890 and (2) that after 1890. In the former period, the Dutch colonial rule had virtually no hold over the region.

(1) Before 1890

Because the Endenese involvement in the sphere of occasional raids on Sumba and the resulting slave trade was against the Dutch
colonial policy, in 1836 the Dutch government in Kupang sent an expedition to Ende. There took place a battle between this expedition and the rajadom of Ende. The latter surrendered and recognized the authority of the Netherlands<24>. Since that time, the raja of Ende and the Dutch Colonial government made successive contracts<25>.

During this period, minimal direct involvement was the Dutch government principle. For example, in 1868, the posthouder at Ende was notified by the Resident that he had been sent there not to govern but only to observe what was happening in Ende (anonymous 1912). The posthouders were placed in Ende in order to keep an eye on the Endenese involvement in the slave trade (de Bruyne 1947: 6-7).

Before 1907, Ende had no "Controleur"; and the "posthouder" there does not seem to have had a strong hold over the area<26>. We can see a few reasons for the weak position of the posthouders. First of all, it was the Dutch government policy at that time not to be involved directly in native affairs, thus posthouders were not assigned any power to govern. Secondly, because of the poor relationship between the raja and the Government, resulting from Dutch concern with the slave trade, the raja would not support the posthouders. The raja was sometimes suspected of a secret alliance with the rebels. More importantly, the raja was still only one figure among local headmen; he was not as strong as the word raja would suggest.
Thus, for the Dutch, the urgent thing to do was to reinforce the power of the rajas of Ende, who were sometimes described as "weak" (zwakken radja van Ende (van Heutsz 1926: 133)). Here, before proceeding any further, let us consider the history of the Endenese dynasty, including a founding myth of the rajadom.

According to the founding myth of the rajadom of Ende, a man from overseas (Jawa), who married a daughter of the native lord of the land of Ende, was given power and rights over the land of Ende by his father-in-law, and became the founder of the Endenese dynasty. This first raja is usually named Jari Jawa (possibly derived from the Indonesian expression dari Jawa, "from Java"), but sometimes called Raden Husen, a Javanese Islamic name(27). The dynasty's genealogy(28) can be reconstructed as follows:
Figure 2-3 Genealogy of the Endenese Dynasty

(3) Inderdewa
(1) Inderdewa
(2) Baba Pandé (-1862-) (1839-1876)

+--------+
|        |
|        |
+--------+

(3) Aru Busman (3)
| (Bousou) (2) (-1839)

+--------+
|        |
|        |
+--------+

(2) Pua Note
(1) Aru Busman (1876-1895)
| (La Usu) |
| (La Jusu) |
| (1896-1907) |

+--------+
|        |
|        |
+--------+

(2) Pua Meno (1909-23)

Harum
Busman Abdul
| Rachman (1924-1948?)

| |
| |

Sources:
(1): van Suchtelen 1921
(2): van Dijk 1925
(3): interview with Hasan Aru Busman in 1979

(2) After 1890

An incident<29>, which reveals the not so simple relationship between the Endenese raja and the Dutch Government, happened in the year of 1890, the year which, according to one officer (de Vries), demarcates the period before 1907.

In June 1890, a Kupang-interned prisoner Bara Nuri, an Endenese headman, escaped and returned to Ende. The Dutch Colonial Government requested the raja of Ende to help the Government catch Bara Nuri. After repeated failures, mainly due to the Dutch government's reluctance to help cooperate with the raja, the raja finally managed...
to capture Bara Nuri<30>.

In 1896, the raja, Pua Note, was formally appointed as raja of Ende by the Dutch Government<31>.

2.4.4 1907 and After

The political situation of the Ende onderafdeeling before 1907 was summarized by de Vries as follows:

...the influence of our (Dutch) government did not go further than the vicinity of (the town of) Ende. ...

Besides the necessary improvement, which was considered desirable for Ende and for which orders were given, the Controleur also gave the headmen of the nearby mountain-villages to understand, with emphasis, that their villages had to be tidy, the paths had to be maintained etc., in short, all the ordinary things, but, to which these headmen had never listened. ...

They did not consider the "Compagnie" as their master. (de Vries 1910: 46-7)

Then came the year 1907, which saw the beginning of the Dutch period of intensification of rule.

At the end of the preceding year, the Dutch Government sent the first Controleur of Flores to Ende, A. Couvreur (Winokan 1960: 71) (van Suchtelen 1921: 12), showing its concern to involve itself in the affairs in Flores<32>.

In July 1907, the town of Ende, where the Colonial Government set its capital, was raided by rebels led by several mountain Endenese chiefs<33>.
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In this incident, the raja Pua Noté is said to have played a "treacherous part" (verraderlijken rol) (van Suchtelen 1921: 12)<34>. Thus, the raja was suspected of prior knowledge of a meeting at Nanga Kéo on the 2nd of July where the village heads decided to plunder Ende, even though the government was not sure whether the raja himself urged them to do so (de Vries 1910: 56-7). This suspicion later made the Dutch government decide to exile the raja.

In August, military reinforcement came from Kupang, and the whole land of Flores was pacified by the military force<35>. In September, more headmen came to submit to the government. In the same month, the first civil officer (Spruyt) was sent to Ende for east Flores, including Ende, instead of postholders<36>.

From this time to 1910, with further reinforcement from Kupang, the Controleur and the armed police repeatedly went through the villages of the area and pacified them, while confiscating rifles and registering the population (de Vries 1910: 63-73)<37>.

The following work song (baka cenda) collected in the Nga'o-region, although not specifically referring to the 1907 event, may help to understand how the people there felt (or feel) toward the Dutch rule:

buu bholo moo We work only to get tired,
jomba tynngga mbonggo We labour only to get exhausted.
'epu ghedu tana The earthquake shakes the land,
'angi weo wolo The wind sways the hill.
tua roka 'opa The foreigners levy taxes,
'ata dii dho The police capture us.
'epa ladê ghedu Down there, they are shaken,
After replacement of the raja of Ende<sup>38</sup> and integration of numerous petty kingdoms into a fewer large kingdoms, four raja were assigned to each of the four landschaps<sup>39</sup>.

Thus the Dutch colonial government took firm action, and until 1924 the administrative system in central Flores remained stable. The system is shown in Figure 2-4.
2.4.5 Reorganization in 1924

In the middle of the relatively peaceful years of the Dutch colonial rule, in 1916, there broke out a rebellion against the Dutch rule in a northern part of Tanah Rea, Wolo Waé, under the then head of the district, Nipa Do. This rebellion is one reason for the reorganization of the administrative system of the central Flores in 1924. Another, more important, reason was the economizing policy of the Dutch colonial government. It took place as one of a series of the reorganizations in various parts of Flores (e.g. in 1917 in Riung and in 1931 in both Larantuka and Sikka regions).

Before 1924, the Onderafdeeling Endeh consisted of four landschappen: from the west to the east, Tanah Rea, Endeh, Ndona and Tanah Kunu Lima. Tanah Rea comprised three districts: Wolo Waé,
Tanah Djea and Nanga Panda. In 1924, the landschap of Tanah Rea was dissolved and the district of Wolo Wae was assimilated into the landschap of Nageh, while the remaining two districts were assimilated into the landschap of Endeh. At the same time, in 1924, the landschap of Ndona and Tana Kunu Lima were united with two gemeenten from the former landschap Endeh to form one landschap called Lio<42>.

2.4.6 Present Indonesian Administration

Under the present Indonesian administration, the whole region belongs to Kabupaten Ende (Ende regency), which, in turn, consists of six kecamatan (sub-districts). In the former landschap Endeh, there are two kecamatan: Kecamatan Nanga Panda, which virtually corresponds to the pre-1924 landschap Tanah Rea, and Kecamatan Ende, which is situated in almost the same place as pre-1924 landschap Endeh. In the former Lio region, there are four kecamatan: Ndona, Detu Soko, Mage Koba (or Ma'u Role) and Wolo Waru; the first two and about half of Mage Koba corresponding to the pre-1924 landschap Ndona and the remaining domain of Mage Koba and Wolo Waru being the landschap Tanah Kunu Lima.

Here I show 3 maps of the administrative divisions in the years prior to 1924, after 1924 and in 1981. All the divisions, past or present, are official structures imposed upon the native world from without; nonetheless they reflect some native political divisions, as these divisions have always been the result of a dialectic between the interests of the outside and the indigenous political divisions.
Figure 2-5 Administration in Central Flores (before 1924)

MAP OF ADMINISTRATION IN CENTRAL FLORES
(DUTCH COLONIAL PERIOD)
ONDERAFLINGEN ENDEH
Pre 1924
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Figure 2-7 Administration in Central Flores (at present)

MAP OF ADMINISTRATION IN CENTRAL FLORES
PRESENT INDONESIAN GOVERNMENT

(Kecamatan Nanga Panda)

1. Tenda Mbepa
2. Kamu Bheka
3. Kebi Rangga
4. Tenda Rea
5. Keru Rea
6. Bhera Mari
7. Rapo Rendu
8. Nggo Rea
9. Ondo Rea
10. Ndoru Rea

+ (Perwakilan Pulau Ende 4 desa's)
2.5 Field Work

My wife (and also my co-field-worker, Eriko Nakagawa<42>) and I arrived in Ende in August 1979. After about a week's inquiry in the town of Ende, we made friends with an Endenese man called Adolfus Odja (pronounced 'Oja). He invited us to his father's village, Keka Dori, to the west of the town of Ende. We decided to stay with his father, 'Epu, in the village Keka Dori. Keka Dori is situated in the ritual domain called Tana Rhorho ("Land of Rhorho").

'Epu and Sebhi, 'Epu's daughter's husband who had not completed his bridewealth payment, became our teachers, especially at the early stage of fieldwork.

After about half a year of the fieldwork there, 'Oja came to the village and said that his (Lionese) wife's father was dying. We went to the city of Ende and after a few days, his father-in-law died. We went to his Lionese village as wife-takers to take part in the funeral. There, in that Lionese region, we made good friends with one Lionese man. After that, during the fieldwork, we paid occasional visits to that Lionese village and did fieldwork there. For some time, we relied upon only that friend of ours for information.

Sebhi, 'Epu's daughter's husband, insisted on our coming to his native village, which belongs to another ritual domain closely connected (at least in Tana Rhorho's people's conception of their social world), called Tana Dea. That is how we visited the land of Tana Dea. Towards the end of our first fieldwork, we spent lots of time in Tana Dea region, especially because Sebhi was chosen as
Kepala Desa (head of an administrative unit) in his desa, which made fieldwork very smooth.

Thus, during the initial fieldwork, we were "siblings" in the mountain Endenese region, "wife-takers" in the Lio region and "wife-givers" in the Tana Dea region. These relationships by which we were introduced into the three communities made the fieldwork "natural" in the sense that we were placed in an appropriate social niche.

Although this dissertation focuses upon the mountain Endenese region, I will occasionally, when necessary, make some references to the remaining two cultures in the central part of Flores.

2.6 Village Keke Dori

In this section of this ethnographical introduction, I will describe the village called Keke Dori, where I spent most of my time during my first fieldwork. Keke Dori is situated in the mountain Endenese region, in a ritual domain (tana) called Tana Rhorho.

Unlike Lionese villages which tend to be large, sometimes so large that only one village forms an entire administrative unit (desa), Endenese villages have an average number of ten to fifteen households. The village Keke Dori is, however, exceptionally large; there are 30 households, including 4 elementary school teachers' households. At the time when our map was made there were 280 individuals in the village.
The village is composed of 6 geographical parts. The oldest site is Pu'u Kerara, and the second oldest is Dori wawa, or upper Dori. At present, when a villager says "the village" (nu'a), he refers to Dori wawa. Dori ora or central Dori and Dori wena or lower Dori are newly opened sites. The villagers cleared the forest, which had been tabooed (pire), only after the second world war. The elementary school was opened there in 1969 and since then there have always been 2 to 4 teachers living in the village. At first, all the school teachers at Keka Dori came from various Lionese regions. However, all the present teachers come from villages within the surrounding area, although none from this village.

The five households located in the area called "new settlements" on the map are the houses which were laid along the line between 'Epu's house and Niko Dhangu's house. They are the houses which were burned by a fire which occurred in 1981. They did not rebuild the houses on the old sites because, as they say, the place was "hot."

Pu'u Terē must have been a new settlement. In my first fieldwork, there were two households there. One household was split into two (the two heads of the split households are full-brothers), and both brothers moved to another village nearby (Pu'u 'Upē). The other household, Jedho, which resided in Pu'u Terē during my first stay has now moved into Pu'u Kerara. The present households, Setu and his eldest son, Sendo, moved there between the two periods of my fieldwork. Setu used to live on a site next to 'Epu's house; that site is now included within 'Epu's fence. Sendo (Setu's eldest son), during my first fieldwork, was still living with his newly married
wife's family in a village called Pemo, east of Kakua Dori.

The fences which surround almost all the houses are quite new. During my first fieldwork, except for the teachers' houses, no house had a fence. That is quite a remarkable change which surprised me much on my arrival in the village the second time. Other surrounding villages still observe the fenceless traditional pattern.

As to the names for the household-heads indicated on the map, I tried to use the names the villagers use in everyday conversation. Although almost all the villagers have converted to Christianity, mainly after 1965, they still tend to use "village names" instead of the Christian names. Exceptions are the school teachers and one person, Niko Dhangu, who is young and the only person in the village who went to a high school.
Chapter 3 Ideology of Kinship

3.1 Introduction

There are two ordering principles of kinship recognition in Ende. Roughly speaking, these might be called those of "descent" and "alliance": the former is a body of rules as to how to identify a person with others and the latter, how to differentiate a person from others.

3.2 Descent

We may well begin our description with the conscious ideology of descent.

3.2.1 Attributive Identity

Descent, i.e., the identity relation as defined by kinship is, in Ende, the most fundamental of all identity relations. That is, any other identity relation (such as jural, political and economic(1)) is expressed as 'ari ka'rë ("same sex siblings"), the identity relation derived from kinship(2). In other words, physiologically or biologically conceptualized identity relation is extended into other language systems such as jural, sociological and economic, even though there is no clear folk physiological theorization about this kinship identity relation.

In Ende, descent as is pertinent for identity relationship is
reckoned patrilineally. Thus, agnatically related persons are "identical" ("structurally equivalent"<3>); they are called 'ari ka'ē (same-sex siblings). When asked of one's genealogy, an Endenese counts only his/her patrilineal ascendants. This is the underlying ideology of such notions as that which the Endenese express as susu 'embo kajo ("accumulation of grand and great-grand parents") or 'ura ("line").

This agnatic principle of identity is evident, among others, in the expression for unmarried female children. They are, before their marriage, called 'ana mbana ("children," "go away"), that is, those who will, in due course, leave their natal descent group. Thus, agnation is the underlying principle of all other social relations of identity.

The identity relationship defined by agnation implies various relationships in other systems. In economic terms, the agnatic principle prevails over the spheres of inheritance and property ownership. A parcel of land is "shared" among agnatically related people<4>. A woman, after her marriage, has no say over her father's land, at least in principle. Other property, such as elephant tusks and golden items, are inherited from father to son as well. Jurally speaking, agnatically related persons are supposed to share the same rights and hold the same obligations both to themselves and to the outsiders.

3.2.2 Attributive Differentiation

Thus far, we have been arguing that the principle of agnation
operates as an identity relationship. As was stated in the introductory chapter, any attributive principle of classification can have a relational function as its counterpart. In the context of Endenese kinship classification, this relational functioning of the principle of agnation can be formulated as: "if two persons are not patrilineally related, then the two persons are not identical." As opposed to the identity aspect, this aspect is "weak," in the sense that one does not always follow this explanatory device in all the explanations. If two persons are related patrilineally, then one cannot avoid identifying them, but if two persons are not patrilineally related, one may still identify them by recourse to some other means, such as co-residence. One may, of course, differentiate them. It is up to the explainer.

If we symbolize \( I \) for identity relationship, and patrilineal relationship as OG/OG (standing for one's Own Group), then

\[
OG/OG(a, b) \rightarrow I(a, b)
\]

and weakly

\[
not \ OG/OG(a, b) \rightarrow not \ I(a, b)
\]

3.3 Alliance

Let us now proceed to the ideology concerning alliance. This is, primarily, the principle of difference in Ende.

3.3.1 Asymmetric Alliance Complex

The Endenese have a clear ideology of "asymmetric alliance (or mother's brother's daughter marriage)" such that in everyday
discourses, they often make such statements as: "This is my (classificatory) MBD so she is my would-be spouse." "I should have married the MBD. But I did not. So, the MB gave me a piece of land in lieu of his daughter." "I can joke with her because she is my MBD, a would-be spouse of mine."

It is only in these ways that I speak about the Endenese matrilateral cross cousin marriage and in no other ways. To state my point of view more explicitly, it is most relevant to argue against a common assumption of "obligatory marriage" theories.

At the very beginning of his treatise upon matrilateral cross cousin marriage, Leach states as follows:

There are two kinds of marriage. The first results from the whims of two persons acting as private individuals; the second is a systematically organized affair which forms part of a series of contractual obligations between two social groups. (Leach 1961: 56)

The Endenese society falls outside this dichotomy in a couple of senses: (1) that in the Endenese society, there co-exist the two types of marriage and (2) that no specific marriage can be said to belong to either category in the most rigorous sense: a marriage may begin as a result of the whims of two persons, and may be described as such, but in the following situation, the two groups may concern themselves with the marriage and trace an old alliance; this alliance will be used to justify the marriage in one of the traditional Endenese ways of marrying to the effect that the marriage concerned is described as if it had been "a systematically organized
affair ... between two social groups." Also, (3) that a specific marriage might be regarded as "whimsical" by one party and as "obligatory" by another, a situation which often arises in the form of wife-givers' claiming a "new alliance" and wife-takers' claiming an "old alliance."

In Ende, it is the description of marriage that counts. In other words, it is not a marriage itself but how it is described and who describes it that way, that we want to analyze. Especially the former shall be analyzed here. As is clear from the above examples, even though what kind of description is employed is determined more or less according to political intentions of the parties concerned, the whole repertoire of descriptions is fixed culturally. To reveal this repertoire is our main aim here.

The matrilateral cross cousin marriage finds its expression in the following idioms. In an institutionalized way, among others, a man must pay his closest MB (usually his actual mother's brother, or more generally, the representative of his maternal descent group) a fine called rberho 'urhu // rhangga wara, "jumping over the head // crossing over the shoulders," if he does not marry his mother's brother's daughter. Negatively, if a man marries a classificatory father's sister's daughter (an alliance called rarha sarha, "the wrong way"), he must pay to his FZH, in this case WF at the same time, a fine termed kaa sarha minga // pesa sarha bhara, "eating wrong fat // partaking of wrong lard" coupled with su'a bharhe ngadu // rhigu pa'a rhe'e, "the handle (of a machete) turns into the blade // the back turns into the edge." In these ways, "others," that is,
those who have a difference relationship with one, are classified into two clearly distinguished categories: one's wife-givers (called ka'e 'embu) and one's wife-takers (called weta 'ané).

3.3.2 Relational Identity

As descent operates as a differentiation function, matrilateral cross cousin marriage can operate as an identity function, which is "weak," in the same sense that the attributive differentiation is "weak," that is, the employment of this device for any explanation is optional.

The functioning of relational identity needs more careful analysis than the descent working as differentiating principle, because there can be several structurally different hypothetical cases.

As I stated in the introductory chapter, when a relational principle works as an identity relation, it takes a form such as follows: if a and b are 'different' and c and b are 'different,' then a and c are 'identical': the same logic that works in the formula "one's enemy's enemy is one's friend." In Endenese kinship ideological system, this hypothetical key function 'is-different' can mean two empirical predicates, that is, 'is-wife-giver-to' (let us write this predicate as WG/WT) and 'is-wife-taker-to' (WT/WG). Each function is the converse of the other, in the sense that whenever WG/WT(a, b) holds, WT/WG(b, a) holds as well. The Endenese system assumes that WT/WG can work as a relational identity relationship. In other words, WG/WT(a, b) and WG/WT(c, b) do not necessarily mean
I'(a, c) (because the implied identity relationship is a "weak" one, I will use a different symbol, I', from the one I used for the identity relationship caused by agnation, I), whereas WT/WG(a, b) and WT/WG(c, b) means I'(a, c).

Still there are several possible ways of materializing this type of relational identity relationship (WT/WG(a,b) & WT/WG(c,b) --> I'(a, c)), depending on when the key alliance (the alliance which causes the WT/WG relationship) occurs. The 3 hypothetical (and likely) cases are shown below.

![Figure 3-1 Three Possible WT/WG Relationships](image_url)

Each of the 3 pairs (a and c, a' and c', and a'' and c'') can be seen as one type of materialization of relational identity (WT/WG, WT/WG-->I'). Only that type of pair which is represented as a'' and c'' is the Endenese selection for appropriate relational identity. The ideology underlying this selection is the one called "sharing the origin." According to the Endenese, one is said to come from (or "originate") one's mother's natal group (a group articulated in terms of agnation). If two persons "come from" the same group, then they are called "to have come together," mai bou. They are in a way regarded as 'identical.' As a convention, we will call persons who are in a relation of MZS/MZS as "uterine siblings."
Another hypothetical case is shown in the figure below:

Figure 3-2 MBDH/WFZS

The daughter of b is a potential wife of a. Suppose c marries her, then a and c are regarded in a way identical. The strength of this relation (let us call this "retrospective siblingship") as an explanatory device depends upon the kind of relation that holds between a and c's W (or a's MBD). The latter relation wholly depends on the relation between b and b's Z (or a's M). How the B/Z relation affects one between the BD/ZS shall be discussed fully later. Suffice it to say here that, if the B/Z relation is "special," then the BD/ZS relation becomes such that they are supposed to marry each other. Returning to the case above, we can now say that when the relation between b and b's Z is "special," the explanatory device, by which to regard a and c as identical, is strong.

3.3.3 Marriage Types

As a marriage (wai rhaki) is one of the most fundamental factors in alliance relationship, let us investigate some idioms concerning marriage.

The Endenese distinguish five types of marriage; let me give a
brief description of each type one by one.

(1) Mburhu Nduu // Wesa Senda

Following the Road // Tracing the Path.

This is a man's marriage with his mother's brother's daughter, or following the Endenese way of speaking, that with (a girl from) his old wife-giving group. Because this is a revision or renewal of the already established relationship, the Endenese say, there is no need to pay bridewealth. There is an ideology of marriage with one's mother's brother's daughter in the sense that she is regarded as one's potential spouse and the relationship terminology does not contradict this ideology much (see the next chapter). There are two aspects in the Endenese attitude towards this type of marriage. One is a positive attitude, which finds expression in such idioms concerning Mburhu Nduu // Wesa Senda as:

piu soku // ndua 'uma [Whenever we run short of something] we have only to take from the storehouse // we have only to go down to the field.

kombê piu // rhera ero [Whenever we run short of something] we only have to take at night // we only have to pick in the daytime.

In the first stanza, the proximity in topographical terms expresses that of kinship.

However, this type of marriage is not always considered an ideal. Another expression for this type of marriage is illustrative in this respect.
Here the mother's brother's daughter is compared to what is old and rotten; if you cannot find anybody else to marry, then you have to take what has been offered to you for a long time (the mother's brother's daughter has been, since your birth, your would-be spouse).

The ideal type of marriage for an Endenese is not the one that renews an already established relationship but the one that creates a new relationship.

(2) 'Ana Arhe

Asking

'Ana Arhe is contracted with a group allegedly as yet unrelated. This type of marriage can be called an ideal one. A wife married in this fashion is usually regarded as more prestigious than her co-wives recruited in other ways.

The following narrative (5) from my fieldnote will illustrate the matter of prestige among co-wives according to the ways of their marriages.

(In village Keka Dori, there were two half brothers (with the same father and different mothers) who had been competitive, originally over their father's property).

Arguing over their precedence, they referred to the way of
marriage of each other's mother. One brother said:

My mother came to the (father's) house earlier than your mother.

This comment implies his superiority because of the precedence of his mother's "arrival" at the house. Replying to this allegation, the other says:

Your mother came as a tu'a(6) (in a marriage type of Mburhu Nduu // Wesa Senda) but my mother came in a way of "carrying a knife and holding a jacket"(7) (in a marriage type of 'Ana 'Arhe).

This counter-response clearly illustrates the 'Ana 'Arhe marriage's superiority over the Mburhu Nduu // Wesa Senda marriage (that is, a MBD marriage).

As opposed to Mburhu Nduu // Wesa Senda in which practically no bridewealth is demanded, one has to pay a considerable amount of bridewealth to conclude a marriage in this way. 'Ana 'Arhe also has a rigidly structured procedure consisting of a couple of named stages.

(3) 'Ana Dheī Dhato

Love By Themselves

This type of marriage is regarded as a simplified version of "Asking" or 'Ana 'Arhe. Unlike the following two types ('Ana Poi and 'Ana Paru Dheko, which are regarded as improper, pelu, 'hot'), this type is regarded a proper procedure, as is 'Ana 'Arhe, and less
bridewealth is required than in 'Ana 'Arhē, so this is the most favoured type of marriage among the people. The difference from 'Ana 'Arhē is that 'Ana Dhēi Dhato marriage involves a longer stay by the would-be husband in the bride's parent's house until the bridegroom's party has paid the whole bridewealth.

(4) 'Ana Paru Dhēko

Run and Follow

This is totally different from 'Ana 'Arhē or 'Ana Dhēi Dhato in that it is considered to be improper (pelu, "hot"). In this type of marriage, it is the girl who plays the foremost part. She "runs" to a boy's house, or "follows" him. After the girl runs away, the group of her parents' go to the boy's house and make an aggressive demand (called jeke) for bridewealth.

(5) 'Ana Poi

Taking Away

This type of marriage is not practiced any longer in the region where I studied<8>. This used to be performed only by the sons of the rich. A boy would take away a girl on his horse as he rode past. More aggressive jeke was performed and the boy's party was obliged to pay what the girl's party named. There could be no negotiation<9>.

(6) Remarks on Ideology of Marriage

The most striking feature about the Endenese ideology of alliance
is that on the one hand, people take matrilateral cross cousin marriage for granted (that is the way people see their mother's brother's daughter), while, on the other hand, actual matrilateral cross cousin marriage is not conceived of as the ideal type of marriage at all. Thus, the ideology of matrilateral cross cousin marriage is neither a rule nor a norm in the usual sense of the word. This is a framework through which the Endenese see their possible marriage partner: mother's brother's daughter or non mother's brother's daughter.

Another, perhaps more, important point to make clear is that there is another significant category of "others" (than wife-givers and wife-takers), that is, "strangers" (non-relatives), with whom marriage is more prestigious than with a member of one's wife-givers. Let us write this non-relative relationship as NR/NR. This is another kind of differentiation function. This function does not work as a relational identity relationship.

3.4 Summary

Let us recapitulate what has been stated in this chapter.

In the Endenese kinship ideology, there are two principles: a patrilineal descent complex (attributive classification) and a matrilateral cross cousin marriage complex (relational classification). As an attributive classification, the primary aim of the principle of patrilineal descent is the identity function, and as a relational classification the primary aim of matrilateral cross cousin marriage is the differentiation function. Both principles
have, as their secondary aims, the complement of their primary aims. The predicate non-relative operates only as a differentiation function. For a convention, let us name these formulae as is shown in Table 3-1.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>relatives</th>
<th>non-relatives</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>matrilateral</td>
<td>complex</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OG/OG</td>
<td>WT/WG, WG/WT</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

identity | A1 | B2(WT/WG, WT/WG) |

differentiation | A2 (not OG/OG) | B1 | C1 |

To paraphrase the table, according to the rule of A1, patrilineally related persons are identical (a strong explanatory device), according to B2, a man's WG's WT is like him (a weak explanatory device), according to A2, non-patrilineally related persons are not identical (weak) and according to B1 a person's WG (or WT) is different (strong). And finally, according to C1, non-relatives are different.

It should be also noted here that uterine siblings, that is, persons who are regarded as 'identical' through B2 (such as MZS/MZS), do not belong to either of the relationships described above. They are not agnates (though they are 'like' agnates), not WGWT, WT/WG, nor complete strangers.
Chapter 4 Terms of Kinship

4.1 Introduction

This chapter analyzes the Endenese kinship terminology. I have no presupposition that a kinship ideology and a kinship terminology in one culture should have a certain kind of relationship. It turns out that, in Ende, the terminology reflects most of the ideological principles. Taking this homomorphism as given, my intention in this chapter is to reveal principles of the Endenese kinship system, other than those consciously and dogmatically held ideological principles.

These principles, which are found in the terminology and not in the ideology, (I will call these 'irregularities' in this chapter) might be relevant, and might be not, in analyzing the Endenese kinship system as an explanatory system. The relevancy will be attested in separate chapters.

Most of the data presented here were collected in the early stage of my field work when I did not know enough of the actual kinship network. Questions such as how one should call one's mother's brother were used to acquire the data. The analysis is done in the way appropriate to the kind of data, to reveal the semantics of kinship terminology. Data such as who calls whom by which term in what kind of contexts shall be presented and analyzed accordingly in a separate chapter with an aim to reveal the pragmatics of the kinship
Before proceeding to the presentation of the data, let me expound on the distinction between terms for reference and those for address. At least in Ende, the kinship address terminology does not differ from that of reference when asked. That is, when an anthropologist asks an Endenese how one "addresses" another who is in a certain kinship relationship (a certain relationship defined by a certain reference term), he answers that one should "address" that person by the kinship term (in the reference terminology) or just by name. This is the theory. Practice differs from theory, though I could not get any theorization of these deviations except on a few occasions (which I will mention in due course in this chapter). In so far as we are concerned with the native explanation, therefore, it is sufficient for us to deal with only the reference relationship terminology. Thus, the presentation of the data here is limited only to the reference terminology.

4.2 Data

The Endenese kinship reference terminology is as follows:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Speaker</th>
<th>Specifications</th>
<th>English Gloss</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>kajo</td>
<td>ms/ ws</td>
<td>PPP</td>
<td>great grand parent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CCC</td>
<td>great grand child</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>any person of Ego's third ascending/descending generation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'embu</td>
<td>ms/ ws</td>
<td>PP</td>
<td>grand parent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CC</td>
<td>grand child</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>any person of Ego's second ascending/descending generation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'ema</td>
<td>ms/ ws</td>
<td>F, FB, FPBS</td>
<td>father</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MZH, FMBDH</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'ine</td>
<td>ms/ ws</td>
<td>M, MZ, FBW</td>
<td>mother</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FPBBSW, FMBD</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mame</td>
<td>ms/ ws</td>
<td>MB, FMBS</td>
<td>mother's brother</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MBWB</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ms</td>
<td>WF, WMB</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tu'a</td>
<td>ms/ ws</td>
<td>MBW, FMBSW</td>
<td>spouse's parent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ms</td>
<td>WM, WMBW</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ws</td>
<td>HM, HF</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tu'a</td>
<td>ms</td>
<td>WBW (= rhime)</td>
<td>(see rhime)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ws</td>
<td></td>
<td>HZH (= rhime)</td>
<td>(see rhime)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(this part will be relisted later)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>tu'a</th>
<th>ms</th>
<th>SW, BSW, BSWB, WBD, MBSD</th>
<th>child's spouse</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ws</td>
<td></td>
<td>SW, HBSW, BD</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SWB, HBSWB, BS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(this part will be relisted later)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>no'o</th>
<th>ms/ws</th>
<th>FZ, FFBBD, FFZD, FZH, FZSW</th>
<th>father's sister</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ws</td>
<td></td>
<td>HM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>aki</th>
<th>no'o</th>
<th>ms/ws</th>
<th>FZH, FFBBDH, FFZDH, FZH</th>
<th>father's sister's husband</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ws</td>
<td></td>
<td>HF</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Term</td>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>Codes</td>
<td>Relationship</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'ari</td>
<td>ms</td>
<td>B, MBD, WZ</td>
<td>brother</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(ka'e)</td>
<td>ws</td>
<td>Z, FBD, MZD</td>
<td>mother's brother's daughter</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ws</td>
<td>FZS, HB</td>
<td>father's sister's son</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>weta</td>
<td>ms</td>
<td>Z, FBD, MZD</td>
<td>sister</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ms</td>
<td>FZD</td>
<td>father's sister's daughter</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nara</td>
<td>ws</td>
<td>B, MBS</td>
<td>brother</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ws</td>
<td>FBS, MZS</td>
<td>mother's brother's son</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'eja</td>
<td>ms</td>
<td>MBS, WB, FZS, ZH</td>
<td>mother's brother's son</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>father's sister's son</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'ipa</td>
<td>ws</td>
<td>MBD, HZ, FZD, BW</td>
<td>mother's brother's daughter</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>father's sister's daughter</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rhime</td>
<td>ms</td>
<td>WDW</td>
<td>wife's brother's wife</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ws</td>
<td>HZH</td>
<td>husband's sister's husband</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tu'a</td>
<td>ms</td>
<td>WBW (= rhime)</td>
<td>(see rhime)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ws</td>
<td>HZH (= rhime)</td>
<td>(see rhime)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hai</td>
<td>ms</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>wife</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>aki</td>
<td>ws</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>husband</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.3 Irregularities

The whole terminology clearly shows itself as a coherent system to one who is already versed in the Endenese kinship ideology. The systematic nature could be shown in several ways. Simply for convenience's sake, let us represent the data above in tables according to one anthropological convention. The terminology can be ordered as in the Figure 4-1 and 4-2.
Figure 4-1 Man Speaking Relationship Terminology

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{m} & \rightarrow f = \text{m} \rightarrow f = \text{m} \rightarrow f = \text{m} \rightarrow f = \\
\text{mame} & \rightarrow \text{tu'a} \rightarrow \text{mame} \rightarrow \text{'ine} \rightarrow \text{'ema} \rightarrow \text{no'o} \rightarrow \text{aki} \rightarrow \text{no'o}
\end{align*}
\]

'embu

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{'eja} & \rightarrow \text{rhime} \rightarrow \text{'eja} \rightarrow \text{[Egg]} \rightarrow \text{weta} \rightarrow \text{'eja} \rightarrow \text{weta}
\end{align*}
\]

'tu'a
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Some women informants maintained that these two classes (BS and BD) should be called 'ane too. This information was firmly rejected by a male informant in the company. However, I heard once the male informant, who had rejected this view, himself use the word 'ane in this way (referring to WBS). If we follow this usage of 'ane, then the terminological system would look closer to a "symmetrical alliance."

In what follows, I want to show, instead of the terminology's systematic nature, its irregularities from the ideological system described in the previous chapter.

I will relist a table from the previous chapter about the ideological principles. Because kinship terminology, by definition, presupposes, as its universe of discourse, relatives, I omit the NR/NR ideology from the table.
Table 4-2 Identity and Differentiation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>agnation</th>
<th>matrilateral</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>cross-cousin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>marriage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>identity</td>
<td>A1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>differentiation</td>
<td>A2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

According to A1, patrilineally related persons are identical (strong), according to B2, a man's WG's WT is identical (weak), according to A2, not patrilineally related persons are not identical (weak) and according to B1, a person's WG (or WT) is different (strong). A deviation from either A1 or B2 means an increase of kinship terms (because what should be counted as one and the same are differentiated), and a deviation from either A2 or B1 means a decrease of kinship terms (because what should be counted as different are assimilated).

In what follows, I will classify those irregularities into two types: (1) pragmatic irregularities and (2) semantic irregularities. The type (1) is related to the actual usage. The type (2) is related to deviations from a hypothetically idealized system which might be an logical outcome from the principles described in the previous chapter.

Below, each rubric of a relationship term is followed by one or two English renderings. These renderings are listed only for the reading's sake and are not meant to be exact renderings of the terms.
4.3.1 Pragmatic Irregularities

(1) Mame, kaka, bele, 'eda (Mother's Brother)

There are 4 kinds of the terms for the mother's brother. The last one, 'eda, is an 'Aku-nese word which is currently used in that part of the Ja'o-nese speaking area which is adjacent to the 'Aku-nese speaking population. The Endenese are clearly aware of the fact that 'eda is a loan word. Kaka could be also a loan word from, this time, the Nga'o-nese language, though I have not heard people say so(1). Those terms are used interchangeably. In the mountain region, mame is more often used than the rest of them. Bele is most often used as a term of address both in the mountain and the coastal areas.

(2) 'Ema, baba (Father)

These two terms are utterly interchangeable: no distinction is made between these two terms, either in semantic terms (such as whether used specifically for the genealogical father or not) or in stylistic terms (such as whether used in address or in reference). The corresponding term, 'ine ("mother"), though, does not have any synonym. There is a vague statistical tendency for the mountain people to use 'ema more frequently than the coastal dwellers.

(3) Aki no'o (Father's Sister's Husband)

This is the only compound description (meaning FZ (no'9)'s husband (aki)) given by informants when I asked the basic kinship terminology. Even though this is a compound, I do not see any reason to regard this as secondary, because there is no other term to
designate the structural position occupied by aki no'o. This term is, thus, clearly different in nature from such a compound expression as 'ana weta "child of a sister (ms)," which can be expressed simply as 'ane.

(4) Tu'a (Child's spouse, Spouse's Parent)

Many informants show great confusion about the term tu'a and cannot agree with each other, especially in cases of female informants. Some young informants, both male and female, designate WFB as tu'a. This information was rejected by older informants. Most women could not articulate the difference among their aki no'o (FZH) by birth (in other words, their brother's aki no'o) and their aki no'o (HFZH) by marriage (that is, their husbands' aki no'o) and their tu'a (HF). These three classes are sometimes termed as tu'a, sometimes as aki no'o.

Another feature (which is no longer of a pragmatic nature but has a semantic implication) worth noting here is that this is the only term which refers to both the descending and ascending generations without being wholly self-reciprocal<2>, a fact that is, perhaps, one of the reasons of the confusion.

Among the various usages of the term tu'a, the most often used one is tu'a as son's wife (both for ws and ms). The other usages of tu'a are, in everyday contexts, paraphrased by such expressions as 'ana 'eia (child of the brother-in-law (WBC)) for ms or 'ana nara (child of the brother (BC)) for ws.
4.3.2 Semantic Irregularities

Ordinary semantic irregularities(3) are not treated here.

(1) Female Same Sex Sibling identification

All through the terminological system, it is apparent that there is operating a rule which might be called a female same sex siblings identification such that, in one term, for example, 'ema, there are included, along with F, FB, FFBS, such non agnates as MZH. In the previous chapter, we saw that among such relations, only those relations that are represented by MZS/MZS are ideologically upheld (by the ideology of "sharing the origin") and also that the uterine siblingship thus defined is a weak explanatory device, in the sense that one does not have always to employ this relation as an explanation. Thus, there is no ideological background for identifying MZH with F. In other words, an Endenese could not explain why MZH is called 'ema, the same term as for F and his agnates.

Let us represent this principle ('female same sex sibling identification') as the symbol B2' such that B2' contains B2 (MZS/MZS or sharing the origin). The part of B2' which is not B2 is not defined by the Endenese ideology. This is merely a terminological identification rule.

(2) Hai (Wife), Aki (Husband)

Hai and aki mean "wife" and "husband," respectively in the sphere of kinship(4). These two terms are redundant (a deviation from both A1 and B2). The proper structural positions are, as it were, already
occupied by the terms of 'ari and ka'c. Besides that, neither of them has what is called "classificatory" or "extended" meaning (as is defined in the introductory chapter). None of the four possible extensions from two kinds of identity relationships (A1 and B2) obtains.

(1) hai(X, Y) & A1(Y, Z) → hai(X, Z)
(2) hai(X, Y) & A1(X, Z) → hai(Z, Y)
(3) hai(X, Y) & B2(Y, Z) → hai(X, Z)
(4) hai(X, Y) & B2(X, Z) → hai(Z, Y)

The 4 cases are represented in ordinary kinship diagrams below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Figure 4-3 Hypothetical Extensions of Hai</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(1) hai(X, Y) + A1(Y, Z) → hai(X, Z)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2) hai(X, Y) + A1(X, Z) → hai(Z, Y)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+-----+ +-----+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1   1   1   1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o == 2 2 0 0 == 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X  Y  Z  X  Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-   -   -   -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3) hai(X, Y) + B2(Y, Z) → hai(X, Z)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(4) hai(X, Y) + B2(X, Z) → hai(Z, Y)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+-----+ +-----+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1   1   1   1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 = 0 2 2 = 0 2 = 0 2 = 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 = 0 2 2 = 0 2 = 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o == 2 2 0 0 == 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X  Y  Z  Z  X  Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-   -   -   -</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Thus, one may not call one's MBD or one's WZ as one's hai unless one actually marries that person(5). In this way, the two terms (hai and aki) are exceptions to both the identity relationship through descent (agnation) and that through alliance (matrilateral cross cousin marriage complex): W and WZ are not identified, nor are W and MBD identified. They are determined solely by Ego's marriage.
(3) Rhimé

The same can be said, mutatis mutandis, of the rhimé relationship (WBW/HHZ or MBSW/FZS). Let us speak from the male point of view for the time being. The relationship of rhimé is established only after one's 'êja's (of the wife-giver's side) marriage; the rhimé relationship is between Ego and Ego's 'êja's wife. Even though the mediating category, 'êja, is "classificatory" (MBS, WB, WFBS etc. extended by both the agnation (Al) and the matrilateral cross cousin marriage complex (B2)<6>), the category rhimé is not classificatory, in the sense that, while WBW is rhimé, WBWZ is not<7>.

There is one feature common to these three "descriptive" terms which might further delineate them from the rest: while all the other ("classificatory") terms are used as vocatives, the three terms are never used as such. Rhimé are not allowed to address each other. No special address term is used (at least, I have never heard) between a wife and husband. Neither nara and weta ("brother and sister") nor 'ari and ka'ê ("younger sibling and elder sibling") are used. They employ personal names.

(4) 'Êja, 'ipa (Brother-in-Law, Sister-in-Law)

These two terms result from a deviation from BI, thus causing the system a scarcity of terms. Each of them is used in multiple positions which should be structurally differentiated (such as MBS and FZS, or WB and ZH).

'Êja for man to man, and 'ipa for woman to woman<8> present the
only symmetric nature of the system<9>, which led Needham to render the Endenese terminology as one of "symmetric prescription" (Needham 1968, 1970).

(5) 'Ari ka'ē

The pair of terms, 'ari and ka'ē, represent both kinds of divergence (redundancy of terms and scarcity of terms) at the same time.

One structurally identical class is divided by two, according to the age difference to Ego. In no other classes, is age pertinent. Age difference works this way: if two persons thus defined ('ari and ka'ē) and linking kinsmen belong to the same generation<10>, the age difference is 'cooked' (that is, determined by the age difference of the linking kinsmen, and not by that of the two persons concerned), otherwise is 'raw' (determined by the age difference of the two persons concerned). For example, in the relation of FBS/FBS, the age difference is raw, such that FBSe is ka'ē, whereas, in the relation of WZH/WZH, the age difference is cooked such that WEZH is ka'ē.

'Ari (or ka'ē) means, at the same time, two structurally different kinship relations, one between "same sex siblings" and another between "possible spouses."

To mark the singularity clearly against the ethnographical background, I will make a brief comparison of the Endenese kinship terminological system with two other systems from neighbouring regions<11>: (1) Nga'o and (2) Manggarai.
To make my contention in this brief comparison most intelligible, let us suppose one hypothetical person (a male), and describe the two stages of his lifetime: (1) when all the relatives of his generation (including him) are unmarried and (2) when all the relatives of his generation are married.

To represent a system, figures such as shown below are used.

At the first stage, when no one of Ego's generation has married, because of the features of agnation and the matrilateral complex common to the 3 societies under investigation, there are only 6 possible categories (age difference, wife-giver's wife-giver or such extension being put aside): A (one's wife-giver's male members such as MBS), B (one's own group's male members such as B), C (one's wife-taker's male members, such as FZS), a (one's wife-giver's female members, that is, one's (and one's own group's male members') potential wives, such as MBD), b (one's own group's female members, that is, one's wife-taker's male members' potential wives, such as Z) and c (one's wife-taker's female members, such as FZD).

At the second stage, when every one of Ego's generation has married, there may appear several new categories: a' (one's wife or
wives), a'" (sisters of a' and one's brothers' wives(12)), A' (brothers of a'), C' (husbands of b), C'' (brothers of C')(13), z' (wives of A)(14).

At the both stages, the classification of those people according to each system can be represented as follows:

**Figure 4-4 Ende Before and After Marriage**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WG</th>
<th>OG</th>
<th>WT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ma-</td>
<td>'ari</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>le</td>
<td>'eja</td>
<td>ka'e</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>le</td>
<td>ka'e</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WG</th>
<th>OG</th>
<th>WT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ma-</td>
<td>'ari</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>le</td>
<td>'eja</td>
<td>ka'e</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>le</td>
<td>ka'e</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| fema- | 'ari | weta | weta |
| le | ka'e |

| iZ' | 'ari | a' | weta | weta |
| le | ka'e |

z'='rhime
a'='hai

**Figure 4-5 Nga' o Before and After Marriage**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WG</th>
<th>OG</th>
<th>WT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ma-</td>
<td>'arhi</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>le</td>
<td>'eja</td>
<td>ka'e</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>le</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WG</th>
<th>OG</th>
<th>WT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ma-</td>
<td>'arhi</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>le</td>
<td>'eja</td>
<td>ka'e</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>le</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| fema- | 'ipa | weta | weta |
| le |

| iZ' | 'a' | weta | weta |
| le |

z'='dime
a'='fai
a'"='arhi ka'e
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Put in this way, we are apparently in a better position to understand the Endenese kinship terminology than before, when dealing with hai, rhime and others individually.

The following re-rendition of the three systems might be more intelligible.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1st stage</th>
<th>2nd stage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ende</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>('ari ka'ẽ)</td>
<td>B a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>('eja)</td>
<td>A C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(weta)</td>
<td>b c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(hai)</td>
<td>a'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(rhime)</td>
<td>z'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nga'o</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>('arhi ka'ẽ)</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>('ipa)</td>
<td>a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>('eja)</td>
<td>A C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(weta)</td>
<td>b c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(fai)</td>
<td>a'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(dime)</td>
<td>z'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manggarai</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(ase ka'ẽ)</td>
<td>A B C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(kesa)</td>
<td>a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(weta)</td>
<td>a b c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(wina)</td>
<td>a'</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

At the first stage, we could speak of a consistency between
ideology and terminology. The closer to six (A, B, C, a, b and c) is the number of terms employed, the more consistent is the relation between ideology and terminology. Ende and Nga'o have a much more consistent terminology than Manggarai. At the second stage, we could speak of a distinction between ideology-oriented terminology and event-oriented terminology. The degree of being ideology-oriented/event-oriented can be measured by the degree of the structural shift from the first to the second stage. Both Manggarai and Nga'o are of the latter type; the actual marriages drastically change the whole system. In Ende, the actual marriages are treated as though they followed the ideology, thus WB is regarded as MBS, and WZ as MBD.

This nature of being ideology-oriented of the Endenese terminology can be rephrased in two ways: at the first stage, we can speak of prospective views, in which, for example, MBS is termed as a feature WB, and at the second stage, of retrospective views, in which WB is termed as a MBS. In other words, actual marriages do not affect the Endenese kinship terminology (except in creating categories of hai, aki and rhime), in the sense that the degree to which the terminological system is consistent with the ideology at the first stage does not change much at the second stage. As Kipp said in her article on Karo-Batak funeral ceremonies, "in a sense, every marriage is a cross cousin marriage, or is so regarded post hoc" (Kipp 1979: 67). It is true in Ende, in so far as the relationship terminology goes.
4.4 Qualifiers

In the following section, I will put some remarks upon various qualifiers, aiming to show how the distinction between the marked and unmarked meaning of the term is articulated in the terminological system, a distinction which is not apparent in the first-order kinship terminology analyzed above.

4.4.1 Markers of Agnation

(1) Ngga'ē, ora, susu ('elder,' 'middle,' and 'milk')

Those three may be used in conjunction with either 'ine ("mother") or 'ema ("father"). The system can be seen most easily with such a figure as below. Let the double arrow represent age relationship such that 'x >> y' means that x is elder than y.

| +---+---+---+---+---+ |
| 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| 2 >> 2 >> 3 >> 3 >> 3 |
| A B C D E |
| 1 | |
| 1 EGO |

To Ego, all the males from A to E are classified as 'ema, including his own father, C. Among them, A, the eldest, is called 'ema ngga'ē<15> and E, the youngest, is called 'ema susu<16>; the rest of them, B and D, are called 'ema ora, which is, however, not as often used as the other two, ngga'ē and susu. B may be called 'ema ngga'ē and D may be called 'ema susu.

The terms are also applicable to such classificatory "parents" as
FFBS (A1), FMZS(B2), MZH(B2). The distinction of nege'a and susu follows the rule of distinction applicable between ka'ee and 'ari discussed earlier in this chapter. As eZH is <elder> to yZH (whether the former may be 'elder' or not) so is MeZH <elder> ('ema nege'a) to F.

These qualifiers cannot be used for any other term in the ascending generation (aki no'o, no'o, mame etc.)

In this context, for 'ema and 'ine, the distinction between marked and unmarked is shown in the table below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>unmarked</td>
<td>marked</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'ema</td>
<td>real</td>
<td>classificatory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>('ine)</td>
<td>F (M)</td>
<td>F (M)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(2) Ndoa

This word is a qualifier to 'ari, ka'ee ('same sex sibling'), nara ('brother' (ws)), weta ('sister' (ms)) and 'ine ('mother') and 'ema ('father'). There are two ways of application of the term ndoa. When applied simply, that is, for example, as 'ari ndoa or ka'ee ndoa, it means 'full,' in the sense that it excludes both half sibling and such classificatory sibling as FBC or MZC from the people defined by the compound terms. 'Ema ndoa and 'ine ndoa mean the "real father" and "the real mother" respectively. In these last usages, the word dhadhi ('to give birth to') can replace ndoa, thus 'ema dhadhi (the "father who begot") or 'ine dhadhi (the "mother who gave
thus, the distinction between the marked and the unmarked, which is in contrast with the case of ngga’e and others, is shown in the figure below:

Table 4-4 Ndoa

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>marked</th>
<th>unmarked</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>‘ema</td>
<td>real</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(‘ine)</td>
<td>F(M) F(M)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

‘Ari and ka’e refers to MBD (ms) or FZS (ws) as well; yet ndoa cannot qualify the words used in this manner.

The second usage is ‘ari (or ka’e, weta, para) ndoa plus ‘ine or ‘ema. ‘Ari ndoa ‘ine means "classificatory same sex sibling related through mothers," that is (for ms) such as MZS. In the same way ‘ari (or ka’e) ndoa ‘ema means "classificatory same sex sibling related through fathers," that is (for ms), FBS.

4.4.2 Markers of the Matrilateral Complex

1) Wuru

In the context of kinship, wuru is applied only to such affinal terms as ‘eja, ‘ipa, ‘ane, and mamę, meaning what could be roughly translated as 'true' or 'real'. Thus, mamę wuru is the "real mother's brother," meaning not a classificatory one like MNZS nor mamę by marriage (that is, WF). The same holds true, mutatis mutandis, with ‘ane wuru: it refers to ZS and not DH. When applied
to "eia, it means MBS or FZS, excluding such affines as WB or ZH (that is, "eia by marriage). The word wuru, however, is not used to qualify other terms for affine, that is, aki no'o, no'o, rhime nor tu'a.

The Endenese often translate wuru as "kandung" in Indonesian (though ipar kandung is not a correct Indonesian), which seems to confirm that the most important ("real") mame ("eia, ipa or ane) is one by birth and not one by marriage.

The table below obtains:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>marked</th>
<th>unmarked</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>mame</td>
<td>affine defined</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>etc</td>
<td>by prospective</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>views</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>affine defined</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>by retrospective</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>views</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(2) Simbi

I have not heard this used often. It has the meaning of "classificatory" and is applied to such terms as no'o (FZ) and weta ("sister" including FZD). Though the Lionized version of this word, sibi, is quite often used and used with a clear rule, I have never heard simbi, in Ende, used except for weta and no'o.
Table 4-6 Simbi

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>unmarked</th>
<th>marked</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>no'o</td>
<td>affine defined</td>
<td>affine defined</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>etc</td>
<td>by prospective</td>
<td>by retrospective</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>views</td>
<td></td>
<td>views</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In summary, the figure below obtains:

Table 4-7 Qualifiers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>term</th>
<th>example</th>
<th>marked (underlined)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AGNATES</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ndoa</td>
<td>'ema ndoa</td>
<td>real/classificatory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ngga'c</td>
<td>'ema ngga'c</td>
<td>real/classificatory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(as is extended by A1 and B2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AFFINES</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>wuru</td>
<td>mame wuru</td>
<td>prospective/retrospective</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>simbi</td>
<td>no'o simbi</td>
<td>prospective/retrospective</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(as is extended by A1 and B2)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.5 Summary and Concluding Remarks

In comparison with Nga'o and Manggarai, the Endenese kinship terminological system presents itself as more consistent with and more oriented toward an ideology in the sense that marriages are regarded, terminologically, as if they followed the ideological pattern, creating only such descriptive categories as hai, aki and rhime.

Ideological identification rules (A1 and B2) are marked only through qualifiers (which is another indication of the consistency).
The two kinds of affines (prospective and retrospective affines) identified through B2) are differentiated only through qualifiers such as wury. The two kinds of agnates (identified through Al and B2) are differentiated by, for example, the qualifier ndoa.

Inconsistency is summarized in two terms: (1) redundant identification and (2) redundant differentiation.

Redundant identifications (resulting in scarcity of terms) occur in (1) the identification between MBS (WB) and FZS (ZH), and (2) the identifications caused by a rule of female same sex siblingship (B2'). The former (that is, (1)) cannot be said to be a realization of a certain rule (such as (2)). The fact that the distinction between MBS and FZS is not pertinent is, however, against one strong element of the ideological system to which the relation between wife-giver and wife-taker is oriented. Let us label this assimilation between MBS and FZS as bl. If there were other identifications such as that between MB and FZH, then we could, for example, speak of a symmetric alliance rule. As it is, the deviation of (1) is only local<22>. Indeed the classes which are extended through female same sex sibling identification rule (B2') are marked by some qualifiers but they are treated together with the agnatic extension, the strongest explanatory device in the culture. Thus there is, in this sense, no distinction between extension through agnation and that through the female same sex sibling rule.

Besides hai, aki and rhime, another redundant differentiation (resulting in redundancy of terms) occurs in the differentiation...
between 'ari and ka'ê, the principle of differentiation being 'age.'
The fact that 'age' is pertinent in the relation of 'ari ka'ê is against the other strong element of the ideological system that agnates are 'equivalent.' Let us label 'age' as a differentiating principle as al. Yet, 'age' interferes only in this pair and thus locally and is not pertinent in other spheres of the terminological system.

The irregularities of the terminological system can be summarized as follows: (1) as a global rule, there is a female same sex sibling identification rule (B2'), which, though it is not implied by the ideological system, does not contradict it; (2) as a local rule, there is a rule b1 which identifies, among others, MBS and FZS, a contradiction of the ideological rule of the oriented relation between wife-giver and wife-taker, and (3) also as a local rule, there is a rule al which differentiates, among others, eB from yB, a contradiction of the rule of equivalence among the agnates.
5.1 Introduction

In Chapter 3, we dealt with the problem of social classification and in Chapter 4, with that of genealogical labelling. Those principles we found in Chapter 3 (A1, A2, B1, B2, and C1) are ideologically upheld by the Endenese, whereas the principles which are found only in the genealogical labelling system (a1, b1, and B2') are not necessarily consciously upheld by the people. In this chapter I am going to analyze the system of binary relations based on the terminological system and accompanying prescribed mode of customary behaviour.

The system of normative behaviour is the one that mediates between the two systems described above in the following sense: the system of normative behaviour is described (by the people under study) in terms of kinship terminology<1>, yet as has been noticed by many anthropologists, the system of normative behaviour and that of the terminology do not always correspond in a one-to-one way. The inconsistency between the two systems is, in turn, explained by the ideological system.
5.2 Construction of Pairs

The pairs arranged reciprocally according to the terminological system are shown in the table below.

Table 5-1 Molecules of Kinship

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>f/m</th>
<th>m/m</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>hai / aki</td>
<td>W/H</td>
<td>B/B</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>'ari / ka'e</td>
<td>Z/Z</td>
<td>FZS/MBD</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>m/f</td>
<td>m/f</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>nara / wet</td>
<td>B/Z</td>
<td>MBS/FZD</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>'eja / eja</td>
<td>ZH/MB</td>
<td>MBS/FZS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>'ipa / 'ipa</td>
<td>BW/HZ</td>
<td>MBD/FZD</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>rhime / rhime</td>
<td>WB/HZH</td>
<td>MBSW/HFZS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>'ana / 'ema</td>
<td>S/F</td>
<td>D/F</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>'ana / 'ina</td>
<td>S/M</td>
<td>D/M</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>tu'a / tu'a</td>
<td>WM/DH</td>
<td>MBW/HZS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>mame / 'ane</td>
<td>HM/SW</td>
<td>MB/ZS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>tu'a / no'o</td>
<td>ZHM/MB</td>
<td>BS/FZ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>tu'a / aki no'o</td>
<td>SWB/ZHF</td>
<td>WBS/FZH</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<*> A deviation from the general rule is discernible here. When I asked the term for DH individually as it were (that is, not coupled with WM), the Endeans called tu'a ru'a. Only in the binary relation, they define the relation as tu'a ru'a ("tu'a each other").

Note also the peculiarity of the word tu'a in the note to the relationship terminology table in the previous chapter.

The table is so made that it also shows some of the ideological principles. If a number of typical models within one rubric are juxtaposed vertically, it means that those are structurally of a different nature. Those models in different rows cannot be
translated into each other by either the ideology of descent (patrilineality) or the ideology of alliance (MBD marriage). The difference of most of the types arranged vertically consists in the assignment of gender.

The models juxtaposed horizontally with a double bar (!!!) between them are those which are structurally isomorphic but are different in this point: those on the left are the relations which can be defined before either partner is born (relations by birth), while those on the right are the relations which can be defined only after some conjugal tie is created (relations by marriage). The two models can be translated into each other by the ideology of asymmetric alliance: a man is supposed to marry his mother's brother's daughter. If the marital connection is made in accordance with the ideology of alliance, the models on both sides correspond to each other. In this regard, we might call those on the left "prospective" usages of the terminology and those on the right "retrospective" ones.

5.3 Normative Behaviour

According to the Endenese, there are no prescribed modes of attitudes between persons in relations of 1), 2), 3), 4), 5), 7), 8), 10), 11) and 12) except that they must "respect" each other (taku or "to fear").

Only to those persons in relation of 6) rhime / rhime (termed as rhime rua, literally "two rhime" or "rhime-to-each-other") and 9) tu'a / tu'a, termed, in the same way, as tu'a rua, is applied the
strict prescribed rule of avoidance. They may not call each other's "true name" (ngara nua or "village name," in opposition to the Christian name, ngara santo), nor may they pronounce words similar to the name prohibited (2). They may not touch each other's belongings, such as clothes, containers of tobacco or sirih pinang, still less each other's body. Nor may they talk to each other face to face.

No prescribed joking relationship exists in Ende. Yet, between certain kinds of 'ari ka'e relationships, joking is permissible.

5.3.1 Avoidance

The rules of avoidance are not applied to the same degree to all persons categorized under the same label. Let us take rhime rua relationship, first. As mentioned above, there are two kinds of focal types of rhime rua relationship, namely, MBSW/HFZS and WBW/HZH.

----------------------------------------------------------
Figure 5-1 Rhime Rua
----------------------------------------------------------
(1) MBSW/HFZS
    \-----+
    |    |
    \   |
     o ===  \\
    |    |
     \   |
      \===
    \     |
     (MBSW) (HFZS)

(2) WBW/HZH
    \-----+
    |    |
    \   |
     o ===  \\
    |    |
     \   |
      \===
    \     |
     (WBW) (HZH)

Rhime is a "descriptive" term in the sense that it is not "extended" (though the intermediary category, 'eja, is). From the
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male Ego's point of view, the rhyme-ship is established only through his 'eja's (MBS in Figure 5-1 (1) and WB in (2)) marriage. Negatively put, rhyme-ship is not established with his 'eja's MBD (one who would be a rhyme via B2) nor with his 'eja's WZ (one who would be a rhyme via A1). Still, because of the extendability of the mediating category 'eja, we have two types illustrated above: (1) for the prospective usage and (2) for the retrospective one.

Indeed, the avoidance rule is applied also to the MBSW/HFZS relation, but it is in WBW/HZH relation that the strictest avoidance rule is employed. When I asked the definition of rhyme, people always defined it as WBW. It was not until I asked about MBSW/HFZS relation myself that they assured me that it is also a rhyme rua relation, and that the rule of avoidance should be applied there also.

We could say, in conclusion for the avoidance between rhyme that the avoidance rule is applied more strongly on one specific and "descriptive" relationship than the other.

In tua rua relationship as well, the assignment of avoidance on only a part of the whole range of relations covered by the term is recognizable. There are several structurally different models of the tua relationship but the pertinent type for avoidance is the one between opposite sex. This broad category could be divided in two types: (1) male of lower generation and female of upper generation and (2) male of upper generation and female of lower generation, each of which has two sub-types ("prospective" and "retrospective").
In the range of relationships covered by tu'a rua, the tabooed aspect is emphasized only in WM/DH and HF/SW relationships (Figure 5-3 (1.2) and (2.2)).

In summary, the more tabooed rhime and tu'a from the male point of view is shown below:
Figure 5-4 Tabooed Rhime and Tu'a

\[
\begin{align*}
o &= \hat{\gamma} \\
(WM) &
\quad \quad \quad \\
\text{tu'a} &
\quad \quad \quad \\
\quad \quad \quad \\
&
\quad \quad \quad \\
o &= \hat{\gamma} \\
(WBW) &
\quad \quad \quad \\
rhime &
\quad \quad \quad \\
\quad \quad \quad \\
&
\quad \quad \quad \\
o &= \hat{\gamma} \\
(SW) &
\quad \quad \quad \\
tu'a &
\quad \quad \quad
\end{align*}
\]

The figure above should be contrasted with the figure below which shows categories of less tabooed relations.

Figure 5-5 Less Tabooed Rhime and Tu'a

\[
\begin{align*}
+\quad \quad + \\
\quad \quad \\
0 &= \hat{\gamma} \\
(MBW) &
\quad \quad \quad \\
\text{tu'a} &
\quad \quad \quad \\
\quad \quad \quad \\
&
\quad \quad \quad \\
0 &= \hat{\gamma} \\
(MBSW) &
\quad \quad \quad \\
rhime &
\quad \quad \quad \\
\quad \quad \quad \\
&
\quad \quad \quad \\
0 &= \hat{\gamma} \\
(WBD) &
\quad \quad \quad \\
tu'a &
\quad \quad \quad
\end{align*}
\]

Except for the tu'a of the lower generation, the tabooed rhime and tu'a can be defined as the wife of mame and 'eja respectively, as opposed to the less tabooed category which can be defined as the wives of mame wuru (mame by birth) and 'eja wuru respectively.

Thus, we can conclude, for this part of the system of normative behaviour, that the avoidance characterizes the already marked nature of the labels of rhime and tu'a. The two terms are, in the
nomenclature, exceptions to the prospective/retrospective views by which marriages are regarded as occurring conforming to asymmetric alliance. In the two terms, marriages are treated as events. In the system of normative behaviour, their nature of being descriptive is further enhanced by reducing the range of the intermediary categories ('eja and mame).

5.3.2 Joking and Avoidance

What I have discussed above concerning rime rua and tu'a rua relationships (that is, the fact that the prescribed norms of behaviour are not applied equally to those who are labelled as one and the same) holds true, mutatis mutandis, for 'ari ka'ē relationship as well. Joking (giji tawa) is allowed only between people who stand in 'ari ka'ē relations. There are two<3> types of 'ari ka'ē relationships of apparently different structural implications, as I have indicated in the table above. We must describe them separately. Below in Figure 5-6 and 5-7 are enumerated all possible types and subtypes of 'ari ka'ē relationship.
Before we begin our analysis, it should be remembered that this pair (ʻari kaʻe) is the only one where the difference in relative age functions as a distinctive feature. As the way of functioning of difference in age is not simply defined, let me repeat the matter.
Unless the two persons designated as 'ari ka'ē and the linking kinsman (or kinsmen) are in the same generation, the assignment of 'ari "younger" or ka'ē "elder" is made according to the age difference of the two persons concerned. For example, while the relations of WZH/WZH, HH/BW and ZH/WZ depend for the assignment of 'ari and ka'ē on the age difference between the linking siblings (from the male point of view, WZ/WZ, Ego/B and W/WZ respectively), those of FBS/FBS, MZS/MZS and MBD/FZS depend solely on the age difference of the two persons concerned.

Within the 'ari ka'ē relationship of same sex (1.0) the one extended through the matrilateral prescription, that is, WFZS/MBDH of (1.1) is a relationship where joking is permissible. Within a broad category of (1.2) where B/B would be called a focal type, neither true brothers (yB/eB) (1.2.1.1) nor classificatory brothers related agnatically such as FyBS/FyBS (1.2.1.2) are allowed to joke with each other. It is only among classificatory brothers related through the mothers such as MeZS/MyZS (type 1.2.2.1) that joking is permissible. Between WZH/WZH it is not said that joking is permissible; nor is it said that joking is prohibited between them. In the relationship (2.1), that is, between FZS and MBD, joking is permissible.

'Ari ka'ē relationship of opposite sex (2.0) poses a much more clear-cut situation. I listed two focal types of "prospective" (type 2.1) and "retrospective" views (types of 2.2.1 and 2.2.2). We have to be careful in dealing with types of (2.2.1) and (2.2.2), because, in those relationships, the age difference becomes pertinent to behaviour norm ascribed to the relationship: the prescribed attitude
varies according to the age difference between the linking kinsmen. To exhaust the possibility, we have to consider two subtypes for each of the types of (2.2.1) and (2.2.2)<4>.

Figure 5-8 'Ari Ka'e through Siblings

\[
\begin{align*}
2.2.1.1 &: eBW/HyB & 2.2.1.2 &: yBW/HeB \\
\text{(eBW)} & & \text{(yBW)} & \\
\text{(HyB)} & & \text{(HeB)} & \\
\text{(eZH)} & & \text{(yZH)} & \\
\text{(WyZ)} & & \text{(WyZ)} &
\end{align*}
\]

In none of those relations, joking is permissible. On the contrary, in some of them, avoidance should be practiced. The Endeneese people are quite clear in which relation avoidance should be practiced. (2.2.1.1), eBW/HyB is not an avoidance relation; (2.2.1.2) yBW/HeB is an avoidance relation; (2.2.2.1) eZH/WyZ is not; (2.2.2.2) yZH/WeZ is an avoidance relation.

In summary, the Endeneese kinship behaviour among the 'ari ka'e relationship can be shown in the table below.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Designation</th>
<th>Behaviour</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(1.0) same sex</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1.1) WFZS/MBDH</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1.2.1.1) B/B</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1.2.1.2) FBS/FBD</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1.2.2.1) WZH/WZH</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1.2.2.2) MZS/MZS</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2.0) opposite sex</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2.1) FZS/MBD</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2.2.1.1) HylB/eBW</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2.2.1.2) HeB/yBW</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2.2.2.1) eZH/WyZ</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2.2.2.2) yZH/WeZ</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* + for joking permissible
  0 for none
  - for avoidance

So far we have followed the Endenese way of how they list up various subtypes of 'ari ka'ē and norms of behaviour assigned to those subtypes. Before taking up the Endenese explanation of "why a certain type of 'ari ka'ē has a certain type of norm," it should be made clear what principles make the typology. See the Table 5-3.
Trivial as it sounds, it should be noted that in the type (1.2.), that is, from types of 1.2.1.1 to 1.2.2.2., because of the self-reciprocal nature of the relationships (the reverse of, for example, FBS/FBS is also FBS/FBS relationship), the age-difference in the linking kinsmen can not be pertinent<5>; in other words the fact that the age-difference in the linking kinsmen is not pertinent is not pertinent in this analysis of the dyad.

For purely conventional reason, let us label those distinctive features listed in the second row of the table as the mnemonic pairs
listed in the first row. Let us call those subtypes from (1.1 to 2.2.2.2) "terminal types" and all the possible higher intermediary subtypes (such as 1.2) as simply types and to distinguish them from the terminal types, 0 is added to the number (thus, type (1.2) is written (1.2.0)).

The features listed in Table 5-3 from +a/-a to +e/-e are minimum distinctive features for explaining the singling out of the marked from the non-marked (in terms of normative behaviour) terminal types.

I represent those marked terminal types (either '+', joking, or '-', avoidance) in terms of distinctive features in order to discuss the possible Endenese explanations for the system, feature by feature.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Terminal Types</th>
<th>behaviour</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(1.1)</td>
<td>+a.+b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1.2.2.2)</td>
<td>+a.-b.-c.-d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2.1)</td>
<td>-a.+b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2.2.1.2)</td>
<td>-a.-b.+c.+d.+e</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2.2.2.2)</td>
<td>-a.-b.-c.+d.-e</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The distinction +a/-a is obvious: the Endenese do differentiate a male from a female.

For (1.1) and (2.1), +b is supported by the ideology of matrilateral cross cousin marriage complex. +c is supported by the ideology of patrilineality.
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For (1.2.2.2), -c.-d is supported by the ideology of "sharing origin": (1) a person is said to "derive from" his mother's brother and (2) if two persons have the same "origin" (that is, the same "mother's brother"), then the two persons are called "sharing origin." This ideology functions to differentiate -c.-d from -c.+d, two persons of which relationship (WZH/WZH) do not "share origin."

For understanding the Endenese explanation of (2.2.1.2) (-a.-b.+c.+d.+e) and (2.2.2.2) (-a.-b.-c.+d.-e), one has to know another Endenese kinship ideology, an ideology which I call "the ethical transformation rule of siblings." This rule can become relevant only when the age difference comes to fore. According to this rule, the relationship between same sex siblings<6> is likened to that between persons in different generations: for instance, elder brother is to his younger brother what father is to his son. Application of this ethical transformation rule to the 4 terminal types from 2.2.1.1 to 2.2.2.2 explains the presence and absence of the marked natures of the relationships.

In the figures below, each of the left hand diagrams represents a terminal type and the right hand diagram in the same row represents the new relations acquired through the application of the ethical transformation rule:
(2.2.1.1)  
\[
\begin{align*}
\bullet &= \circ \quad \bullet \quad \bullet \quad \bullet \quad \bullet \quad \bullet \\
eBW & \xrightarrow{\text{HyB}} (M) \quad (S) \\
\end{align*}
\]
(2.2.1.2)  
\[
\begin{align*}
\bullet &= \circ \quad \bullet \quad \bullet \quad \bullet \quad \bullet \quad \bullet \\
(yBW) & \xrightarrow{\text{HeB}} (SW) \quad \text{tu'a tu'a}
\end{align*}
\]
(2.2.2.1)  
\[
\begin{align*}
\bullet &= \circ \quad \bullet \quad \bullet \quad \bullet \quad \bullet \quad \bullet \\
eZH & \xrightarrow{\text{WyZ}} (F) \quad (D)
\end{align*}
\]
(2.2.2.2)  
\[
\begin{align*}
\bullet &= \circ \quad \bullet \quad \bullet \quad \bullet \quad \bullet \quad \bullet \\
yZH & \xrightarrow{\text{WeZ}} (DH) \quad \text{tu'a tu'a}
\end{align*}
\]

(2.2.1.2) eBW/HyB relationship is translated into M/S relationship, where there is no prescribed mode of attitudes, whereas a similar relationship of yBW/HeB is transformed into SW/HF relationship, that is, tu'a rua relationship where there should be strict avoidance. (2.2.2.1) eZH /WyZ is transformed into F/D relationship, whereas yZH/WeZ relationship is transformed into another tu'a rua relationship, that is, DH/WM. The resultant relations of (2.2.1.2) and (2.2.2.2) are the same as those of tu'a tu'a relations, thus they are relations of avoidance.

5.4 Summary

Since the very existence of the labels, *rhim* and tu'a, is contradictory to the ideological system, singling out these two categories and assigning them special modes of attitudes mean a
divergence from the ideological system. The degree to which the system of normative behaviour diverges from the ideological system is higher than that of the divergence of the terminological system from the ideological system. In the nomenclature, indeed rhime and tu'a are descriptive but the intermediate category, 'eja, is classificatory. In the system of normative behaviour, even the range of the category 'eja is reduced to WH and ZH (excluding MHS and FZS).

In discussing the relationship of 'ari ka'e and accompanying modes of attitudes, we have to distinguish two modes of operation of the system of normative behaviour, according to the two types of the relationship of 'ari ka'e.

First, let us discuss the same sex type of 'ari ka'e relationship. Among various subtypes, only such relationships as MZS/MZS are singled out and are marked as a special relations with special type of attitudes, joking. The underlying logic for this singling out process is the ideology of "sharing origin" (B2).

The second type, that is, the opposite sex type of 'ari ka'e relationship is articulated by the principle of relative age (ai). These subtypes of the relationship that are transformed into rhime or tu'a relationships through the application of the Endenese ethical transformation rule are the ones in which an attitude of avoidance should be taken.

Rhime and tu'a avoidance relations are primary and that between
'ari ka'e is secondary, in the sense that an Endenese could not answer such a question as "why should the relationship between tu'a or between rhime be a taboo relationship?" ("I don't know; it has been so since ancestors"), whereas he could answer such a question as "why should a certain kind of 'ari ka'e be a taboo relationship?" ("because it is like a relationship of rhime or tu'a").
Chapter 6 Groups in Kinship

6.1 Introduction

In this chapter, I shall discuss the Endenese explanatory devices for social groups. Each of identity relationships I discussed so far is a necessary condition for the making up of social groups, but is not a sufficient condition. In this chapter we deal with how a group is materialized from various identity relationships.

First, a genuine genealogical notion (agnation) as a means for the making of a group is discussed. Along with an agnatically articulated group is established a secondary relation, uterine siblingship, whose formal principle is similar to an agnatic siblingship on which it is based.

Non-genealogical principles can help the genealogical principle to extend to be coagulated into other kinds of groups also defined in terms of kinship. We will see examples of these non-genealogical principles in geographic and ritual principles. Such a process is guaranteed by the cultural dogma that the kinship language system is fundamental to all the other social language systems. According to the dogma, a certain kinship relationship implies a certain kind of geographic or ritual relationship. Thus, even if there is no real genealogical connection in the relationship concerned, it is assumed that the present geographical and ritual pattern is a result from the genealogical relationship prescribed by the dogma.
6.2 Genealogical Siblings

According to the Endenese principle of agnation, all members being related agnatically to each other are regarded as "siblings."

--------------------------
Figure 6-1 Agnatic Siblingship as a Bond
--------------------------

Agnatic siblingship holds the group together and patrilineality makes the group time-enduring. In other words, patrilineality warrants the reproduction of the group thus conceived.

The agnatic principle supposedly permeates the whole sphere where applicable, because there is no rule of restriction to this principle. But in actual situations, people often neglect this principle, especially when the concerned agnatic relation is a distant one, sometimes simply because of the ignorance of the agnatic tie and sometimes due to some political reason.

6.2.1 Tana Khoro History and Genealogy

The cultural conceptualization of history with its accompanying genealogies will provide a clue to understanding the Endenese agnation. Both "history" and genealogy are called susu 'embu kajo, an "accumulation of ancestors" (i.e., grand-parents and great-grand-
In examining the nature of *susu 'emby kajo* ("history" and "genealogy" at the same time), we have to touch, though in passing, upon the social distribution of knowledge. In that respect, it is convenient to distinguish the following two categories of persons: (1) genealogists and (2) laymen. The distinction is purely conventional; there are no lexical labels for these two categories. By genealogists, I simply mean those people who are said to have much knowledge about "history" and no specialization is implied.

A skeleton of the history of Tana Rhorho, which any inhabitant would agree to admit is as follows. Originally, people lived in a village called Kepi. Then comes an incident which is related in a story entitled "dumb is Nggenda and stupid is Kepi" (ngemi Nggenda // jera Kepi), the most important story in the history of Tana Rhorho. The story is as follows:

Once upon a time, some Portuguese people stayed in the lower part of the river. Kepi, the original village of Tana Rhorho, was situated upstream. These two peoples got along well with each other.

One day, when the Portuguese people went to the river to draw the water, they found the water smelling bad. So, they cried aloud, "'ae wau rae!" ("The water here smells bad!"). Hearing this and feeling affronted, the people there decided to wage a war against the Portuguese. Kepi, because of his friendship with the Portuguese, would not take part in the war party. Instead, it was headed by two men, named Rhorho and Rhéa, both of whom were sisters' sons of Kepi, (in this stage of the story, Kepi, originally a village name, is already personified).

After defeating the Portuguese, Rhorho and Rhéa were going to hold a feast in a place called Raka Tupa. They sent a man on an errand to Kepi, asking him to come down from the mountain and join the feast. Kepi would not reply. They had sent messengers
for seven days and seven nights, when Kepi finally answered:

ja'o ndia huu ngere kuru pambu rhonggo ngere wawi koi wiwi dhiki rheha rho'o
mepu ngere manu rhengge ngere rhako mepu 'iwa mbêpa
rhengge 'iwa menggo
mere si wela rhewa si 'ane

As for me,
My hair is like overgrown weeds,
My back is like a baked pig.
My lips are small,
My tongue is tiny.
Crouching like a chicken,
Lying like a dog.
Crouching still, and not moving,
Lying quietly, and not stirring.
May the sisters be big,
May the sisters' sons be long.

On hearing this reply, Rhorho and Rhea said, "We will divide the jaw into two // (we will) cut the tongue into two." They arranged the division of the former land of Kepi between the two of them. They went so far as to arrange also the system of the land tenure in each domain.

Rhea said, "My domain is of kowë. It is I who plant first, and then the others may follow me."

Rhorho said, "My domain is not of kowë. Where the rain falls first, people there may plant first. If the others feel satisfied, I will be satisfied also."

Thus the domain of Tana Rhorho is significant, in a sense, only as is opposed to Tana Rhea (or Tana Dea as is called in Nga'o-nese). This division of their social world is the first of a series of divisions of Tana Rhorho, and the most important one. Later at certain stages, the inhabitants were further divided and settled into various villages.

As a result of this historical development, there are roughly three kinds of ancestral names discernible in the genealogy of any one who claims oneself to be a descendant of a Kepi-villager: (1) names of those who are believed to have lived in Kepi (let us call
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them the "ancient Kepi villagers"), (2) names of those who are believed to have founded the present villages ("village founders") and (3) other more recent ancestors ("immediate ancestors").

6.2.2 Ancient Kepi villagers

Several names of the ancient Kepi villagers are well known even to laymen. Among others are: (a) Dena Rhēwa (-Rhēwa Hingga)<1>, (b) Tegu Demu - Demu Raka, (c) Napo Rēndu - Rēndu Sara, (d) Raja Tana and (e) Rhorho. Those people are known not only in the genealogy cycle but also in the legend cycle. Dena Rhēwa is the one who went to an underworld and married a daughter of the king of that world. Napo Rēndu is said to have had a long penis, which, every night, went as far as Pulau Ende and made maidens there pregnant.

Because the knowledge about history, especially that of the Kepi period and accompanying genealogies, is kept secret, there cannot occur such a social situation as would enable an adjustment process among the members of the society. Hence the assignment of relationships among these five pairs of names and their assignment in one's own and others' genealogies are only coherent within each genealogist's personal theory. In conversations among themselves or with me, genealogists often said, after reciting a number of names in a genealogy: "I will stop here for the time being." This occurred frequently especially in the company of a large group. The indication was that the genealogist knew more but was not willing to reveal any more.
(1) Divisions of Kepi

Let us examine two actual theories of the ancient Kepi villagers to see (1) how, within each theory, "history" and "genealogy" are presented as a coherent whole and at the same time (2) how multiple theories are incompatible with each other.

(1.1) Banggo's Theory

The first theory is that of a retired primary school teacher, guru Banggo of Teo Ndu'a. According to him, there were three geographical divisions within the village Kepi: (1) Kepi wawo or the upper Kepi, where the original people lived; (2) Kepi ora or the central Kepi, where wife-takers of the upper Kepi lived and (3) Kepi wena or the lower Kepi, where wife-takers of the central Kepi lived. The relevant parts of the genealogies concerned are shown in the figure below.

---

Figure 6-2 Three Kepi by Banggo

```
Rangga  Tana
  Rhewa  Haka
  Dena   Demu
        |------+
       |      |
Sara   Tegu  o = ∆
        |      |
Rendu   Rhorho
```

Upper Kepi  Central Kepi  Lower Kepi

---

Originally, rights over the land of Kepi were held by the upper Kepi people and they were transferred, initially, to the central Kepi people and then from them to the lower Kepi people (at the time of...
"dumb is Nggenda and stupid is Kepi"). Banggo claimed himself to be a descendant of Rhorho.

(1.2) 'Epu's Theory

The second theory we will examine is that held by 'Epu of Keka Dori, my main informant in Tana Rhorho.

He claims a similar division of Kepi into three parts (upper, central and lower Kepi) but the names of residents in the three divisions and their relationships are different from those described by Banggo. In 'Epu's view, the upper Kepi was occupied by Tana Dena, the senior line of the original people; in the central Kepi lived his younger brother Nggenda Dena and in the lower Kepi lived their sister Sara Dena and her husband whose name is unknown. The accompanying genealogies are:

--- Figure 6-3 Three Kepi by 'Epu

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Upper Kepi</th>
<th>Central Kepi</th>
<th>Lower Kepi</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rhewa</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dena</td>
<td>Tana</td>
<td>Sara</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nggenda</td>
<td>o =</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nggai</td>
<td>Hendu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tana</td>
<td>Rapo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Raja</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The incompatibility between their theories is apparent. See Table 6-1 below.
Table 6-1 Three Kepi by Banggo and by 'Epu

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>informant</th>
<th>Banggo</th>
<th>'Epu</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>site/inhabitants</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>upper Kepi</td>
<td>(a) -&gt; (c)</td>
<td>(b) -&gt; (a)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>central Kepi</td>
<td>(b)</td>
<td>(d) -&gt; (a)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lower Kepi</td>
<td>(e)</td>
<td>(c)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(x -> y means x is a patrilineal descendant of y)
((a) to (e) refer to the famous names mentioned in the main text)

The genealogies of the persons cited by Banggo and 'Epu are, nonetheless, coherent within each of their particular theories.

Within a small social circle, it seems that there is always an adjustment process at work. 'Epu's close agnates, for example, recite their genealogy precisely according to 'Epu's scheme. Yet once outside this small circle, as in cases of 'Epu and Banggo, one can discern incompatibilities in various aspects of multiple theories.

6.2.3 Village Founders

In contrast to the "ancient Kepi villagers," the category of "village founders" shows little deviation from one genealogist to another. These village founders are as well known to others as to their descendants. This part of genealogical knowledge is more open(2) than is the case with the upper part of the genealogy (that which contains the names of Kepi villagers).
6.2.4 Immediate Ancestors

The level of immediate ancestors bears special significance to the Endenese. It is pertinent to the only named group in the culture. The possibility of agnatic siblingship to create a group is realized in the Endenese concept waja, a group defined as descendants of a "immediate ancestor." Waja means, in the ordinary sense, an "old man." Thus, waja so and so means merely "so and so, an old one." The term does not refer to any living person, but to the dead, and it also signifies the "(patrilineal) descendants of so and so." Waja A, thus, means "(patrilineal) descendants of A(3)." The eponym, by reference to whom the group waja is defined, is 3 to 4 generations up from the present elders.

Even though I said that waja is the only Endenese label for a "group," be it noted that the category waja never implies a "corporate group" or any other kind of group of sociological significance. The concept has little sociological import: (1) it is an exogamous group but the rule of exogamy is explained in terms of agnatic relatedness and not in terms of waja membership; (2) no jural obligation permeates the concept of waja; (3) religious, or more precisely ritual significance is attached to waja, but this is not the only unit which is of ritual significance; (4) and also when asked, people never define the concept as a ritual group. In brief, features that an anthropologist might describe as those of a corporate group are described, by an Endenese, not in terms of the group, waja, but in terms of its formal principle, the identity relationship of agnation, 'ari ka'e.
The concept serves as an explanatory device in describing various incidents in social world. Some litigation is described as litigations between two waja; a village is described as consisting of a number of waja. In these descriptions and explanatory statements, a waja appears to be a "group." Just as the word such as "lineage" or "clan" provides an anthropologist with an explanatory device, so does the category waja provide the Endenese with an explanatory device.

6.2.5 Uterine Siblingship

Along with the notion of the agnatic descent group is established another relationship which is similar to the agnatic principle: a relationship of uterine siblings.

Let me recapitulate "the Endenese theory of origin" because this is the underlying concept for the relationship. In the Endenese ideology, one is said to "come from" (mai) or "derive from" one's mother's brother or one's mother's natal group (ka'e 'embu pu'u, "the wife-giver of origin"). A mother's brother is said to have a spiritual hold over his sister's children. When one dies, a set of valuables called one's "head" (turhu) should be paid by the deceased's group to the wife-giver of origin. If two persons share the same "origin" (that is, typically represented as MZS/MZS), then two persons are said to mai bou ("come together"). This is the supporting ideology of the uterine siblingship<5>. Even though in the Endenese terminology, it is called "female" 'ari ka'e ('ari ka'e 'ata hai, which I translate as "uterine siblings"), in their exegesis, it is not woman to woman (MZ/MZ) relationship that is emphasized, but the
man to woman relationship (MB/M) or a pair of that relationships.

The uterine siblings share the person who "receives the heads." In other words (see the figure below), A and B are "siblings" in their identical relation to C. In that way, this is similar to a waja membership, because, in the latter system, two persons are "siblings" (belong to the same waja) in their identical relation (patrilineal ascendancy) with a specific person (the eponym of the waja).

---

Figure 6-4 Uterine Sibling

---
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In the subsequent generation, if A' and B' are to be 'ari ka'ē in the way in which A and B were 'ari ka'ē (so that A, B, A' and B' form one group), A' and B' have to marry their mother's brother's daughters (daughters of C, their common "head-takers"). In other words, mother's brother's daughter marriage is the only strategy to be taken so that, among the agnatic group, there is only one uterine siblingship.

Theoretically, that is, with an introduction of another
ideological rule (which the Endenese do not have), the uterine
siblingship could create a group (without incessant MBD marriages)
independently of its patrilineality but still dependently on the
patrilineality of the other group. See the figure below:

\begin{figure}
\centering
\includegraphics[width=\textwidth]{figure6-5.png}
\caption{ZS Lineal Society}
\end{figure}

In this hypothetical society, suppose there is an ideology of
ZS-lineality (which depends for its very lineality on the
patrilineality of the line A) of some kind (say, locality -- thus
this is a patrilineal and avunculocal society), then the uterine
siblingship can create a time enduring group (which, again, depends
for its very nature of being time-enduring on that of the line A).

Because (1) it is impossible to perform mother's brother's
daughter's marriage at such a rate as in the first hypothetical
case\textsuperscript{6}, and (2) the Endenese culture has no ideology for lineality of
any kind to support the second hypothetical case, uterine siblingship
can, in the Endenese context, never create a time-enduring group, in
the sense that there is no guarantee for the group thus articulated
to reproduce itself in the course of time. The principle, thus, is
effective not to organize a group because the group cannot reproduce.
itself, but to articulate relations between individuals. In other words, the principle is purely relational: it starts as a relational device and remains so.<7>

In addition to these differences of functions and logical consequences between the two kinds of siblingship, they have different ideals as a binary relationship. The agnatic sibling relationship more often emphasize the hierarchical aspect<8> articulated in terms of relative age, while on the other hand, the uterine sibling relationship more often emphasize the equalitarian aspect of the relationship.

6.3 Extra Genealogical Identification Rules

Beside the genealogical principle (which coagulates into the category wajā), there are several "fictive"<9> genealogical principles discernible in Ḫndenešē kinship. Some are weak, in the sense that they are seldom employed as explanatory devices in descriptions of the society and are thus optional explanatory devices. Some are strong. They are employed in most explanatory statements concerning kinship and are compulsory explanatory devices.

As a first "fictive" principle, we will take "adoption" (ānāghāwa), which may well be called "strong."

6.3.1 Principle of Adoption

An adoption may be resorted to when there are no male children
after several years of marriage. In that case, the adopted child becomes the legitimate heir of the adopter. Even if a son is born to the adopter after an adoption, the adopted child's status will, theoretically, never change. The adopted child is treated in every respect as if he were a born son of the adopter. Due to the absence of any physiological dogma (such as inheritance of named substance from either parent), there are no conceptual obstacles to adoption being regarded as forming genuine kinship. An adoptee is treated as if he were born as a son. This is what makes the adoption quite different from some other recruitment methods in which the recruited man becomes somehow inferior to the full members of the group<10>. In an Endenese "history," an adoption is not related except as an add-on commentary.

(1) Narrative of Adoption

Incidents of adoption are, as is the case with most Endenese kinship instances, often accompanied by stories.

Here is one example of such kinship story of adoption:

Sue was making a mat. She was pregnant. Then she saw a man chasing a waterbuffalo. It was her brother Kebu. He had no son, so he had to do things like chasing a waterbuffalo by himself. She cried because she was afraid he would be killed. She was apprehensive, and so, she said:

Oh my brother!
If I give birth to a boy, he shall be your son.

Thus she talked with her brother Kebu. After a while, she gave birth to a son, Petu. Kebu and his people came to Sue's house with rice, meat, male and female sarongs to celebrate the birth and, at the same time, to prepare for the future adoption.
Then, when the boy was so big as to be about to walk, Kebu's people waited for Sue's husband's group to come and pay Sue's bridewealth. Sue's people came with a waterbuffalo and killed it there. A piece of meat was, first, given to Petu and he ate it.

And Kebu said to Petu:

Now you have eaten your no'o's waterbuffalo.

In this way, Petu was adopted by Kebu, his mother's brother. For this adoption, a big ceremony was held.

Waterbuffalo meat is what should be given by a wife-taker to wife-giver and thus a mother's waterbuffalo given to the wife-giver should never be consumed by her son. In this respect, the final episode evinces the real detachment of Petu from his natal group; the detachment is further emphasized by Kebu's calling Sue as Petu's no'o ("father's sister").

Besides a number of other ZS adoptions, I recorded two WZS adoptions. The two wife's sister's son adoption cases also conform to a general pattern of adoption (adoption of a man from a wife-taking line), because both cases involved the wife's younger sister's son. If the ethical transformation rule is applied in the relation concerned, then the relation of WyZS and MeZH turns into a wife-giver wife-taker relation. See the figure below:
Although the overwhelming majority of the recorded cases of adoption includes the adoption of one's sister's sons, whenever I asked whom one should adopt, the answer I received was that one could adopt anybody<12>. As the Hndenes do not theorize about adoption, it is not proper to speak of a formal principle; yet it seems apparent that the implicit principle is that adoption be made from one's wife-taking line.

The lack of a culturally fixed rule is a significant fact to be noticed. To reveal the importance of the absence of any formalized explanation, we can, for example, compare adoption with marriage. Adoption is carried out such that the directionality between wife-giver and wife-taker is always relevant. In that way, it is like marriage in which the directionality is cautiously retained. However, while marriage can "make" a new relation of wife-giver and wife-taker, the adoption only conforms to the existent pattern and never creates a new wife-giver/wife-taker relationship. The lack of the ability to produce "new" alliance is due to the lack of a formal theorizing of adoption. In other words, if and only if there is a cultural dogma that 'friends make gifts,' then 'gifts can make friends.'
6.3.2 Geographical Principles

(1) Village Siblings

Besides agnatic siblingship ('ari ka'ē 'ata aki) and uterine siblingship ('ari ka'ē 'ata hai), there is another siblingship called 'ari ka'ē one nua. 'One nua means "within the village." Co-villagers are, in some contexts, considered as 'ari ka'ē without regard to their actual kinship ties.

Ideally, one village should be composed of one descent group. As it is, a village often contains many wife-takers who cannot pay the full bridewealth, or uterine siblings, or even complete strangers who have come from their own villages for various reasons<13>. Some of these lines have lived there for generations; some are living there only for a while, for instance, until they pay the bridewealth. In most cases of complete strangers, quasi-siblingship has been established, "to make lips increase in number and to make the back thick" rhapi wiwi // weso rhonggo. The siblingship thus established is called 'ari ka'ē one nua.

Because of quasi-siblingship in one village, there exists a notion of village endogamy, which does not seem to be observed strictly. Those who marry according to such endogamous marriages are said to "drink their own blood" as in the case of the marriage between agnates.

This verbal assimilation of co-villagers into one category of siblingship is resorted to by outsiders as well as insiders.
 Outsiders often regard a village as forming an homogeneous whole consisting of one descent group. Villagers employ this siblingship to describe their own village (thus ignoring more appropriate relationships such as wife-givers and wife-takers) especially at the early stage of a ceremony such as a funeral or a wedding ceremony, when the host of the ceremony needs help from co-villagers without invoking the intricate kinship obligation among affines (co-villagers can be also wife-givers or wife-takers).

Villages are loosely structured as comprising one whole, the ritual domain of Tana Rhorho. For example, the village Keka Dori is said to function as one who "guards the fortress and minds the hut in a tree" (jaka poly // ṭengga panggo). Another village called Keka Dhere is said to "guard the flat land and mind the plain" jaka ndelu // ṭengga ndena.

Since village siblingship forms an enduring group like agnatic siblingship, a transitive relationship is established, as uterine siblingship is established through an agnatic siblingship. Those who "come from" (mai) the same village are, in this connection, regarded as ḥari ka'ē. The situation is shown in the figure below:
(2) Siblings of Hearth Stones and Hearth

Among village siblings, one might single out siblings of "hearth stones and hearth" (‘ari ka’e rhika rhapu). In contrast to the expression ‘ari ka’e ‘one nua, which is employed for the purpose of assimilation, this expression is more often used to differentiate those who might, otherwise, be classified as one and the same. Whenever people want to distinguish a genealogically related sibling group from a group thus conceived merely through co-residence in a village, they refer to the latter as "siblings of hearth stones and hearth" of the former. The group thus referred to is not necessarily a client group to the dominant group of the village concerned.

The expression "siblings of hearth stones and hearth," thus,
usually refers to a group which was originally a stranger who was recruited to the village community (often through a ritual procedure). The following story provides us an illustrative example of the recruitment (and corresponding detachment).

One day, a dog took away a piece of Jaa's pork. Jaa got angry at his wife, Ndora. Then Jaa went so far as to swear at (mbatu) Ndora's brothers and father, saying they were "witch slaves" (porho o'o). Ndora went back to her natal village. Hearing Ndora's complaint, Waja See, her natal descent group, got angry, and went down with weapons to Jaa's village, Tana Rhii, to start a war. As Waja See was so strong, the 'ari ka'e of Jaa did not dare to fight with them.

Jaa was so disappointed with the cowardice of his 'ari ka'e that he swore that he would leave the village and never come back.

Thus, Jaa fled away with his children. They fled from Tana Rhii to Numba, Ma'u Hongga and then to Nanga Panda, and finally to Pau Mere (in Tana Dea). The people there received Jaa with his children to "make their members increase in number" (tau kesa tembo 'ebe). So Jaa became their 'ari ka'e there. Jaa slaughtered a horse and called all villagers to hold a ceremony.

Because the inhabitants of Pau Mere were so strong, when Waja See came to demand Jaa and were refused, Waja See would not fight with them. Jaa is said to have died there.

This narrative relates not only recruitment to a village community but also ritual detachment from a village community. Taking asylum is, thus, one theme in these narratives about how village siblingship came into being. Another often encountered theme is that people came because they were asked (songga) for help in a war. In a new village, the thus recruited refugee group usually establishes affinal relationships with the autochthonous people there.
6.3.3 Ritual Principle

A group can be described in terms of rituals (nggua). Such a group is said to be of "one ritual and one ceremony" (se nggua // se mbapu). Co-members of a group thus defined are thought of as sharing a ritual (nggua). The ritual is expressed as though it were a substance or an attribute of a person as is indicated in such a saying as 'ata nē'ē nggua, "a man with a ritual."

To understand the significance of the ritual grouping requires a brief summary of the Endenese rituals. Towards the end of the agricultural year, there is held a series of three significant rituals: (1) pesa 'ula "to eat vegetable," (2) notē piso "to smear the knife" and (3) kaa 'uwi, "to eat yam"(21); or, in a more expository way, these rituals are called (1) nggua jawa "maize ritual," (2) nggua 'are "paddy ritual" and (3) nggua 'uwi "yam ritual" respectively.

These three rituals have a basic structure in common: a specific crop (say C) is prohibited to specific category of persons (say P) before the ritual concerned is held; the ritual involves a person's journey to a field to fetch an amount of C; the ritual partaking of C (whereby all the P may or may not be present); and communion (which is rendered in Indonesian "makan umum"(22)). C is maize, rice and yam for (1), (2) and (3) respectively. The category P consists of those who are said to share the nggua (members of se nggua se mbapu).

The rituals of maize and rice ((1) and (2)) are performed by each
household, but the taboo is shared by the ritual group in the sense that one is prohibited from eating C harvested in a field of one's agnates (even though the two persons may conduct the ritual separately). The ritual specific to the ritual group is not usually named.

The yam ritual needs a special analysis. It is the symbol of the unity of the domain (tanga) of Tana Rhoro; all the people of the domain are said to share the yam ritual. The ritual is "cycled" around the domain from one village to another. There are two villages (Bherha and Tera 'Au) which precede Kepi, the original village, in performing the yam eating ritual. After them, Kepi performs the ritual, followed by the rest of the villages. This cycling is expressed in the native phraseology as "one village brings (or ushers) the ritual to another" (luyu nqau). The order of the ritual among the villages is fixed. Little explanation was given as to the origin of this order. One informant said that it might be based on marriage alliance among the villages such that each preceding village is the wife-giver to the next village; another informant suggested that the order might have been based on the order of the division of land by Kepi. A villager of Tana Rhii holds this latter view especially concerning the order Kepi-Raja Wawo-Tana Rhii. The people of Tana Rhii claim themselves to have gotten the land and the accompanying ritual from Raja Wawo because they helped the latter in a certain war through sonyga.

If a village performs the ritual before another village, which is to precede it (an incidence called ndoré "taking over"), then the
latter village will be prohibited from performing the ritual for seven years. The unity of the chain of the participant villages within the domain is further confirmed by a ritual invocation of names of the constituent villages of Tana Rhorho one by one.

During the ritual which spans four nights<28>, people from other villages are not allowed to enter the village performing the ritual. To indicate this prohibition, leaves of coconut palm are hung in a special fashion at both the head and tail of the village.

In this way, the yam ritual demarcates two levels of group as ritually significant: the domain (lana) and the constituent individual village (nya).

In a few villages, the ritual articulation of the group goes further than this. A more minute articulation is symbolized by two sorts of physical object: mboro and wali. Both mboro and wali are containers (the mboro is a larger container made of leaves of the mboro (gebang tree) and the wali is a smaller container made of lontar leaves). Every household prepares one wali full of uncooked rice (around 2 kg), one chicken and one laso full of palm gin (around 1 litter). Materials thus gathered will be consumed at the 'communal eating.' Yams are prepared in the mboro according to a broader agnatic grouping (usually corresponding to a waja). For example, in village Haja Wawo, there are two agnatic groups: (1) descendants of Rhorho and (2) descendants of migrants from Kepi, so that in yam ritual, there are always two mboro prepared.
In those subtle ways, in a performance of the ritual eating of yam, 4 kinds of yam-eating groups are articulated: (1) the domain, through which the ritual cycles; (2) the village, where the ritual is actually held; (3) the agnatic group, which prepares one mboro of yam for ritual eating and (4) the household, which prepares one wati of rice for communal eating.

6.4 Summary

In terms of genealogical segmentation (Kepi villagers, village founders and immediate ancestors) and its hypothetical segmentary projection onto the sphere of the living members of the domain of Tana Rhorho, the whole structure might be drawn as in the figure below:
Among the hypothetical three levels of agnatically articulated groups, only the level of "descendants of immediate ancestors" is utilized by the Enderese to establish an explanatory device for a social group, waja. There are two categories, each of whose extension corresponds to the members articulated at the levels of "descendants of Kepi villagers" and "descendants of village founders," respectively: the domain (tana) and the village (nuu). Each of the definitions of the sets in terms of the domain and the village is, however, different from "descendants of Kepi villagers" and "descendants of village founders." The ritual domain is articulated, primarily, by the legend cycle and the accompanying ritual. The village is articulated by the geographic principle, locality. The genealogical principles of "descendants of Kepi villagers" and "descendants of village founders" work as mere ad hoc charters for
the groups thus conceived. Thus, the domain is firstly a ritual
group founded in a legendary time, and is 'legitimized' by the
culturally primary ideology of kinship as the descendants of Kepi
villagers. The village is firstly a local group, and is 'legitimized'
by the ideology of kinship as descendants of a village founder.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>genealogy</th>
<th>ritual</th>
<th>locality</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lana (domain)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waja (descent group)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In his review article of Meggitt's book, Barnes proposed to New
Guineanists a comparison of genealogy of Mae Enga and other parts of
New Guinea with that of Bedouin and Lebanese Muslims described and
analyzed by Peters (1960, 1963):

... the pedigrees of Bedouin and Lebanese Muslims fall into
three parts. The higher generations in pedigrees are fairly
constant and constitute a description of what he refers to as the
"cultural past." The lower generations record ostensibly
accurately who is the son of whom. In between is an "area of
ambiguity," one or two genealogical levels where in effect there
is argument about how the shifting pattern of relationships
between taxa rising and falling in the hierarchy can be
translated into genealogical terms. ... It would be worth while
applying this kind of analysis to Enga and other Highland
pedigrees. (Barnes 1967: 39)

To understand the Endenese conceptualization of genealogy and
grouping in terms of genealogy, we have to consider two more factors
besides the structure of genealogy itself: the ways of recognition
of genealogy and the meta knowledge about the distribution of the knowledge about "history."

First, let us analyze patterns of recognition of genealogy with regard to grouping. We can discern three types of the ways of genealogy recognition in Ende.

One is an entirely relational classification, almost exclusively made use of by genealogists. This way of recognition is based on "ostensibly accurate" recitation of a genealogy. Siblingship of certain individuals is explained only by its formal definitions. A and B are 'ari ka'ē because, for example, A's father's father's father is C and B's father's father's father is also C. There are no data as to who is 'ari ka'ē with whom in this explanatory system. That is what is to be explained. Let us represent a relation "x is a son of y" as x S y, "x is a son of a son of y" as x SS y, and "x is a patrilineal descendant of y" as x SS... y. Then the definition of 'ari ka'ē (represented as I) in this explanatory system is as follows:

\[ y \text{ SS... x } \& z \text{ SS... } x \rightarrow y \text{ I z.} \]

At the opposite extreme to this explanatory system is an entirely attributive classification. In this theory, the category waja is extensively employed. If two persons belong together to one waja, then they are 'ari ka'ē. Be it noted that the above statement does not suggest an inference process. 'Ari ka'ē-ship is merely an alias for a waja membership. Therefore, in this theoretical framework, there exist only data, such as "a belongs to waja such and such."
other words, siblingship in this system is a given.

In between these two extreme ways of genealogy recognition is a half attributive and half relational classification. The explanatory system is based on unification. Siblingship in this system is recursively defined as below:

\[ y \text{ S } x \& z \text{ S } x \rightarrow y \uparrow z. \]
\[ y \text{ S } x_1 \& z \text{ S } x_2 \& x_1 \uparrow x_2 \rightarrow y \uparrow z. \]

If there is an individual, \( x \), such that \( y \) is a son of \( x \) and \( z \) is also a son of \( x \), then \( y \) and \( z \) are 'ari ka'e. If \( y \)'s father and \( z \)'s father are 'ari ka'e, then \( y \) and \( z \) are 'ari ka'e. Let us see a hypothetical example shown in Figure 6-9.

---

**Figure 6-9 Unificatory Explanation**

\[ \Delta x \]
\[ \Delta y(n) \]
\[ \Delta y(n-1) \]
\[ \Delta y_2 \]
\[ \Delta y_1 \]
\[ \Delta y \]

\[ \Delta z(n) \]
\[ \Delta z(n-1) \]
\[ \Delta z_2 \]
\[ \Delta z_1 \]
\[ \Delta z \]

---

To prove that \( y \) and \( z \) are 'ari ka'e, one has to prove that \( y_1 \) and \( z_1 \) are 'ari ka'e, because they do not share a father; to prove that, one has to prove that \( y_2 \) and \( z_2 \) are 'ari ka'e; this recursive procedure will continue until one reaches the pair, \( y(n) \) and \( z(n) \), who share a father, \( x \). In this usage of the definition, the proving
process is like the wholly relational one. One has to memorize all the relevant genealogies. One can, however, simplify the process by remembering that "y(n) and z(n) are 'ari ka'e." Then the proving procedure would be simplified by one step. If one notes data about y(n-1) and z(n-1) (based on the relation between y(n) and z(n)), y(n-2) and z(n-2) (based on the relation between y(n-1) and z(n-1)), the procedure would be simplified accordingly. Once one notes such data, then one does not have to memorize the generations up from the pair which is already assigned a value of 'ari ka'e. Siblingship is, so to speak, inherited through unification at the preceding level of parents. In the extreme case, the very pair, y and z, might be assigned the value of siblingship. In that case, the explanatory system is wholly attributive. Now siblingship is a given in the system thus conceived. In the last analysis, it can be said that this unificatory system can vary from a wholly relational to a wholly attributive explanatory system.

Having established the three ways of genealogy reckoning, let us proceed to an analysis of the structure of genealogy in terms of the distribution of knowledge and meta knowledge about this distribution.

The 'cultural past,' on which is based the integrity of the social universe, is regarded as stable in Ende, not because the genealogy in that part (ancient Kepi villagers) is "constant," but because that part is inaccessible to laymen and is kept secret by each of the genealogists. It is regarded stable because of the meta knowledge that the knowledge of that part of the genealogy is never
shared. This meta knowledge is shared by the members of the society. The names of the ancient Kepi villagers are, indeed, known to laymen, but it is kept secret how they are related to each other and also who among the living members of the society are the descendants of whom. In Peters's and Barnes's terms, the level of the ancient Kepi villagers serves the two functions, maintaining the conceptual cultural integrity and articulating the "shifting pattern of relationships," which are, among Bedouin and Lebanese Muslims, assigned to two different levels of genealogy. In consequence, the level of village founders is no different from that of immediate ancestors in terms of the three functions of genealogy summarized by Barnes.

"Lower generations" are, in Ende, "ostensibly accurate," as well as the generations "in between," the level of "descendants of village founders." The genealogical structuring of a waja is accessible to any member of the waja as well as to outsiders. Thus, unlike the knowledge about the ancient Kepi villagers, the knowledge concerning immediate ancestors is not regarded as secret. However, in everyday conversation, people tend to use only the labels and rarely have recourse to the genealogy for identity relationship: such explanations as "A and B are siblings ('ari ka'ê) because they belong to the same waja" are more common than "A and B are siblings ('ari ka'ê) because A's genealogy is such and such and B's genealogy is such and such (showing a common patrilineal ancestor)." Consequently, though the knowledge about immediate ancestors is, theoretically, accessible to anyone, it, in actuality, tends to be limited to those who have the knowledge about ancient Kepi villagers, the
genealogists.

Thus, it is apparent that even though genealogy is culturally conceived as the primary factor for forming groups, and indeed the most important group is a genealogically articulated group, waja, the description of the society in terms of constituent groups is not fixed at all.

Genealogy does not provide the Endenese a totalizing device for describing the society. Besides this inability, the principle of genealogy as an explanatory device can be utilized in several different ways. A genealogist might describe the society as a network of individuals related to each other by reciting his whole repertoire of genealogies. A youth might describe it as consisting of a number of waja. A child might explain his 'ari ka'ê-ship with another by referring to the parents' 'ari ka'ê-ship. A specific individual might change his way of description from context to context.

It is always 'saying' that governs the Endenese kinship world.
Chapter 7 Group Relationship

7.1 Introduction

In this chapter I want to elucidate the Endenese kinship system viewed in terms of relationships between constituent groups.

The rule of mother's brother's daughter's marriage in Ende is, as I noted in a previous chapter, rather a presupposition than an explicit rule in the sense that such a statement as "one should marry one's mother's brother's daughter" is rarely heard. It is rather a matter-of-fact presupposition underlying everyday conversation. In other words, it is one of the constitutive definitions/rules of the Endenese kinship language system.

As a consequence of the interaction of this ideology of matrilateral cross cousin marriage and that of patrilineality, three different categories of kin came into being: one's wife-givers (ka'ê 'embu), one's wife-takers (weta 'anê) and one's own descent group ('ari ka'ê), in the sense that any member of one "we" group has the same wife-giver and wife-taker, theoretically. In other words, there are, in general, two kinds of relationship possible: (1) that between wife-givers and wife-takers, and (2) that between members of the same group. We should add to these two relations, (3) the relation between non-relatives ('ata).

My starting point in this chapter is close to Sahlin's when he
writes:

The scheme with which we deal is at least tripartite: social, moral, and economic. Reciprocity and morality are sectorally structured -- the structure is that of kinship-tribal groupings. (Sahlins 1972: 200).

The similarity, though, stops here at the so-presented sentences. What I call moral is moral of relationship and not moral of transaction as in Sahlins' scheme.

My contention here is two fold: (1) a dogma that a special kind of transaction be performed in a special kind of relationship is "explained" within the native vocabulary by another dogma that there be special kind of moral in that relationship and (2) that the syntax of those two types of dogmas can be reversed so that a specific transaction "generates" (or "causes") a special kind of relationship which is to be accompanied by that transaction in the dogma concerned.

Let me describe the Endenese ethics, which are usually stated in a rule-like syntax, of the 3 relationships: (1) that between wife-giver and wife-taker, (2) between agnates and (3) between non-relatives, in this order. Because the ethics concerning prestation in a specific relationship is quite elaborate in the Endenese cultural ethics as well as important in the context of this thesis, it will be specifically described in a sub-section for each relationship's section.
7.2 Givers of Wives and Takers of Wives

7.2.1 Relational Ethics

The wife-giver is called ka'e 'embu, which means, literally, "elder ones and grand parents." The wife-taker is called weta 'ane, meaning "sister and sister's children." The term ka'e 'embu implies 'superiority' which is translated into 'seniority' in agnatic terms ("elder ones and grand parents"). The implication of superiority is further affirmed by various other terms for wife-givers, such as pu'u kamu "trunk and root" (1) or seki topo "handle of a machete"(2).

The superordination of the wife-givers over their wife-takers is salient especially in its spiritual aspect: wife-givers have the power of "cursing" (somba 'oa) over their wife-takers; they can perform wesa ieloa, that is, asking nitu pa'i (wandering spirits) to attack their wife-takers; furthermore, once wife-givers perform pui siku (a kind of magical act - brushing over the elbow with the other hand), wife-takers can be killed. Such is the spiritual power of wife-givers.

The following chant of cursing (somba 'oa) (supposedly made by a mother's brother to his sister's child) gives one example of that superiority of a wife-giver:

ndua ma'e jumbu ndelu Whenever you climb down
[a mountain], may you never
reach a flat land

nuka ma'e sadha worho Whenever you climb up
[a mountain],
may you never get to the
summit

koru kuku manu [Just as] we remove the claw
of a chicken,
nggēra ‘ēko dheke [Just as] we pull out the tail of a rat, [so may you be destroyed]
tibo ribo
ra’e mba’e You grow up only to be cut
You shake yourself only to be beaten down
mata miu wai sia You shall be dead tomorrow
wa’i sia
re’e miu wengi rua You shall be killed
wengi rua the day after tomorrow
‘urhu ndua rhau [You shall be lying with] head towards the sea
rua
tuka rhēngga re‘ta Lying with your belly upwards<3>

The importance of one’s wife-giver is such that, an informant once said, a man without proper wife-giver is as good as an 'ata o'o, "a slave."

The directionality between the wife-giver and the wife-taker (of not only woman’s transference but also of hierarchy) is marked to the extent that one is strongly prohibited from marrying a woman of his immediate wife-taker, a marriage which would result in an alliance contradictory to the existent pattern. Endenese has no word for incest, and there is only mild objection to marrying within an ‘ari ka‘ē group (of various kinds). In contrast with its mild attitude towards “incest” (marrying within), the Endenese culture has a number of expressions for a marriage of a reverse direction. The most often used locution is rarha sarha, "the wrong path." A specific case of "the wrong path" is called papa nggēru weta, "exchange of sisters," which is said never to have occurred. If one commits marriage of the wrong path, then one has to pay an extra brideweight item.

Even though the immediate type of wrong path (such a marriage as that with one’s actual FZD) is strongly prohibited, marriages of such
a type do occur as the distance between two affines increases. As we will later devote one section to this ambiguously used word, "distance," suffice it here to note that the Kendenese conception of mother's brother's daughter marriage does not include the idea of circularity; that is, a marriage with one's wife-taker's wife-taker might be still regarded as a wrong path even though this is a marriage which would be regarded as one concluding a circle in a society with the ideology of a circular alliance.

Though there is no explicit folk theory of "flow of life," a similar ideology exists: one is supposed to "come from" or "derive from" (mau) one's mother's natal group or in other words, one's mother's brother's group.

When one dies, one's close agnates (the group I in Figure 7-1 below) should give a prescribed amount of valuables called 'urhu or "head" to the group II.

---

**Figure 7-1 Head Exchange**

---

As one can see from the above figure, the institution is interwoven in the texture of descent and alliance. The right of "receiving a head" (simo 'urhu) should be inherited through patrilineal lines. But the duty of "giving a head" as it were, though
the Endenese would never employ such a term, would not be inherited
patrilineally unless A's son marries a girl from the descent group
II, which results in (actual or classificatory) mother's brother's
daughter marriage.

As the mechanism of defining who receives whose head works with
more than a mere genealogical principle described here<4>, it is
sometimes hard to know why one specific person is to receive another
specific person's head. Almost everyone knows, however, who is to
receive whose head inside one's social world, even though sometimes
one cannot specify why.

In rare cases, due to the absence of proper wife-givers at a
funeral (because of, for example, a conflict between affines
described as ro'j<5>), the head is not given to anybody and is
divided among the participants of the ceremony. The expression
alluding to the head thus "consumed" on such an occasion is of
significance to see the nature of this gift: 'urhu pesa dhato '[we]
have eaten the head among ourselves," 'urhu korha 'embe '[we] have
rolled the head and thrown it away." The gift is not merely named "a
head," but also described as though the gift were a physical "head."
The idea concerning this gift is, one might conclude, closely related
with the theory of the physiological origin of maj: one "comes from"
one's mother's brother and one's head goes back there upon one's
death.

There should be a good relation between two groups related as
wife-giver to wife-taker, the ethics of which finds expression in a
phrase papa pawë, "good to each other"(6). Papa means, roughly: (1) "a side" as a noun (which always presupposes the "other side") as may be used in the context of a feud or dispute and (2) "each other" as an adverb, as may be used in a phrase such as papa rhaka "to help each other"(7). Thus, the basic assumption of the usage of the word papa is that there are two entities being taken into considerations and that the two entities referred to are discrete. The discreteness or heterogeneity can not be overemphasized. In this light, the "superiority" and "inferiority" of the wife-giver and the wife-taker over each other can be paraphrased more articulately into "hierarchy in terms of quality." Thus, as these two are heterogeneous and discrete, it is considered to be normal that they should sometimes be split. There is a cultural scenario employed at the break-up of the relation. A break up can occur by such an act as mentioning a prohibited name of such an affine as rhimè or tu'a. Thereafter the affines "ignore each other" (ro'j). Sometimes to make this hostile relation explicit, "sorghum is sprinkled" (wesa wele), symbolizing the separation(8). To re-establish the normal relationship, the two parties have to hold an appropriate ceremony, inviting people to publicize the "reconciliation" (warhe), and at the same time, a ceremonial gift exchange should take place between them.

Thus, whatever the personal relations may be, the conflict between the affines, once it takes place, is cast into the cultural scenario of ro'j, wesa wele and warhe and thus is stereotyped. In other words, this kind of conflict is never "scandalized," unlike such occurrences as conflict between agnates, for which the culture prepares no scenarios.
7.2.2 Economic Ethics

Wife-givers are not only givers of wives but also, as it were, the 'absolute givers.' In any transaction between affines, the giving aspect of the wife-givers is almost always emphasized. In marriage, the wife will be 'given' to the wife-taking group, though the wife-takers should make a prestation (i.e. bridewealth, or ngawu, which means "property" or simply "things") to the givers of the wife; the latter aspect is rarely emphasized. For example, the cultural scenario employed for describing the ro'ı (the separation between individuals or groups of affines, especially between two rhime) is always described as the wife-takers affronted by the wife-givers, thus wife-givers "giving" something to the wife-takers.

In what follows, some idioms of the Endenese "giving and receiving" scenarios shall be listed.

(1) Giving to Sisters and Transferring to Sister's Children

Pati Weta // Ti'i 'Ane.

According to tradition, Tana Rhorho used to be divided (originally by Kepi, and then secondly by one of the descendants of Rhorho) into parcels of land with heads and tails. Those parcels of land have their appropriate rituals (nggua). But because of the custom that the wife-giving group gives a parcel of land to its wife-taking group, there are now lots of individually owned parcels of land, which have no head or tail. Let us consider the figure below:
(A) and (B) are half-brothers of one father. At a certain time, (A)'s mother's brother gave him a parcel of land (L1) and (B)'s mother's brother gave him L2. (A) has no right over (B)'s land, L2, and, likewise, (B) has no right over L1. Here, maternal affiliation intervenes in the patrilineal principle: even though (A) and (B) are sons of one father (the closest relation in a patrilineal complex without redundancy), their ownership of L1 and L2, respectively, is exclusive. In the next generation, (C) and (D) are, as were (A) and (B), half-brothers of one father. They share the ownership over the land L1: patrilineal principle works without any interference from outside the principle. (C) and (D) can divide L1 between themselves, but this division is different from the previous case, where a mother's brother gave land to his sister's son. The dividing of land among agnates is called bagi; (C) and (D) still hold the right over the each other's parcels of land. This is not, thus, "dividing" in the strictest sense of the word, but "sharing." If (C) wants to give part or whole of L1 to his sister's son, (C) has to have (D)'s consensus beforehand.
Pati ("to give") means absolute abandoning a right of every kind over the land:

\begin{align*}
pati \text{ weta} & \quad \text{(I) have given (this parcel of land) to my sister,} \\
ti'i \text{ 'ane} & \quad \text{Have transferred to my sister's son.} \\
pati 'iwa ka \text{ wiki} & \quad \text{I have given, never to withdraw,} \\
ti'i 'iwa ka \text{ rhai} & \quad \text{I have transferred, never to reclaim.} \\
kai pati \text{ wiki} & \quad \text{If I should withdraw after giving,} \\
ti'i \text{ rhai} & \quad \text{I should reclaim after transferring,} \\
kojo \text{ koe rhia} & \quad \text{A crab shall dig a hole,} \\
mbenge \text{ tembu rhewu} & \quad \text{A mushroom shall grow under my floor<9>.}
\end{align*}

Transactions expressed by this idiom are made on various occasions and for various reasons. One is that if a man's sister's son does not marry his daughter, but he wants to give something in place of (tau nia "for making a face of") his daughter. His ZS, upon or before receiving the promised land, should give his MB articles of the kind that would normally constitute bridewealth. But this counter-gift for the land is usually not mentioned as a meaningful part of the description of this transaction.

Another occasion is transference of land as compensation; some types are verbally fixed.

(2) Giving a Piece of Mat

"Giving a piece of Mat" or pati le'e refers to a sub-class of pati weta // ti'i 'ane, emphasizing a specific motive for the gift. A typical example of this form of transaction is given in a fixed
narrative as below.

\[ \begin{align*}
| & | \\
0 & \approx \approx \approx \approx 2 & 0 & \approx \approx \approx \approx 2 \\
A & & B
\end{align*} \]

A and B are of the relation called rhime rua, i.e. WDW and HZH (see Figure 7-3).

One may not pronounce one's rhime's name. Suppose in the figure above, A, by accident, pronounces his rhime's name (that is, B's name). B then cries and cries and never stops. A offers such things as sarongs for compensation, but B keeps crying. A finally asks what B really wants. Then B says ja'o honga te'e (I want to have a piece of mat). Now A is obliged to give B a parcel of land, which was metaphorically referred to as mat.

The narrative omits the counter gift which is to go from B to A afterwards. The emphasis is always placed on the "action of giving" (of the wife-giving party) and the gift is never couched in terms of balanced reciprocity(10).

(3) Giving a Bone

"Giving a bone," pali toko, is explained as a compensation paid by a war-leader to the relatives of his warriors who died in the battle. This custom seems to have ceased long ago. The items which had to be given were "land."

The only narrative I recorded of this idiom is as follows:

Buja of Keka Dori had a son who was going to marry soon.
After accumulating the prescribed amount of the bridewealth, he gathered (songga) co-villagers and wife-takers to carry the bridewealth to the bride's village. On their way to her village, one of Buja's party felt thirsty, so Buja asked Hami, his sister's daughter's husband to climb a coconut palm tree to pick a coconut. Unfortunately, the young man fell from the top of the tree and died. After the party returned to their village, Buja made a compensation to the family of the young man.

This compensation was described as an example of the pati toko. Both the fixed style of narrative and the example cited above suggest that this is what might be translated as "death payments." This example also shows a "giving" aspect of the wife-givers<11> (Buja is Hami's WMB).

7.3 The Elder and the Younger

Now let us proceed to the relationship between agnates, that is, 'ari ka'e 'ala aki.

7.3.1 Relational Ethics

The relationship among agnates is totally different from the relationship between wife-giver and wife-taker described above. The relation is that of homogeneity and unity as opposed to heterogeneity and discreteness between wife-giver and wife-taker. Those people who are 'ari ka'e are of one and the same group, and have everything in common. No exchange can be possibly made between members of the same group.

Marriage is a privileged form of exchange; thus, marriage between agnates is, theoretically in the Endenese context, prohibited. Those who marry in such a way are said to have "drunk
one's own blood," minu raa dhala, but there is no such fine as is imposed upon when one commits a marriage of the "wrong path" (a marriage of a man with a girl of his wife-taking group).

The ethics permeating the relationship is called se 'ate, "of one heart" (literally, 'liver'). In contrast to papa which presupposes two discrete entities, se emphasizes unity. For example, se ngua // se mbapu, "one ritual and one ceremony" is the idiom employed to express the unity of a ritual domain; sa'o se mboko // tenda se pata, "one house and one veranda" is for the unity of a descent group. There should be no break up of this relationship; in consequence, there are no scenarios for such an occasion. Theoretically, or in terms of morals, it is an impossibilium for 'ari ka'ẽ to break up, because they are one and the same.

Even if the equality aspect is emphasized among 'ari ka'ẽ or agnates, the coupling of the words 'ari ("younger sibling") and ka'ẽ ("elder sibling"), however, connotes some kind of hierarchical structure ('ari being "junior" to ka'ẽ): let us employ a word "precedence" to express this hierarchical nature, so as to distinguish clearly this from that between wife-giver and wife-taker (expressed as "superiority"), because, while the hierarchical nature of 'ari ka'ẽ is established on the basis of the difference in terms of quantity, that between wife-giver and wife-taker is in terms of quality.

Whereas the distinction between 'ari ka'ẽ relationship and that between wife-giver and wife-taker should be always kept in mind, it
should not be forgotten that they have one thing in common, that is, the "hierarchical structure," which would enable the Endenese to translate one relation into another; one can find an example of this translation in an expression for wife-giver, ka'ë'ëmbu, "elder ones and grand parents," which is a translation of "superiority" into "precedence."

When an Endenese wants to emphasize the hierarchical aspect of the relation 'ari ka'ë, he uses either of the two words, 'ari or ka'ë. Expressions such as "he is my 'ari," or "he is my ka'ë" are used to emphasize the hierarchical connotation of the relationship. In contrast, when used paired, 'ari ka'ë, the expression does not connote any hierarchical relationship between the two persons concerned. "He is my 'ari ka'ë" emphasizes the equalitarian aspect of the relationship.

7.3.2 Economic Ethics

The ethics among agnates is expressed as se 'ate, "one heart." The word se presupposes an indivisible entity. An egalitarian principle permeates the sphere of agnatic relations. Thus the exchange is impossible, by definition, among agnates because an exchange always needs two discrete entities.

Those transactions performed among agnates are marked by the word bagi, that is, 'sharing' or 'redistribution.' Those two ways of rendering would be rather misleading; let us follow the Endenese further.
What one owns cannot be given to one's agnates. If ever one wants to dispose of it, one has but to divide (bagi) it. As opposed to the 'giving' (pali) where ownership is quite clear, in cases of bagi, ownership is ambiguous. He who divides (bagi) something cannot dispose of that thing without the consensus of the agnates (the extension varying). Thus, this is quite close to 'sharing' in English usage. Yet a man can take the leadership in disposing of the thing; in this respect, the word can be better translated as 'dividing' or 'redistribution.'

7.4 Non-Relatives

7.4.1 Relational Ethics

Only in exceptional cases do the Endenese encounter non-relatives in the strict sense of the word, since in an Endenese social world, one can almost always find some sort of kinship relation with another. But, for some political reasons, one sometimes wants to establish the relation of non-kin<12>, especially when the previous affinal relations influence the amount of the bridewealth<13>.

7.4.2 Economic Ethics

The transactions between non-kin are designated as 'buying and selling' (mbeta and leka)<14>.

This fact accords with what van Baal describes in his article on the gift under the name of 'transaction' (handelen). The Endenese transactions of 'buying and selling' have the characteristics of handelen listed by van Baal as 'strictest (and immediate)
reciprocity,' 'bargaining' and the effect of 'separating' (15).

The transaction of buying and selling takes place in such everyday contexts as the weekly market (merhu) or between Endenese villagers and Lionese (from Saga) who sell earthen pots in far away Endenese villages, or with wandering Ndaonese goldsmiths. Though "real" strangers are rarely encountered in an actual social world, people can pretend as if they were strangers to each other and do that kind of economic transactions proper to strangers.

7.5 Summary

Thus, the distinctions of 'giving and receiving' on the one hand and 'dividing' on the other are closely connected with the distinction between the ethics applied to the two relations concerned: (1) papa pāwē between affines which presupposes the discreteness between the two groups and (2) se tātē between agnates, which presupposes the oneness or indivisibility in the group.

The arguments so far could be summarized as in Table 7-1.
Table 7-1 Ethics Among Kin

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>relationships</th>
<th>ethics</th>
<th>exchange</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>'ari</td>
<td>se 'ate</td>
<td>bagi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ka'e</td>
<td>(one heart)</td>
<td>(to divide)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(agnates)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>weta 'ane</td>
<td>papa pawe</td>
<td>pati simo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ka'e 'embu</td>
<td>(good to each</td>
<td>(to give and to</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(affines)</td>
<td>other)</td>
<td>receive)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'ata</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>mbeta leka</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(non-relatives)</td>
<td></td>
<td>(to buy and sell)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Thus we can figure out, only temporarily though, a social world of one person, consisting of kinds of categories of persons related to one another in one way or another:

Figure 7-4 Endenese Social World

```
+-----------------+    +-----------------+    +-----------------+    +-----------------+
|                 |    | wife-takers     |    |                 |    |                 |    | wife-givers     |
| +-----------------+    | +-----------------+    | +-----------------+    | +-----------------+    |
|                 |    | Ego             |    |                 |    |                 |    |                 |
|                 |    | Agnates         |    | non-relatives   |    |                 |    |                 |
| +-----------------+    | +-----------------+    | +-----------------+    | +-----------------+    |
| <-----------------+    | <-----------------+    | <-----------------+    | <-----------------+    |
|                  |    | to share        |    | to give (receive)|    | to sell (buy)   |
```

The culturally admitted syntax is the following: If two persons are in the relationship of ka'e 'embu and weta 'ane, then the applied economic relation should be that of pati and simo; if the relation is that of 'ari and ka'e, the economic relation should be that of...
and if the relation is that between non-kin, then the economic relation should be that of mβeta and ṭeka. In other words, the cultural dogma has it that a specific kin relation causes a specific mode of transaction.

The explanatory syntax, however, can be, and is sometimes, reversed. The supposed logical connection combines an economic activity not with the kinship relation but with the more abstract feature like "discreteness" or "indivisibility" which is presupposed by such kinship relation as kare tembu and ṭeta 'ane (as is expressed through such ethics as papa pawe).

To accommodate these two points, the causal connection should be the one shown in Table 7-2.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Privileged Domain</th>
<th>Concerned Parties</th>
<th>Economic Activity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agnates</td>
<td>Indivisible</td>
<td>Bagi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wife-givers and</td>
<td>Discrete hierarchically</td>
<td>Pali/simo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wife-takers</td>
<td>Organized Entities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-relatives</td>
<td>Discrete</td>
<td>Mbeta/Leke</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Entities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<----- reversible causal connection

The reversible causal connection is discernible in many aspects of the Endenese kinship system. The most conspicuous example is found in the sphere of marriage payment, ngawu.

In concluding a marriage, the groom's side should pay a
prescribed amount of valuables called ngawu. Ngawu means "property" in general or what could be translated as "things." So, in this context, the word is properly translated as "bridewealth."

The ngawu has much to do with the membership of the woman in that, before the ngawu has been paid, the woman is still regarded as belonging to her natal group and that only after the payment is fulfilled, does the woman belong to the husband's group. Thus, in this sense, ngawu is not a countergift to a wife given to the groom's party, but what could be rendered as "transfer payment" (for the bride from her natal group).

Categorized in this way, the wife-givers' superiority still retains because there is no reciprocity here (ngawu are not considered as a countergift). Permeating this causal language game are the wife-givers and wife-takers on the one hand and pali and simo on the other.

On many occasions, however, one can hear seemingly contradictory remarks upon the same marriage transaction, remarks usually made by the wife-takers' side, in which the ngawu given to the wife-givers is referred to as werhi or the "price" and, correspondingly, the marriage transaction itself is articulated as mbela, "buying" (a woman).

To consider this seeming deviation, there are some more points to be taken into account. Firstly, this utterance is solely made by the wife-takers; wife-givers never say that they "sell" the woman. The
second point is that the reference to the transaction as a "buying" does not imply any insult on the bride.\(^{17}\)

There are two possible logical solutions to this problem, the two being interrelated in some way.

The supposed relations between the parties are (1) discrete and hierarchical, as is represented by the wife-giver and wife-taker relationship, when the \textit{pati simo} syntax is employed and (2) discrete but non-hierarchical/neutral, as is represented by the non-kin relationship, when the \textit{mbeta teka} syntax is employed. Thus, for any wife-taker, it is desirable to employ the \textit{mbeta teka} language game because then the concerned relation will become that of a "discrete but non-hierarchical" one whereas the employment of the \textit{pati simo} language game means that wife-givers are superior to them. Thus, by the employment of the \textit{mbeta teka} syntax, or "brideprice" language game, the aspect of "discreteness" of the wife-givers and wife-takers relation is over-emphasized, or in other words, the aspect of "hierarchical-ness" is neglected.

The second explanation for this deviation is made in terms of the marriage ideology. The ideal marriage for any Endenese is not one with his mother's brother's daughter but that with (a girl from) a new (as yet unrelated) group. In other words, the partner in the marriage negotiation in the former case is one's wife-givers (in the sense that the groom's mother comes from the bride's group); thus the appropriate economic scenario should be that of \textit{pati} ("to give") and \textit{simo} ("to receive"). On the other hand, in the latter case, the
partner is (or, at least, is regarded as) one's non-kin.

This does not mean that any matrilateral cross cousin marriage is articulated in terms of "bridewealth" scenario and any marriage with a new partner is articulated in "brideprice" scenario. Rather the "bridewealth" scenario can make the concerned marriage a matrilateral cross cousin marriage and "brideprice" scenario can make the marriage as that with a new partner.

The type of marriage is, like kinship grouping, neither "being" nor "doing" but "saying."
'ono woso we beg of you (ancestors) a lot (of children)
rina kapa we ask of you a bunch (of offsprings)
dhadhi ngee may we give birth more and more (of children)
mesa mbeka may we hatch thickly and thickly
dhadhi 'ana 'ata give birth to boys
aki for them to stand and speak
tau dari ngasi give birth to girls
dhadhi 'ana 'ata hai
tau pasa rhaki for them to be paired and married.

8.1 Introduction

At the beginning of this dissertation, I defined one of the most important Endenese language systems, conventionally called kinship, as consisting of two kinds of primitives: (1) concepts related to culturally conceptualized human reproduction and (2) concepts related to specific kinds of economic transaction. The second kind of primitives have been several times alluded to in the preceding chapters, but it is in this chapter that the systematic analysis is made of these "specific kinds of economic transactions."

There are roughly two categories of economic transactions in Ende: (1) inheritance and (2) prestation. Rules of inheritance help to articulate a pre-established kinship group; some rules of prestation work independently of the other rules of group formation.
As I will concern myself with the Enderese economic system, it is appropriate to examine, first, the Enderese system of economics in general.

8.1.1 Goods to be Exchanged

Let me consider the goods used in the Enderese exchange system.

There are many varieties of goods exchanged among the Enderese. The Enderese distinguish two categories of goods: (1) those wife-givers give to their wife-takers and (2) those wife-takers give to their wife-givers. There are some things which fall outside these two categories. The distinction is very clear, even though there is no lexical distinction between the two categories (such as is seen sometimes in other parts of the world as in the example of "female" and "male" articles). For example, pork is an article which should flow from wife-giver to wife-taker. If a man visits his wife-taker, he never eats pork meat, though, nowadays, because of the shortage of meat, sometimes one has nothing to serve one's wife-givers except pork. Yet, as in other kinship institutions we have discussed, it is not being nor doing but saying which matters in this case. A passage from my fieldnote will illustrate this.

One day, I was invited to Šengga's house at Pu'u 'Upe with Rñaki of Tonda and we were served pork there. I was quite surprised when Rñaki asked whether the meat was dog, which question was promptly affirmed by Šengga. Rñaki assured me that it was pork and told me that because he was a wife-giver to Šengga he should consider the pork as something else.

The importance of the rhetoric of saying will be further
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confirmed by the following episode concerning bananas.

Bananas (muku) are also things which must not be given to wife-givers. If one wants to serve bananas to a wife-giver, one must say, as a euphemism, pirhu 'ae petu ("things to go with coffee").

Once a man was visiting his wife-takers and they served him with bananas without saying that they were "things to go with coffee." So, right on the spot, he broke the dishes and poured the coffee out and left the place without saying anything.

For the full list of the 2 categories, see Table 8-1.

---

Table 8-1 Goods To Be Exchanged Between Affines

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Things given by wife-givers to wife-takers</th>
<th>Things given by wife-takers to wife-givers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>pig (wawi)</td>
<td>any other meat than pig</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(chicken, cattle, goat, waterbuffalo etc.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rice ('arec)</td>
<td>('eko)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>banana (muku)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cookies (hirhu)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>male and female</td>
<td>elephant tusks (su)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sarong (rhuka and rhawo)</td>
<td>gold items (wea)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>land (tana)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All the things listed in Table 8-1 can be "sold" and "bought" as well as "given" and "received" except land. Land is something on which

kēwi tau 'āe to tap a palm tree
kēma tau kaa so as to sap water,
   to work in the field
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powi nuwa
so as to make food,
to feed ourselves

pagh a jangga
to be satisfied,
to raise ourselves
to be tall.

Thus, land is never to be sold. It can only be given (pati) to somebody.

In gift exchange such as is represented typically by bridewealth transactions between wife-givers and wife-takers, there can be no "exchange rate." The same objects which are exchanged ("given" and "received") can, however, also be "sold" or "bought." On such occasions, the exchange rate becomes clear in the sense that there can occur bargaining and a demand for proper payment.

The evaluation of things is fixed. For example, elephant tusks are evaluated by their length and not by weight. Animals with horns are evaluated by the length of their horns and not by weight. Pigs are evaluated by their height (the distance from the ground to the top of the back).

For the evaluation of elephant tusks, see Figure 8-1.
A typical exchange rate among elephant tusks, rice and gold items, at a certain time, might be the one in Table 8-2.

Table 8-2 Exchange Rate

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>elephant tusks</th>
<th>rice (kg in husked</th>
<th>gold items</th>
<th>rupiah **</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>sue</td>
<td>11 ndeka*(88)</td>
<td>1 doo kaa</td>
<td>50,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>minu 'aè</td>
<td>22 ndeka (176)</td>
<td>2 doo kaa</td>
<td>100,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>wesa</td>
<td>44 ndeka (352)</td>
<td>4 doo kaa</td>
<td>200,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>repa</td>
<td>88 ndeka (704)</td>
<td>8 doo kaa</td>
<td>400,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* ndeka (or sometimes called too) is a container for rice
** rupiah is mentioned only for the sake of convention

Of course, if there is a bad harvest, then the price of elephant tusks goes down to the extent that a minu 'aè is exchanged with less than 10 ndeka. The important thing to note here is not the exact figures but the fact that there exists a (more or less) fixed rate for those valuables. In other words, the fixed exchange rate enables those "valuables" (that are proper to prestation between wife-giver and wife-taker) to be exchanged among strangers (in terms of "buying" and "selling").
8.2 Inheritance and Sharing of Property

Because there is hardly any notion of inheritance of biological properties (except perhaps physical resemblance), the notion of inheritance of economic property is important to articulate the oneness of a kinship group.

There are several modes of inheritance, some of which are compatible with each other and others which are not: a group articulated by one inheritance principle (a property sharing group) might be merely a subdivision of another property sharing group; and one property sharing group might cross-cut another property sharing group.

Let us examine modes of inheritance, according to kinds of goods to be inherited.

8.2.1 Land

There are two kinds of land: (1) land with "head" and "tail" and (2) land without them. The former type shall be called "ritual land" and the latter "secular land."

(1) Ritual Land

In the history of Tana Rhorho of Ende, in the distant past, there occurred a series of divisions of the land of Kepi, the original place of the ritual domain. These parcels thus divided are the examples of the ritual land: each division of land was accompanied by a division of rituals (nggwa) so that each parcel has its own
ritual. The boundary of each parcel is marked by its head and tail, referring to the northernmost and southernmost tips of the parcel. This type of land is "owned" by male members of the patrilineal descendants of the people who were given such land. Any non-member can cultivate ritual land provided that he follows the ritual obligations proper to the land.

A senior male of the senior line of the group holds the ritual right over the land. He is the one who decides to allow non-members to cultivate and/or utilize a part of the land; he is the one who receives what is prescribed by the ritual obligations to be given by the cultivator; he is the one who holds the ritual that everyone should follow.

However, he cannot dispose of the land (give it or sell it). It is forbidden to "sell" land. A group, however, can give land provided that all the members of the land-sharing-group agree.

This giving process leads us to the second category of land, "secular land" or land without head and tail.

(2) Secular Land

The giver in such a process is always a group, whereas the taker of the land is always an individual. In other words, "giving" highlights a group and "taking" singles out an individual from a group.

The kind of land thus given is different from the ritual land in
that (1) it has no head or tail and (2) it has no accompanying ritual. If one wants to cultivate this kind of land which may be "owned" by another person, one should pay whatever the owner asks.

Inheritance of this land differs from that of ritual land as well. An owner can prescribe who will inherit the land. If there is no such testament (na'uy), then the senior male member of the patrilineal descendant will lay claim to it. Unlike the inheritance of ritual land, there is no linear inheritance of secular land, unless so planned. In the scheme of secular land inheritance, "age" (an absolute age) plays the role, whereas in the scheme of ritual land inheritance, \langle age\rangle (a categorized age) plays the role.

(3) Ritual Land and Secular Land

The distinction of the two categories of land is according to the two categories of "owning."

Western neighbours (Tana Dea people) and the eastern neighbours (Lionese) have these similar categories of ownership and corresponding categories of land. Yet, among both people, the two systems of land tenure stand independently, as it were, over a domain, whereas, in Ende, the two systems are locked together. A parcel of land, in Lio or in Tana Dea, can be described in two ways, that is, ritually or secularly, whereas in Ende, a parcel of land is owned either ritually or secularly and never both. In Tana Dea, for example, the land of Tana Dea is divided into a certain number of ritually owned parcels of land, called pu'uy muku. At the same time, it can be said that it is divided into a number of secularly owned
parcels (called kuy). In other words, every parcel has two owners, a ritual lord and a secular lord. In Ende, a parcel of land has only one owner, either secular or ritual.

In terms of group formation, ritual land defines the largest agnatic group (being founded in a "historical" time) whereas secular land defines a segmentation of the group (singling out a particular individual and consequently only his descendants). Being closely connected with the "history," the number of plots of ritual land is fixed, whereas plots of secular land can at any time increase in its number. In terms of a group's internal structure, ritual ownership makes the group hierarchical by singling out the senior line, or by crystallizing the category age (age), whereas secular ownership makes the group equalitarian in the sense that everybody in the group has a fair chance of being the "owner" by simply outliving someone else to become the oldest senior member.

8.2.2 Ngawu

Ngawu refers to a certain kind of property, movable and usable as bridewealth, such as elephant tusks and gold items. These items are passed strictly from a father to his eldest son. If a father is still alive, only he knows how much ngawu the family holds. The main source of ngawu is his daughters; the father will receive ngawu as their bridewealth. The father is the redistributor of the ngawu thus acquired, using it for his sons' bridewealth. If a father dies leaving some of his sons unmarried, then they will be taken care of by the eldest son, who now holds the ngawu. Once married, none of the younger brothers has rights over the ngawu still left in the eldest
brother's hands.

This seemingly strict agnatic principle breaks down in the case of polygamy. If a man has daughters from different wives, then a part of the ngawu acquired as bridewealth from the daughter of a particular wife should be used for a son of that woman (i.e. the girl's full-brother). There seems to be no rule as to whether, after the death of the father, the eldest son can take the remaining ngawu, which was acquired through a marriage of his half-sister.

Thus, ngawu ownership singles out what could be called a nuclear family as a group from a larger group; no married brothers of the same father share ngawu. At the same time, the ngawu ownership guarantees the sharing of ngawu between unmarried brothers.

As a matrilineal factor intervenes with the agnatic principle in land ownership in the form of giving (the rule being the wife-giver giving land to the wife-taker), so too, in ngawu ownership, it intervenes in the form of giving sisters.

8.2.3 Harvest

There are three modes of co-operation in the agricultural activities: (1) kema bou, (2) rhangi and (3) lobho. Kema bou ("working together") implies no separation among co-workers. Therefore, this is done only by the co-members of a ngawu sharing group, such as between a father and his unmarried sons or between unmarried brothers. Rhangi means the co-operation until the planting phase: such as clearing the forest and burning. After planting, the
people who have cooperated in rhangi work separately. No sharing of
the harvest is implied. Rhangi cooperation is usually carried out by
married brothers or a wife-giver and a wife-taker. Tobho refers to a
physical separation between fields, or making of such a fence. Tobho
is carried out when two persons, whose fields happen to border each
other, do not want to interfere with each other. No cooperation is
implied in any manner.

Thus, the harvest-sharing group who work in the kema bou fashion
is exactly the same as the ngawu sharing group. If there is a surplus
harvest, then the ngawu sharing group can increase their stock of
ngawu by buying additional ngawu through the sale of the surplus.
Therefore, a dependent such as an unmarried son cannot acquire his
own ngawu in this fashion.

8.2.4 Perennial Crops and Livestock

The property aspect of perennial crops and livestock is described
in terms of mbungku, "efforts." This property ownership is strictly
individual-oriented. Whoever takes care of perennial crops (such as
cocoanut palms) or livestock has every right over the disposition of
them, which are called his or her mbungku.

This is the only chance for an unmarried man (not the eldest son)
or a woman to acquire his/her own property. Mbungku of a woman cannot
be disposed of even by her husband or her brothers.

Cash ownership operates according to the same principle. A youth
nowadays sometimes goes to the city and works there as a labourer (on
road construction etc.) and earns a wage. This acquired cash belongs exclusively to him; even his father cannot do anything with it.

Because of this last principle, the system can work without putting some people in eternal dependency. Mbunggu can create ngawu, and then a new ngawu holding group.

8.2.5 Ornaments

Some of ornaments (such as earrings suwo) are given to a daughter who marries out. These are called ngatu narhu, "a lunch sent." These items might be given either by her father or by her mother, who may have been given them as her own ngatu narhu. Once a woman gets a "lunch," she usually keeps quiet about it and gives it to her daughter on the latter's marriage. There is, however, no conceptualization of matrilineality in Ende to describe this inheritance, nor are there many instances of long matrilineal inheritance of a particular item. Sometimes a woman dies without giving "lunch" to her daughter, thus the "lunch" passes to her husband or son. Sometimes, voluntarily or not, she contributes her "lunch" to a certain transaction (such as bridewealth transaction) of her ngawu holding group.

8.2.6 Summary of Inheritance

Except for the last principle which occurs only sporadically and never lasts long, inheritance follows the patrilineal line. Various principles, which are allowed in the sphere of the agnatic principle, are employed for various kinds of inheritance, and those principles
operate not only for articulating the formation of the kinship group, but also for articulating the internal structure of the kinship group.

All the principles can be represented as in Figure 8-2 in their relations to the group thus articulated.

The Figure 8-2 is, however, too static a representation of the system. The whole system is more dynamically maintained than was described above. For example, the unity of a secular land holding group is confirmed when it gives a part of its land to an individual, thus causing a potential formation of another secular land holding group.
group. An individual without ngawu will feed animals to get his own ngawu resulting in the formation of another ngawu holding group. The only stable group, stable in the sense that it always reproduces itself in the course of the time, is the ritual land holding group. In this connection, it should be noted that there are a number of individuals who do not belong to any ritual land holding group: new comers. Thus, agnatically related persons do not necessarily belong to one specific property holding group, unless there is a ritual land holding group to which both of them belong.

8.3 Bridewealth Transaction

In the previous section, we have discussed the principles of inheritance and sharing of property. If we may rephrase "inheritance" as a lineal economic transaction, then, in this section we are going to deal with lateral economic transactions: the transactions between non-agnates, especially bridewealth transactions.

The first thing to be noted is that bridewealth is exchanged not only between the bride's group and the groom's group: (1) that the groom's group must accumulate bridewealth from various categories of relatives (agnates, "uterine siblings," co-villagers as quasi-relatives, and their own wife-takers), (2) that the bridewealth given to the bride's group is divided among the agnates and wife-givers and (3) that the distribution of bridewealth is of a great importance -- whether it is used for another person's bridewealth or whether it is used to buy a parcel of land.
A woman who has "married out," pasa rhaki, has some implicit rights over things which are acquired with the bridewealth given for her. This rule has never been explicitly brought forward by an Enendenese; yet it has to be presupposed in order for us to understand various rules concerning bridewealth transactions. This is especially so if the acquisition involves pati-simo ("give" and "take") and bagi ("share" or "divide") transactions. By contrast, those economic transactions described by such terms as leka and mbeta ("to sell" and "to buy"), negerhu ("to exchange," a typical application of which can be found in changing money of large denominations into small change) or rhaka ("to help," that is, activity which should be rewarded by strict reciprocity) do not yield a special relationship. The former kind of transactions are "meaningful" whereas the latter kind (leka and mbeta) are "neutral."

Let us consider "meaningful" transactions of bridewealth. As I noted earlier, three aspects have to be considered: (1) who paid the bridewealth, (2) who received the bridewealth and (3) how the bridewealth was used afterwards.

8.3.1 Who Paid the Bridewealth?

This factor has to do with the assimilation or recruitment process of a kinship group.

(1) Body and Trunk

Paying someone else's bridewealth is one way of recruiting a man into a kinship group. Suppose B has no bridewealth to pay and A pays
all the bridewealth for B, then B is regarded as a tembo rhoo ("body and trunk") of A and A's agnates. This principle of recruitment to an agnatic group is different from adoption in that a man recruited into the group in this fashion is regarded as inferior to the other members of the group.

The assimilation of B into A's group affects the following generations. In the succeeding generation, bridewealth for B's daughter is paid to A and A's agnates and the husband of B's daughter is regarded as A's wife-taker. See the figure below for the entire flow of bridewealth.

---

Figure 8-3 Bridewealth Transaction in Tembo Rhoo

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{A} & \leftarrow \text{B} = 0 \\
\hat{\omega} & \leftarrow \omega = 0 \\
\text{bridedwealth} & \leftarrow \text{bridedwealth}
\end{align*}
\]

---

The critical term in a narrative of tembo rhoo is "paying the bridewealth (for another person)" (wa'u ngawu). The narrative is dissimilar to and should be clearly distinguished from narratives without the critical term, however ostensibly similar the phenomena are to a tembo rhoo narrative. For example, a narrative of bou or "gathering" held by a prospective groom's group whereby participants contribute something to the future bridewealth, is told in terms of rhaka, "help," instead of wa'u ngawu, and thus the groom has, and will have, nothing to do with the helpers except in terms of a pure economic debt, which should, in due course, be "reimbursed"
(2) Woman's Remarriage

In the case of woman's remarriage, the same logic works. If the man who marries the former wife of another man without repaying the brideweight<1>, he is regarded as a member of the former husband's group and if he repays the brideweight, then the two persons stand in the same relation as those whose wives are sisters.

Yet in some cases, not paying brideweight functions to enhance the relation between the two without creating hierarchical relations. It seems that creating siblingship in this manner works especially when the new husband is willing and able to repay the brideweight.

Let us consider the case of a woman's remarriage in which brideweight for her first marriage played some part in deciding the relationship between the first and second husbands.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Figure 8-4 Kapa's Wife's Remarriage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

First Kapa married Wea. Then Kapa married 'Ewu. Wea did not like Kapa's second marriage so she fled to her elder sister's place and lived there.
Gaso wanted to marry Wēa. So, Dhaē went up to Kapa's village and told Kapa about Gaso's intention. Kapa went down to Gaso's place.

Gaso wanted to repay the bridewealth (nggerhu ngawu "to reimburse the bridewealth") Kapa had paid for Wēa. Kapa said "No. Let us be siblings (ʻari kaʻe) from now on."

If Gaso had repaid ("changed" nggerhu) the bridewealth Kapa had paid for Wēa, then the two marital ties would not have created any meaningful connection, and the two marital ties would not have established a meaningful siblingship, though in a genealogical sense, they would have become ʻari kaʻe all the same. However, according to the informant who recounted the above story, a relation of ʻari kaʻe established by marrying another man's wife with "repaying the bridewealth" is soʻo reʻu ("more distant") than the one without "repaying."

(3) Widow Remarriage

Widow remarriage is carried out in a similar fashion. If a man marries a widow without repaying (nggerhu) the bridewealth (to the late-husband's close agnates), then he becomes a lembo rhuo of the group. If he repays the whole bridewealth, then he will be an ʻari kaʻe but rather a distant one, though his children and the children by the former husband may be very close ʻari kaʻe ʻala hai (uterine siblings) to each other.

In contrast to a woman's remarriage, there is a culturally fixed scenario for a compromise in the case of a widow's remarriage: that is, repaying a lesser amount of the bridewealth (usually half) to the former husband's group. The payment is called luum ʻula kaa
("bringing food"), and by that payment, the new husband can retain a close relationship with the former husband's group without becoming a dependent (a tembo rhoo) of the former husband's group.

8.3.2 Who Received the Bridewealth?

The previous factor ("who paid the bridewealth") dealt with the wife-taker’s side; this section will deal with the wife-giver’s side. This factor leads us into investigating the differentiation process of a kinship group. Bridewealth given to the wife-giving group is redistributed among agnates of the bride's group and its own wife-giving group. This is sometimes described as "bridewealth falling upon (so and so)" werhi ngena ndeka (so and so). This redistribution process describes the range of the wife-givers of the group which has given the bridewealth. In short, whoever receives the bridewealth of the key alliance is regarded as a wife-giver and whoever does not is not.

When 'Epu of Kēka Dori described his marriage with his wife, Pama, he described the kinship relation before the marriage as in Figure 8-5.
In terms of genealogical connections only, Pama would be defined as a daughter of 'Epu's wife-taker because Petu (Pama's father) is a wife-taker of Ņđa, who is Kapa's "brother" through their wives, thus the marriage between 'Epu and Pama would be a "wrong path." To this comment of mine, 'Epu made two justifications for his marriage.

(1) When Kapa married Susu, Roja, a man from Keke Kē (Pama Petu's village), received some portion of bridewealth (werhi Susu nggena ndeka Roja). In that way, men of Keke Kē (including Petu) are in a sense wife-givers to 'Epu Kapa.

(2) What is more important is that the bridewealth which Petu gave for Kē was used only for Ria's (Kē's FBS) marriage and Kapa did not receive any portion of that (werhi Kē iwa nggena ndeka Kapa). Thus, Kapa is not a wife-giver to Petu.

The permeating process of the bridewealth distribution of the two key alliances (Susu with Kapa and Kē with Petu) resulting in creation and demarcation of wife-givers can be visually represented in the figure below:
So, economic transaction takes precedence over, at least in this story, the genealogical relation in determining the wife-giver and wife-taker relationship. Even if one person is another's wife-giver in a genealogical sense, he may not be regarded as such if he does not receive the bridewealth of the key alliance (the alliance which has made them, in a genealogical way, wife-giver and wife-taker).

8.3.3 How the Bridewealth Is Used?

This factor has to do with two things which seem to be separate phenomena, although they are actually one and the same thing and form two sides of the same coin.

Endenese describe one type of marriage as mburu nduu // wesa senda, "following the track and connecting the path." The most usual explanation for this type of marriage is a "marriage with one's mother's brother's daughter"; another explanation describes this marriage as a marriage in which a brother pays for his wife all the
bride wealth given for his sister: in the Endenese rendering, wa' u se 'imu // nai se 'imu, "one person goes out (referring to one's sister) and another person comes in (referring to one's wife)."

The underlying logic is: wa' u se 'imu // nai se 'imu ("one going out and another coming in") type of marriage is not a mother's brother's daughter's marriage in itself but it inevitably leads to one. If a brother used all the bride wealth which was paid for his sister, then the sister has a right over one of her brother's daughters: a daughter of the brother should marry with a son of the sister(2).

There is no logically mediating concept(3) between the wa' u se 'imu // nai se 'imu ("one going out and another coming in") marriage and the following mburu nduu // wes a senda ("following the track and connecting the path") marriage such as "debt" or "economic origin." The rule is simply: wa' u se 'imu // nai se 'imu marriage should be followed by mburu nduu // wes a senda.

-------------------------------------------------------------
Figure 8-7 Economic Siblingship and MBD Marriage
-------------------------------------------------------------
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In this transaction and the following matrilateral cross cousin
marriage, it is based on the brother-sister link, which is emphasized in the Endenese discourse. Nothing is mentioned about the role played by the sister's husband.

Concerning this causal connection between wa'u se 'imu // nai se 'imu ("one going out and another coming in") or what could be rendered as an "economic brother-sister link" and mburhu nduu // wesa senda ("following the track and connecting the path") marriage, a different word-for-word glossary for the name mburhu nduu // wesa senda is relevant.

People usually interpret the name as follows. Mburhu is a track of an animal such as is often seen in a paddy field after the animal has done damage, and wesa is a small path, hence the translation, "following the track and connecting the path." Yet, both mburhu and wesa have other meanings. Mburhu can also mean "ten (10)" and wesa an "elephant tusk of a certain length"(4). So, according to one informant, wesa are the most important articles of bridewealth and they are usually counted in "tens," thus the name of the marriage mburhu nduu // wesa senda should be translated as "following the tens and connecting the elephant tusks"; in other words, "following the bridewealth."

A woman who marries according to this marriage type is called tu'a and the process is called tuu tu'a ("to bring a tu'a"), but whereas mburhu nduu // wesa senda explicitly means a marriage with this woman, tuu tu'a does not necessarily lead to such a marriage. A tu'a might remain in the house where she was "brought." Such a woman
is regarded as an element of the property of the house.

If we consider the first factor ("who paid the bridewealth," which leads to "economic" siblingship) along with this aspect of bridewealth ("how the bridewealth is used," which leads to tuu tu'a or "economic" mother's brother's daughter marriage), we can see the Endenese way of conceiving of "mother's brother's daughter marriage" more clearly.

---

**Figure 8-8 Endenese MBD Marriage**

```
<p>| |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---+---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
```

---

In a hypothetical case in Figure 8-8, suppose that the bridewealth for C is used for B's marriage. This transaction, first of all, results in the recruitment of B into A's group as *tembo rhop*. Another consequence of this transaction is that C and B are now "bridewealth linked brother and sister" and, therefore, B's daughter should marry a son of C.

Let us see one narrative of a chain of transactions from my field note: the case of Gaspar's elephant tusk.

'Epu of Ke'ka Dori was in great need of cash. So he deposited
(pē'i) some of his palm trees with Pambo and Pambo gave him money.

When Gaspar Bheo (a school teacher in Kēka Dori, who happens to be 'Epu's wife's sister's son) married, Jata "helped" him as a co-villager ('ari ka'e 'one maka) by giving one elephant tusk. Gaspar wanted to return it, so he came to 'Epu's house and took one elephant tusk (which had been given to 'Epu as bridewealth for one of his daughters). Afterwards, when Gaspar became well off, he went to 'Epu's house and returned one elephant tusk to him. 'Epu went to Pambo and gave the elephant tusk and was given back his palm trees.

Though the transactions are interconnected to form a long chain of exchange, almost all of the vocabulary employed for describing the transactions consist of "neutral" (in the context of creating a relationship) verbs such as pē'i ("to deposit"), nggerihu ("to exchange" or "to reimburse") and rhaka ("to help"), all of which, like teka and mbeta ("selling" and "buying") are considered "transactions between non-kin" and therefore whose employment in a discourse does not create any kinship relationship.

The chain contains only two "meaningful" (in the context of kinship) transactions, that is Gaspar's marriage (and the elephant tusk paid for it) and 'Epu's daughter's marriage (and the elephant tusk paid for it), but the two incidents are not connected meaningfully. The elephant tusk 'Epu handed to Gaspar was returned as another elephant tusk and the transaction did not contain any pāti simo or bagi vocabulary but is only described as nggerihu ("changing").

If we concentrate only upon the "meaningful" transactions which were carried out in 'Epu's daughter's marriage and Gaspar's marriage, the story might be summarized as below:
'Epu received an elephant tusk from one of his daughter's marriage. Gaspar took the elephant tusk and used it for his marriage.

The flow of bridewealth exactly corresponds to the type we have just discussed. The important point to be marked is not only the actual flow of bridewealth but also, or more importantly, how it is described: in the above episode, the elephant tusk was handed by 'Epu to Gaspar, not as bagi or pati, but as rhako "to help" (thus, the thing should be in due course "reimbursed" nggerhu).

Let us consider the counter-factual case minutely so as to see how a different description of the same transaction would result in a different situation in terms of kinship obligation.

Suppose a bagi scenario had been employed for the transaction. This would have resulted in exactly the same situation to that which I termed a "bridewealth linked brother and sister" (and, in subsequent generation, an "economic MBD marriage"). Thus, one of Gaspar daughters would have had to marry one of 'Epu's daughter's son.
As it was, since the rhaka ("to help") and nggerhu ("to reimburse") scenario was employed, there was no meaningful relation accruing to 'Epu's daughter and Gaspar (or 'Epu's daughter's son and Gaspar's daughter for that matter).

Here again, we have seen how important "saying" is in defining the relationships in the Endenese kinship system.

It is good, the Endenese people say, to have successive tu'a for generations.
Among the Endenese, a single tuu tu'a (that is, what we call "mother's brother's daughter's marriage") is not rare; there are a few twice-repeated tuu tu'a recorded; but more than twice-repeated tuu tu'a rarely happen. One of the longest tuu tu'a is shown in Figure 8-11.
Figure 8-11 Chain of Tuu Tu'a

\[\begin{align*}
\Rightarrow Wani
\Rightarrow \uparrow \\
\Rightarrow Tika & \Rightarrow \leftrightarrow Mamo \\
\Rightarrow \quad \leftrightarrow Rere \\
\Rightarrow Pambo
\Rightarrow \uparrow \\
\Rightarrow Wenggu & \Rightarrow \leftrightarrow Hamba \\
\Rightarrow \quad \leftrightarrow Pou
\Rightarrow \uparrow \\
\Rightarrow Honggi & \Rightarrow \leftrightarrow Roga \\
\Rightarrow \quad \leftrightarrow 'Ida
\Rightarrow \uparrow \\
\Rightarrow Khada & \Rightarrow \leftrightarrow Raso \\
\Rightarrow \quad \leftrightarrow Boi
\Rightarrow \uparrow \\
\Rightarrow Hua & \Rightarrow \leftrightarrow Ria \\
\Rightarrow \quad \leftrightarrow Ndora
\Rightarrow \uparrow \\
\Rightarrow \quad \leftrightarrow \rightarrow \rightarrow Ladi
\end{align*}\]

The institution of tuu tu'a sometimes creates a one-group-ness just like tembo rhoo.

A marriage with someone else's tu'a without paying the bridewealth (nggerbu ngawu) makes one 'ari ka'ê with the "owner" of the tu'a.
In Figure 8-12, B and A are bridewealth linked brother and sister because the bridewealth paid for B is used by A for his marriage. D, a daughter of A, is now a would-be spouse for F, a son of B. In other words, D is a tu'a of B. Suppose, E, instead of F, marries D. In that case, E becomes 'ari ka'ē of F; the nature of the relation may vary according to whether E pays the bridewealth or not.

The situation is just like the process of recruitment as a tembo rheo. The difference is that in cases of tembo rheo, the payment of bridewealth and the marriage take place simultaneously, whereas in cases of marriage with someone's tu'a, bridewealth has been paid, so to speak, before the marriage concerned takes place.

If one pays the bridewealth, a marriage with another's tu'a (or torho hai, would-be spouse) creates an important relationship, though not in sociological terms, because the relation does not yield any right or obligation for, e.g., corporation. The relationship is meaningful as an explanatory device: the resulting 'ari ka'ē-ship cannot be dismissed (even when there are multiple relations traceable between the two persons concerned) in describing the relationship. In the terminology we employed in the previous chapter, we can say that
'ari ka'ē through a marriage with another ortho hai (would-be spouse) is "strong."

8.3.4 Other Bridewealth Transactions

There are two other payments which play some part in determining a kinship relation. Though they may not be called bridewealth in the usual sense of the word (as it is used in anthropological convention), I will still use the word "bridewealth" because that is the way the Endenese people conceive of those payments (that is, as ngawu).

Both kinds of payment are related to non-mother's brother's daughter marriage, one seen from the father's sister's side and the other seen from the mother's brother's side.

(1) Pounded Maize

compensation paid for the wife's father's sister

A sister has a right over her brother's daughter especially when the brother has used the sister's bridewealth for his marriage. Therefore, if the brother's daughter marries someone other than the sister's son, then the husband of the brother's daughter should pay a prescribed amount of "bridewealth" to his wife's father's sister(5).
This portion of bridewealth is called jawa tosa ("pounded maize").

According to one woman informant, jawa tosa should not be carried away by the sister, but should be left there in the brother's hands. Otherwise, she continued, the brother-sister link would be considered "cut."

(2) Jumping over the MB's shoulder

When a sister's son is going to marry someone who is not his mother's brother's daughter, the mother's brother can claim a portion of bridewealth called

rherho 'urhu Jumping over the head,
rhangga wara Crossing over the shoulder.

If he does this, then the sister's son can claim from his mother's brother a payment called

to'u jopu Grasping the top of the head,
dheo ngero Holding the crown of the head.
If the mother's brother does not give the to'u jopu payment, then he is no longer considered to be a proper mother's brother in the sense that he can no longer request continuous payment appropriate to the relation from his sister's son(s). From the sister's son's point of view, if his brother wants to marry the mother's brother's daughter, then it should be regarded as a marriage with a new group ('ana 'arhe) because she is no longer a daughter of the mother's brother but a woman of an unrelated group. The situation is described in a number of extra mbuku which specify payments in this type of marriage:

korho soi       A fortress has hindered,
as a papa        A fence has been built.

If the mother's brother gives the prescribed amount as a to'u jopu, then he can remain as a mother's brother and his sister's son's marriage with his daughter will be considered as mburhu ndumu // wesa senda.

8.3.5 Summary of Prestation

We can discern two ways of the functioning of the economic
principles.

The first function of the economic principles operates as a filtering function upon two genealogical principles of descent and alliance. The economic principles provide a set of meta-rules. The principles of economic transaction clarify those penumbralae which the genealogical principles leave undefined. The typical example can be found in the economic principle for defining one's wife-givers (see 'Epu's marriage with Pama). In the genealogical sense, for example, whoever is categorized as one's mane ("mother's brother") is regarded as one's wife-giver. The economic principle is much clearer and more far reaching than genealogical principles: whoever receives the bridewealth of the key alliance is a wife-giver and others are not. Thus, even if a man is called one's mane, he is not so regarded on certain occasions if he has not received the key bridewealth.

The second function is as primitives of the language system of kinship. The economic principle can establish an assimilation into a kinship group (an attributive classification) and a differentiation of individuals into different kinship categories (relational classification) which genealogical principles cannot.

The payment of someone's bridewealth and the marriage with tu'a are the examples of the former and "one going out another coming in" (with its resulting "bridewealth linked brother sister") is an example of the latter.

Even though the terms for those relationship created by the
economic principle are derived from the genealogical vocabulary, such as 'ari ka'e (or "siblingship") and nara weta (or "brother and sister"), the genealogical principles alone cannot explain the terms (in the sense that those who are, for example, called 'ari ka'e may have no genealogical connections proper to 'ari ka'e).

Not only the labels but also the attitude can be created "economically" without regard to genealogically defined relationships. See the following passage from my fieldnote.

---

Figure 8-15 Here
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(Here was a tu'a of 'Éwu, i.e., Kapa paid bridewealth for Here in order that she would become a wife of one of his sons. It turned out that Jape married her without repaying the bridewealth.)

In a conversation, Here mentioned the name of Jape's father, Rhigo, an act usually regarded a severe transgression of the avoidance proper to the HF/SD relationship. One woman pointed that to her. Here answered the accusation by saying, "Do you think Rhigo paid for my bridewealth?"

Thus, in her understanding, the avoidance should be maintained not between HF and SW but between the payer of the bridewealth and the woman for whom the bridewealth was paid. Here had been very cautious not to mention the name Kapa.
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It is the economic principles that create those relationships.
Chapter 9 Dramaturgy of Kinship

9.1 Introduction

Let us examine some Endenese ritual scenarios (1) to see how the principles of identity relation and difference relations are expressed in a liturgical time scale.

We will investigate scenarios of marriage and funeral ceremonies. They are held in situations which are critical to an Endenese kinship world. One is held when a new relationship is being established and the other when one constituent member of the world disappears.

9.2 Marriage

The five marriage types ('Ana 'Arhe, 'Ana Mburhu Nduu Wesa Senda, 'Ana Dheī Dhato, 'Ana Paru Dheko and 'Ana Poi) and accompanying scenarios described briefly in Chapter 3 provide not only the framework for people to see the events; they are, in a sense, like ordinary scenarios, things on which people "play" or are supposed to play. Thus, two seemingly similar forms of behaviour can be described in different ways in two different scenarios.

In the following narrative is told the switching of scenarios so that a specific person can gain a more favourable end:
Anton himself wrote a letter to his lover. Then he gave the letter to Dalu to be handed to the lover. It turned out that she wanted this marriage too. So, Anton and his family prepared things for this marriage. So far so good. They acted like in 'ana dhei dhatu marriage. Then, the would-be bride's family called Anton's family to come to their place and "sit and talk" (a procedure proper to 'Ana 'Arhe). Silly enough, Anton's family went up to the bride family and sat and talked. Now, things changed and Anton's family had to follow 'ana 'arhe procedure which would cost them much more than 'ana dhei dhatu marriage.

Generally speaking, this type of statement bases its intelligibility on a common conception (on the part of the speaker and listeners) of the marriage scenarios (thus, we could call this type a meta language system, i.e., a language system about another language system). Most of what are called "political" narratives belong to this category of meta language system.

Each of the five marriage types mentioned above has its own procedures: feasts and bridewealth negotiations. For an example, let us consider a scenario of 'Ana 'Arhe marriage, the most prestigious of the five.

'Arhe means "to ask." The parents of a boy go to the parents of a girl and "ask" for the girl. This might be called a "marriage of arrangement." There are, roughly speaking, three stages of 'Ana 'Arhe marriage: (1) 'ana 'arhe or "asking"; (2) luu nzawu or "carrying bridewealth"; and (3) po sia (short for papa sins(2)) or "marriage feast."

9.2.1 Asking

'Asking' ('ana 'arhe) is the first stage, in which a man from the
bridegroom's side, sometimes accompanied by a second, goes to the woman's house to ask for a girl.}

The messengers from the bridegroom's side are called kore mbore // taka taso, "digging out // tilling through" or sometimes called rherbu rharu, "a cotton needle". These messengers are said to suffer a lot. Furthermore, it is said, because of their duties in this marriage, they cannot perform their subsistence activities. For these reasons, they will be paid later for their sufferings by the groom's group.

If the marriage is approved by the bride's group, then after a short while, the group of the bride sends a messenger called padha rhelia, "one on the bridge," to the wife-taker, announcing the date of the "carrying the bridewealth (to wife-giver's village)" (luu ngawu)

9.2.2 Bringing the Bridewealth

'Carrying the bridewealth' (luu ngawu) is composed of two stages: (1) leo tanda, "to hang a token" and (2) renda (or wenda) tanda, "to detach the token." The former is a provisional stage and the latter is the main one. In the first stage, the wife-taking group brings a small portion of bridewealth to let others know that the girl is now engaged; and then the wife-taker, after accumulating a prescribed amount of bridewealth, brings all of it to prepare for the marriage feast (pe sia). The token procedures compare the marriage process to the agricultural process.

Leo tanda is only a simplified version of wenda tanda in the
form, even though each has its own meaning in the exegesis of the scenario; here the latter will be discussed fully.

In ordinary situations, an Endenese kinship world has three components, i.e., one's group, one's wife-givers and one's wife-takers. In theory, in an 'Ana 'Arhe marriage, the two parties (the bridegroom's and the bride's) are not related to each other in either of the three possible relationships. When these two parties are about to take on this first stage of gift exchange ('carrying the bridewealth'), each of them undergoes a representational metamorphosis (representational to each other). The bridegroom's group behaves as if they had no wife-givers and the bride's group behaves as if they had no wife-takers, so that each side can unite with the other to form one complete social world.

---

![Figure 9-1 Marriage Scheme](image)

(1) At Groom's Place

The drama begins at the bridegroom's village, set about a month or two before the day of the actual 'carrying of the bridewealth.'
First of all, the groom's family holds an informal meeting to gather bridewealth among close agnates. This kind of meeting is called bou, "gathering." Those articles assembled from close agnates do not count as debt.

A little later, the group sends a messenger to other relatives and co-villagers, saying that on a certain day there will be held a "meeting for gathering bridewealth" (bou wai rhaki). Articles given on this occasion count as debt<10>.

Finally, a messenger is sent to "tell" (beku) the wife-takers to bring articles. The amount announced is usually so high that the wife-takers themselves are, in turn, obliged to call for help from their relatives of various kinds and from their own wife-takers. This portion from the wife-takers is substantial but never considered as any debt. This contribution is called by the same term for bridewealth (ngawu). See Figure 9-2.
In this way, the groom's group organizes their social world according to the classificatory system to the degree that the only missing element is the wife-giver's group.

(2) At Bride's Place

On the very day of 'carrying of the bridewealth' (lumu ngawu), the scene shifts to the bride's village. In describing the situation of the scene, it is most relevant to introduce a distinction made by the Endenese between 'ala napa "waiting people" and 'ala mai "coming people."

The first act is set in a temporary construction (ghumbu sundə) made specially for this occasion in the village or house yard (wewa). Initially, the bride's family and their close agnates are
the only 'waiting people'; they wait for other people to come. When a group of people, say, a group of co-villagers, come, they, as waiting people, stand up and serve the 'coming people' with tobacco and sirih pinang. After this, these 'coming people' become 'waiting people,' who wait for another group to come. The most important group of 'coming people' is the group of the wife-givers, that is, the bride's mother's brother<11>. Yet, they too, after being served, become 'waiting people,' the last component group on the bride's side who must wait for the final group, namely, that of the bridegroom to come.

Now exactly as in the drama at the groom's village, at the bride's village too, the bride's group has dynamically reorganized its social world to the extent that the only missing fragment is the wife-takers.

Before the bridegroom's group arrive, all the bride's group are present. Towards evening, the bridegroom's group arrives at the bride's village with the bridewealth. All through the ceremony, they and only they remain 'coming people' who have yet to be assimilated to the bride's group's social world.
There exists a hostility or an enmity between the last 'coming people,' that is, groom's group on the one hand and the 'waiting people' on the other, to the extent that the two sides are afraid of each others' spiritual attack (tau, usually performed by witches). See, for example, the following narrative.

Suppose wife-takers are coming, say, from the village Tenda to our village Keka Dori. When they are approaching Pu' u 'Upe (a village on the way from Tenda to Keka Dori, much closer to Keka Dori), all little children hide themselves. Because they are afraid of wife-takers' spiritual attack from the place that close to them. Once wife-takers have entered the village of Keka Dori, then nothing can happen.

For another example, when Banggo of Teo Ndu'a was marrying, Banggo's father, Rhada, went to ask Nua Rea of Pemo for magical help. When wife-givers were near Teo Ndu'a, a container of palm gin which had been put in Rhada's house was broken down into pieces (because of the spiritual attack of the coming people). The waiting people were scared. Nua Rea calmed them and went out to the yard and danced toja (to counterattack). Then one of the coming people died (because of Rea's magical dance) and another followed.

When wife-takers enter the village, they hide the bridewealth
with a sarong. Among bridewealth elements, elephant tusks are given to some women of the 'waiting people' to be "put on their legs" (pembe supe).

The bridegroom's group is served with tobacco, sirih pinang and coffee. Except for a few persons who are to entertain 'coming people,' all 'waiting people' stand and withdraw.

After about an hour's chattering, the bride appears with a woman follower, with a sirih pinang container in her hands. The bride herself begins to serve the bridegroom's group with sirih pinang going from one person to another. This service is called rhoo weti "serving sirih pinang," whereby each man or woman who is served by the bride should offer some money (Rp 100 to Rp 500) to her. Rhoo weti and kaa muku hirhu "eating bananas and cookies" take place occasionally throughout the ceremony.

At night between nine and ten, the bridegroom's group is shown into a house, where the negotiation of the bridewealth (mbabho) is to take place. When the wife-takers enter, people inside sprinkle water (rheka 'ae) on their legs, because the wife-takers are considered "hot" (petu). For this service a due portion should be paid later (usually an elephant tusk).

Then the wife-takers hide the bridewealth they have brought in a secluded partition (mbeki) of the house. Then both parties proceed to carry out mbabho (the negotiation talk).
Ideally the negotiation talk consists of the wife-giver's relating mbuku (couplets, prescribing the amount of the bridewealth) and of the wife-taker's bargaining until both sides reach an agreement. A mbabbo does not end, usually, until dawn.

9.2.3 Marriage Feast

Several days after wenda landa, the feast (pe sia)(14) is also held in the bride's village. Pigs given by the wife-givers are served to the wife-takers; waterbuffaloes given by the wife-takers are served to the wife-givers. The marriage is established(15).

9.3 Funeral

If a marriage ceremony can be called a ceremony for a "creation" of a certain kinship relationship, a funeral can be called that of a "reconfirmation" of the relationship. Whereas, in a marriage ceremony, the scenario describes in subtle ways how the two parties establish the relevant relationship that reorganizes the internal structure of each side, in a funeral, the scenario concerns itself with ways to avoid the possible break-up of the once established relationships.

A scenario(16) of a funeral rite is composed of a couple of stages; let us see the scenario from the beginning.

9.3.1 Notification

When someone dies, his or her agnates and/or co-villagers send messengers to "notify" (sodho) the deceased's relatives that there is
going to be held a funeral gathering (ghena). At the same time, pieces of bamboo filled with petroleum are put in a fire in order to make continuous explosive sounds so that people of the neighbouring villages know that someone has died in that village. The deceased's agnates, helped by the co-villagers, prepare food for the coming funeral ceremony; pounding and winnowing the rice. Some of the women, whether they be agnates or guests, begin to lament (nangi)<17> over the deceased.

Messengers for the "notification" tell people not only about the funeral ceremony to come but also their kinship relations to the deceased. Thus, a message of a sodho might be like: "So and so died last night and the funeral ceremony will take place tomorrow. You come as a wife-taker."

The assignment of the kinship relationship is of importance since in most cases multiple relations can be traced between any specific two persons. Failure to assign the kinship rule in the notification procedure often causes the anger of the notified person. Less frequent are cases where the notified person disagrees with the assigned kinship relationship. The assignment is not done arbitrarily but based on the everyday usage.

9.3.2 Sitting Up All Night For The Charred Wood

That evening those present at the deceased's house, that is, his agnates and co-villagers sit up all night (pa'i). They put certain species of woods (kaju sambi and kaju meru) into the hearth. Then this charred wood (nopo 'api) is put under a mat. Some of those
present sit upon the mat, as the Endenese say, for the purpose of preventing witches from stealing the charred wood. What the wood symbolizes remains vague, yet the Endenese say that this procedure (called "sitting up all night for the charred wood" pa'i nopo 'api) brings about the separation between the living and the deceased(18).

9.3.3 Gift Exchange

Before and after the "sitting up all night for the charred wood," a funeral meeting is held, called "arrival" (ghena). The deceased's relatives "arrive" from various villages. Men will sit on the veranda of the deceased's house, while women sit inside. In a marriage ceremony, two groups are discernible -- the bridegroom's group and the bride's group -- each of which has not assimilated each other to their own social world yet; in contrast, in a funeral ceremony, there is an already established social world around the deceased.

On the arrival, a mbabho (negotiation for the ceremonial gift exchange) takes place. Unlike a marriage ceremony where there exists only one relationship (i.e. that between the bridegroom's group and the bride's group), in a funeral, there are two relationships: (1) that between the deceased's group and its wife-takers and (2) that between the deceased's group and its wife-givers. In most cases, the negotiation with the wife-takers takes place first.

As in a marriage ceremony, there are also mbuku (couplets prescribing the amount of the payment) for a funeral; yet these mbuku are not descriptive, nor do they contain, in most cases, any parallel lines. The most important of these is a gift grossly called
"three animals" (ẽko terhu) paid by the deceased's (eldest) daughter's husband, which consist of:

1) kungu mue "burned claws" a goat
2) tana toro "red land" a horse
3) mbegha "annihilated" a waterbuffalo

After this important article, there come various lesser mbuku.

The negotiation (mbabhu) with the wife-takers is immediately followed by that with the wife-givers. The most important among the mbuku that the group of the deceased must pay to the wife-givers is a mbuku called terhu, "head." It is paid to the deceased's mother's brother, the representative of the "wife-giver of origin" (kaẽ 'embu pu'yu). Then a mbuku called ra e rio, "water for bathing," is paid to the natal group of the deceased's wife. The rule of the payment differs depending on whether the deceased is male or female and whether the deceased is married or not. See the Figure 9-4 and Table 9-1.

---

Figure 9-4 Head Transaction

```
+-------------+
|             |
|             |
|             |
|             |
E             |
+-------------+
|             |
|             |
|             |
|             |
F             |
```
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Table 9-1 Who Receives One's Head

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>deceased</th>
<th>male/</th>
<th>female</th>
<th>married/</th>
<th>unmarried</th>
<th>&quot;head&quot;</th>
<th>&quot;water&quot;</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>E (MB)</td>
<td>F (WB)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>E (MB)</td>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>E (MB)</td>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>A (B)</td>
<td>A (B) or B</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If a married man (A) dies, his "head" is given to his mother's brother and the "water for bathing" is given to his wife's brother. If a woman or a man dies unmarried (C or B), her or his "head" goes to the mother's brother but there is no payment of the "water for bathing." If a married woman D dies, then both her "head" and "the water for bathing" are given to her brother.

All the other wife-givers will be given such mbuku as teni te'e, "those who sit on the mat" or rheki gemo, "putting (twigs) over the hole."".

If it happens that the relation between the group of the deceased and his wife-giving group has not been good, then the wife-giving group sometimes claims an additional mbuku.

9.3.4 Burial

Burial takes place after "sitting up all night for the charred wood" and "arrival."

On the death, the corpse is moved out of a sleeping partition (mbeke) onto the floor (ora ndawa). The site is dug first
symbolically by the wife-givers, followed by the co-villagers or agnates of the deceased. Then the corpse is brought to the burial site and buried.<sup>26</sup>

9.3.5 Going to Bathe

On the fourth night<sup>27</sup> after the death, there is held a significant ritual called mbana rio, "going to bathe"<sup>28</sup>, significant both for the deceased and the bereaved.

Early in the morning (it is prohibited to "go to bathe" after dawn), the bereaved<sup>29</sup> leave for the nearest river to bathe themselves. They bring clothes with them which have not been washed since the death and wash them<sup>30</sup> there. This is a separation from the dead, say the Endenese. When they approach the village returning from bathing, a curer ('ata marhi) purifies them<sup>31</sup>. Entering the house, they change their clothes.

In the house, a ritual called kaa kerha or "eating to part (the deceased)"<sup>32</sup> is held subsequently. This ritual at home is followed by another which is performed at a big tree (such as a banyan tree). The ritual is called pori sibha, "to free (the bereaved of the deceased)<sup>33</sup>)," which consists of the curer's sprinkling rice grains over the bereaved.

During this pori sibha activity at the tomb, those in the house sweep inside and under the house; it has been forbidden to sweep before this ritual. Inside the house, they prepare for kaa kerha // pesa wisa ("eating for cutting and partaking for severing")<sup>34</sup> for
the bereaved to eat. After this ritual eating, all the participants eat the food from the same dish (kao bou // minu 'imu, "eating together and drinking side by side").

The main theme of a funeral ceremony is expressed in this contrast between the names of the two successive stages of the rite: "Eating for cutting and partaking for severing" performed by the bereaved for the deceased and "eating together and drinking side by side" performed by all the participants for the living. In short, the dead should be separated and the living should stick together.

After this small ceremony all the guests, wife-takers and wife-givers are served. If the mbabho of the death-payment has not been concluded, then it will be held on this occasion.

9.4 Summary and Concluding Remarks

The most important difference between the two ceremonies described is the completeness of the social world which is at stake. In the 'asking' marriage, the social world is not complete, and it is the creation of such a complete social world that the whole ceremony aims at. First, two components (bridegroom's group and bride's group) prepare themselves through (1) 'gathering' (bou) on the bridegroom's side and (2) 'carrying the bridewealth' in which the bride's side assimilates 'coming' people to 'waiting' people, in order to form one group. Ceremonial gift exchanges that take place in 'carrying the bridewealth' and later in the 'marriage feast' establish the proper relationship between the two groups thus articulated.
In contrast with the 'asking' marriage ceremony, in a funeral, a social world has already been established around the deceased. It is the reconfirming of this social world so that it does not dissolve with the death of the constituent member that the whole scenario of the funeral ceremony is about. Harmony of the social world, consisting of the living members, is repeatedly emphasized throughout the scenario, sometimes at the expense of the deceased. Often the vices of the deceased are talked about to the effect that all the ill relationships that existed in the past social world are spoken of as if they were due to the deceased.

These are the frameworks that the two scenarios cast upon the events of marriage and funeral.

Actualization of the scenarios in an actual situation needs a special analysis, since the actual world is always distorted and not compatible with the idealized world on which scenarios are based, in the sense that multiple kinship relationships can, almost always, be traced between individuals. The multiplicity may be due to complicated genealogical connections, or to past economic transactions or some extra genealogical factors such as co-residence.

To comprehend fully the process of the actualization of scenarios, we have, first of all, to remind ourselves of one of the most important maxims of Endenese kinship: kinship is not just 'being' nor merely 'doing' but 'saying.' In each of the conjunctive points of the scenarios where an establishment of certain
relationships is called for, there is always found a process of
'saying.' In the 'asking' marriage, the points are 'gathering' (boy),
and 'carrying the bridewealth' (tuu ngawu). On both occasions the
saying process, bêku ("to tell"), is employed. When one is 'told' as
a wife-taker by a certain group, then one is a wife-taker and has to
play the appropriate role in the liturgical script. In the same
manner, in the scenario of funeral, notification (godho) works by
assigning kinship roles to the participants.

One may be 'told' by multiple parties and may thus be assigned
multiple roles in one ceremony. Consequently, it often happens that
one person plays several different roles at different stages of one
drama. When a marriage was contracted between co-members of my
resident village, I was, first, 'told' by the bridegroom's group to
be a sibling to them, and later by the bride's group to be their
sibling as well. It happened that I knew the bride's group's
wife-givers, and thus was 'told' by them to act as one of their
members too. First, I contributed to the bridewealth gathered by the
groom's side. On the day of 'carrying the bridewealth,' I accompanied
the bride's group's wife-giver and gave a sarong to the bride's group
as was expected of a wife-giver, and became one of the waiting
people. I withdrew from the scene and then became a member of the
coming people, the bridegroom's group, and came to the bride's house,
and was treated as such. Finally at a later stage, I was a member of
the bride's group and received some portion of bridewealth. Because
the marriage involved two groups of one village, several villagers
played multiple roles like me.
In any kinship drama based on such scenarios as were described in this chapter, one at one stage of the drama pretends and plays a certain role which is merely one of the possible roles one can assume. The role might be different from the one which usually comes to fore in an everyday situation. If, for example, a man dies whose 'head taker' happens to be a co-villager, the head taker almost surely comes, at least at first, to the deceased's house not as a wife-giver, but as a co-villager. He might even contribute something to the deceased's agnates as a co-villager. It is at a later stage that he appears to the house as a wife-giver, with appropriate gifts and is treated as such by the deceased's agnates. Once in a funeral I observed a man being reprimanded by the deceased's group for the small amount of his payment as a wife-taker. The man replied that he had not yet come as a wife-taker properly.

In short, 'saying' (accompanied with 'playing') functions prominently in a kinship drama. A scenario provides a ready framework, to which the 'saying' can refer at any stage of the drama.
Chapter 10 Village Keka Dori

10.1 Introduction

This chapter deals with the village called Keka Dori. In this chapter, I will concentrate upon how a coherent narrative world is established through the recounting of village kinship structure. Most of the descriptions of the village are, unless otherwise mentioned, based on accounts by 'Epu of waja Bhisa, made on various occasions during my stay with him in the village.

10.2 Introduction to Village Keka Dori

The village Keka Dori consists of about 30 households made up of 200 odd population. According to the elders' account of the village, in former days (a generation ago, that is, around the World War II), it seems to have been a general rule for a father and his sons (even after their marriages) to live together in a house; hence there seem to have been a much smaller number of households then. At present, there is only one instance of a father and married sons living together in village Keka Dori. There is also only one instance of the married brothers (of a dead father) living together, though it often so happens that they live close together (within calling distance).

A unanimously agreed upon description of the kinship structure of the village by villagers might be as follows:
(1) There are 3 named kinship groups, waja Bhisa, waja Juma and Waja See.

(2) There are other people, new comers to the village, called hereafter non-waja (although there is no corresponding native terms).

Even though there are a couple of agnatically related groups of fair size among non-waja, these groups are never defined by the term waja; even though waja See has almost no living member in the village (the only member sometimes live in the village, sometimes in his wife's village), the name is always mentioned in describing the village composition in terms of the kinship structure.

10.3 Village Composition

When villagers talk about the village community in terms of kinship, they employ three named kinship groups to describe it: (1) waja Bhisa, (2) waja Juma and (3) waja See, even though about the half of the village population are not included into any of the three groups.

10.3.1 Descent

Let us, first, look at the village Keka Dori in terms of each group's internal formation.

(1) Waja Bhisa (or Waja Mari)

There are 9 households (or 9 ngawu holding groups) of waja Bhisa in the village.
Waja Bhisa (or as it is sometimes called waja Mari) is the group said to consist of the original people of the village. At a certain time, the ancestors of waja Bhisa are said to have given a portion of their land to waja Juma and waja See.

In Figure 10-1 and 10-2 are listed the constituting lines of waja Bhisa, including the lines that have died out.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Figure 10-1 Waja Bhisa</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>^ Mari+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>^ Reta+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>^ Kesu+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>^ Bhisa+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>^ Wasa+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>^ Bhato+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'Eto Jata Rindo+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(in Numba) 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 (the only son) 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>living in</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manggarai)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Occasionally, 'Epu referred to the 3 lines of waja Bhisa: (1) Reta Mari, (2) Mosa Mari and (3) 'Api Mari. He did so when he explained why Gebo (non-waja, of Buja's group) was sometimes regarded as of "one ritual" with waja Bhisa: "Gebo's father took the ritual of the line of 'Api Mari which had died out."

Unlike other groups in the village, the importance of the senior line (the line of 'Eto) is emphasized. 'Eto is a member of the eldest line of Waja Bhisa, although he lives in a coastal Muslim village (called Numba-Basa)<1>.

Kako ('Epu's PF) was living near the town of Ende when Bhisa met him. They recounted their genealogy and found that they were closely related agnatically. This kind of meeting with one's agnates is described:

toko gesi gena the bone was broken and a piece flew and fell on the
very place
the water was sprinkled and
reached the very spot

So, Bhisa brought Kako to Keka Dori to live there. I have never
heard anybody doubt the agnatic relatedness between Bhisa and Kako.

Papu was adopted by Kapa ('Epu's F).

---Adoption of Papu by Kapa---

When Padi died, Papu and Gato were small boys and Kapa had
been married for a while without a son. So Kapa adopted Papu so
that he could stand and speak (tau dari ngasi) and that he could
make the hearth flare up and make the earthen pot hot (tau rhiro
rhapu banga anga).

All the members of waia Bhisa are of "one ritual and one
ceremony" (se nggua // se mbapu<2> including the descendants of
Papu.

Also, all the members form one ritual land holding group, the
ritual land of Keka Dori or the land of Ngoi Rajo.

Jata and 'Eto form a secular land holding group as being the
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descendants of Bhisa.

Kapa was a rich man, having acquired an amount of secular land and ngawu, thus his descendants (3 to 7) form one secular land holding group. Being the eldest of the two important wives of Kapa, Sapou and 'Epu form two independent secular land holding groups inside this group.

(2) Waja Juma

The constituent households of Waja Juma and their relations are as follows:

---

**Figure 10-4 Waja Juma**

```
  ▲ Juma+
    ।
  ▲ Pendi+ ▲ Dura+ eB ▲ Jala+
    ।        ▲
  ▲ Mbena ▲ Kowa+ Dawi+ ▲ Jewa+
      ।    ▲
  ▲ Kaju ▲ Do'a ▲ Dei ▲ Dala 5 6 7
      ।  ▲
  ▲ Musa Pawe 'lma
  ▲
```

The three lines listed below are tembo rhoo of waja Juma.
Figure 10-5 Tembo Rhoo of Pendi

\[ \begin{align*} &\text{Rhako}^+ \quad 0 = \text{Rengga}^+ \quad \text{Juma}^+ \\
&\text{Rhigi}^+ \quad \text{Sue}^+ \\
&\text{Ruti}^+ \quad \text{Gaja}^+ \quad \text{Maru}^+ \quad \text{Rheba}^+ \\
&\text{Naga}^+ \quad \text{Jewa}^+ \\
&\text{Mbena} \end{align*} \]

(died out) Gati \quad Rhii \quad (in Mbena's) \quad (unmarried)

Nobody of the village could trace any genealogical connection among the four descent lines above (waja Juma, Ruti and Naga's, Gati's and Rheba's lines). Yet, those persons underlined are said to have lived together and they were called tembo rhoo of Pendi. They were tembo rhoo of Pendi because Pendi and Juma, Pendi's father, paid their bridewealth for their marriage: Juma paid bridewealth for Sue and Pendi paid bridewealth for Maru, Rhii and Jewa (Ruti's wife).

Gati has his own household and the children of Rheba live with Mbena (Pendi's son).

Some of the process of the recruitment to the status of tembo rhoo of these persons are known. One of the stories is as follows.
Nua Joto was a would-be spouse of Rhigi. Juma married her. So, the storyteller proceeded, Juma allowed his would-be spouse, 'lē See, to marry Rhigi. In the subsequent generation, when Naga married Bhoko, it was Juma who paid the bridewealth (wa'u ngawu) for the marriage.

This series of transactions has a few consequences worth considering. First, Juma's payment of bridewealth for Naga resulted in Naga's recruitment into Juma's tembo rhoo ("the body and trunk"). Another new relationship resultant from the chain of prestation is that, because Juma paid bridewealth to Rheto (the father of Gebo, of Buja's group), Juma became a wife-taker to Rheto, even though Naga, for whose marriage the bridewealth was given, was not genealogically related to Juma. See the figure below.
Waja Juma is said to have come to Kēka Dori from a village called Pu’u Kumi, though members of waja Juma have, at least at present, no social contact with their distant agnates in the original village.

‘Epu never traced the genealogy of waja Juma until it came to ancient Kepi villagers; thus waja Juma is classified as a refugee lineage, at least in ‘Epu’s conceptualization<5>. Waja Juma is not, in other words, a ritual land holding group. They form, however, one secular land holding group.

(3) Waja See

Waja See has almost no members living in Kēka Dori. The only member Jape used to live in a nearby village, Tana Rhii, but recently he has come to live in Kēka Dori more often than before. Yusu, another member of waja See, lives in a coastal village Numba, because of his father’s marriage with a Muslim woman. He himself was born in Numba.
Although people recognize the agnatic relatedness between waja See on the one hand and descendants of Pani and Jaa in Tana Rhii on the other, the latter two lines are never called waja See.

Waja See is said to have come from Worho Ara, a village now abandoned near Tana Rhii.

Waja See's genealogy above Jeja is: Jeja Sengo, Sengo 'Ogo, 'Ogo Bawa, Bawa Renga, Renga Rangga, Rangga Ria, Ria Raja, Raja Tana, Tana Ngai, Ngai Nggenda, Nggenda Dena, Dena Rhewa. 'Epu recognized, thus, that waja See is the descendant of the ancient Kepi villagers.

(4) Non-Waja's

There are two substantial groups which are not recognized as waja
in the village: Pambo's group and Buja's group (though the two terms are never used by the people).

Pambo, along with his two brothers is patrilineally related to Pani and Dhangu, whose father, Papu, was adopted by Kapa and thus recruited to waja Bhisa.

---

Their most closely connected agnates live in Pemo and Kota Waru Papa Jawa, to the east of KeKa Dori(6).

There are 3 households of Buja's group:
Figure 10-10 Buja's Group

Sarhe is said to have come Keka Dori from a place called Komba Ndaru, within the area of Tana Rhorho. Sarhe married a woman of waja Bhisa.

Buja's ngawu holding group and Banda's form one secular land holding group, separate from Gebo's group which is a ngawu holding group as well as a secular land holding group.

Juma, Ara, Baê and Waro with all the school teachers (Alex Kawê, Lipus Gembo, Hanes Bhato and Gaspar Bheo) have no patrilineally related persons in the village.

Juma, Ara, and Baê are waja Bhisa's wife-takers. And to them, waja Bhisa stands as an old wife-giver. None of them came to the village because of the non-fulfillment of bridewealth payment. Bae's father came to the village because waja Bhisa wanted him to stay with
them(7). Juma came to the village on account of a conflict with his agnates in the original village (Nio Rhombo). Ara came to the village more recently, only several years before, from a nearby village called Tonda, where his other agnates live(8).

Figure 10-11 Other Members of Keka Dori

```
  +----------------+  +----------------+  +----------------+  +----------------+
  |                |  |                |  |                |  |                |
  |  Kesa          |  |  Kako Sina     |  |  Bago          |  |  Baha          |
  |                |  |                |  |                |  |                |
  |                |  |                |  |                |  |                |
  |                |  |                |  |                |  |                |
  |                |  |                |  |                |  |                |
  |                |  |                |  |                |  |                |
  |                |  |                |  |                |  |                |
  +----------------+  +----------------+  +----------------+  +----------------+
```

Bae's father's natal village is near the town of Ende and outside any villager's social world; the genealogy of Bae does not, therefore, contain any mention of Kepi villagers.

Ara's agnates live in village Tonda, the second oldest village in Tana Rhorho.

Juma's agnates in the original village (Nio Rhombo) are said to be the original inhabitants of that village (like waja Bhisa in Keka Dori) and they are the ones who "hold" the ritual of "eating yam" there. Although I have never heard 'Epu or Juma reciting Juma's genealogy, Juma's elder brother in Nio Rhombo once gave me a genealogy in which he claimed that he was a descendant of ancient
Kepi villagers.

Waro came from a nearby village Tana Nhii; the reason for his shift is not clear. Although Waro has no patrilineally related kin in the village Keka Dori, he is in a relation of uterine siblingship ('ari ka'e 'ata hai) with 'Epu, because the same group receives their "heads." Even though they are genealogically from different levels (as is shown in the figure below), because they are about the same age, they employ 'ari and ka'e rather than 'ema and 'ana between them(9).

Figure 10-12 Waro and 'Epu
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10.3.2 Alliance

If 'Epu is asked about the affinal relationships among the kinship groups, he would answer as follows:
### Table 10-1 Conceptualization of Alliances in Keka Dori

| +------- | +------- | +------- | +------- |
| | waja   | waja    | waja    | non-    |
| | See    | ->      | Bhisa!  | ->      | Juma    | -->     | waja    |
| | +------- | +------- | +------- | +------- |
| | wife-  | wife-   | wife-   | wife-   |
| | givers | takers  | givers  | takers  | givers  |

Waja See is the wife-giver to waja Bhisa, and waja Bhisa to waja Juma. All non-waja are wife-takers of one or another of the three waja. The actual affinal relationships are quite different and more complicated than is suggested by the above figure.

(1) Waja Juma and Waja Bhisa

First, let us see the relationship between waja Juma and waja Bhisa, the relationship roughly categorized as that between wife-taker and wife-giver.

(1.1) Musa-Jewa-Jata line and 'Éto-Bhato

Musa-Jewa-Jata line of waja Juma is a wife taker to waja Bhisa, especially to 'Éto-Bhato line (the senior line of waja Bhisa). See Figure 10-13 below.
Musa and Pawê married other women than 'Eto's daughter, though. Although nobody explicitly mentioned the (economic) relation between Metê and 'Eto, as 'Ima was thought to be going to marry a daughter of 'Eto<10>, it seems that they (Metê and 'Eto) were bridewealth-linked brother and sister.

(1.2) Mbena-Pendi and Kapa

Mbena-Pendi line of waja Juma is a wife giver to Waja Bhisa, especially to Kapa's line (a subsidiary line of waja Bhisa, via Kako). See the figure below.

Let us consider the stories about the marriages (especially about the bridewealth transactions) of the two subsequent alliances of Kapa's sons (Mbaha and Sapo).
The first would-be wife of Mbaha was Mbiwa. Mbiwa was tu'a of Dhaē, Mbaha's mother and Pendi's sister. Kapa gave bridewealth to Juma's group. But because of Mbiwa's reluctance, Juma gave Hi'a (daughter of Gati) instead. He did so because Mbiwa and Hi'a were
tuka sa'o (living) inside a house
torho tenda (staying) upon a veranda

because it was Jewa who paid the bridewealth for Gati's marriage (11).

Thus even though Mbaha's wife (Hi'a) has no genealogical connection with waja Juma, Mbaha is considered to be a wife-taker to waja Juma. When Jewa's sons (Musa, Mage and 'Ima) married, Mbaha gave one elephant tusk for each of them.

The flow of bridewealth and resulting kinship relation can be summarized as in Figure 10-16.
The second story is more complicated, because it involves a third party, Buja's group.

Pendi and Rupi were bridewealth linked brother and sister; that is, Pendi used what had been given for Rupi, as his own bridewealth ("one goes out, and another comes in" wá'u se 'imu // nai se 'imu). Mbindi, a daughter of Pendi, was, thus, to marry Banda (a marriage of "following the road and connection the path" mburhu nduu // wesa senda). After everything had been arranged for the marriage of Mbindi and Banda (additional bridewealth having been paid), Mbindi went into Sapo's house and married him (marriage of "running and following" 'ana paru dheko).

So, when Banda married with another woman (in the fashion of "asking" 'ana arhe), Kapa paid all the bridewealth for Banda. In this
way, Kapa’s sons and Bheti’s sons became ‘ari ka’e.

In explaining the relationship between waja Juma and waja Bhisa, these episodes will suffice; yet since this chain of transactions has another interesting consequence, let us consider the sequence of the episodes connected by another marriage of “following the road and connecting the path,” mburhu nduu // wesa senda marriage which did not occur.

Figure 10-18 Tu’a of Mbindi

The bridewealth of Mbindi was used for Ruti’s marriage with Jewa. This is how Ruti became Pendi’s tembo rhou. Mbindi, whose bridewealth was used for Ruti’s marriage, could claim tu’a from her “brother” Ruti. And she did and Siti, a daughter of Ruti and Jewa, was “brought as a tu’a” (tuu tu’a).

Another incident followed which is also of interest.
Figure 10-19 Tu'a of Mbindi (Continued)
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Mbindi's son would not marry Siti. Tu'a as she was, Siti stayed with Mbindi. When Ngga came to Mbindi's house, she told Ngga to marry Siti and Ngga obeyed.

Ngga's line is also in the position of wife-taker to Pendi because Rhea Renga, father of Remo, is also a tembo rhoo of Pendi (see Figure 10-19). Even though there was no mention of how the bridewealth for Remo had been paid, it is likely that a part of it was used for Ruti's marriage. Thus, Ngga's marriage with Siti is a marriage with another person's tu'a as well as with his own tu'a. The bridewealth paid by Ngga for Siti was received by Mbindi and Sapo.

Let us summarize this long chain of transactions and resultant relationships. In a simplified way, the chain could be represented as follows:
The bridewealth ngawul connects A and a as bridewealth-linked brother-sister and makes b a would-be spouse for D, son of a. The marriage of E with b and subsequent payment of bridewealth (ngawu2) for D's marriage by E's group make D and E siblings (reciprocal ones without any hierarchical connotation). The bridewealth ngawu3 for b is used for C's marriage and thus makes (1) C a tembo rhuo ("the body and trunk") of A's group and at the same time (2) C and b bridewealth-linked brother and sister. The point (2) leads to the arrangement that c, a daughter of C, is a would-be spouse of b's son. E's marriage with c makes F a sibling of E's group; because F repaid the bridewealth, F is not regarded as a tembo rhuo.

Of theoretical importance is that, although a MBD marriage itself is not practiced often, it does provide a strong device for explaining kinship relationships: the husband of one's MBD (especially mother's bridewealth-linked brother's daughter) is one's 'ari ka'e, whose nature, however, may vary according to the bridewealth payment. None of the marriages told in the story above is a MBD marriage, yet all are transpositions of would-be MBD marriage and thus are able to create new relationships.
(1.3) Do’a-Dawi and 'Epu-Kapa

Now let us return to the main argument and continue to examine the relationships between waja Juma and waja Bhisa.

Do’a-Dawi's line of waja Juma is, especially to Kapa's descendants, in the position of a kind "of the same group" because Kapa married "a woman who was to marry with Dawi" ('orho hai Dawi).

There is no connection between Susu's father and Dawi's mother in genealogical terms; they must have been in the relation of bridewealth-linked brother and sister though I was not given any story telling the origin of the relationship.

---

Figure 10-21 Waja Bhisa and Waja Juma (Do’a's Line)
---

What we encounter here is another instance of the employment (as an explanatory device) of "a MBD marriage which did not occur."

(1.4) Summary

Let us see the whole structure of the relations between waja Bhisa and waja Juma here.
What we have seen above is that a seemingly consistent group category (in this case, waja) can be split into sections, according to its relationships with the outside (namely, affinal relationships). Waja Juma is divided into three sections according to each section's affinal relationship with waja Bhisa, which, in its turn, is affected by the affinal relationship as well: (1) the Musa-Jewa-Jata line of waja Juma is a wife-taker to waja Bhisa (2) the Mbēna-Pendi line is a wife-giver to waja Bhisa and (3) the Dawi-Dura line stands in a sibling relationship with waja Bhisa.

Waja Bhisa, in its turn, is divided into two sections: (1) the senior line (Etlo and Jata) which is a wife-giver to the Musa-Jewa-Jata line of waja Juma and (2) descendants of Kako who are wife-takers to Mbēna-Pendi line and are, at the same time, in a sibling relation to the Do'a-Dawi line of waja Juma.
Even though we see the division of each waja, the identity relationship (a waja being one group) is, as much as possible, emphasized in any kinship drama. If, for example, a member of waja Juma is invited by a member of waja Bhisa to participate in a certain kinship drama (and to play his role according to their mutual segments' relationship), the invited member will call, to follow him as his *ari ka* in that drama, all the other members of waja Juma, some of who may be separately invited.

(2) Waja See and Waja Bhisa/Waja Juma

Because of the small number of its constituting members, waja See has no such complicated kinship network in the village. It is convenient, in this respect, to treat its relations with waja Juma.
and waja Bhisa at the same time in this sub-section.

Let us see, now, the relationship between waja Bhisa and waja See. Several generations ago, waja See was wife-taker to waja Bhisa.

---

**Figure 10-23 Waja Bhisa and Waja See (Original Situation)**
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Because of one of waja Bhisa's (Bhato) marriage with a woman from waja See, Waja See is now considered to be a wife-giving group to waja Bhisa. See Figure 10-24.

---

**Figure 10-24 Waja Bhisa and Waja See (Present Situation)**
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But Jape, the only member of waja See living in Keka Dori, married lu'a (a woman "bought") of Kapa, without repaying the bridewealth, so that Jape is more or less considered inferior. If
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Jape had been a stranger, he would have been definitely considered of tembo rhou of waja Bhisa. But waja See as he is, he stands in an ambiguous position to waja Bhisa, especially to the descendants of Kapa.

The only kinship relation recorded between waja See and waja Juma is the following.

[A diagram is shown here.]

The 'ari ka'e relation between Kaju of waja Juma and Yusu of waja See was effectually exploited by Kaju when there occurred a conflict between 'Eto of waja Bhisa and Jape of waja See over a parcel of land. Kaju took waja See's side and, even though other members of waja Juma did not willingly participate in this conflict, he behaved as if he were a member of waja See.

(3) Non Waja, Waja Bhisa and Waja Juma

In this sub-section, we are going to deal with various kinship relations of non-waja, both with waja groups and with other non-waja. First, what I called Buja's group is discussed.
(3.1) Buja's Group

There is one interesting affinal relationship observable between the waja Bhisa and one line of Buja's group.

---

Figure 10-26 Waja Bhisa and Buja's Group (Gebo's Line)

---

The line of Gebo has been a wife-taking line ("ura weta 'ane") to waja Bhisa for some generations. Gebo's line has lived in waja Bhisa's village for a long time (since Sarhe's time). Gebo's line and waja Bhisa tend to be regarded as belonging together, though from the waja Bhisa's point of view, that does not amount to identity. As one line of waja Bhisa has died out, this tendency (of regarding Gebo's line as one branch of waja Bhisa) is being accelerated. This identification is done especially by the third party (that is, someone of neither Gebo's line nor of waja Bhisa).

As 'Eto is the head-taker of Gebo, 'Eto is still regarded (by Gebo) as a wife-giver, but the rest of waja Bhisa are regarded as 'ari ka'ê with him. A son of Papu, who had been recruited to waja Bhisa through adoption, married a daughter of Gebo; thus Papu's
descendants are considered as wife-takers, even though they are waja Bhisa.

I heard a man of waja Bhisa saying that Gebo's line "took the place of" (mbou "to steal") a line of waja Bhisa that died out. The most significant of all the devices employed by Gebo for his identification with waja Bhisa is that Gebo follows the way of ritual of waja Bhisa; he is in the relation of "one ritual and one ceremony" with waja Bhisa. This sharing of the ritual among Gebo and members of waja Bhisa is well recognized even by members of waja Bhisa; they take care that Gebo's family should not eat rice from their field before an appropriate ritual (since rice tabooed for them is also tabooed for Gebo owing to the shared ritual(15)).

On the contrary to Gebo's close relation with waja Bhisa, Gebo's other agnates, Buja and Banda, are more closely related with waja Juma:

---

Figure 10-27 Waja Juma and Buja's Group (Buja's Line)

---

Buja explained Buja's group's relation with waja Juma as follows: "owing to the bridewealth of my mother (Rupi), the mother of Mbena and others came into waja Juma": in other words, Rupi
(Buja's mother) and Pendi (Mbena's father) were bridewealth-linked brother and sister.

In this Buja-Banda-Gebo agnatic aggregate, we detect some kind of internal division among the members, just like what we observed in waja Juma's case. The difference is that, in this case, one agnatic aggregate is split, not in its relations to a group, but in its relation to two groups.

Figure 10-28 Buja's Group

```
+--------+
|        |
| Buja   |
|        |
+--------+  

+--------+   +--------+
| waja   |
|        |
| Juma   |
+--------+   +--------+
```

The two segments, Buja's segments and Gebo's segment have nothing in common except their agnatic relatedness. They are separate secular land holding groups, Buja's segment receiving secular land from its wife-giver, waja Juma and Gebo's from its own wife-giver, waja Bhisa.

(3.2) Pambo's Group

Let us see, secondly, what I termed Pambo's group.

Pambo's group has been a long-standing wife-taking line to waja Bhisa. See Figure 10-29.
Because there is no narrative nor actual instances of kinship drama which could have enabled me to see the internal articulation of Pambo's group, we shall, instead, consider the pattern of its members' residential shifts.

The Endenese people seem occasionally to shift their residence during their life-time. Even though there is no rule, in the strictest sense, of residential pattern prescribed for a certain kind of kin, there is an explanatory rule about the pattern, that is, "if two persons live close together, for example, within calling distance, they are close." Although this explanation is not couched in terms of kinship, as the group concerned (that is, Pambo's group) has no other guarantee of their identity than the agnatic relatedness (they have no ritual land), the residential pattern can be a good index of the degree of their identity.
The pattern of the shift of residence of the members of this group is complicated and all the shifts occurred during and between my stays there in the village, which enabled me to observe the pattern at the first hand.

Among the 3 brothers (Pambo, Setu and Gerhi, from the eldest to the youngest), Setu was the closest to waja Bhisa because of his marriage with tu'a from waja Bhisa.

At the beginning of my stay in the village in 1979, Setu lived within calling distance of 'Epu and Mbaha of waja Bhisa. At that time, Pambo, the eldest and Gerhi, the youngest, along with their married sister Remi lived in a separate hamlet called Pu'u Tere, which is usually included within Kēka Dori. The connection, as it were, between Pambo's group and waja Bhisa was their mother, Noi, and she was still alive and lived with Remi and her husband.

Pambo and Gerhi married women from Rēkē's group; Pambo married a daughter of Rēkē and Gerhi a daughter of Sēngga. Rēkē and Sēngga form a ritual land holding group. Sēngga, along with his full brother 'Ēa, lived in Pu'u 'Upe, a small settlement of only two houses, a couple of hundred meters north of Kēka Dori. Rēkē, their PFPSS, and the eldest of them, lived in Nio Nhēko, a hamlet around a kilometer east of Kēka Dori-Pu'u 'Upe.
Like most other client kinship groups, Pambo's group has no land of their own. The most valuable property which could be inherited by any of the living members of the group was coconut palm trees. They were Noi's mbunggu. Noi chose Setu, whose wife came from the same group (waja Bhsa) as she did, as a custodian of the trees, which means Setu would have been able to inherit them after Noi's death. In 1980, however, Noi decided that Setu no longer be the custodian of the palm trees<16>, and until now she has not decided who should be the custodian<17>.

Setu, soon after, shifted his residence to Pu'u Terē<18>. By that time, Pu'u Terē had been abandoned. Pambo and Gerhi had moved into Pu'u 'Upe, the hamlet of their wives' fathers; Remi (and her husband, Jēdho and her mother Noi) had moved into Pu'u Kerara, to join Jata of waja Bhsa and Bae, a wife-taker of waja Bhsa. Pambo and Gerhi worked on the land of Reē's group.

Reē "gave" a parcel of land (of his group's) to Pambo in the form of pati weta // ti'i 'ane. Pambo paid a certain amount of ngawu for the land. This ngawu was used for Reē's son's education. This caused a conflict between Reē and Sengga who also had a right over
the land in question (and consequently, the ngawu received for that),
even though, as an elder, Ṛkē was to have leadership in such
dealings.

The disjunction occasioned by this land/ngawu transaction between
Ṛkē and Sēngga, which had been recognized as forming one group,
aFFECTED their wife-takers, Pambo and Gerhi. Besides being agnates,
Pambo and Gerhi are also uterine siblings because both of them are
wife-takers to Ṛkē's group.

Pambo strongly took the side with Ṛkē, his wife's father. After
a while, Gerhi shifted residence to Pu'u Kerara, to join Hemi, his
sister, because, as Gerhi said, "I did not want to be involved in a
conflict between my wife's father (Sēngga) and my own brother
(Pambo)."

The 3 stages of the group's successive shifts of residence can be
visually represented as in Table 10-2.
Table 10-2: Pambo's Group's Shifts of Residence

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stage 1</th>
<th>Stage 2</th>
<th>Stage 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ritual Land Holding Group</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This long episode relates a story of how a client group came to split on account of its host groups, even though they are, among themselves, patrilineally related.

In the first stage, Setu was affiliated with a ritual land holding group, waja Bhisa, because of his close alliance link with it, whereas Pambo and Gerhi along with their married sister Remi (in whose house their mother, Noi, lived) formed one independent group, their identity being strengthened by their identical tie with another ritual land holding group (Reke's group). Unlike Setu, they were not dependent upon their wife-giving ritual-land-holding group.

In the second stage, because of the break up of his relationship with his wife-giving ritual land holding group (owing to the mbunge of his mother, one of his links with that group), Setu now stood alone, trying to form its own ngawu- and secular-land- holding group. Pambo and Gerhi were totally dependent on Reke's group in...
this stage. Remi, along with her mother Noi, now went to Noi's natal group, waja Bhsa, Remi's brothers' wife-giver.

In the final stage, by Reke's group's giving secular land to Pambo, Pambo was singled out and became a potential source for a secular land holding group; Gerhi dropped out and joined the old wife-giver, waja Bhsa.

10.4 Concluding Remarks

What I described above in this chapter is mainly a social world described by one person, 'Epu of waja Bhsa. The coherence of the world does not need summarizing here. Let us, instead, examine briefly another version of this world as told by another constituent member of the society, Do'a of waja Juma.

Below is a list acquired through an interview with Do'a of waja Juma about the waja identity of several villagers and relationship terms by which Do'a refers to those persons, coupled with my short comments, which are mostly based upon information described in the main text, that is, information from 'Epu.
Table 10-3 Do'a's Relationship Terminology

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>who</th>
<th>relationship terms</th>
<th>waja</th>
<th>comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gati F</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>waja Juma</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mbena F</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>waja Juma</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toni B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>waja Bhisa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'Epu 'eja (WT)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Bhisa</td>
<td>waja Bhisa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mbaha 'eja (WT)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Bhisa</td>
<td>waja Bhisa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buja 'eja (WT)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Juma</td>
<td>non-waja, but a wife-taker to waja Juma</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Banda 'eja (WT)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Juma</td>
<td>non-waja, but a wife-taker to waja Juma</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gebo 'eja (WT)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Bhisa</td>
<td>non-waja, but a wife-taker to waja Bhisa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bae 'eja (WT)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Bhisa</td>
<td>non-waja, but a wife-taker to waja Bhisa</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(F for baba (father), B for 'ari ka'e (brother), WT for wife-taker and WG for wife-giver)

All non-waja are regarded as belonging together with the waja with which they have a relationship of wife-taker. When Do'a talked about his own waja, namely, waja Juma, descent overcame alliance: the internal segmentation of waja Juma I discussed above never affects his articulation of waja Juma here. But when he discussed the identification of the people who are not waja Juma, alliance takes the precedence over descent in the sense that (1) agnatically related Buja-Banda-Gebo group is divided into (i) Buja-Banda whose close relation with waja Juma leads Do'a to include them as waja Juma and (ii) Gebo whose close relation with waja Bhisa leads Do'a to include this group as waja Bhisa and (2) Toni-'Epu-Mbaha of waja Bhisa are classified into two different kin categories according to their affinal relations with Do'a. In all of this, Do'a did not make any misunderstanding about their membership in terms of waja. Toni was
classified as a "brother" (ka'e) and 'Epu-Mbaha as ēja of wife-taker.

From these two descriptions of the social world, we can establish the order of the strength of kinship categories and relations as explanatory devices. In what follows, A represents a speaker, or a user of the devices, and B represents a person about whom A is to explain the relationship.

If A and B belong together to the same waja, then the relation is always called ari ka'e ('siblings'). If B belongs to a different waja, then the relation is described, being based on particular kinship history, without regard to the dogmatically held relationship between two waja (such as wife-giver/wife-taker relation between waja Bhisa and waja Juma in Keka Dori). In both cases, in which B belongs to a certain waja, B's waja's name is always used for his waja membership. If B does not belong to any waja, the relation is described in accordance with relevant kinship history. Sometimes (as in Do'a's description) B is regarded as belonging to a waja on which B is dependent. Sometimes (as in 'Epu's description) B is regarded simply as a non waja.

A specific explanatory device, waja, varies in strength according to the relationship concerned and sometimes according to the user. It is most exclusively used when two persons belong to one waja, and used to a lesser degree when the two persons belong to different waja, in the sense that the dogmatic relationship between the two waja concerned does not affect an individually held relationship.
When B does not belong to any waja, then the usage of the concept waja depends upon the user. 'Epu is a known genealogist, while Do'a is not. 'Epu extensively utilizes his knowledge of genealogies to describe the relationship concerned, whereas Do'a simply extends the category waja through the dependency relationships to be applicable to non waja members.

Among the elements which constitute what I termed 'kinship history,' we can discern the prominent strength of the economic mother's brother's daughter's marriage as an explanatory device. It does not occur often. But especially when it does not occur, it provides a linkage. If a man marries someone else's economic mother's brother's daughter (that is, a daughter of a woman whose bridewealth his father used for his marriage), then one must employ 'ari ka'e-ship in describing the relationship between them.

In contrast to the strength of the economic mother's brother's daughter's marriage is a relative weakness of the agnation, the culturally primary relationship in Ende. It is weak especially in the context where there is no other relationship than the agnatic relatedness. People do conceive the agnatic relatedness of the members of, for example, Buja's group or Pambo's group, but these members tend to split easily by the influence of waja groups.
On the other hand, if, as is sometimes done, the pieces of a jigsaw puzzle were automatically cut in different shapes by a mechanical saw, the movements of which are regularly modified by a camshaft, the structure of the puzzle exists, not at the empirical level (since there are many ways of recognizing the pieces which fit together); its key lies in the mathematical formula expressing the shape of the cams and their speed of rotation; something very remote from the puzzle as it appears to the player, although it "explains" the puzzle in the one and only intelligible way. (Levi-Strauss 1960: 52).

The Endenese kinship language system is almost the only language system with which the Endenese can explain/describe socially significant phenomena.

Under the phenomenal complexity and looseness lie the simplicity and logicalness of the system. At the surface level, we recognize concepts such as waja, wife-giver, wife-taker, economic matrilateral cross cousin marriage and the domain, each of which seems to be sometimes working on its own, sometimes interlocking with each other in some mysterious way. At an intermediate level, we can see such principles as the ideology of descent, alliance, prestation and ritual, which seem more systematic than the categories at the surface level but still complex enough to perplex an observer. At the deepest level are such notions as an identity relationship, difference relationship, relational and attributive ways of classification, which work in almost a mathematically calculable way.
To accord this essential simplicity of the system with the world, which might or might not be a mess, but which is certainly not logical, is a pragmatics of 'saying.' 'Saying' redefines the world to be compatible with a specific world view realized by a specific usage of the system at a specific time.
Notes To Chapter 1

<1> I follow Searle's definition of the term:

I want to clarify a distinction between two different sorts of rules, which I shall call regulative and constitutive rules. ... for example, many rules of etiquette regulate inter-personal relationships which exist independently of the rules. But constitutive rules do not merely regulate, they create or define new forms of behavior. The rules of football or chess, for example, do not merely regulate playing football or chess, but as it were they create the very possibility of playing such games. (Searle 1969: 33)

<2> I tried to introduce an already established term for what I have in mind. Candidates are: (1) language game (by Wittgenstein 1958, 1968) (2) language strata (by Waisman (1953)) and (3) semantic field (by linguists)

The first one ("language game") was the most attractive and the phraseology really means what I want to say; the problem was that the originator defined the concept very vaguely and lots of scholars have attached their specific meaning(s) to this concept.

The second author mentions almost exactly what I want to say. But the phraseology is rather awkward. I am not sure whether what I call language systems are structured like strata (that is, layers upon layers).

The last one (semantic field) is clearly different from what I call language system but it has some resemblance to it. Figuratively put, language system is to semantic field what competence (as defined by Chomsky) is to langue (as defined by Saussure).

<3> See the following passages from Danto 1985:

We have some terms which refer to individual human thought and action which presuppose something about social facts, and some terms which refer to individual human thought and action which do not involve that sort of presupposition. I do not know if there is in fact the latter sort of term, but let us suppose there is. Now any term, the correct application of which to an individual human being presupposes some fact about the organization of society, I shall call an S-predicate, and any term the correct application of which to an individual does not involve such presupposition, I shall call an I-predicate. A sentence which employs an S-predicate will be called an S-sentence. Any sentence which uses I-predicates alone (i.e. as non-logical terms) I shall call an I-sentence. Thus:

(s-1) The bank-teller certifies the withdrawal-slip,
(s-2) The man makes marks on the piece of paper.
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are respectively instances of an $S$- and an $I$-sentence. (Danto 1985:273).

you cannot translate an $S$-sentence into an $I$-sentence without presupposing another $S$-sentence. (Danto 1985: 274).

It may further be agreed that, in the categorical sense mentioned earlier, we understand actions, under certain descriptions of them, with reference to some rules, norms and conventions. (Danto 1985: 275).

(4) Of course, it should be noted here that structuralists are not that obstinate; Needham, in the same article after the passage I quoted above, in referring to the Chinese yin and yang symbolism and, to a lesser degree, the Indian Mitra and Varuna bipartition, says:

There will presumably be some significant similarities among the terms listed in one column, such that in certain contexts a relationship of homology of the type asc can indeed be demonstrated;... Moreover, there are in fact forms of symbolism in which it can be said that a series of homologous symbolic terms do share something of a common quality. (Needham 1973a: xxviii)

(5) To understand (roughly) the citation below, read (1) objects as nodes (or individuals), (2) category as system and (3) morphism as relation(s). The authors use the category theory but to understand the aim of the paper roughly, it might be convenient to read a category as just an ordinary algebraic system with relations.

(6) The main aim of this article is to get a proper $C$-sk from $C$, and the authors suggest as one method double mappings of morphisms and objects of $C$. This footnote is inserted only to avoid a possible misunderstanding of their aim in the article, which is out of my concern here.

(7) This relation is not given any name in the article but referred to as "the type $RR(-1)=1$" where $R(-1)$ is a converse of $R$ and $1$ is an identity relation (ibid 87).

(8) See, for example, the following passage from Fortes:

A lineage is a corporate group from the outside, that is in relation to other defined groups and associations. It might be described as a single legal personality -- "one person"... (Fortes 1953: 25).

In this culture, (if we trust Fortes's rendering of native explanation) "structural equivalence" is what is given.

(9) To use an example clear to the extent that it sounds absurd, I am not sure whether the authors want to explain the frequency of ritual exchange between two villagers (actor's meaningful descriptions) or the frequency of the physical approach between two villagers within 50 cm (some viewer's meaningful descriptions).
<10> The passage is not meant to be a criticism of Needham's analysis. His contention lies in other points as explicitly stated in the quoted passage: discrepancy between actual age and generation. Thus the negligence of the distinction I am arguing does not alter the whole analysis of his.

<11> Terminology after Morgan 1871.

<12> Here, I follow an anthropological/sociological convention rather than a mathematical convention, in which an identity relation means one by which an element is related to itself. The term, "equivalence relation," (a relation which is symmetric, reflexive and transitive) is, in mathematical terms, closer to what I have in mind.

<13> If we take Lorrain and White's argument as discussing native explanation, these formulae presuppose an opposite situation to what is described by Lorrain and White; whereas in my argument, the identity or equivalence relation is a presupposition, that is, an element of EG, in Lorrain and White, equivalence relation is what is to be explained, that is, ED. A corresponding formula of Lorrain and White to (1) in the main text would be such as:

\[(1') \text{ if } r(x, y) \& r(x, z) \text{ ... then } i(y, z)\]

<14> This is only a possible example. An explanatory statement might be that A is <older> than B because A's lineage is older than B, or that A is <older> than B because A's land of origin is older than B's.

<15> In the sense that "givers" are meaningful only when there are "takers."

<16> In other words, wife-givers stand on their own without their wife-takers.

<17> Ways to "freeze" the relationship varies from one culture to another: "legendarization" is only an example of various possibilities.

<18> The categories of wife-giver and wife-taker will function as relational categories also in the same culture.

<19> This is meant to be a typical example of attributive classification. See the quotation from Fortes in a previous footnote.
Notes To Chapter 2

<1> In this subsection, most crop names are followed by either J, N or A, each of which means Ja' o-nese, Nga'o-nese or 'Aku-nese respectively. If no specification is made, it implies that the name is common to the 3 languages.

<2> An informant, who is, incidentally, a northern Lionese, once told me that this crop (sorghum) had been their staple crop before the rice.

<3> A Nage Kéo man whom I happened to meet after the fieldwork confirmed this view; he said he had had no difficulty in understanding the Nga'o-nese spoken in Ende Kabupaten.

<4> One based on 1980 statistics. There are 7 kecamatan (districts) in Ende kabupaten (regency): (1) Nanga Panda, (2) Ende, (3) Ndona, (4) Wolowaru, (5) Maurole, (6) Detusoko and (7) Kopeta Ende (the town of Ende). The population of each kecamatan is as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Kecamatan</th>
<th>Population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nanga Panda</td>
<td>27,651</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ende</td>
<td>18,139</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ndona</td>
<td>22,036</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wolowaru</td>
<td>45,592</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maurole</td>
<td>23,967</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Detusoko</td>
<td>25,238</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kopeta Ende</td>
<td>52,392</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The estimation of the coastal Endenese population was made by adding the Islamic population of (1) Nanga Panda (14,274), (2) Ende (2,177) and (7) Kopeta Ende (26,546) (Total 42,997).

That of the Lionese population was calculated by adding the population of 4 kecamatan (3), (4), (5) and (6) (Total 116,833).

That of the Tana Dea population was calculated by adding population of 6 desa from (1) Nanga Panda, (2) Keri Rea 1,210, Tenda Rea 1,822, Tenda Mbepa 1,094, Kamu Bheka 969, Rebi Nangga 2,128 and Ondo Rea 1,768 (Total 8,991).

That of the mountain Endenese was calculated by adding population of 2 kecamatan (1)(27,651) and (2)(18,139) minus the Islamic population there (14,274, 2,177), minus the 6 desa of Tana Dea (8,991). (Total 20,348).

The non-Islamic population of (7) Kopeta Ende are regarded as non-natives.

<5> There might be as many Lionese in Kabupaten Sikka. Kecamatan Paga in Kabupaten Sika has a population of 34,246, most of which could be regarded as a Lionese population, and Kecamatan Nita has 28,377, half of which could be regarded as a Lionese population. Thus, the whole Lionese population, both in Kabupaten Ende and in Kabupaten Sikka, is, approximately, 165,000.
Notes

(6) See previous footnote. There must be much more in Kabupaten Ngada.

(7) Kaka Dupa is said to have been from Wio (Sumba), and his mother was Pesa Papu's sister.

(8) Some typewritten documents referred to in this section lack paging, in which case paging is mine. Apparent mistypings are corrected without marking them as sic. The spellings of "oe," "dj" and "tj" for native names are replaced with "u," "j" and "c" respectively.

(9) All through the dissertation, I will use the spelling "Ende" except for the registered name of the onderafdeeling and landschap, for which the old spelling "Endeh" will be used.

(10) Another version of the same story was recorded by van Suchtelen (1922).

(11) Near Larantuka (Lawayong?).


(13) In Houffaker's chronology, the two priests' deaths on Solor and Adonara (an island further east) are mentioned in the decade of the 1590's, probably caused by Muslim natives. The centre of the Solomese rebellion, a Muslim village Lamakera, was, however, destroyed by the Portuguese reinforcement which came from Malaka in 1599.

(14) At the beginning of the 17th century, there happened an interesting episode in the history of Flores, which tells us the relation between a Makasarese principedom and some native headmen on Flores. In 1602, a native headman, called Ama Kira (according to Houffaker; the original Portuguese rendering of the name is Amequira) raised the war, and Ama Kira asked for the help of a Makasarese prince, who sent a fleet under the command of a man called Dom Joao (apparently once a Christian). The fleet under Dom Joao attacked the fortress on Pulau Ende, and was defeated. Dom Joao, after the defeat, returned to Makassar, and the prince of Makassar sent rice to Solor and concluded a peace with the Portuguese (Houffaker 1922: 43-4) (van Suchtelen 1921:9) (Abdurachman 1982).

(15) Even 300 years later on, in 1905, when a posthouder summoned the head of Numba, name of Batambo, he replied that he had nothing to do with the Company, since he stood under the Portuguese government. (de Vries 1910: 38)

(16) A city on Timor, the present Capital of the province of east Nusa Tenggara.

(17) Descendants of Portuguese men and native women.

(18) A city on the eastern part of the Flores.

(19) As the fortress on Pulau Ende was recovered by the Christian
natives and Portuguese under a man called Dom Cosma in 1613. Van der Velden, who had been appointed as commander of Solor by Scotte, planned an attack on the fortress. This plan was, however, not carried out.

(20) The Portuguese in Larantuka, in 1616, managed to defeat the Dutch on Solor and regained the fortress, only to lose it again in two years. In 1618, the Dutch made an assault on Larantuka, and failed. In 1625 and 1629, the Portuguese attacked the fortress, and in the latter battle, the fortress became the possession of the Portuguese. But the Portuguese occupation of Solor did not last for ten years. In 1636, attacked by the Dutch, the Portuguese had to abandon the fortress again, and this time, forever.

(21) Even though the formal transference of Flores from the Portuguese to the Dutch took place as late as 1851 and 1859 (eastern Flores), the Portuguese began to lose their control over this part after 1657, when the Dutch East India Company established Fort Concordia in Kupang and the Dutch began to set a strong hold on the area.

(22) Baraai, a coastal Endeinese village about 6 km west of the city of Ende, recognized its subordination to the Company and received a "posthouder" in 1691. The posthouder, though, seems to have stayed there only for a short time (de Bruyne 1947: 57).

(23) In 1756, the rajadom of Ende is said to have exported its cinnamon to the Company. This fact suggests that even though there were many equally strong headmen in central Flores, Ende became conspicuous among them by this time.

(24) According to Bruyne (1947), on 14 May 1838, Ende was punished for its pirate activity by the two ships (de Bruyne 1947: 6).

(25) In 1839, the raja of Ende (Bousou) concluded a contract with the Dutch Colonial Government (van Dijk 1925) (van Suchtelen 1921: 11). In 1855, Ende received a Malay-speaking "posthouder" (van Suchtelen 21: 11). Incidentally, he was a Christian native from Kupang (de Vries 1910: 13) and could not speak Dutch (anonymous 1912). In 1861, the raja of Ende (Pande) concluded a long contract with the Dutch government (Winokan 1960) (van Dijk 1925), replacing the former contract of 1839 (van Suchtelen 1921: 11).

(26) For example, in 1874, the Endeinese went to Sumba to take part in a war (possibly to do with slave trade), but the posthouder could not do anything, even though the Government did not approve of the slave trade. Also, when a warfare broke out among the Endeinese kampongs in 1878, the "posthouder" just fled to the Pulau Ende (van Suchtelen 1921: 11). In 1879, the dwelling of the posthouder was attacked by a troop of villagers and one servant was killed (Anonymous 1912). Another "posthouder," in 1882, could not do anything either when another war broke out between Endeinese kampongs.

De Vries abstracted descriptions of this war of 1882 from the posthouder's journal, which dramatically illustrates the weak standing of the posthouder at Ende:
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Towards the end of 1882, when there broke out a war between the north and south villages of the capital Ende, the posthouder here stood powerless against the war.

One day, one of the heads of the parties came to the posthouder to ask for gun powder. As he refused to obey the request, he was told: "since mister will not give me any gun powder, it is better that he should disappear from Ende today."

On the following day, the posthouder relented and gave gun powder, that is, 6 packs and 80 carriages.

Several days after, armed mountain people came openly inside the fence of the posthouder's dwelling to take coconuts, and shouted to the helmsman of the boat lying in the roads. "These are not the coconuts of the Commandant (the title used here for posthouder); he did not plant them and nobody has ever asked him to stay here."

Several days later, when the posthouder tried to settle the dispute between the north and south villages, he was told: "Even if the Resident comes out of Kupang, he must first pay a visit to the villages before we visit him." Not long after that, the house of the posthouder was fired upon. (de Vries 1910: 22–3).

<27> Another version of this story is found in Roos 1860.

In still another version which I collected, the foreignness of the origin of the dynasty ("the stranger kings") is further emphasized by another transference of the power (from a native lord to his son-in-law, and then from the latter to his son-in-law).

<28> Hooyer 1914 lists a different version of genealogy.

<29> S. Dietrich has made extensive library research on this incident and other two incidents on Flores in the 19th century. For more detailed account of the event, refer to Dietrich 1983. Here I mainly follow the description of de Vries (1910: 25ff).

<30> On returning to Ende, Bara Nuri called for help and set himself up in a village, Manu Nggoo. The raja of Ende (Aru Busman) attacked the village, in vain.

On the 8th of January 1891, the warship Java appeared in Lpi bay of Ende. With this help and about 1,000 men gathered by the effort of the raja, the raja attacked the fortification of Bara Nuri, on the 10th of January, and failed again. In February, reinforcements came from Kupang: the cruiser van Speijck.

Seeing that Bara Nuri would not surrender despite the repeated attack of the raja and the Dutch force, the posthouder (Hozet) sent for a truce. After concluding the peace, Bara Nuri came out, only to be captured by the posthouder, an act of "treachery" (Dietrich 1983: 44) on the posthouder's side. Some of the headmen told de Vries later in 1910 that the posthouder had said to Bara Nuri that Bara
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Nuri should come to Ende so that people could choose him as Raja (de Vries 1910: 28).

<31> When another war broke out between the raja of Ende and some other villages (Nanga Baa and Watu Sipi) in 1904, the Government quickly sent a ship, H.M. Mataram, to help the raja.

<32> The general administrative situation at that time was as follows: the eastern part of Flores formed one afdeling (afdeeling Larantuka en onderhooirigheden) under a civil gezaghebber. The rest of Flores formed one onderafdeeling under a posthouder (of the afdeling Soemba en Onderhooirigheden) (Anonymous 1912: 126).

<33> On the 2nd of July 1907, the posthouder received news that some inhabitants of villages (Ndatu Ko (Ndetu Ko' u), Woro Are, One-Kore, Manu Nggo'o, Howo Heke, Woro Waku, Manu Haru, Ai Bo, Watu Hoga, Wora Wao, Keka Wi'i, Pu'u Parj, Kopo Nio, Nua Bosi, Woro Jaa, Woro Karo, Kori Bari, Woro Nagge, Ndungga, Tombe Koa, Babu, Mbomba Besar, Mau Bongga (Ma'u Rongga), Numba, Pengga Jawa and Nanga Panda (de Vries 1910: 48)) planned the abisdiction of the government and the destruction of the capital Ende.

On the 3rd of July, the posthouder summoned those suspected headmen to the town of Ende, but the headmen refused to obey the order (ibid 49).

On the 5th and 6th of the same month, the whole of the town of Ende was burned down and plundered by mountain villagers. The town inhabitants and the Chinese merchants fled to Pulau Ende. 50 people were reported to have died during the raid (ibid 49). This incident is still remembered by the people there as nggera Ende ("the destruction of Ende").

When the cargo service steamer Van Swoll came to Ende on the 9th of July, she found nothing but the ruins of Ende. With the news, she went to Sumba, from where the government steamer Pelikaan was sent, by the order of the Resident, with reinforcements. Van Swoll, with further reinforcements on board from Kupang, returned to Ende (ibid 42-3).

With these reinforcements, the Controleur began to attack the "rebels" on the 11th of July. Even though the counter-attack did not turn out very successfuly, the appearance of the Government's artillery and man-power induced many headmen to submit themselves to the government (ibid 49-50).

<34> The fact that the dwelling of the raja remained unharmed may have been one of the causes of suspicion; also there had been tension between the Colonial government and the raja -- the taxing of the Chinese merchants by the raja in 1906 had not been approved by the Resident.

<35> On 10 August, military police (The 3rd constabulary (marechaussee) company of the 4th battalion) arrived from Kupang under H. Christoffel. The whole company departed Ende on 12 August to Nua Bosi (a mountain village north of the town of Ende) and from 12
to 28 of August, the area between Ndona and Nanga Panda was repeatedly patrolled; after that the company left for the area known as Rokka (Ngada), which had been notorious for its continuous opposition to the Dutch Government. Rokka had once been attacked in 1890. This time, the operation was conclusive (a detailed account of this operation can be found in Winokan 1960: 11-3). And after this, the Controleur (Couvrleur) could set foot in the land of Ngada.

<36> In September and October, the civil officer went to several villages to pacify them. During his absence, on the 21st of October, Napo Oja and Mari Longga attacked the town of Ende (H. Christoffel was still either in the Ngada or in the Manggarai area). The name of Mari Longga is still familiar to people. This raid was, however, defeated by the force which remained in town.

<37> De Vries reported the number of the killed people on the side of "enemies" in the operation as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1907</td>
<td>224</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1908</td>
<td>146</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1909</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>413</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

and the number of confiscated rifles as 5385. (de Vries 1910: 74-5)

<38> Haja Pua Noté was exiled first to Alor and then to Kupang. The raja Harum, who succeeded Pua Noté, was also, a couple of months later, exiled to Alor, from where he departed to Mekka, where he died. His younger brother Pua Meno succeeded to the throne in 1909.

<39> In 1909, the same year when raja Pua Meno was assigned as raja of Ende, Kaka Dupa and Mbaki Mbani were chosen as raja of Tanah Rea and Ndona, respectively. In 1910 (April) as a preliminary step towards the total political/administrative integration of Flores, 63 petty kingdoms ('miniatuurrijkes') were brought into the following 10 landschaps: Tanah Rea, Ende, Ndona, Wolodjita, Nggela, Mboeli, Ndori, Lise, Poe and Sooi - Moke Asa - Wolo Gai - Wena Ria (de Bruyne 1947: 11).

In 1915, Lise, Mbuli, Nggela, Wolo Jita and Ndori were combined to form one landschap Tanah Kunu Lima and Rasi Wangge was chosen as raja of Tanah Kunu Lima. Mbaki Mbani was chosen raja of Ndona, consisting of the former landschap Ndona, Poe and Sooi-Moke Asa-Wolo Gai-Wena Ria.

<40> The Controleur J.F. Sprock described this rebellion in his Memorie van Overgave (1927), the dramatized Indonesian rendering of which can be found in Doko 1973.

<41> In the landschap Lio, there was a gemeente-system, which was said to be almost in accordance with the traditional genealogically based system. (de Bruyne 1947: 12).

<42> Even though I will use "I" for the ethnographer throughout the thesis except this section, I owe to her much of the information cited.
(1) These kinds of adjectives I will use rather freely throughout this dissertation. Their meanings are, in this case, "in terms of ethno-jurisprudence," "in terms of ethno-politics" and "in terms of ethno-economics," respectively. I believe that those Western origin words for defining language games are, maybe not universal but at least in Knde, relevant.

(2) There are two aspects of the word 'ari ka'e. One meaning is what I describe in this chapter, that is, what can be translated as "same sex siblings." Another meaning is more hierarchical; the term in this latter connotation could be translated as "younger and elder(same sex) siblings." If a person says, "he is my 'ari ka'e," then what he implies is "we belong together"; whereas if a person says, "he is my 'ari (or ka'e)," then what he implies is "he is my junior (or senior)."

(3) As in the case of Tallensi (see a footnote in the introductory chapter), the structural equivalence is what is given.

(4) Fuller and more detailed accounts of the Kndenese categories such as "inheritance" or "sharing" will be found in the chapter which deals with the Kndenese ethno-economics.

(5) This story was told by a third person (a friend of one of the two persons mentioned in the story).

(6) Tu'a is a multivocal word. It is a kinship term referring to certain categories of kin (the analysis of the word in this meaning will be done in this and the following chapters). It also refers to a woman recruited to a group, as in this case, through the marriage of mbaru nduu // wesa senda.

(7) Every marriage type has an alternative name, taken from the stanza (mata mbuku) describing the procedure of the marriage.

(8) It seems that there are two kinds of generalizations concerning marriage types. Some people maintain that there are five types of marriage and that "taking away" is not practiced any longer, as I described in the main text. Others say, not explicitly though, that the names "running and following" and "taking away" actually refer to the same type of marriage, as described from the bride's side and as described from the groom's side respectively.

(9) In village Keka Dori, the rate of each marriage type is shown in the table below:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>type of marriage</th>
<th>number(%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>'Ana 'Arhe</td>
<td>11 (24.4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'Ana Dhei Dhato</td>
<td>18 (40.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'Ana Paru Dhekhe</td>
<td>7 (15.5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'Ana Mburhu Nduu // Wesa Senda</td>
<td>7 (15.5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'Ana Poi</td>
<td>2 (4.4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>45</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

However, this information is not definitive; as I will discuss in a later chapter, the description can vary from one person to another (and sometimes from time to time). A man might describe his own marriage as that of 'Ana 'Arhe, the other might call the same marriage 'Ana Dhei Dhato.
Notes To Chapter 4

(1) The, so to speak, genuine Enderenese word  mame  is different from the other two in that the  kaka  and  'eda  mean not only MB but also the ZC in their original languages.

(2) For example, the term kajo does refer to both ascending (PP) and descending generations (CC); but it is perfectly self-reciprocal.

(3) Such as omission of cross generational equation (deviation from A1) or assimilation of possible categories of persons who are two or more generations up from EGO (deviation from A2).

   The standard on which is based a decision whether the irregularities are "ordinary" or not is conventional.

(4) Outside the kindship sphere, these terms have other meanings. Hai and aki also mean "female" and "male" respectively and "to marry" (the former for ms and the latter for ws). Because, as a verb, the words can mean "to copulate" or "to have an intercourse," people sometimes specify the meaning of "marriage" by attaching a word "ana" ("child"), thus hai 'ana or aki 'ana, even when the couple referred to have not had children.

(5) This holds true in all places I visited, including the area near the city of Ende, where Kennedy acquired contradicting data (that is, MBD as hai).

(6) There is a difference of degrees of avoidance among those types according to the types of  eja  included. See the next chapter.

(7) She is more or less non-kin.

(8) For ethnographical information: it may be interesting that in some areas in the central part of Flores,  eja  is used between women (by the Ja'o-nese speaking population of northern coast). This kind of slight semantic shift (which might render the whole system entirely different) occurs quite frequently when one goes from one place to another in the central part of Flores. To name another example,  mame  ("mother's brother") means "mother's brother's wife" in the Nga'onese region.

(9) Thus, in their usage as a vocative,  eja  and  ipa  are the only terms which are not laden with any hierarchical connotation. One cannot tell whether the addressee is younger or older than the addressee (which  ari  or  ka'e  explicitly reveals), nor can one tell whether the addressee belongs to a (superior) wife-giving group or an (inferior) wife-taking group to the addressee (which the other terms for affines reveal). One of the terms is, thus, the most convenient addressing term for a stranger about whose age one is unsure.

(10) In our temporary convention, siblengship is defined on its own, that is, without tracing the connecting point, that is, a common parent.
Nga'one live adjacent to the Endenese (to the west). Among them, I have lived for a short time, and thus know something. Though I have had some experience with Lionese (the eastern neighbour of the Endenese), Lionese do not pay as much attention to the kinship terminological system (they usually use only personal names), so I omitted the Lionese system from the consideration. Between Manggarai and Nga'o/Ende, there live several peoples, among others, Ngadanese. The available data seem to suggest that the Ngadanese kinship system does not have the principles of agnation nor a matrilateral complex. Thus I also dropped the Ngadanese from the comparative scheme here.

This is rather unsystematic classification, but this is more conventional in the light of empirical data, at least, in the three societies under study.

Sisters of C', which might be called c', are not significant in either of the 3 systems.

Wives of C (one's wife-taker's male members) are, in all 3 societies, counted as b, one's "sisters," (definitely so in both Ende and Nga'o, and I assume so in Manggarai), and thus cause no problems, at least in analyzing these three societies.

Nggale is a multivocal word. Nggale, usually coupled with dewa, refers to a being which people usually render in Indonesian as tuhan (God). 'Ata nggale is an honorific title for such persons as the raja of Ende. The same expression, 'ata nggale, can be used to refer to a free person, as opposed to a slave, 'ata o'o. 'Ata nggale mere means "an adult person," as opposed to 'ana dhiki, "a child." Nggale also means "an owner"; for example, nggale raha means "the owner of the dog," nggale nlo, "the owner of the palm trees."

The first-born is called kae pu'u ("elder sibling," "origin, trunk"). The last-born is sepu susu ("end, tip," "milk").

'Ana ndoa means not a "real child" but a "twin."

Wuru means, in everyday context, "to leak" or "to ooze."

Kandung is used for distinguishing "real" (narrowly defined) kin from "classificatory" kin. For example, saudara (se) kandung means "saudara (siblings) from one mother and one father."

The only explanation I got is that no'o simbi does not refer to the actual PZ.

For example, mame sibi means "classificatory mother's brother," classificatory in the sense that the mame thus conceived is not related to Ego matrilineally, such mame as MPBS.

This (miss)identification in the terminological system may have occurred from some historical accidents or perhaps as Needham suggests, from logico-historical transition from some form of kinship system to another form. These considerations are outside my concern here. What is important in this treatise is what the Endenese explain.
Notes To Chapter 5

(1) Radcliffe-Brown writes as follows:

The general rule is that the inclusion of two relatives in the same terminological category implies that there is some significant similarity in the customary behaviour due to both of them, or in the social relation in which one stands to each of them, while inversely the placing of two relatives in different categories implies some significant difference in customary behaviour or social relations. Some anthropologists make a great point of real or supposed exceptions to this rule, but they seem to forget that there can only be an exception when there is a general rule to which it is an exception. (Radcliffe-Brown 1950: 9)

(2) Those words are called ngę'u or mbe'u. For example, if the prohibited name is "lso," then ngę'u are such as lso, asa, esa etc. Ngę'u is regarded as kidding or sometimes as an abuse.

(3) Since I have never heard joking practiced between two women, I have eliminated the type f/f from the consideration here.

(4) Let double arrows (<< or >>) indicate age difference (A >> B and B <<< A equally mean that "A is older than B").

(5) If norms were oriented, the difference would become pertinent (FeBS -> FyBS would be different from FyBS -> FeBS). In Ende, norms are (at least, within the relations of the marked 'ari ka'e) self-reciprocal.

(6) In the realm of opposite sex siblings (that is, a brother and sister, nara wela) age difference is not pertinent either in the terminology or in ideology.
Notes To Chapter 6

(1) A recitation of genealogy consists in starting from Ego's name and then proceeding to ascendants. An Endenense name consists of two separate parts: one's personal name followed by the father's name. Thus, a genealogy might sound as: Jou Kea, Kea Tuja, Tuja Nhera, that is, "Jou son of Kea, Kea son of Tuja, Tuja son of Nhera"

(2) For example, the village Tonda was founded by Nggungga 'Uwa, Kea Dori by Ngoi Rajo, Raja Wawo by Tika See, Ndeko Tere by Mosa Nia.

(3) Since the ancestors referred to, in this case A, are always known and are traceable genealogically from any member of that waja, a waja may well be rendered as a "lineage."

(4) See below under the ritual principle.

(5) It is true, WZH-WZH relation is also called 'ari ka're, but this relationship corresponds only with terminology. No ideological backings, such as maj bou ("sharing the origin") etc., are attached to this relationship. It is not until the generation of their sons -- MZS-MZS -- that terminology and ideology are co-ordinate: in other words, only then, can an Endenense explain why the two persons are called 'ari ka're.

(6) See Kunstadter et al 1963.

(7) A relational category can turn into an attributive category as in the second hypothetical case.

(8) See Chapter 7 for the more refinement of the hierarchical case.

(9) "Fictive" in terms of the Endenense conception. Some genealogical relations look "fictive" to an outside observer such as an anthropologist. For example, most genealogies have some mythical figures contained in them, to imply that those people with the genealogies are patrilineally related. This assertion looks "fictive." But, I do not mean "fictive" in that sense. Those relations are claimed to be true by the Endenense. By "fictive genealogical relations" I mean those relations couched in kinship terms which, the Endenense say, are not genealogical.

(10) But because of the similarity between these institutions (in the sense that a non-agnate is recruited into a kinship group), they are mixed, more or less on purpose, especially by the sons of an adopter who were born after the adoption was made. This kind of claim, however, may probably, if made publicly, be rejected by the majority of the society.

(11) There is one BS adoption recorded. I first heard about the brother's son adoption (the only agnatic adoption I recorded) of a distant village (it took place in a village Mbegho, and I lived in a village called Keka Dori). When I got an occasion to visit the village, the villagers described the assumed adoption as:
As one person died without a male descendant, his property passed into the hands of his brother's (second eldest) son.

It seems that this was not an adoption but merely an inheritance of property from one's father's brother.

(12) It may be worth noting here that the fact that the Endenese adoptions are made such that one's sister's son becomes one's own son and that there is no mention of such a rule might be significant in a comparative perspective. In Lio regions, people say that one should adopt one's sister's son (and, simultaneously, sister's daughter) while in Nga'o regions, people say one should adopt one's brother's son and that it is not good to adopt one's sister's son because he is "of different blood."

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lio theory</th>
<th>Ende any</th>
<th>Nga'o practice</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ZS</td>
<td></td>
<td>BS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ZS</td>
<td></td>
<td>BS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(13) Theoretically at least, wife-givers may not settle in their wife-takers' village because they will not be given a parcel of land to cultivate from their wife-takers, since land is a thing which should flow from wife-givers to wife-takers. However, it does happen that strangers who have lived in a village give their women to the original inhabitants, which results in a situation where new comers are wife-givers to the original inhabitants.

(14) The structure of Tana Rhorho, as it is conceptualized as consisting of villages is loose compared with, for example, Tana Déa, where every village is assigned a certain function and special name such as 'head of the domain' and 'guardian of the domain.'

(15) Patrilocality warrants the reproduction of the group.

(16) No logical connection was made by the teller of the story; the dog may have been brought there by Ndora, or something like that would be the cause of Jaa's anger.

(17) When used separately, porho or 'ala porho means "witch" and o'o or 'ala o'o means "slave"; sometimes they are coupled to form such as shown in the story. The meaning of coupling the words is not completely clear.

(18) Incidentally, waja Seé is also a refugee group from the north coast to a village (Mbeaho, Keka Dhere) of Tana Rhorho. People of waja Seé are sometimes claimed to have been employed (songga) warriors.

(19) This ritual oath of detachment from one's village is called meso mdeko // wuru pere "to drop away from the village yard and to shut the door to the village." The swearing is made facing the tubu musu ("village altar"),

kami 'iwa ka nuka sua We are not going to go up into the village again,
kami 'iwa ka tama
mangga
kai nuka nua
tama mangga
kojo koe rhia
mbenge tembu rhewu

We are not going to enter the hamlet again.
If ever we go up into the village,
If ever we enter the hamlet,
(them) let crabs dig holes,
(and) mushrooms grow under our floors.

<20> In the context of mutual help in agriculture, songga is an act of gathering people (mainly villagers).

<21> The Emdenese language has two major categories of food: (1) what might be called "staples" (kaa) and (2) "vegetables" ('ula) (including meat). The words for the process of cooking and eating are differentiated according to which category of food is being processed, thus (1) pedhe - kaa for the category kaa and (2) nasu - pesa for the category 'ula.

<22> The two eating ceremonies ("the ritual eating" and "the communal eating") should be clearly distinguished. The former is ritually significant in that the procedure is full of prohibitions. The transgression of these prohibitions is said to cause fatal results to the people concerned; the range of "the people concerned" varying from only the eaters to all the villagers (according to villages). The latter ("communal eating") has no such prohibitions.

<23> It seems that the Tana Nhorrho people hardly pay any attention to the other rituals outside Tana Nhorrho, whereas the situation is quite different from that in Lionese regions where people are acutely aware of the differences (mostly trivial) in the ways of the rituals between their neighbouring domains.

<24> The reason of their precedence might be, an informant once told me, that the two villages perform the rituals of maize at the same time as the rituals of yam.

<25> Nothing special is, contrary to the assumption this phraseology might suggest, performed either visually or symbolically (no special utensils are commonly used, for example).

<26> The order is as follows:


<27> This and the following statements were given in reply to the anthropologist's question, and not promptly. In other words, no explanatory statements as to why the order of yam ritual among the villages came to be created are included in a set of a fixed narrative or "history" of Tana Rhorrho. In this connection, it should be noted, too, that there are few histories which tell about the origin of rituals.

<28> One night for ritual and the rest for the taboo (pirc).
Notes To Chapter 7

<1> The botanic metaphor employed in the expression pu'u kamu "the trunk and root" for wife-giver is recognizable as well in an expression rhombo "young shoot" for wife-taker.

<2> The Lionese expression also conforms to this pattern: jie jame (Lionese) "mother and father."

<3> The last two lines describe the position of the dead at a funeral.

<4> The mechanism of defining the head taker involves the principle of prestation.

<5> See below in this chapter.

<6> Van Suchtelen defines the expression papa pawe as "concluding peace (truce)" (vrede sluiten) (1921: 228).

<7> Forth makes a remark upon the word papa in Sumbanese:

Papa refers to one member of a pair. The two entities, which may be concrete or abstract, can be similar or opposed; and in the latter case their relation may be one of contradiction or complementarity.... Papa can thus mean both 'partner, counterpart' and 'competitor, enemy.' (Forth 1981: 59).

And also, in the concluding chapter, referring to the dual classification, he writes:

we might further recall the term papa ('complement,' 'partner, counterpart,' 'competitor, enemy,' etc.), a word that is applied to a host of binary relations which, though logically diverse, all share in common the features of duality and asymmetry. (Forth 1981: 416).

<8> That sorghum functions as a boundary maker is discernible as well in an agricultural activity whereby a planter sprinkles sorghum alongside the boundary of his field. Chalk, 'oka, is loaded with the similar symbolic implication as well.

<9> A crab (kojo)'s digging hole and mushroom's (mbenge) growing under the floor are regarded inauspicious. In the text, the two lines allude to an abandoned house, symbolically representing a family whose members have been extinct.

<10> People do not consciously claim that, in most accounts, wife-giver is always a giver; for example, when I asked the informant, on hearing the account in the main text, what would happen if the wife-giver is affronted, he was disconcerted and pondered and asked for help from a man who happened to be present there; they said that there must be some institutions for that kind of situation,
but that they were not well-versed in tradition and did not know.

<11> There was no mention of what was given on this particular occasion.

<12> I suppose it is better to count the non-kin relationship as one kind of relationship rather than to count this as outside the relationship.

<13> As I noted earlier, the marriage with a new partner requires a larger amount of bridewealth than the one with the old wife-givers.

<14> A piece of information from Kennedy's fieldnote is relevant here. To explain a word papalela (which Kennedy thought as an Endenese word but is actually an eastern Indonesian word), Kennedy first gives as a gloss "outsiders," and then further elucidates the meaning by rendering it as "people who have no land, incomers who buy and sell" (Italics added) (Kennedy 1955: 130).

<15> Concerning the last point, it is quite suggestive that both the Endenese (mbeta) and the Lionese words (geti) for 'selling' may also mean 'severed' or 'cut' ('terlepas' in Indonesian).

<16> The figure certainly reminds one of the figure by Sahlins (1974(1965): 199) where he shows the co-relation between mode of exchange (termed "reciprocity") and kinship residential sectors. There are two important differences worth emphasizing between this and his figures. Firstly, his model is totally his explanatory model, of which the people under study may or may not be conscious; whereas, on the contrary, the model represented here is an Endenese ethno-economic model.

Secondly, his explanatory model is, as an explanatory model should be, uni-directional causal model (put crudely, the kind of kinship residential sector "causes" the kind of reciprocity), whereas the Endenese model is, despite its dogmatic uni-directionality, just as it should be like in Sahlins model, double directional in its actual application. As to the second point, it will be fair to point out that Sahlins does recognize this double directionality of the model; he writes, for example, "If friends make gifts, gifts make friends" (ibid 186). The double directionality was only claimed in the theoretical part of this treatise and was never touched upon in the main body of the argument, so that, for example, Firth, unfaithfully to Sahlins' claimed theory as well as faithfully to his treatment of materials, summarizes Sahlins's article as:

Sahlins points out that the connection between material effort and social relation may constrain a given movement of goods, but a specific transaction suggests a particular social relation. (Firth 1967: 3, Italics added)

However the double directionality can only be explained, as in my model, when we base our explanatory model on the people's explanatory model.

<17> Referring to a marriage transaction as "wife-givers' selling a
woman" does insult the bride.
Notes To Chapter 8

<1> The resulting situation is virtually the same as that of tembo rhoo: a man (ex-husband) pays a bridewealth (of the wife) for another (new-husband).

<2> This institution seems similar to Lovedu's "cattle linked siblingship" (Krige 1939), although there are some significant differences between those two institutions. Firstly, unlike cattle in Lovedu, bridewealth in Ende can be freely exchanged with anything. And secondly, in connection with the first point, whereas in Lovedu, siblingship creates the cattle link, it is the bridewealth transaction, in Ende, which creates a special kind of siblingship.

<3> see Needham 1976.

<4> See the exchange rate described above in this chapter.

<5> Note that this payment is meant to be for the wife's father's sister and not to wife's father's sister's husband. The emphasis is always on the (bridewealth- linked) brother and sister and not brother and his sister's husband, even though the actual origin of the bridewealth is the latter (sister's husband).
Notes To Chapter 9

<1> In Endenese, rituals are called nggua, including both agricultural rituals and rites de passage; there is no lexicographical distinction between the two. Yet, the Endenese contextually distinguish the two by specifically referring to the former as nggua tana watu ("rituals of the earth and stone"). Also, from the anthropologist's view point, there is clearly a distinction between the two in that, in the latter (that is, rites de passage) kinship relationship always comes to the fore (one cannot perform any rite de passage without inviting one's wife-givers) whereas in agricultural rituals kinship relation is usually ignored.

<2> Papa means "each other" and sia means "bright"; the meaning may be that the new couple "together" wait for the "bright" morning.

<3> This asking procedure is called:

'ono muku asking for a banana,
rina tewu requesting a sugar cane,
'ono rhawo asking for a female sarong,
rina rhambu requesting a jacket.

These two kinds of metaphors (botanic and clothing) are constantly used throughout the scenarios and the accompanying text.

This constant use of the two kinds of metaphors gives to both the cultural scenarios and the accompanying texts (mata mbuku) a touch of consistency.

<4> The couplet might be called (through the concept of agriculture) a botanic metaphor.

Other names for the messengers are:

'ana kuni children for ordering,
'embu dudu grand children for commanding,
roka mosa for the lord to push away,
turha rhaki for the master to send away.

<5> This expression is in accordance with the metaphorical expression for the girl as a piece of female "sarong" (rhawo).

<6> Such as:

tutu seru suffering from the (wife giver's)
shouting
wangga ngasi carrying their anger (to the
wife-taker)

<7> Thus,
kema meta
ghawo aso
'uma pepu mbaru
moke mata hatu
their work remains unfinished,
their task remains incomplete,
their fields get damaged and rotten,
their palm trees become dead and black.

<8> Short for tēo muku // tanda tewu, "to hang a token on the banana tree and to attach a sign on the sugarcane."

<9> Short for so'i ru'ul // wenda tanda, "to bring the sign of prohibition down and to detach the token." The sign of prohibition ru'u are usually attached to either perennial (such as palm-tree) or annuals (maize).

<10> Nowadays, a secretary is assigned to record all the contributions.

<11> They come with a pig or two (wawi), a sack-full of rice (care guni), pieces of sarong (rhuka rhowo) and bananas (muku).

<12> Those women sit still inside the house, the elephant tusks on the legs. They will be paid their due portion afterwards. Among them, the most important figure is the bride's mother's brother's wife.

<13> Before starting mbabho, the wife-takers offer to the wife-givers the following:

(1) bhangga 'api ("to keep the fire") two pairs of gold items for the "hot hearth" and one pair for the "cold hearth"
(2) piu pare ("(for those who) arrange rice") two pairs of gold items
(3) piu tua ("(for those who) arrange palm gin") two pairs of gold items
(4) regu nio ("(for those who) grate coconuts") two pairs of gold items

<14> Pe sia is also called
wudu pe nduu to stitch to be connected
sati pe dhawi to sew to be related

Here again is found another metaphor for clothing.

<15> There is one more stage of the marriage ceremony. I put this information in a footnote because this part concerns only the individuals and not the groups.

From the next morning of the pe sia up to the fourth day, the husband goes from village to village. Whoever receives him must give him something; such as eggs, chickens, money, tobacco or golden items. The wife stays in her house. Neither of the newly married couple as well as two accompanying children are allowed to take a bath. This four day performance is called nėdha.
After ndedha, in the evening of the fourth day, the couple with the children take baths in a yard following a prescribed procedure, and are now allowed to live together in the husband's village.

<16> There is only one scenario available to the Endenese, except the newly-introduced Muslim scenario, which is not of significance in the mountain. There are no special categories of death (such as "bad death").

<17> Nangi is differentiated from ordinary crying or weeping (rila). It has a melody, though a little monotonous, and the lamenter tells a story over the deceased. When a good lamenter is doing nangi, others refrain from their nangi.

Laments occur sporadically throughout the ceremony until the burial takes place. Once the corpse is buried, lamenting is strictly forbidden.

<18> I have never heard of any Endenese being afraid of the deceased; what people are most afraid of is witches' wandering in search of the flesh of the newly dead during the several days after the death.

The set of scenes revolving around death is a crossing point between the narrative of the funeral (culturally 'proper' sequence of events) and that of witchcraft (culturally 'improper' sequence). The narrative of witchcraft, which relates, for example, how witches assemble among themselves to eat the corpse of the newly dead, is in a sense an inverted version of the funeral.

<19> The third item (mbegha) is needed only when one of a married couple dies while the other is already dead.

<20> Such as

1) pusi moki to fill the mouth
2) rhani urhu // a pillow at the head and sipo kemo a bolster at the side
3) mbuku rhambu a mbuku for a jacket
4) pere werhe to crunch and swallow and to send //ngatu a lunch narhu

<21> According to one informant, 'ae rio was introduced recently, probably two generations ago.

<22> The last name alludes to a custom by which each of the wife-givers put a twig on the hole of the tomb in which the corpse is lying; each of those wife-givers is given a certain amount of money, and then removes the twig away so that the hole can be filled and the burial can be finished.

<23> Those additional mbuku are called:

1) ora onda // the waist is bent mbuku nirhu and the knees are sour
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2) wesa mbaru // the path has been closed
   ratha kapa and the road has been covered thickly
3) roo ’iwa sodho // (you) did not tell us about the sickness
   baja ’iwa nosi and did not let us know about the disease
4) buu ’iwa se puju // you did not let us look after the ill
   wija ’iwa se bita and did not let us give him medicine

<24> One old man remembers that in his youth, arboreal burials used
   to be held at a banyan tree.

He cannot remember the name of rheda (mentioned in van Suchtelen
1921: 101) (the 'Aku-nese form of which, leda, is still retained by
the Lionese, although the Lionese do not perform this type of burial,
either). The same informant says a second burial used to be held
after an arboreal burial. He did not offer other information about
the arboreal burial.

There seems to be only one vague rule concerning the choice of
the site of a tomb (rate): an influential man, such as a speaker of
customary adat, should be buried within the village yard (wewa) while
ordinary persons will be buried outside the village.

<25> It is placed there with legs towards the door. When carried to
   the site, the corpse must be turned around so that legs go out
   first.

<26> The corpse goes round the site four times in the clockwise
direction. The body is placed with head in the upward direction and
the legs in the downward direction. With the corpse, are buried such
valuables as gold items, and sometimes, some amount of cash. On the
tomb are placed broken dishes and a broken earthen pot. The
deceased's personal belongings (such as clothes) should never be
owned by other persons.

<27> Going to bathe can be held on the second night for the purpose
   of simplification, but not on any other night.

<28> The ritual is called by a couple of names. It is sometimes
called mbana rio, "going to bathe" or wa’u rio, "finishing a bath" or
semu turu (or huu), "washing the head (or hair)." For the
convenience's sake, the first name (mbana rio) shall be employed
through this section.

<29> The co-residence defines the range of the bereaved.

<30> On the spot, they put a comb and a kind of plant (purhu) by the
   river and breaks a coconut. Then they put the coconut at a foot of a
   big tree. They sprinkle water on each other's head and body. After
   that they start back to the village. On their way back, it is
   forbidden for them to look back.

<31> The curer puts down rattan and a leaf of korhë at the entrance
   of the village. Those who have been to "bathe" step over the rattan
   and the leaf. When they enter the village, the curer smears them with
   magical rice grains (bhongi) and then throws the grains backward in
   the direction they came.
<32> The curer pours a mixture of pig's blood, coconut palm oil and water into a shell of a coconut. Then the curer takes a little of the mixture out of the coconut shell, and put it on the feet of everyone present. Then the curer dips leaves of kela and banyan in the mixture and takes out the leaves and smears the floor with the bunch of leaves.

<33> The bereaved prepare a coconut, an egg, cooked rice and meat on a tray (kadho rhoka) and bring the tray to the tomb. The curer smears the people who brought the tray with magical rice grains and they come back to the house without looking back. On the spot, being left alone, the curer sprinkles the magical rice grains, ordinary rice grains, maize, and sorghum over the tomb and he goes back to the house.

<34> On a tray are prepared pork meat, a boiled egg and cooked rice. The egg is cut into two. A small portion of each kind of food is taken and put on the feet of the each participant by the curer. Then the curer feeds the cooked rice and the egg to the participants. The participants are not allowed to use their own hands.
Notes To Chapter 10

<1> Because of his marriage with a Muslim woman.

<2> Gebo, of Buja’s group (to which group we will soon turn), is included as well into waja Bhisa’s ritual group. There are, however, only two households, Sapo’s and Gebo’s, which hold rituals at present day.

<3> Waro of Keke Dori.

<4> At this stage, Juma and Rhigi might have stood in the relation of mere ‘ari ka’e or Rhigi might have become already a lembo rhoo of Juma.

<5> Buja, a member of waja Juma’s client group, gave me a version of waja Juma’s genealogy which ends in ancient Kepi villagers.

<6> Even though Pemo and Keke Dori are close to each other, Pambo’s group and its agnates in Pemo do not have close social contact with each other.

<7> This statement was made by ‘Epu, a member of waja Bhisa and not, as might be expected from the statement, by any member of Ba’e’s group.

<8> It is said that he shifted the residence because of repeated illness that fell on his children. This episode implies witchcraft among the agnates.

<9> Until I pointed out the genealogical distance, neither of them recognized it.

<10> The reason why ‘Ima was chosen as a would-be husband for ‘Eto’s daughter is simply that he is the only Muslim among the brothers (sons of Mele, who is also Muslim).

This arrangement for the marriage came to fore when a girl went into ‘Ima’s house to marry (marriage of “running and following,” paru dheko). There was a considerable turmoil in the village.

<11> The marriage of Gati referred to here may be his first marriage whereby Gati begot Ri’a. His second marriage was with Rhii, a wife of Pendi. In both cases, it seems that Gati did not pay his own bridewealth.

<12> This information was provided by Buja, Banda’s elder brother. Other parts of the story was given by ‘Epu.

<13> Both live in the coastal village Numba-Basa.

<14> Later, when a conflict arose between Kaju and other members of waja Juma, Kaju declared that he was no longer a member of waja Juma.
but a member of waja See.

<15> I have not heard of an episode of how Gebo and waja Bhisa came to share the ritual, nor have I heard of any fixed narrative of sharing a ritual.

<16> I was present at the negotiation between Noi and Setu; the reason for this decision was not revealed as an episode; Noi was just hostile to Setu throughout the session.

<17> One villager said that it was quite likely that, now that Setu had been dismissed, Noi's eldest son, Pambo, would inherit those palm trees.

<18> This shift took place between my 1st and 2nd field work.

<19> This was done presumably because Toni's marriage with Kajo—a woman of waja See to which group Do'a stands as a wife-taker. Thus, Toni and Do'a has the same wife-giving group, hence they are "siblings."

<20> The assignment of the term 'eja to 'Epu by Do'a may have been done with some political intention he had at the time of this interview. Do'a usually calls 'Epu Ka'ë (because of his father's (Dawi) relation with 'Epu's mother (Susu)) and only Mbaha as 'eja because both Mbaha's mother and wife come from waja Juma.
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