TANEBAR-EVAV AND EMA: VARIATION WITHIN THE EASTERN INDONESIAN FIELD OF STUDY

The southeast Indonesian field of comparative study marked out by van Wouden in his *Types of Social Structure in Eastern Indonesia* (1968) has benefited from a series of modern ethnographic accounts that have deepened and enriched our understanding of van Wouden's themes (see Fox 1980a). Among recent monographs are two that because they have been published in French have received less attention in Britain than they might otherwise have attracted. The first of these launched Louis Dumont's *Atelier d'anthropologie sociale*, published jointly by Maison des Sciences de l'Homme and Cambridge University Press. It is a study by Cécile Barraud (1979) of the single village located on a small island of the Kei Archipelago. The second book is devoted to the Ema (or Kemak) of central Timor (Renard-Clamagirand 1982) and results from research undertaken as part of a team that worked in several regions of what was then Portuguese Timor in the 1960s. Other studies produced by this group are devoted to the Bunaq (Berthe 1972; Friedberg 1978) and the Fataluku (Campagnolo 1979).

In the Moluccas, where the Kei Archipelago is situated, and on and near Timor, Austronesian speech communities collide with cultures using non-Austronesian languages related to those spoken in Irian Jaya (Stokhof 1977: 2). Linguistic and cultural boundaries do not strictly coincide. As Barraud remarks (1979: 247), Tanebar-Evav is situated in a region where social structures seem to mingle. On Timor there are peoples speaking non-Austronesian languages, such as the Makassae, whose social structures display features of asymmetric marriage alliance central to van Wouden's

---

[*Editors' note:* Another article by Dr Barnes, on 'The Leiden Version of the Comparative Method in Southeast Asia', appeared in the previous issue of *JASO* (Vol. XVI, no.2, pp. 87-110).]

model and other non-Austronesian peoples like the Bunaq where non-unilineal descent groups are linked by asymmetric marriage alliances maintained by a form of marriage that nevertheless is rarely practised. The Bunaq could almost be said to have simultaneously two social structures, only one of which corresponds to van Wouden's model (Berthe 1961; for a summary see Barnes 1980: 101-4). These variant forms therefore take on special interest when compared with neighbouring societies that are closer to expectations about alliance systems. Both Tanebar-Evav and the Ema speak Austronesian languages. The Ema have what might appear to be an almost crystalline form of asymmetric marriage alliance. Tanebar-Evav has a complex social organisation in which both asymmetric and symmetric alliances are recognized options, but today decreasingly important ones.

Tanebar-Evav is a small village of around six hundred persons that alone occupies a tiny island of the same name at the extreme southwest of the Kei Archipelago. Evav is the local name for Kei, Kei being the name imposed by outsiders. Being closest to Tanimbar, the island is called Tanebar-Evav in distinction to Tanebar-Mav, which is the Tanimbar Archipelago. The same language is spoken throughout the Kei grouping, but Tanebar-Evav maintains traditional cultural forms more tenaciously than other communities.

Barraud begins her work with a discussion of social space: 'The mystery of the composition of a space is fascinating to explore and it was one of the first shocks [I] experienced at the time of my arrival in the village' (1979: 26). Since Codrington (1885: 165) linguists and anthropologists have complained about the difficulty of determining the correct use of terms of direction in Austronesian languages. They generally lack names for the cardinal points strictly speaking. Instead they have terms indicating wind directions, which in modern languages, such as Bahasa Indonesia, have taken on the connotations of north, south, east, west, and the points in between. In addition there are terms relating persons and objects in the local situation, which often carry important symbolic and cosmological implications as well. Though based on the fairly simple opposition of landward versus seaward or upstream versus downstream, precise applications in differing terrains are difficult to predict. 'On shore the sea and the cultivated inland are generally spoken of as down and up; and, according to the configuration of an island, these points of direction are perpetually changing' (ibid.). On the opposite sides of an island, meanings become reversed. The difficulty cannot be ignored, for the relevant terms are constantly used in speech, as Sibree discovered once on Madagascar, when his host told him that he had rice grains stuck on the 'southern' side of his moustache (Sibree 1896: 210, quoted in Condominas 1980: 26). Firth (1970: 191) repeats an almost identical comment from Tikopia: 'There is a spot of mud on your seaward cheek'.[1] These terms are

---

[1] In my study of Kédang thought (1974: 87), I wrote: 'It would seem strange to us to think of the objects and persons around us in terms of north, south, east, and west; but this is just the

recognized to be a central aspect of the common Austronesian heritage, but so far there are few intensive discussions of specific systems. Barraud's treatment therefore is the more welcome and can be set beside those that do exist (e.g. Barnes 1974: 78-88) to deepen comparative understanding.

Tanebar-Evav direction terms 'correspond to a local conception of the world divided into high and low that orients the island, the other islands, but also the village, the house and the whole of the local universe' (1979: 51). There is no need to repeat the details of the analysis here, but mention may be made of the fact that the sail boat serves as a symbolic model of society and that its orientation is the same as that of the house. The people of Tanebar-Evav build and sell sailing boats, and the boat is a key symbol of social relationships involved in warfare and the exchange of women. There are two hierarchically related images of society in general marked by the words *lôr* and *haratut*. The subtle nuances of these images have recently been elucidated by Barraud (1985). Both words have several meanings, but explication of them in this respect begins with the meaning 'whale' for *lôr* and 'one hundred catches' in the sense of fish or game animals for *haratut*. The advantage of beginning with a consideration of space appears when the author argues that the patrilineal social groups represented by the 'house' are not to be understood on the model of segmentary lineage systems. It is not a collection of lineages composed by a line of ancestors that organizes society, but the set of houses tied together by exchanges, myths and beliefs. The house is theoretically divided into right and left halves occupied by separate patrilineages hierarchically related as elder and younger. This essentially spatial principle, Barraud suggests, is superior to the principle of patrilineality and shapes it. Lévi-Strauss, of course, has claimed that the idea of the house, in the sense that one speaks of a 'noble house', should be added to ethnological vocabulary, and he has referred to Indonesian examples including those from Timor (Lévi-Strauss 1984: 189-99).

The discussion of the house, in the sense in this case of a patrilineal descent group, merely initiates a description of what in fact is a rather complex pattern of overlapping groupings of different kinds. 'Tanebar-Evav is placed at the periphery of three collections of societies that employ apparently contrasted systems' (1979: 247). To the west are cultures characteristically

---

usage which is given to the direction indicators in Kédang.' Only after the book was in production and could no longer be changed did I notice my mother and grandmother one day in my grandmother's dining room talking about objects about them in precisely this way. They were even identifying where the milk was in the refrigerator by saying whether it was on the north or south side of the eggs. They had been using the cardinal points in this way all my life without my paying attention to it. The point is that such usages are commonplace, but I have lost the knack. Not until I had returned from and written about a remote culture did I discover this fact about my own.

patterned on asymmetric alliance among patrilineal groups. Barraud describes those to the east as being a good deal more mysterious, 'as though floating in repeating sequences of ceremonial exchanges.' To the south there are the bilateral marriage systems of Australia (1979: 247-8). Tanebar-Evav houses are composed normally of two distinct patrilineages. Lineages are the holders of titles and functions, conductors of rituals, owners of land and coconut trees, and the units involved in exchanges. The twenty-four houses are distributed among nine *ub*, who sacrifice to one of nine ancestors. Member houses of an *ub* are located adjacent to each other and provide mutual support and assistance. The *ub* is hierarchically ordered by a paternal uncle-nephew or elder-younger relation between houses. The *ub* is *not* a patrilineal descent group, as the constituent houses lack genealogical connection. They all fall into one of three spatial divisions of the village called *yam*. *Yam* are not thought to be descent groups and lack a common ancestral cult. They represent society in rituals and exchanges of general interest. The people of Tanebar-Evav also speak of their society being divided into two halves, but the halves are purely conceptual. Barraud remarks that this balance between dual and tripartite division is similar to features of spatial division and the distribution of offices. Others have underlined the significance of dual and tripartite divisions in eastern Indonesian cultures, and the theme is known not only from Lévi-Strauss's paper on dual organization (1956), but also from the second chapter of van Wouden's book. A cross-cutting grouping is the common *fam* (a word of European derivation), linking certain houses within a *yam*. The *fam* possesses a name, but lacks a particular function or role, has no cult or property and is not exogamous.

In the Tanebar-Evav relationship system there is only a single term for the first descending level, although this term may be qualified by an adjective to specify nephew or niece (with no regard to the sex of either the person designated or the linking relative). Another adjective specifies the son-in-law or daughter-in-law. Barraud says that the pattern at this level is 'Hawaiian'. In the level of reference, a male applies the same term to his sister and to female cousins both cross and parallel. The equivalent male relatives he distinguishes by relative age terms. A female ego applies the same terms, but inversely according to sex. Distinction of sex relative to ego is therefore of primary importance at this level. For affinal applications absolute sex is determining. The pattern of terms at the intermediate level is more complex than at the first descending, but the configuration remains essentially cognatic. Barraud points out that at the first ascending level the distinctions and equations are found that would be characteristic of a Dravidian or symmetric prescriptive terminology. She argues, however, that the usages at this level are determined by the same relative sex principle as at the level below. Beyond the medial three levels, there are separate self-reciprocal terms disregarding sex at each of the second, third, fourth and fifth ascending and descending levels. In sum the terminology has the following prominent characteristics: generation alternation, the importance of relative sex, symmetric prescriptive pattern in the

first ascending level and a cognatic non-prescriptive pattern in the next two levels below.

Institutions relating to marriage and alliance are equally complex. Barraud notes a disaccord between the terminology and the rule of matrilateral cross-cousin marriage applied to the eldest son of a house or lineage. Such a marriage in Tanebar-Evav leads to widespread shifts in the classification of relatives. Nothing in the terminology, she says, would suggest the existence of a system of asymmetric alliance. This circumstance leads her to speak of a functional heterogeneity between the terminology and the marriage rule.

There are in fact two forms of alliance. The first accords to the model of generalized exchange, hierarchical relations between affines of opposed kinds and oriented exchange cycles. The hierarchical relation of affinity is dualistic (superior wife-givers versus inferior wife-takers), but intransitive, and it does not create hierarchically divided groups within the village. Each lineage is situated by reference to its list of wife-giving groups and of wife-taking groups. One of the wife-giving lineages is recognized as the trunk or base wife-givers, those who provided the first woman for the house. These ties are supposed to be maintained by repeated marriages in subsequent generations, but brothers may not take wives from the same lineages. In fact marriages with the 'base' wife-giving lineages are on the whole rather infrequent. New alliances are created and the network of alliance is therefore constantly changing. Wife-givers represent a particularly feared category of ancestors called the 'dead-gods'. Otherwise the religious, ritual and exchange implications familiar in this kind of relationship throughout Indonesia apply here, except that the exchange cycles are not characterized as masculine and feminine.

The second form of alliance involves immediate reciprocity between two partners related symmetrically. Such marriages do not require counter-prestations. The relationship is egalitarian. Generally a woman is given in one generation and another is returned in the next. Direct sister exchange is rare but does occur. Not all houses have direct exchange partners, though some strongly value the relationship. Barraud says that generally the option exists as a potentiality, but is rarely realized through marriage. She also specifically notes that this form is in accordance with the features of the first ascending level of the terminology.

Since houses should not be allowed to disappear, groups in danger of disappearing assure their continuation by adoption. The relation between adoption and marriage alliance, which can vary, is an important issue and has been given continuous attention (some of the evidence is summarized in Barnes 1980). Among the Bunaq adoption is permitted only among allies or may even be used to initiate an alliance. It entails the exchange of nearly the same prestations as in the elaborate marriage form associated with alliance. Barraud says that in Tanebar-Evav adoption is not disguised alliance or a means to make an otherwise prohibited marriage possible. Nevertheless adoption is conceived of as a marriage and requires the same exchanges. It is the only means

permitted for assuring the continuity of exchange units. Especially relevant, of course, is the adoption of males. Villagers explicitly compare male adoption to the procedures for obtaining wives, and Barraud remarks that we could draw a parallel between the circulation of men and that of women. Adoption pertains, therefore, to the general issue in the region of how persons of either sex are circulated in respect of other life-providing valuables and how the relevant exchanging units are constituted, defined and maintained.

Because Tanebar-Evav consists essentially of noble or once noble lineages, Barraud's information on the subject of social classes, or as she calls them 'orders', is limited. However, her discussion of the subject as applied to the archipelago, while preliminary, is of considerable comparative interest. Above all, she shows that van Wouden's speculation that types of alliance rules are linked to social class (nobles practising asymmetric alliance and expensive exchanges, commoners symmetric alliance and no exchanges) is unsubstantiated.

Barraud devotes two chapters to the circulation of values, and she has returned to the subject in a joint article on exchange with de Coppet, Iteanu and Jamous. Ceremonial prestations are exchanged in connection with marriage ceremonies, funerals, the completion of a house, the launching of a boat, and ceremonies of departure and return. In what Barraud calls hierarchized relations, such as between wife-givers and wife-takers, the prestations are oriented, with cannons, gongs and jewelry going to the superior, while plates and cloth are returned. The prestations concern not just the living, but involve also the relations to the ancestors and God. Although in her book (1979: 93) Barraud wrote that the house is comprised like a moral person, like a social being, her opinion on this issue appears to have shifted. More recently (Barraud, *et al.* 1984: 502), she writes that the house in Tanebar-Evav is not a moral person founded on unilineal descent, but a bundle of relations linking the takers to the givers and to God and the dead. The exchange of women is not sufficient to account for Tanebar-Evav society. The exchanges themselves create the exchanging units, and the house is constituted by the relation of exchange between the dead and the living. The superiority of the givers is founded on the fact that they represent the ancestors and divinity, the guardians of life and death (Barraud, *et al.* 1984: 478-9).

In explaining how these exchanges work, Barraud establishes a factor of considerable historical importance which has repeatedly been encountered in Indonesia. The objects circulate in a system interior to society and in a sense make it up. They are not used for external commerce as are other commodities, and their exchange is not, like that of other commodities, related to the market principle or subject to the fluctuations of the international market. Nevertheless, the actual wealth objects often come from the exterior world and have been acquired by commercial exchanges (see Barnes 1980: 119-20; 1982: 14). On Tanebar-Evav the objects in question consist in Dutch or Portuguese cannon, gongs from China, Sumatra, Java or Bali, Chinese or European dishes and

plates, as well as jewelry and cloth of non-local derivation. Indonesian currency is increasingly entering into the gifts. Previously they had integrated Chinese, Arabic, Portuguese and Dutch currency. What is distinctive is not the nature of the objects circulated, but their usage in closed ceremonial cycles. Disregarding the actual metal, the people describe as gold, *mas*, all forms of jewelry and currency. Barraud's enquiries revealed that prior to the introduction of cannons, boats and two products classed as being of the sea and the earth, fish and game, were exchanged for women. Boats made in the village and sold elsewhere represent above all else the relation to the exterior. Products of the earth are closer to home, though perhaps seen as still outside the village, while those of the sea are also related to the exterior. Objects of wealth are sometimes called *ubrān*, a phrase which means the interior, contents, significance or sense of the *ub*. In addition to meaning a kind of grouping of houses, as already explained, *ub* has the sense of a jar for storing millet, grandfather, ancestor and 'fish-ancestor'. *Ub* contain men, like the jars contain millet. Golden grained millet symbolizes in the same way as 'gold' jewelry the true riches of society. 'Society defines itself in the limit of its containers: valuables are, like millet, men, ancestors, the content which assures the existence of society.' Elsewhere (Barnes 1973; 1974: 105-6, 111) I have also described totalizing phrases and images in Kédang which unite gold, objects of wealth, and products of the field with spiritual values and radiant luminosity. Like the Kédang (Barnes 1974: 107-9), Tanebar-Evav has a legend about a tree of wealth, the leaves and branches of which were made up of these objects. As Barraud concludes, gold - the wealth objects - is at the origin of history.

Like Barraud, Renard-Clamagirand (1982) begins her study of Ema society with essentially spatial considerations and a description of the house both as physical object and as an extended social grouping. I have, with her permission, summarized aspects of her depiction of Ema institutions in two publications (Barnes 1978: 22-5; 1980: 99-101), and I do not need to repeat what I have said there.[2] Since then, her work has been published, and therefore

---

2 'Injunction and Illusion' (Barnes 1978) was published without my being shown the proofs, which explains the various omissions and misspellings in the references. Worse, the editors gave it a new first sentence without my knowledge or permission, which introduces the absurd claim that 'prescriptive alliance is not usually examined in relation to the analysis of segmentary descent systems'. The claim is patently false and a worse error than the one the paper was intended to correct. Two sentences in paragraph two (p.19) were run together, while part of each was omitted. They should read, 'For my purposes, I will draw upon a little regarded article by Basil Thompson (1895). Encouraged by Lormer Fison, Thompson set out to explain the system of Fiji, "from the point of view of compulsory or obligatory marriage."'

has become more widely available. It should be remarked that the Ema, like the Bunaq and other peoples situated near the border with Indonesia, were in the path of the Indonesian invasion of 1975. What loss of life and culture has resulted is unknown, but we must fear that the devastation has been great.

Among features that distinguish her work, besides her fifty-six striking photographs, are extensive genealogies which permit a comparison between actual marriages and the lists of recognized wife-givers and wife-takers that she also records for each patrilineal clan. Unlike the situation in Kédang, these lists ensure that actual ties of asymmetric affinal alliance are maintained among the clans. She found no marriages in violation of these rules, although the genealogies suggest that a certain percentage (perhaps around 12%) of marriages takes place between groups with no previous formal relationship.

Renard-Clamargirand writes that the terminology expresses in a particularly coherent way the obligation to marry a matrilateral cross cousin and to enter into a system of generalized exchange. Though the specifications she gives are not as extensive as might be wished, the terminology can indeed adequately be represented in a diagram presupposing patrilineal descent and asymmetric marriage alliance (see Tables 1-4). There are, however, certain contrasting features of interest. Like the Jinghpaw Kachin of Burma, the Ema equate (in the Ema term *liar*) MBS, FZS, WB, and ZH. In both terminologies this is the only symmetric feature. The appropriate asymmetric distinctions and equations are made at the first ascending level, but only by the adjectives qualifying the words *amar* and *inar*, reflexes of proto-Austronesian terms that characteristically designate F and M, respectively, and their appropriate parallel cousins. If the adjectives were to be disregarded, there would be only a cognatic pattern at this level. It would be interesting to see whether this implicit feature has any resonance in Ema sociology.

Van Wouden's model of eastern Indonesian social organization involved four exchange groups in two phratries and linked by matrilateral cross-cousin marriage. An elaborated version involved double unilineal descent and sixteen marriage classes. None of the evidence he surveyed suggested that any society currently had institutions remotely like this arrangement. The Ema too cannot be described in these terms. Nevertheless Renard-Clamagirand found a model of alliance among four partners applicable in various ways to her material. Furthermore, Ema practices reveal ways in which such a four-term pattern could reduce to three-partner cycles. She has already published part of this demonstration in English (Clamagirand 1980: 146-8).

She writes that the division of the community into east and west is apparent in collective rituals. Three patrilineal core or 'mother' houses located in the east in a relation of younger to elder brothers may not intermarry. In the west three such houses are similarly related. In addition there are three chiefly houses, not designated as being east or west. The eastern houses also may not contract marriages with those of the west. As a result eastern and western houses must contract their alliances with the

Table 1

Ema relationship Terminology (terms of reference, male ego)

1.	*tatar, beir*	great-grandparents, ancestors
2.	*amar tuman*	MF, FF
3.	*inar tuman*	MM, FM
4.	*amar*	F
5.	*amar ba'ak*	FeB, MeZH
6.	*amar mori*	FyB, MyZH
7.	*amar na'i*	MB, WF
8.	*amar bagi*	FZH
9.	*inar*	M
10.	*inar ba'ak*	MeZ, FeBW
11.	*inar mori*	MyZ, FyBW
12.	*inar na'i*	MBW, WM
13.	*inar ki'i*	FZ
14.	*ka'ar*	eB, FeBS, MeZS, WeZH
15.	*alir*	yB, FyBS, MyZS, yBW, WyZ, WyZH
16.	*nanar*	WeZ, eBW
17.	*mtor*	Z, FBD, MZD, FZD, WBW
18.	*liar*	FZS, MBS, ZH, WB
19.	*her*	MBD, W
20.	*anar*	C, BC, ZC
21.	*anar mane*	S
22.	*anar ine*	D
23.	*anar bagi*	SW
24.	*anar lain*	DH
25.	*ubur*	DC, SC, CC
26.	*beir anan*	great-grandchildren

Table 2

Ema relationship terminology (terms of reference, female ego)

1.	*tatar, beir*	great-grandparents, ancestors
2.	*amar tuman*	MF, FF
3.	*inar tuman*	MM, FM
4.	*amar*	F
5.	*amar ba'ak*	FeB, MeZH
6.	*amar mori*	FyB, MyZH
7.	*amar na'i*	MB
8.	*amar bagi*	FZH, HF
9.	*inar*	M
10.	*inar ba'ak*	MeZ, FeBW
11.	*inar mori*	MyZ, FyBW
12.	*inar na'i*	MBW
13.	*inar ki'i*	FZ, HM
14.	*ka'ar*	eZH, HeB
15.	*alir*	yZ, FyBD, FyZD, MyZD, yZH, HyB, HyBW, yBW (if not MBD)
16.	*nanar*	eZ, FeBD, FeZD, MeZD, HeBW, eBW (if not MBD)
17.	*mtor*	HZ
18.	*nar*	B, FBS, MZS, MBS, HZH
19.	*nar her*	MBD, 'BW'
20.	*nar ine*	BW (if MBD)
21.	*lair*	FZS, H
22.	*anar*	C, BC, ZC
23.	*anar mane*	S
24.	*anar ine*	D
25.	*anar bagi*	SW
26.	*anar lain*	DH
27.	*ubur*	DC, SC, CC
28.	*beir anan*	great-grandchildren

Table 3

Ema categories of descent and alliance
(terms of reference, male ego)

(f)	(m)	< (f)	(m)	< (f)	(m)	< (f)
			amar tuman	*inar tuman*	*amar tuman*	*inar tuman*
	amar bagi	*inar ki'i*	*amar ba'ak* *amar amar mori*	*inar ba'ak* *inar inar mori*	*amar na'i*	*inar na'i*
	liar	*mtor*	*ka'ar* [Ego] *alir*	*nanar* *her* *alir*	*liar*	*mtor*
anar	*anar anar lain*	*anar anar ine*	*anar anar mane*	*anar bagi*		
ubur	*ubur*	*ubur*	*ubur*			

Table 4

Ema categories of descent and alliance
(terms of reference, female ego)

(f)	(m)	< (f)	(m)	< (f)	(m)	< (f)	(m)	< (f)
					amar tuman	*inar tuman*	*amar tuman*	*inar tuman*
			amar bagi	*inar ki'i*	*amar ba'ak* *amar amar mori*	*inar ba'ak* *inar inar mori*	*amar na'i*	*inar na'i*
	nar	*nanar* *mtor* *alir*	*ka'ar* *lair* *alir*	*nanar* [Ego] *alir*	*nar*	*nanar* *nar her* *nar ine* *alir*	*nar*	
	anar lain	*anar* *anar ine*	*anar* *anar mane*	*anar* *anar bagi*	*anar*			
ubur	*ubur*							

chiefly houses, who control the circulation of women. Chiefly houses also may not intermarry. The author demonstrates a number of four-partner exchange cycles, each of which necessarily involves two chiefly houses and two non-chiefly houses. The overall pattern is one of bipartition in conjunction with four-term chains. There are three separate groupings of three houses each. Dualism, tripartition and quadripartition are present therefore in a single configuration representing the whole community. The bipartition represents an alternative to exogamous moieties or two endogamous communities. No exchanges take place directly between east and west. By not participating in the division, the chiefly houses are able to surmount it and maintain alliances on both sides. Each chiefly house has one wife-giver and one wife-taker on each side.

This model apparently receives some overt oral and practical substantiation. As the author shows, information in its support can also be extracted from the lists of recognized allies for each of the lineages. She also sets forth clearly some of the discrepancies they reveal. At any event, this model does not account for all of the practical detail of the present alliance arrangements. Not even all of the core houses are accomodated by it, much less all of the 114 lower-order lineages. Her record shows too many apparent contradictions of it. Some segments of the western houses contract alliances with those of the east or with other western lineages. The same is true of the eastern houses. Even the chiefly houses actually contract alliance with other chiefly lineages. I do not wish to argue that these contradictions to the model do not have their explanations in terms of the rich distinctions in the sociology of clanship that the author describes. Nevertheless, whatever its empirical standing, the model emerges within a greatly more complex sociological reality.

Houses which are not allied to each other may, as in other cultures of the region, recognize a relationship of ceremonial elder and younger brotherhood with each other that normally excludes intermarriage. By examining these relationships, Renard-Clamagirand found further local four-partner cycles. However, there are recognized procedures for obtaining women from groups to whom one is allied only by means of an intermediary, that is, from a wife-giver's wife-giver. When two houses of a four-partner circuit resort to this option, they split the cycle into two triadic relationships. In consequence, wife-takers of wife-takers become wife-givers. For some, this procedure can lead to the painful necessity of shifting attitudes toward close relatives. Such strains, the author argues, can be averted only when generalized exchange is practised by four lines. Followed in two successive generations, but with alternative intermediaries, this procedure can convert generalized exchange among four alliance groups into direct exchanges, as happened in one strongly disapproved of case. Renard-Clamagirand writes of the contradiction that seems to exist between the desire to close alliance cycles as quickly as possible, in order to return the woman to the nest from which she originated, and the desire to extend through several houses by means of female descendants. The quandary has been felt and dealt with differently by different cultures. The Rindi of Sumba dislike closed cycles

of alliance, especially among three partners (Forth 1981: 409). In Kédang on the other hand, a chief strategy in acquitting the obligations of marriage prestations is uncovering closed cycles of outstanding obligations, and a highly favoured marriage is with the daughter of the daughter of a woman from ego's own clan, though these marriages rarely take place (Barnes 1974: 248, 289; compare Lehman 1970).

There is a great deal more of interest in these two books and much in the ethnographic facts that strikes anyone familiar with another Indonesian culture as being startlingly familiar, but at the same time strangely transformed. For example Barraud (1979: 155) writes that in Tanebar-Evav a house that stands as wife-taker in an alliance established by the ancestors is called *vu'un*, a term which means both a knot in wood and joint or articulation, as in the structure of a body. Renard-Clamagirand (1982: 205, 267) writes that collective festivals, particularly those at the beginning of the seasons, are called knots, *hu'un*, because they are the points of reference in the annual calendar and for time in general and that 'knots' have the sense of marked or important events. These instances of botanical idiom including trunks, joints and tips as metaphors for social and temporal relationships are of a kind that has repeatedly received attention (Fox 1971; Barnes 1974: 229-33) and that, along with the 'house' and the relative age terms elder and younger for expressing other social categories, Fox has argued (1980b: 331) are needed in a redefinition of the structural core of van Wouden's model. Each of the suggested additions and others are amply demonstrated in the two studies under consideration.

In summarizing the social categories revealed for Tanebar-Evav by Barraud - but also in his view a part of a structural core shared throughout eastern Indonesia - Fox (1981: 483) comments that 'Barraud's achievement is not simply to have depicted another new configuration of these categories, but to have indicated how they are manipulated to maintain a lived in reality'. Hicks has remarked (1982; 1984) of both *Marobo* and *Tanebar-Evav* that each exemplifies the Maussian inspiration behind van Wouden's attempt to demonstrate 'the essential unity of social organization, myth, and ritual' (van Wouden 1968: 9). There are now several modern ethnographic accounts that represent proven achievement in the area and that have provided substantial tests of van Wouden's programme to a degree not possible when he was compiling ethnographic information for his book. In large measure they confirm the present usefulness of his programme. In Fox's view (1981) they also confirm a theoretical shift from the formal study of models toward the investigation of metaphors for living. These metaphors comprise the common civilization behind the manifold variations found among the disparate eastern Indonesian communities.

R.H. BARNES

REFERENCES

BARNES, R.H. 1973. 'The Rainbow in the Representations of Inhabitants of the Flores Area of Indonesia', *Anthropos* Vol. LXVIII,nos. 3-4, pp. 611-13.

... 1974. *Kédang: A Study of the Collective Thought of an Eastern Indonesian People,* Oxford: Clarendon Press.

... 1978. 'Injunction and Illusion: Segmentation and Choice in Prescriptive Systems, *Anthropology* Vol. II, no.1, pp. 19-30.

... 1980. 'Marriage, Exchange and the Meaning of Corporations in Eastern Indonesia', in J.L. Comaroff (ed.), *The Meaning of Marriage Payments,* London: Academic Press.

... 1982. 'Number and Number Use in Kédang, Indonesia, *Man* n.s. Vol. XVII, no.1, pp.1-22.

BARRAUD, Cécile 1979. *Tanebar-Evav: Une Société de Maisons Tourneé vers le Large,* Cambridge and Paris: Cambridge University Press and Editions de la Maison des Sciences de l'Homme.

... 1985. 'The Sailing-Boat: Circulation and Values in the Kei Islands, Indonesia', in R.H. Barnes, Daniel de Coppet and R.J. Parkin (eds.), *Contexts and Levels: Anthropological Essays on Hierarchy* [JASO Occasional Papers No.4], Oxford: JASO.

..., D. de Coppet, A. Iteanu and R. Jamous 1984. 'Des relations et des morts: quatre sociétés vues sous l'angle des échanges', in Jean-Claude Galey (ed.), *Différences, valeurs, hiérarchie: Textes offerts à Louis Dumont,* Paris: Editions de l'Ecole des Hautes Etudes en Sciences Sociales.

BERTHE, Louis 1961. 'Le mariage par achat et la captation des gendres dans une societe semi-feodale: les Bunaq de Timor central', *L'Homme* Vol. I, no.3, pp. 5-31.

... 1972. *Bei Gua: Itinéraire des Ancêtres, Mythes des Bunaq de Timor,* Paris: Editions du Centre National de la Recherche Scientifique.

CAMPAGNOLO, Henri 1979. *Fataluku I: Relations et Choix, Introduction Méthodologique à la Description d'une Langue 'Non Austronésienne' de Timor Oriental,* Paris: SELAF.

CLAMAGIRAND, Brigitte 1980. 'The Social Organization of the Ema of Timor, in James J. Fox (ed.), *The Flow of Life: Essays on Eastern Indonesia,* Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press.

CONDOMINAS, Georges 1980. *L'Espace Social à Propos de l'Asie du Sud-Est,* Paris: Flammarion.

CODRINGTON, R.H. 1885. *The Melanesian Languages,* Oxford: Clarendon Press.

FIRTH, Raymond 1970. 'Postures and Gestures of Respect', in Jean Pouillon and Pierre Maranda (eds.), *Echanges et Communications: Mélanges Offerts à Claude Lévi-Strauss,* Tome I, The Hague and Paris: Mouton.

FORTH, Gregory L. 1981. *Rindi: An Ethnographic Study of a Traditional Domain in Eastern Sumba* [KITLV Verhandelingen, no.93], The Hague: Nijhoff.

FOX, James J. 1971. 'Sister's Child as Plant: Metaphors in an Idiom of Consanguinity', in Rodney Needham (ed.), *Rethinking Kinship and Marriage* [ASA Monograph 11], London: Tavistock.

... (ed.) 1980a. *The Flow of Life: Essays on Eastern Indonesia,* Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press.

... 1980b. 'Models and Metaphors: Comparative Research in Eastern Indonesia', in James J. Fox (ed.), *The Flow of Life: Essays on Eastern Indonesia,* Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press.

... 1981. Review of Cécile Barraud, *Tanebar-Evav* (1979), *Man* n.s. Vol. XVI, no.3, pp. 483-4.

FRIEDBERG, Claudine 1978. *Comment fut Trancheé la Liane Céleste et Autres Textes de Littérature Orale Bunaq (Timor, Indonésie),* Paris: SELAF.

HICKS, David 1982. Review of Cécile Barraud, *Tanebar-Evav* (1979), *American Anthropologist* Vol. LXXXIV, pp. 216-17.

... 1984. Review of Brigitte Renard-Clamagirand, *Marobo* (1982), *Man* n.s. Vol. XIX, no.4, p.698.

LEHMAN, F.K. 1970. 'On Chin and Kachin Marriage Regulations', *Man* n.s. Vol. V, no.1, pp.118-25.

LEVI-STRAUSS, Claude 1956. 'Les organisations dualistes existent-elles?', *Bijdragen tot de Taal-, Land- en Volkenkunde* Vol. CXII, no.2, pp. 99-128.

... 1984. *Paroles Données,* Paris: Plon.

RENARD-CLAMAGIRAND, Brigitte 1982. *Marobo: Une Société Ema de Timor,* Paris: SELAF.

SIBREE, James 1896. *Madagascar & Its People,* London: Religious Tract Society.

STOKHOF, W.A.L 1977. *Woisika I: An Ethnographic Introduction,* Pacific Linguistics, Series D, no. 19, Canberra: Australian National University.

WOUDEN, F.A.E. van 1968. *Types of Social Structure in Eastern Indonesia* (transl. Rodney Needham) [KITLV Translations Series 11], The Hague: Nijhoff.