THE LEIDEN VERSION OF THE COMPARATIVE METHOD IN SOUTHEAST ASIA

Unity in Diversity (P.E. de Josselin de Jong 1984a) presents the results of an international symposium on 'Indonesia as a Field of Anthropological Study' held at Leiden, The Netherlands, 22-26 November 1982. The idea of a 'Field of Anthropological Study' (FAS) derives from Jan Petrus Benjamin de Josselin de Jong's inaugural lecture, 'De Maleische archipel als ethnologisch studieveld', delivered on 24th May 1935 upon his appointment to the Chair of Indonesian and General Anthropology at Leiden University. In this lecture, the speaker presented a programme for further anthropological studies in the archipelago guided by attention to features of a system comprising the structural core of numerous ancient Indonesian cultures. This programme, intended to reveal the ethnological unity behind the obvious cultural diversity, had already been significantly exemplified by the path-breaking survey of eastern Indonesian social forms in Γ.A.Ε. van Wouden's doctoral dissertation *Sociale Structuurtypen in de Groote Oost*, defended 28th February 1935, supervised by J.P.B. de Josselin de Jong, and today accepted as an analytically original precursor to Lévi-Strauss's *Elementary Structures of Kinship*. Patrick Edward de Josselin de Jong (1980a: 317) writes, 'I cannot now, forty years later, contribute anything to answer the question to what extent van Wouden's comparative research led de Josselin de Jong to recognize Indonesia as a field of ethnological study or whether van

---

I wish to thank Professor Rodney Needham, Professor Dr P.E. de Josselin de Jong, Dr Peter Carey, Miss Penelope Graham and Mr Andrew Beatty for reading and commenting on this article. I am also grateful to Professor Dr A. Teeuw for translating and elucidating the Indonesian national motto. [*Editors' note:* A further article by Dr Barnes, concerning two recent French books on eastern Indonesia, is to appear in the next issue of *JASO*.]

Wouden was stimulated by his supervisor's teaching to apply the field of ethnological study approach to eastern Indonesian societies.' Whatever the answer may be, these two publications of 1935 effectively serve as the joint inspiration for *ethnologisch studieveld* work.

Encouraged by a revival of Indonesian language, literature and anthropological studies following the post-colonial doldrums of the late 1950s and early 1960s, the Leiden group decided to consider how much the idea of an Indonesian field of anthropological study had been revised since 1935. In order to keep the discussion from being confined only to the Leiden circle, they invited an international group of scholars to comment on papers written primarily by the Leiden authors. By publishing the results of a seminar so defined, they are inviting further international attention to the occasion for such re-examination, the boundaries and focus of the field, the elements of its structural core, and the use of their approach.

P.E. de Josselin de Jong (1984b: viii) says that their intentions were turned into a definite plan by the publication of three books: *The Flow of Life: Essays on Eastern Indonesia* (Fox 1980a), *Nature and Man in South East Asia* (Stott 1978) and *Natural Symbols in South East Asia* (Milner 1978). Indeed, a variety of publishing activities has made maritime Southeast Asia increasingly convenient for scholarly treatment as a special anthropological area. Among these are two series of the Royal Institute of Linguistics and Anthropology, Leiden: the *Verhandelingen*, of which *Unity in Diversity* is the latest, and the Translation Series. The latter is important not only because it has made many significant works of Dutch scholarship available in English, but also because some of these works are occasionally difficult to obtain even in the Dutch original. Of immediate relevance is the appearance in the Translation Series in English of van Wouden's *Types of Social Structure in Eastern Indonesia* (1968) and *Structural Anthropology in the Netherlands: A Reader* (P.E. de Josselin de Jong [ed.] 1977a), which makes available the inaugural lecture and several other classic papers central to the FAS direction. Among these are van Ossenbruggen's investigation of numerical classification on Java, Pigeaud's study of Javanese divination, Onvlee's splendid discussion of the social symbolism behind Sumbanese dam construction, van Wouden's paper on double descent in West Sumba, and J. P.B. de Josselin de Jong's long critique of Lévi-Strauss's theory of elementary kinship structures. *Unity in Diversity* and *Structural Anthropology in the Netherlands*, both edited by P.E. de Josselin de Jong, are as close to being a wedded pair as any two collections of essays by diverse hands can be. Contrary to what might be expected, less than half the papers in *Symbolic Anthropology in the Netherlands* (edited by P.E. de Josselin de Jong and Schwimmer, 1982) have any bearing on Indonesia, and in some that do the connection is slight.

Maritime Southeast Asia still lacks and undoubtedly will never have its own *Homo Hierarchicus*, but the sense that it is drawing together as an international area of scholarship is

bolstered by several recent collections of archaeological, historical, geographical and anthropological papers conceived within a broad scope. Among these books may be mentioned *Sunda and Sahul: Prehistoric Studies in Southeast Asia, Melanesia and Australia* (Allen, Golsen and Jones [eds.] 1977), *Early South East Asia: Essays in Archaeology, History and Historical Geography* (Smith and Watson [eds.] 1979), and *Indonesia: The Making of a Culture* (Fox [ed.] 1980b) - all of which are useful for understanding the prehistorical background and population events behind any Southeast Asian field of study.

Among primarily historical works may be mentioned *Perceptions of the Past in Southeast Asia* (Reid and Marr [eds.] 1979), *The Development of Indonesian Society from the Coming of Islam to the Present Day* (Aveling [ed.] 1979), the fourth and much expanded edition of D.G.E. Hall's *A History of South-East Asia* (1981),O.W. Wolters's *History, Culture and Region in South East Asian Perspective* (1982), and *Slavery, Bondage and Dependency in Southeast Asia* (Reid [ed.] 1983). Within the national boundaries of modern Indonesia, these historical works are strongly biased toward the western islands and, inevitably for history, generally limited in scholarly imagination to topics that can be approached through written documents and inscriptions.

Wolters's attempt to establish features of the 'cultural matrix' of ancient Southeast Asia invites comparison with J.P.B. de Josselin de Jong's 'structural core'. Wolters makes no reference to any of the literature on the *studieveld* movement, nor to any of its ideas. Wolters's conception embraces both mainland and maritime Southeast Asia, while de Josselin de Jong was concerned only with the island world. P.E. de Josselin de Jong (1984c: 2) abbreviates the structural core to four elements. First is the resilience of Indonesian cultures toward foreign cultural elements, which they Indonesianized, rather than rejecting or taking over unchanged. Second there is 'socio-cosmic dualism', followed by double descent and finally asymmetric connubium. This list, however, reflects changes in attitude that have taken place in the last fifty years. J.P.B. de Josselin de Jong (1977) originally described a more complex, and empirically more improbable, configuration, which included unilineal descent groups linked in a closed chain of affinal relations, a hierarchical system of etiquette, rights and duties in which bride-givers were superior, the constant circulation throughout society in opposite directions of 'masculine' and 'feminine' goods, a cross-cutting system of phratry dualism linked by symmetric connubium, double unilineal descent, and a primary four-fold division of society. Furthermore, the dualistic social division was part of a cosmic dichotomy. Other elements of the core were the distribution of functions among individual dignitaries and groups, the preference for particular numbers, caste-like systems existing prior to Hinduism but culturally closely related to Indian caste, and finally a variety of foreign influences and Indonesian responses to them. J.P.B. de Josselin de Jong recognized that the social structural elements were found in eastern Indonesia (Timor, Kei, Tanimbar, and the Moluccas) and in the west (particularly the Batak peoples of

Sumatra), but not in Celebes or Borneo.

In contrast, the following features may be extracted from Wolters's discussion (1982: 1-15) of the 'cultural matrix'. The ancient inhabitants of Southeast Asia lived in fairly isolated groups, of which none should be deemed peripheral because all looked outward and, 'Every centre was a centre in its own right as far as its inhabitants were concerned.' The major language families (Austronesian, Austroasiatic, Sino-Tibetan, Tai-Kadai) were represented by numerous local and isolated speech variations. Linguistic similarities did not provide cultural bridges. Kinship provided the idiom of social organization, but it was cognatic and lineages were relatively unimportant. Leadership was based on a 'big man' model, centering around 'men of prowess' possessing an abnormal amount of personal or innate 'soul stuff'. Leadership became associated with an ancestor cult, with special speech forms for addressing superiors, with prestigious public life and with a hierarchy established by the leader who rewarded achievements and meritorious deeds with titles and gifts. The arrival of Hinduism brought ideas of personal devotion (*bhakti*), popular cults of Śiva and Viṣṇu, elitist teacher-inspired sects, and divine kingship.

Without yet offering criticism or appreciation of these two speculative schemes, we may note that though they could be rendered compatible in various ways, they generally place emphasis differently where they are closest, and they strikingly diverge when it comes to issues of kinship and leadership. Wolters's attempt to impose the Melanesian model of 'big men' is precipitate and at least likely to cause confusion before it brings clarity in considering the multitude of issues about leadership in the various Southeast Asian regions.

Whereas the *studieveld* places unilineal descent, in its variety, and marriage alliance at the centre of interest, Wolters simply leaves societies with these social concerns out of the Southeast Asian picture. Characteristic of historians who have worked in Indonesia and Malaysia, he shows an implicit bias of interest for the cultures of the western part of the region, commonly, but not always, characterized by literacy, cognatic kinship, strong Indian influence, and involvement in problems of state formation. Conversely, the *studieveld* is also characterized by what it leaves aside. Though most of the recent practitioners have carried out research in the west, especially on Sumatra, J.P.B. de Josselin de Jong and van Wouden eventually acquired field experience in the east, on Kisar, Wetar and Sumba (J.P.B. de Josselin de Jong 1937, 1947; van Wouden 1977). Unusual in Indonesian scholarship, the *studieveld* model was worked out in large part, but not exclusively, for eastern Indonesia, though also derivative from and applicable to Batak groups of Sumatra and certainly relevant to highland peoples of Burma and Laos. Attempts have been made to find relevance for it in Java, in a rigid way by Rassers and others, more cautiously by P.E. de Josselin de Jong (1970).

A field of study suggests boundaries and perhaps a focus. In his inaugural lecture, J.P.B. de Josselin de Jong proposed the

Malay Archipelago as the field. The subtitle of *Unity in Diversity* refers to Indonesia as a field of study. In his contribution to that book, Marschall (1984: 85) comments that a concept based on the cultural unit of Indonesia is spoiled if it is defined by features which are not pan-Indonesian, such as connubium, and that the word 'Indonesia' should be dropped. In the same book the comparative linguist Blust (1984: 28) asserts that 'One of the enduring ironies of the FAS-approach is its repeated, often implicit references to "Indonesia" as a self-contained region of related peoples' and that 'the expression "Indonesian language" has no meaning from the standpoint of the criteria relevant to language classification' (p.31). In his summary and conclusions P.E. de Josselin de Jong (1984d: 238-9) defends himself from the charge of defining an ethnological field in terms of national and former colonial boundaries by referring to comparative linguists (R.A. Kern, Dempwolff, Uhlenbeck) who had spoken of 'Indonesian languages' as applicable well beyond the bounds of the modern Republic of Indonesia (the languages of the Philippines and Madagascar, for example).

The problem, however, is inherent in the word and its history and cannot therefore be disposed of simply by setting the facts straight. Bosch (1951: 393) has remarked that if 'Indonesia' has any meaning it is 'the archipelago of the Indus...which naturally is nonsense'. It was made generally known by the title of a book by Bastian (1884) and taken over by Wilken in his writings, where Indonesians were 'the inhabitants of the Malay Archipelago, the Philippines, the population groups of Indonesian origin in Madagascar, and also the Papuans of West New Guinea' and Indonesia 'covered the archipelago of the Dutch East Indies together with British Borneo and Portuguese Timor' (Ave 1976: 228). In other words, in Wilken's usage, the region occupied by Indonesians was vaster than the geographical area termed Indonesia. Several authors have noted that Bastian did not invent the name, but adopted it from J.R. Logan (1850), who accepted it from a friend G.S. W. Earl, who invented it and proposed that it stand for the Malay Archipelago (see R. Jones 1973 and Ave 1976 for a list of relevant publications).

As a scholarly contrivance Indonesia did not therefore originally refer to the territory of the Netherlands East Indies, but early in the twentieth century it was adopted by nationalists as a name for the developed Malay language, which with its burgeoning literature was conceived as the 'linguistic vehicle of national unity' (Ricklefs 1981: 176) and taken over in the names of many nationalist groups and parties. A demand by the nationalist politician Muhammad H. Thamrin that the Netherlands Indies be named Indonesia and that the word *Inlander* (native) be replaced by Indonesian in government documents was rejected in 1940 by the Dutch government in exile (Ave 1976: 229; Pluvier 1974: 140). Of course, the word was eventually adopted as the name of the new republic.

The point of the preceding review is to demonstrate how the scholarly and political aspects of the quandary about what Indonesia means play back on each other. It is not the case that

Indonesian national unity lacked a basis, but none of the factors which suggest unity indicate that the national boundaries be drawn where they were in fact drawn. This problem was recognized by the Indonesian nationalists. In his defence oration at his political trial of 1930, Sukarno conceded that 'Physically [only] Indonesia has been made one; physically she has been bound into a unified whole. But this unity, according to one socialist, is "an imposed unity, merely the unity of subjection"' (Paget 1975: 86). It is interesting to compare this rhetoric with J.P.B. de Josselin de Jong's defence five years later (1977: 168) of the Indonesian field of study:

> We in Holland are accustomed to hearing the views expressed that the population of the Netherlands East Indies is by no means homogeneous; that the only thing knitting together the many parts of this archipelago, which is as heterogeneous as can be with regard to race, language and culture, is the authority of the mother country; and that hence there is no question of a national, indigenous feeling of unity. It is not my intention at present to deliberately refute this statement, superficial and contrary to reality though it may be. I would rather call your attention to a few phenomena which shed light on the significance of the Malay Archipelago as an ethnographic field of study, and which will, I hope, at the same time reveal at least something of the unity which makes the diversity all the more instructive and interesting.

This statement obviously responds to political events of the times, as well as to the fact that most anthropological fieldwork in Indonesia was undertaken then by administrative or legal officers serving in the Netherlands East Indies or by Catholic and Protestant missionaries, all of whom generally had received anthropological instruction during their university studies (P.E. de Josselin de Jong 1984b: vii). It may be recalled that at the time the statement was made the full territorial limits of the Indonesian colony were barely a quarter of a century old and that the Dutch were to possess the Netherlands East Indies for only a further seven years.

A major problem facing the nationalists was the temptation to expand their nationalist aspirations beyond the bounds of the old Dutch East Indies. Fortunately the views of Mohammad Hatta, Indonesia's first Vice-President, prevailed, namely, that Indonesia be established on the basis of the unifying factors present in the situation, identified with the territory of the former Dutch-held state (H.P. Jones 1973: 273). Until 1975, this principle effectively guided the policy of the Indonesian government and justified the campaign for acquiring the racially, culturally and linguistically predominantly unrelated Irian Jaya (West New Guinea) in 1962. Sukarno was sometimes tempted to step over these bounds, as seen by the episode during World War II when he allowed

himself to be drawn into the short-lived Japanese-condoned project for a Greater Indonesia, incorporating Malaya, or the period of 'Konfrontasi' with Malaysia (Pluvier 1977: 355-6; H.P. Jones 1973: 273).

The arbitrary nature of the present make-up of Indonesia was also demonstrated by moves by various foreign powers to break it up. This aim had been part of the original Japanese plan in World War II. It surfaced again in the Dutch-instigated 'United States of Indonesia' after the war and in an army-led rebellion in Sumatra, covertly supported by the Eisenhower administration. Indonesia is currently involved in a costly war in the former Portuguese part of Timor of ten years' duration, which marks the first lasting deviation from the original principles of the Republic's territorial formation.

Unity in Diversity is, of course, the official (but slightly inaccurate) translation of the Indonesian national motto, *Bhinneka Tunggal Ika* (Ricklefs 1981: 244), sometimes rendered 'diversity in unity' (Peacock 1973: 135). The motto derives from an Old Javanese Buddhist text of the fourteenth century and expresses the ultimate identity of Buddha and Siwa. Literally it means 'different they are, one are they'. Dutch scholars have tended to regard 'Indonesia' as extending beyond the national entity, while nevertheless looking out at the island world from the political formation to which their scholarship has had such close institutional and historical ties. This circumstance no doubt lies behind Blust's claim (1980a: 2) that with the exception of H. Kern, who placed his Old Javanese studies in a comparative context of Malayo-Polynesian investigations, 'the Dutch contribution to comparative Austronesian linguistics has been characterized by a tendency to define its scope in political terms (the comparison of "Indonesian" languages), and by an absence of systematic reconstruction.' Of course, Austronesian languages extend from Easter Island to Madagascar and the boundaries of the family coincide with neither national nor cultural limits. P.E. de Josselin de Jong (1984d: 238) appears to be willing now to drop the idea of an 'Indonesian' field and also to contemplate variant levels of fields of study.

P.E. de Josselin de Jong (1984c: 3-7) wishes to identify three periods in the *studieveld* tradition. The first period dates from 1935 until 1956. Dutch regulations did not permit persons to be sent under government auspices to do anthropological or linguistic research until they had proven themselves by writing a doctoral thesis based on library research in The Netherlands. Van Wouden's survey and P.E. de Josselin de Jong's study of Minangkabau and Negri Sembilan (1951) were written under these circumstances and both applied a model to the information found in the ethnographic literature. The lack of direct experience inevitably affected the way they handled the data and contributed to a sense that the model was leading the interpretation of facts, rather than facts determining the interpretation of models. 'One looked for resemblances. When there were imperfections in the resemblances (as was often the case), one had a. to explain the imperfections, and b. to find data which would outweigh them.' After World War II, van Wouden and P.E. de Josselin de Jong managed to obtain field experience in West Sumba and Negri Sembilan, respect-

ively. Both authors published articles in 1956 (republished in 1977) reflecting this experience and marking 'a turning point which, in retrospect, was so influential that I do it the honour of calling it a period.' Their application of the model became less rigid and the model open to modification. The final period brings the group to the present. In this period they distinguish between rule principles and idea principles, which appear to be jural regulations affecting groups on the one hand and ideological or classificatory principles on the other. The terms are exemplified, but not defined, in *Unity and Diversity* (P.E. de Josselin de Jong 1984d: 238, 242, 248-50). The group also claims to be less interested in imperfect resemblances than in transformations, inspired by Lévi-Strauss's 'logical transformations' without yet being quite the same thing. 'What we now need to do, is to... adopt a coherent, well-defined method.'

Referring to van Wouden's model of a two-phratry system of four marriage classes based on matrilateral marriage and double unilineal descent, Fox (1980f: 233-4) has remarked that none of the fourteen ethnographers contributing to *The Flow of Life* found confirmation for it and that several had shown it to be neither a genuine historical reconstruction, nor a valid interpretation of ethnographic evidence, but instead an unworkable illusion based on the merging of the different analytic constructs. 'Since the '50s, research on this subject has aimed primarily at disentangling the various incompatible elements of this model.' Curiously, Blust (1980a, 1980b) has tried to demonstrate an unmodified version of this model for Proto-Austronesian society. This step led him to conclude that the ethnological field of study approach 'must be viewed with renewed interest by all historically minded anthropologists' (1980a: 225).

The elements of the model are indeed heterogeneous. The criterion of response to foreign influence merely refers to a disparate set of factors which, though important in Indonesia, are of a kind that must be given careful consideration everywhere. J.P.B. de Josselin de Jong's comments about Indonesian resilience, itself real enough, is reminiscent of similar observations elsewhere. 'The combination of large-scale borrowing - or inventing - with a strong tendency to retain the old is a characteristic feature of Indian culture' (Dumont 1952: 83). The question of socio-cosmic dualism relates to Durkheimian influence on early Dutch anthropology, often described (Needham 1963: xxxii; P.E. de Josselin de Jong 1972), and to the lessons the Dutch took from Durkheim and Mauss's essay on primitive classification. What most inspired several contributors to *The Flow of Life* was not the complex model, but van Wouden's determination to treat social structure and social classification as a totality in Mauss's sense (Fox 1980c: 3).

Van Wouden showed that an asymmetric marriage system functions equally well with either a matrilineal or patrilineal rule of descent. He then inferred that such a system would necessarily involve both matrilineal and patrilineal groups or clans (1968: 90-1, 163). He built up his phratry model on this basis. These points had already been discovered and demonstrated by Fortune (1933),

though neither van Wouden nor J.P.B. de Josselin de Jong refers to this paper, so directly related to their own model. Van Wouden's system can easily be diagrammed (Fortune 1933: 8; van Wouden 1968: 91; P.E. de Josselin de Jong 1980b: 37). The empirical difficulty is that, as van Wouden later realized (1977: 218), in Indonesia double unilineality governing groups does not occur in conjunction with asymmetric marriage rules. Both institutions are found on Sumba, but double descent is characteristic only of Kodi in the west, while asymmetric marriage alliance is practised in the east.

In attempting a revision of Murdock's classification (1940) of societies with double descent, Goody (1961) proposed that double descent be recognized only in societies with both matrilineal and patrilineal corporate groups - corporateness being defined as holding property. In his commentary Fischer (1961) accepted that recognition and naming of both kinds of groups by members of a society was essential, but declined to accept the criterion of corporateness, preferring instead to distinguish between double descent systems with and those without corporate groups. It is easy to sympathize with Fischer's position. As Bulmer (1961) remarked, 'does not this criterion [corporateness] suggest, for example, that because the Nuer lineage is not corporate, it is not particularly important?' I have tried to show (Barnes 1980b: 98, 117) that even where corporate groups are associated with unilineal descent in eastern Indonesia, it is corporateness which reveals complications and demands explanations rather than being itself an answer. However, P.E. de Josselin de Jong (1961) accepts neither the requirement of recognition, nor that of corporateness. Hence P.E. de Josselin de Jong says (1984c: 7) that van Wouden is correct to conclude that circulating connubium with generalized exchange was emphasized at the cost of double descent in eastern Sumba, 'but only if we concentrate on double descent as a "rule principle": the participants in this connubium system are the patrilineal descent groups. However, matrilineality is also recognized in this society, but is an "idea principle".' His example of the 'idea principle' of matrilineality is that in eastern Sumba a person is recognized as belonging to the highest nobility only if he is able to trace a purely high noble ancestry in the matriline as well as the patriline, without a single ancestor of lower nobility.

Since the author does not spell out what he means by 'idea principles', it is difficult to assess the notion without fear of misrepresenting it. Nevertheless, that rule principles should be entirely distinct rather than one kind of manifestation among many of idea principles seems doubtful. The above example shows that the Leiden authors recognize double descent even when its features are relevant to only a segment of a community. Furthermore, it raises the question whether P.E. de Josselin de Jong clearly distinguishes between double descent and cognatic kinship. Presumably, if any one of four grandparents were of inappropriate rank, ego's standing would be affected, but only two of the grandparents are related to him through a unilineal principle. The debates in Britain of the 1950s and early 1960s over the understanding of

descent, corporateness, complementary filiation, affinity and marriage alliance informed Kloos's critique (1963, 1964) of P.E. de Josselin de Jong's attempt to discover double unilineal descent among the Minangkabau of Sumatra and Negri Sembilan of western Malaysia. As de Josselin de Jong's book was originally conceived (1980b: 40), it did seem to be open to the objection that the author was looking for evidence of double unilineal groups; and seen in those terms the evidence simply failed to support a case. In the revised edition (1980b: 224), the author concedes that he is now less concerned with the question whether principles become manifest in actual descent groups. In keeping with this attitude, he chooses not to distinguish between descent and filiation, though he recognizes (1980b: 225) that other authors would deem much of his evidence for patrilineal descent in Minangkabau society as exemplifying patrifiliation to matrilineal descent groups or differential rules of inheritance.

P.E. de Josselin de Jong (1984c: 7) considers that the matriline in Toba Batak society is recognized in passing textiles and weaving equipment from mother to daughter. The father's heirloom treasures are divided among his sons, while those of the mother are divided among daughters (Niessen 1983: 468; 1984: 68), allegedly exemplifying double unilineal descent. These examples suggest that the 'idea principles' of the Leiden group are similar to Needham's formally presented 'elementary modes of descent' (Needham 1971: 10). However, the differential inheritance of household possessions according to the sex of parents and children is one of the more common examples of what is sometimes called parallel descent. By treating this Toba Batak example as evidence for double descent, the Leiden authors seem implicitly to reject Needham's list of six modes and to be returning to Murdock's recognition of only four kinds, bilateral (cognatic), patrilineal, matrilineal, and double - although Murdock (1949: 44-5) did not in fact count examples of parallel and alternating descent as double descent. There are indeed grounds for arguing that the six modes are not of the same analytic standing. The sixth, cognation, is not even a principle, nor do the six modes exhaust the formal possibilities (Barnes 1982b: 224 n.5). Following this line of thought, we might reduce the list to two principles, denominated patrilineal and matrilineal, which appear in a variety of formal combinations (compare Scheffler 1966: 544-5).

In van Wouden's (and Fortune's) original model of circulating connubium and double descent, the marriage system and the descent lines were plainly distinguished features, diagrammatically as well as in fact. There are, however, concomitant aspects of Indonesian societies with asymmetric marriage alliance which occasionally have been characterized as alternative descent lines. Among the Toba Batak the wife-takers must regard the wife-givers as a source of supernatural power, *sahala*, which may be beneficial, but which creates fear and respect. The wife-givers are the source of all life and prosperity (van Ossenbruggen 1935: 11), and they stand in the mortal world as the deputy of the High God (Vergouwen 1964: 55). Kloos (1963: 294) criticized Fischer for saying (1952: 118) that the *sahala* is inherited matrilineally because if the

mother's group does not help, one goes further to that of the mother's mother, whereas in fact *sahala* derives from the *patrilineal group* of the mother or mother's mother.

Like the Toba Batak, the Kédang and the neighbouring Lamaholot of the East Flores Regency compare wife-givers to Divinity. In Kédang, the 'trunk mother's brother' is spoken of as God, while the Lamaholot describe him as 'like a second God' (Barnes 1974: 247-50; 1977a: 150; 1979: 23). Both societies practise prescriptive asymmetric marriage alliance. The people of Roti, who do not have such a marriage system, do nevertheless recognize alliance between patrilineal groupings. Within alliance the Rotinese mark the tie to the 'mother's brother of origin' and the 'mother's mother's brother of origin' (Fox 1971; 1980d: 118-19). On Roti a person derives flesh and blood via his mother, and her agnates provide rituals sustaining his life. The nature of the alliance group is unspecified and may according to context be defined as a house, a lineage or a clan. In each case, of course, the grouping is patrilineal. In Kédang too the analytic notion of an alliance group cannot be given a fixed definition (Barnes 1980a: 81-5). In all three societies, if for some reason the genealogical mother's brother is unavailable as 'trunk mother's brother', the position passes to close agnatic relatives, either the son, brother or parallel cousin of the mother's brother. What Fox calls the line of maternal affiliation linking a Rotinese to the group of his mother's brother and mother's mother's brother is not matrilineal descent, but matrifiliation to patrilineally ordered alliance groups, within an overarching alliance relating the groups. According to Fox (1980d: 131), 'Instead of attending to the complex use of categories and the hierarchy of relations they can connote, van Wouden confounded levels of alliance by compressing them into one.' Given the structural relativity inherent in the alliance groups, the meaning of alliance cannot be located in the, only sporadically occurring, political content of marriage alliance among substantive groupings.

Hocart (1923) wrote that cross cousins in Fiji are 'gods to one another', ancestor and descendant, god and worshipper, even though the relationship is marked by ritualized ill manners and appropriation, in other words, a joking relationship. The Fiji pattern is symmetric, unlike the eastern Indonesian asymmetric arrangement under immediate consideration (there are, of course, also symmetric systems on Flores, Pantar, Alor and Timor).[1] Mauss

---

[1] Miller (1984: 13) contrasts the institutionalized licence towards matrilateral kin in Fiji with the Indonesian pattern where maternal kin are ambivalently beneficial and harmful. Thus in Fiji a privilege may be conferred on a sister's son to take freely possessions from his mother's brother or mother's father. In fact this regional distinction does *not* exist. In Kédang a sister's son may claim some of his mother's brother's coconut trees at his mother's brother's funeral. By doing so he would, however, incur heavy obligations (Barnes 1974: 179).

(1969: 122) said of relationships of this kind that they 'correspond to reciprocal rights and that, generally, when these rights are unequal, they correspond to a religious inequality.' A religious inequality is inevitably a hierarchy. J.P.B. de Josselin de Jong realized that if we abstract from the chain of alliances and look at the position of any one group, we see that it finds itself in the centre of a triad, constituting a micro-society. Each group in fact occupies three different positions from the point of view of hierarchy: wife-giver, wife-taker, and the centre of the triad. Alliances are accompanied by the exchange of goods and persons as well as a 'hierarchically based system of etiquette'.

Here is posed the question of the relation between the differential position of allies and the nature of hierarchy. Two underlying issues may also be referred to. As we know, Dumont (1966) has distinguished between hierarchy and social stratification, applying his idea of encompassment of contraries to hierarchy, whereas social stratification implies merely unequal access to power and resources. Furthermore, Leach has argued (1954: 211) that an asymmetric (*'mayu-dama'*) marriage rule like that of the Kachin of Burma will not be found with stable equalitarian social organization because alliance inequality will lead to status inequality. Finally there is the problem of class systems in the archipelago. J.P.B. de Josselin de Jong (1977: 177) referred, perhaps incautiously, to 'the caste-like class systems found throughout Indonesia'. Although in terms of empirical groupings, as well as ideological categories, asymmetric alliance produces triads and other plural patterns, the alliance tie is basically dyadic, that is, wife-giver versus wife-taker. Native language idiom expressing alliance is also commonly dyadic. Wife-givers in Southeast Asia are religiously superior and in idiom and practice are analogous to ancestors or Divinity. This kind of superiority, however, is ultimately intransitive. You may be God or priest to me, and I may be God or priest to someone else, but you will not be God or priest to him; indeed, he may stand in that position to you. Social stratification, however, is transitive. There is a crucial difference, therefore, between the situational, religiously defined, inequality of affines and class inequality (Barnes 1974: 245). The former appears to me to be closer to what Dumont calls hierarchy, though what is being encompassed by what is a complicated question.

Leach (1952) criticized P.E. de Josselin de Jong's attempt to discover circulating connubium in Minangkabau society precisely because wife-givers are superior to wife-takers in Indonesia, as they are among the Kachin. This criticism actually constitutes an attack on the idea of a closed cycle of alliances as an empirical reality. It provoked de Josselin de Jong (1980b: 218-21) to reaffirm the difference between alliance status and social class by reference to Indonesian ethnography, though he now appears (1984c: 4) to prefer to speak of 'asymmetric' rather than 'circulating' connubium. This retreat is well advised because although in a model, and occasionally in fact, 'circulating connubium', 'alliance cycles' with closure, or what have you, is compatible

with alliance inequality, clear patterns of culturally recognized, stable alliance cycles leading to closed circles are actually quite rare in Indonesia. Though I agree, naturally, with de Josselin de Jong's rebuttal to Leach, Leach's arguments about combining alliance with class may help in explaining the confusing empirical variety we find in practical implementations of alliance ideologies. A good deal of Leach's discussion of Kachin alliance, the indeterminacy of groups, the importance of the status of mothers and wives, and even the oscillation between stratified and equalitarian community structures either obviously applies to Indonesian societies of the appropriate kind or could by argument be made to apply.

For example, Leach (1961: 84-6) shows that at each level of Kachin society, but particularly for chiefs, cycles of three groups, 'cousin circle paths', can form, establishing the equality of the parties, maintaining prestige by huge, but imaginary bridewealth obligations, and even forming the basis of large-scale political alliances. Van Wouden (1977: 217-19) concluded that a completely closed system of alliance relations would require a fixed number of groups, but that the arrangement had never been encountered in Indonesia. However, on Tanimbar the foremost groups of one community maintain asymmetric alliances with similar groups in other communities. On Sumba, royal lineages were linked by such alliances with similar lineages elsewhere. Van Wouden therefore spoke of the 'international character' of such alliances. This observation brings up two further considerations. In the first place, there is the historical question whether the precise maintenance of asymmetric alliances is not primarily an activity of an aristocracy, with commoners or non-aristocratic communities being unable or unconcerned for political, economic or class reasons to follow a strict pattern. The second matter is that this 'international' character affects alliance for all groups through the bridewealth objects, characteristically of outside derivation, which circulate among allies. The basically non-commercial exchanges at the centre of the community are therefore inextricably linked to foreign trade, and hence the essentially internal focus of social structure is simultaneously outward-looking (Barnes 1980b: 119). It is at precisely this point of internal/external orientation that Barraud has applied Dumont's conception of hierarchy to Tanebar-Evav society (1979, 1984, 1985).

Indonesian class systems, where they exist, commonly consist in rulers, aristocrats, commoners and slaves, with possible distinctions within each group. Lineages of aristocrats, commoners or slaves may belong to the same clan, and slave lineages sometimes obey the same alliance rules as the superior members of their clan (Barnes 1977a; Forth 1981: 414). Pigeaud (1962: 468-9) says that Javanese society as a whole in the fourteenth and preceding centuries was probably divided into the four classes of rulers, men of religion, commoners and bondmen, though the bondmen received no recognition. The Indian varna categories were known in East Java, but hardly corresponded to reality. In tenth-century Java, villages were relatively egalitarian. They were run by a council of authorities, *rama*, divided into those with special

functions, often four in number, and the other elders. The *rama* belonged to the *anak wanua* (children of the domain, earth), the dominant group of descendants of the presumed village founders. Inscriptions give few details of others in the village who were not *anak wanua* (de Casparis 1981: 136-7). Allowing for the somewhat imprecise nature of this picture, it would apply easily to parts of eastern Indonesia well into the twentieth century and, at least residually, still today - for example, in East Flores (Arndt 1940: 101-4). The quasi-democratic structure of the Javanese village contrasted with the hierarchic nature of central government. After the eighteenth century, the Javanese village theoretically replicated the central government (de Casparis 1981: 140-7). Remnants of Indian caste influence are most apparent in Bali and Lombok, where Howe argues (1985) that any attempt to compare Balinese title groups to Indian caste leads not to a simple answer, but to a multitude of supplementary questions. J.P.B. de Josselin de Jong did not explain what he meant by caste-like systems throughout Indonesia, culturally related to Indian caste, but existing before Hindu contact. In particular, the underlying opposition of purity and impurity in Indian caste is lacking for much of Indonesia.

Among his criteria were the distribution of functions among individual dignitaries and the preference for particular numbers. These two issues are often connected. Wolters includes the mandala pattern among his cultural complex. There is a tendency to represent village, regional or state structure by a numerically defined structure, commonly of even-numbered positions around a centre, such as the Javanese *monca-pat* and *monca-lima* (5 and 9 structures, respectively), described by van Ossenbruggen (1977). Tambiah's chapter seven (1976: 103-31) offers a survey of surveys in some respects of the Southeast Asian exploitation of mandala-like geometric patterns of several levels of complexity, rising to seventeen and thirty-three configurations in Buddhist state theory. Though the mandala strictly speaking belongs to Hindu and Buddhist influence in Southeast Asia, very similar patterns appear to be pre-Hindu. Tambiah says they constitute communities from clan-based societies practising slash-and-burn agriculture to complex polities of valley-based sedentary rice cultivators. He has united them under his phrase 'galactic-polity'.

In his chapter on dualism and tripartition, van Wouden (1968: 25-84) draws together information from the east for a variety of configurations, including the common system of four cooperating officials of diverse functions and a division between secular and sacred authority associated with ruler or political head and 'lord of the land', respectively. Among sources for East Flores not used by van Wouden, Vatter (1932: 81) and Arndt (1940: 101-4) describe an ideal pattern in which four autochthonous land-owning clans of a village share four offices called head (*koten*), hind quarter (*kelen*), sacrificer (*hurit*, from *suri*, sword), and speech (*marang*). At the sacrifice, the bearer of the office of *koten* holds the animal's head and subsequently receives it when the animal is divided. This official holds the animal from behind and normally receives the hind legs. *Hurit* kills the animal, while

marang recites the ritual text. *Koten* is the most prominent of the four ritual figures and assumes leadership over affairs within the village. Vatter calls him to some extent the minister of the interior, and Arndt says he is lord of the land. *Kelen* concerns himself with external affairs, especially peace and war and relations with neighbouring villages. There are generally wide divergences from the pattern throughout the region, and in places it appears to have been totally absent, but the Raja of Larantuka incorporated it into his governmental structure. A Timor myth connects this four-part authority structure with the story of four tribes who travelled from Malaysia to Larantuka, Flores and from there to Timor, leaving behind in Larantuka the ancestors of its raja (Grijzen 1904: 18; van Wouden 1968: 46). Influenced by van Ossenbruggen, Jansen (1977, originally 1933) described the numerology of Ambonese political classification, which was often of four-five structure, but sometimes simply a fourfold or twofold unit. The familiar four-quarter or *suku* pattern of Sumatran cultures has parallels, and no doubt at least linguistic influence, throughout the archipelago. P.E. de Josselin de Jong (1980b: 108, 153) also found the four around the centre pattern in Minangkabau and Negri Sembilan territorial organization, and Schulte Nordholt (1971) has comprehensively described a similar arrangement and its elaborations in Timorese political history.

The preference for particular numbers, referred to by J.P.B. de Josselin de Jong, actually concerns a complex of related issues. One of these literally concerns the frequent use of a specific number or pair of numbers for classification, in which case they serve as conventions or templates, what Bergaigne called 'frameworks prepared beforehand' (Barnes 1982a: 16-17; Lévy-Bruhl 1926: 196). Examples are the frequent use of seven in Malay magic (Skeat 1900: 50), the special symbolic preference for nine among the Wemale of Seran (Jensen 1948: 55), the preference for eight or its even fractions to express completion or fulfilment on Sumba (Onvlee 1977: 157), four as an expression of unity among the Atoni of Timor (Cunningham 1973: 212), and three to express completeness and nine to express totality on Roti (Fox 1980d: 110). Behind these practices lies the distinction between the even and odd number series. Generally even numbers are complete numbers, with exceptions as just seen (i.e. Roti), and Dempwolff (1938) has reconstructed, at least for the western branch, words of Proto-Austronesian for both the odd- and even-numbered series, as well as for 'hundred' and 'thousand'. Dahl (1981: 53) accepts that reflexes of the root for 'hundred' are widely distributed in Austronesian languages outside of Formosa, but recognizes 'thousand' only in western languages.

The symbolic or classificatory use of specific numbers has been found to relate to the underlying opposition between the odd- and even-numbered series (Barnes 1982a), and the older Dutch contributions to symbolic numerology could perhaps be expanded and deepened by attention to this background. The symbolic interchangeability of numbers also is only to be understood by reference to the opposition between the two series. In Wemale, Seran, odd numbers are preferred to even numbers and appear to be to some

extent interchangeable (Jensen 1948: 55ff.). The same seems to hold true on Roti (Fox 1980d: 110) and is certainly true of Kédang (Barnes 1974, 1975, 1982a). In Rindi, east Sumba, two, four, eight, and sixteen are symbolically equivalent (Forth 1981: 35; compare Adams 1980: 216-18). Very similar cultures in closely adjacent regions can differ as to which series they regard as preferable. In Kédang, Lembata odd numbers are propitious ('the numbers of life'), while in Rindi, Sumba, even numbers are propitious (Forth 1981: 211).

Austronesian languages have ten-based number systems. Lancy (1983: 104, 106) says of the number systems of the Austronesian languages of New Guinea, which like those farther west are base-ten and have terms for 100 and 1000, that they are flexible and appear to be used in a variety of applications. Unlike other Papua-New Guinea systems, as true counting systems, they do treat number as a concept. Furthermore, an Austronesian-speaking fishing community, the Ponam, where Lancy and his colleagues conducted Piagetian tests, was found to provide the necessary environmental support for cognitive development in Western terms, whereas it was uncertain that other kinds of societies in Papua-New Guinea did so (1983: 145). Austronesian numbers appear to have been relatively recently introduced there. Dahl (1981) appears to attribute the development of the Austronesian numeral system to cultural growth connected with seafaring, migration and above all trade. 'Even very primitive forms of trade call for numerals' (Dahl 1981: 46). These systems and their use in trade also imply the ability to perform basic arithmetical operations, at least for smaller quantities. In this light Jansen's comments (1977: 103) on Ambonese symbolic arithmetic take on special interest.

After this survey of factors, the question may now be taken up as to the use of the idea of the anthropological field of study. Fox (1980e: 330-1) has written that 'research in the social categories of particular societies has tended not to dispel the notion of a structural core but rather to reinterpret it.' However, P.E. de Josselin de Jong (1984d: 240) thinks it remarkable that though persons have suggested additions and deletions, no one has questioned the utility or status of the structural core as such, about which he confesses to have grave doubts. He prefers to speak of a 'basis for comparison', the constituents of which are 'basic elements'. We may wonder whether this modification represents anything more than a shift of metaphor. The similarity of J.P.B. de Josselin de Jong's programme to the recommendations of Eggan (1954) and Evans-Pritchard (1965), that controlled comparison should be of linguistically and ethnologically related societies, has been noted by various authors (see Fox 1980c: 3). The Leiden authors also distrust broad statistical comparisons. P.E. de Josselin de Jong argues that the *studieveld* conception, being programmatic, is to be distinguished from the cultural area method of American anthropology, which is based on proven common traits. There is something unusual about a fifty-year-old programme that has not yet reconstituted itself into a synopsis of proven results.

There is no doubt, though, that scholars will continue to work with an open-ended set of comparative themes. Among these

is the general question of descent. We can expect a variety of principles to be exploited in any society. Societies that organize corporate or non-corporate descent groups patrilineally are apt to have neighbours who do so matrilineally, but they may also have neighbours with what in effect are cognatic descent groups (Barnes 1980b). Similarly, symmetric and asymmetric prescriptive systems are apt to be adjacent, and they are also apt to have related, non-prescriptive or simply cognatic neighbours, especially in eastern Indonesia (Needham 1984: 227). Whatever is meant by prescriptive alliance, non-prescriptive societies in the east are likely to have institutions that are relevant to the theme of alliance (Fox 1980d).

Blust observes (1980a: 205) that the majority of western Indonesians reckon descent through bilateral kindreds and lack extended corporate groups. These have been 'lost over a more or less continuous area in the Malay Peninsula, Java, Sumbawa, Borneo, parts of Sulawesi, and the Philippines.' Except for Bima, the societies in question speak Western Malayo-Polynesian languages. There are, of course, cognatic systems on Flores, Pantar, Alor, Timor and in the Moluccas. Sumatran groups speaking languages of the Western Malayo-Polynesian family have descent systems and sometimes alliance systems that make them not just directly, but intimately comparable to Central Malayo-Polynesian-speaking communities of eastern Indonesia. Blust finds it difficult to explain the distribution of cognatic societies by diffusion of a common influence or by parallel development. Berthe (1970) attributed the cognatic system of Java to wet-rice agriculture, but this factor will hardly serve for all societies in question. Like the *studieveld*, Berthe's survey is notable for leaving out of the picture the cognatic peoples of Borneo (see King 1978). Fox (1980f: 234) remarks that a large percentage of Austronesian societies do not fit the simple type of bilateral versus prescriptive and unilineal. He proposes that the proto-terminologies of the various linguistic sub-families be worked out before ambitious attempts like Blust's be made to arrive at the proto-organization for all of Austronesia. This effort would also provide a background for establishing smaller anthropological fields. This approach should facilitate coping with the diffusion of social forms across the boundaries of major language families, such as occurs where Austronesian confronts non-Austronesian languages on Timor, in the Moluccas and in Irian Jaya, and runs against Austroasiatic languages on the Southeast Asian mainland.

In addition to the themes of descent and alliance, or their absence, there are further comparative factors requiring consideration. Among these are the common dual division between secular or war leader and the lord of the land, the differential distribution of ritual offices (often four in number), and the issue of social classes. The distinction between male and female cosmological principles appears to be more general than that between male and female cycles of goods exchanged in connection with marriage. The relation of external trade (and warfare and slavery) to these internal systems of exchange is extremely important. Also pertinent is the co-existence of international trade in some areas with

non-cash economies and local, ritualized, permanent barter networks of subsistence goods and crafts. Numeracy and the possibility of an ancient and widespread knowledge of writing (de Casparis 1975: 1; Blust 1976: 33,36) also deserve consideration. Niessen's suggestion (1984) that textiles be added to the list of elements receives support from the fact that early Austronesian forms exist for weaving cloth, the loom and the weaving sword.

Fox (1980e: 331) has pointed to the shared social category of the house for descent groupings, relative age categories, and the reference to 'trunks' and 'origins' as metaphors for social relationships like that between mother's brother and sister's child (see also Barnes 1977; 1979: 29). In this respect, reference may also be made to the orientation of building material in the construction of houses and boats. Houseposts commonly have to retain the orientation of the original tree, and evidence has recently begun to emerge that this rule of orientation expressed horizontally as 'move to the right' may well be widespread and serve as a powerful social metaphor for marriage regulations (Barnes 1974: 337 - s.v. *wana pan*; 1975: 82-3; Forth 1981: 515 - s.v. movement to the right; Howe 1983: 152). Direction terms are a central issue (Blust 1980a: 220; Barnes 1974: 78-88), as is the yearly calendar, especially as it is marked by celestial events (see Barnes 1974: 117-21 and the references cited there).

This list is not exhaustive, and some factors offered here may indeed prove to be only scattered and uncommon. I would prefer to work with an expandable list and to include items at various stages of proven relevance, starting with those which are known to be of concern everywhere, but including some that are not always present and others which are speculatively offered on the chance that they will be found to have more importance than at present recognized (e.g. rules that things must circulate to the right). Smaller areas of common history and languages should be well worked out with constant reference to pan-Austronesian forms. An approach that restricts itself too much by reference to linguistic boundaries will not deal adequately with cultural comparison. Pragmatically we ought not to exclude non-Austronesian-speaking communities directly associated with Austronesian social patterns. What use does the FAS have? It has definitely had programmatic value. That stimulus will remain for all who read the relevant literature. That it ought to be tenaciously defended and preserved at all cost now, I doubt. It is, after all, only one among several ways of training ourselves what questions are useful to ask. Boundaries may be left to take care of themselves, but most would probably now concede that 'Indonesia' is not the proper name for an ethnological field.

R.H. BARNES

REFERENCES

ADAMS, Marie Jeanne 1980. 'Structural Aspects of East Sumbanese Art', in Fox 1980a.

ALLEN, J., J. GOLSON and R. JONES 1977. *Sunda and Sahul: Prehistoric Studies in Southeast Asia, Melanesia and Australia,* London: Academic Press.

ARNDT, Paul 1940. *Soziale Verhältnisse auf Ost-Flores, Adonara und Solor,* Münster i. W.: Aschendorffsche Verlagsbuchhandlung.

AVE, Jan B. 1976. 'Supplementary Remarks on Russell Jones's Article on "Indonesia"', *Archipel* no.12, pp. 227-30.

AVELING, Harry (ed.) 1979. *The Development of Indonesian Society,* St Lucia, Queensland: University of Queensland Press.

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

... 1975. 'Mancala in Kédang: A Structural Test', *Bijdragen tot de Taal-, Land- en Volkenkunde* Vol. CXXXI, no.1, pp. 67-85.

... 1977a. 'Alliance and Categories in Wailolong, East Flores', *Sociologus* Vol. XXVII, no.2, pp. 133-57.

... 1977b. '*Mata* in Austronesia', *Oceania* Vol. XLVII, no.4, pp. 300-19.

... 1979. 'Lord, Ancestor and Affine: An Austronesian Relationship Name', *NUSA* Vol. VII, pp. 19-34.

... 1980a. 'Concordance, Structure, and Variation: Considerations of Alliance in Kédang', in Fox 1980a.

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

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

... 1982b. 'Personal Names and Social Classification', in David Parkin (ed.), *Semantic Anthropology* [ASA Monograph 22], London: Academic Press.

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

... 1984. 'Comments on J.D.M. Platenkamp's Paper', in P.E. de Josselin de Jong 1984a.

... 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.

BASTIAN, A. 1884. *Indonesien oder die Inseln des Malayischen Archipel,* Berlin: Dümmler.

BERTHE, Louis 1970. 'Parenté, pouvoir et mode de production: Eléments pour une typologie des sociétés agricoles de l'Indonésie', in Jean Pouillon and Pierre Maranda (eds.), *Echanges et Communications: Mélanges Offerts à Claude Lévi-Strauss,* Tome II, The Hague: Mouton.

BLUST, Robert 1976. 'Austronesian Culture History: Some Linguistic Inferences and their Relations to the Archaeological Record', *World Archaeology* Vol. VIII, no.1, pp.19-43.

... 1980a: 'Early Austronesian Social Organization: The Evidence of Language', *Current Anthropology* Vol. XXI, no.2, pp.205-47.

... 1980b. 'Notes on Proto-Malayo-Polynesian Phratry Dualism', *Bijdragen tot de Taal-, Land- en Volkerkunde* Vol. CXXXVI, no. 2/3, pp. 215-47.

... 1984. 'Indonesia as a "Field of Linguistic Study"', in P.E. de Josselin de Jong 1984a.

BOSCH, F.D.K. 1951. Review of H.J. de Graaf, *Geschiedenis van Indonesië, Bijdragen tot de Taal-, Land- en Volkenkunde* Vol. CVII, pp. 392-3.

BULMER, Ralph 1961. Comments on Goody 1961, *Current Anthropology* Vol. II, no.1, p.13.

CASPARIS, J.G. de 1975. *Indonesian Palaeography: A History of Writing in Indonesia from the Beginnings to C. A.D. 1500*, Leiden: Brill.

... 1981. 'Pour une histoire sociale de l'ancienne Java, principalement au Xème s.', *Archipel* no.21, pp.125-51.

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

CUNNINGHAM, Clark E. 1973. 'Order in the Atoni House', in R. Needham (ed.), *Right and Left: Essays on Dual Symbolic Classification*, Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

DAHL, Otto Ch. 1981. 'Austronesian Numerals', *NUSA* Vol.X, pp. 46-58.

DEMPWOLFF, Otto 1938. *Austronesisches Wörterverzeichnis*, Berlin: Reimer.

DUMONT, Louis 1952. 'A Remarkable Feature of South Indian Pot-Making', *Man* Vol. LII, no. 121.

... 1966. *Homo hierarchicus: essai sur le système des castes*, Paris: Gallimard.

EGGAN, F. 1954. 'Social Anthropology and the Method of Controlled Comparison', *American Anthropologist* Vol. LVI, pp.743-65.

EVANS-PRITCHARD, E.E. 1965. 'The Comparative Method in Social Anthropology', in *The Position of Women in Primitive Societies and Other Essays in Social Anthropology*, London: Faber and Faber.

FISCHER, H. Th. 1952. *Inleiding tot de Culturele Anthropologie van Indonesië* (3rd edition), Haarlem: Bohn.

... 1961. Comments on Goody 1961, *Current Anthropology* Vol. II, no.1, pp. 13-14.

FORTH, Gregory L. 1981. *Rindi: An Ethnographic Study of a Traditional Domain in Eastern Sumba* [KITLV Verhandelingen 93], The Hague: Nijhoff.

FORTUNE, R.F. 1933. 'A Note on Some Forms of Kinship Structures', *Oceania* Vol. IV, no.1, pp. 1-9.

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

FOX, James J. (ed.) 1980a. *The Flow of Life: Essays on Eastern Indonesia*, Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press.
... (ed.) 1980b. *Indonesia: The Making of a Culture*, Canberra: Research School of Pacific Studies, The Australian National University.
... 1980c. 'Introduction', in Fox 1980a.
... 1980d. 'Obligation and Alliance: State Structure and Moiety Organization in Thie, Roti', in Fox 1980a.
... 1980e. 'Models and Metaphors: Comparative Research in Eastern Indonesia', in Fox 1980a.
... 1980f. Comments on Blust 1980a, *Current Anthropology* Vol. XXI, no.2, pp. 233-5.
GOODY, Jack 1961. 'The Classification of Double Descent Systems', *Current Anthropology* Vol. II, no.1, pp. 3-25.
GRIJZEN, H.J. 1904. *Mededeelingen omtrent Beloe, of Midden-Timor*, Batavia: Albrecht.
HALL, D.G.E. 1981. *A History of South-East Asia* (4th edition), London: Macmillan.
HOCART, A.M. 1923. 'The uterine nephew', *Man* Vol. XXIII, no.4.
HOWE, Leopold E.A. 1983. 'An Introduction to the Cultural Study of Traditional Balinese Architecture', *Archipel* no.25, pp. 137-58.
... 1985. 'Caste in India and Bali: Levels of Comparison', 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.
JANSEN, H.J. 1977. 'Indigenous Classification System in the Ambonese Moluccas', in P.E. de Josselin de Jong 1977a [originally published in Dutch in 1933].
JENSEN, Ad.E. 1948. *Die drei Ströme: Züge aus dem Geistigen und Religiösen Leben der Wemale, einem Primitiv-Volk in den Molukken*, Leipzig: Harrassowitz.
JONES, Howard Palfrey 1973. *Indonesia: The Possible Dream*, Singapore: MAS AJU.
JONES, R. 1973. 'Earl, Logan and "Indonesia"', *Archipel* no.6, pp. 93-118.
JOSSELIN DE JONG, J.P.B. de 1937. *Oirata: A Timorese Settlement on Kisar*, Amsterdam: NV-Nord-Hollandsche Uitgevers-Maatschappij.
... 1947. *The Community of Erai (Wetar)*, Amsterdam: NV-Nord-Hollandsche Uitgevers-Maatschappij.
... 1977. 'The Malay Archipelago as a Field of Ethnological Study', in P.E. de Josselin de Jong 1977a [originally published in Dutch in 1935].
JOSSELIN DE JONG, P.E. de 1961. Comments on Goody 1961, *Current Anthropology* Vol. II, no.1, p.14.
... 1970. Review of Robert Jay, *Javanese Villagers, American Anthropologist* Vol. LXXII, no.5, pp. 1128-9.
... 1972. 'Marcel Mauss et les origines de l'anthropologie structurale hollandais', *L'Homme* Vol. XII, no.4, pp. 62-84.
... (ed.) 1977a. *Structural Anthropology in the Netherlands: A Reader* [KITLV Translations Series 17], The Hague: Nijhoff.
... 1977b. 'The Participant's View of Their Culture', in P.E. de

Josselin de Jong 1977a [originally published in Dutch in 1956].
... 1980a. 'The Concept of the Field of Ethnological Study', in Fox 1980a.
... 1980b. *Minangkabau and Negri Sembilan: Social-Political Structure in Indonesia* [3rd impression], The Hague: Nijhoff [originally published in 1951].
... (ed.) 1984a. *Unity in Diversity: Indonesia as a Field of Anthropological Study* [KITLV Verhandelingen 103], Dordrecht and Cinnaminson U.S.A.: Foris.
... 1984b. 'Foreword', in P.E. de Josselin de Jong 1984a.
... 1984c. 'A Field of Anthropological Study in Transformation', in P.E. de Josselin de Jong 1984a.
... 1984d. 'Summary and Conclusions', in P.E. de Josselin de Jong 1984a.
... and Erik SCHWIMMER (eds.) 1982. *Symbolic Anthropology in the Netherlands* [KITLV Verhandelingen 95], The Hague: Nijhoff.
KING, Victor (ed.) 1978. *Essays on Borneo Societies* [Hull Monographs on South-East Asia no.7], London: Oxford University Press.
KLOOS, P. 1963. 'Duolineaire afstamming en het matrilaterale cross-cousin huwelijk', *Bijdragen tot de Taal-, Land- en Volkenkunde* Vol. CXIX, no.3, pp. 287-300.
... 1964. 'Duolineaire afstamming en het matrilaterale cross-cousin huwelijk: Repliek', *Bijdragen tot de Taal-, Land- en Volkenkunde* Vol. CXX, no.3, pp. 368-75.
LANCY, David F. 1983. *Cross-Cultural Studies in Cognition and Mathematics*, New York: Academic Press.
LEACH, E.R. 1952. Review of P.E. de Josselin de Jong, *Minangkabau and Negri Sembilan*, *Man* Vol. LII, no.229.
... 1954. *Political Systems of Highland Burma: A Study of Kachin Social Structure*, London: Bell.
... 1961. *Rethinking Anthropology*, London: Athlone Press.
LEVY-BRUHL, Lucien 1926. *How Natives Think*, New York: Knopf.
LOGAN, J.R. 1850. 'The Ethnology of Indonesia', *Journal of the Indian Archipelago and Eastern Asia* Vol. IV, p.343.
MARSCHALL, Wolfgang 1984. 'Comments on Sandra Niessen's Paper', in P.E. de Josselin de Jong 1984a.
MAUSS, Marcel 1969. 'Parentés à plaisanteries', *Oeuvres*, Vol.3, Paris: Editions de Minuit [originally published in 1928].
MILNER, G.B. (ed.) 1978. *Natural Symbols in South East Asia*, London: School of Oriental and African Studies.
... 1984. 'Comments on P.E. de Josselin de Jong's Paper', in P.E. de Josselin de Jong 1984a.
MURDOCK, George Peter 1940. 'Double Descent', *American Anthropologist* Vol. XLII, pp. 555-61.
... 1949. *Social Structure*, New York: Macmillan.
NEEDHAM, Rodney 1963. 'Introduction', in Emile Durkheim and Marcel Mauss, *Primitive Classification*, Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
... 1971. 'Remarks on the Analysis of Kinship and Marriage', in Rodney Needham (ed.), *Rethinking Kinship and Marriage* [ASA

Monograph 11], London: Tavistock.
... 1984. 'The Transformation of Prescriptive Systems in Eastern Indonesia', in P.E. de Josselin de Jong 1984a.
NIESSEN, S.A. 1983. 'Toba-Batak Matriliny: A Deception?', *Bijdragen tot de Taal-, Land- en Volkenkunde* Vol. CXXXIX, no.4, pp. 465-9.
... 1984. 'Textiles are Female...But What is Femaleness? Toba Batak Textiles in the Indonesian Field of Ethnological Study', in P.E. de Josselin de Jong 1984a.
ONVLEE, L. 1977. 'The Construction of the Mangili Dam: Notes on the Social Organization of Eastern Sumba', in P.E. de Josselin de Jong 1977a [originally published in Dutch in 1949].
OSSENBRUGGEN, F.D.E. van 1977. 'Java's *Monca-Pat*: Origins of a Primitive Classification System', in P.E. de Josselin de Jong 1984a [originally published in Dutch in 1916].
PAGET, Roger K. (ed.) 1975. *Indonesia Accuses! Soekarno's Defence Oration in the Political Trial of 1930*, Kuala Lumpur: Oxford University Press.
PEACOCK, James L. 1973. *Indonesia: An Anthropological Perspective*, Pacific Palisades, California: Goodyear.
PIGEAUD, Theodore G. Th. 1962. *Java in the 14th Century: A Study of Cultural History*, Vol. 4 [KITLV Translations Series 4,4], The Hague: Nijhoff.
PLUVIER, J.M. 1974. *South-East Asia from Colonialism to Independence*, Kuala Lumpur: Oxford University Press.
REID, Anthony (ed.) 1983. *Slavery, Bondage and Dependency in Southeast Asia*, St Lucia, Queensland: University of Queensland Press.
... and David MARR (eds.) 1979. *Perceptions of the Past in Southeast Asia*, Singapore: Heinemann.
RICKLEFS, M.C. 1981. *A History of Modern Indonesia c. 1300 to the Present*, London: Macmillan.
SCHEFFLER, H.W. 1966. 'Ancestor Worship in Anthropology or, Observations on Descent and Descent Groups', *Current Anthropology* Vol. VII, no.5, pp. 541-51.
SCHULTE NORDHOLT, H.C. 1971. *The Political System of the Atoni of Timor* [KITLV Verhandelingen 60], The Hague: Nijhoff.
SKEAT, Walter William 1900. *Malay Magic*, London: Macmillan.
SMITH, R.B. and W. WATSON (eds.) 1979. *Early South East Asia: Essays in Archaeology, History and Historical Geography*, New York: Oxford University Press.
STOTT, P.A. (ed.) 1978. *Nature and Man in South East Asia*, London: School of Oriental and African Studies.
TAMBIAH, S.J. 1976. *World Conqueror and World Renouncer: A Study of Buddhism and Polity in Thailand Against a Historical Background*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
VATTER, Ernst 1932. *Ata Kiwan, unbekannte Bergvölker im Tropischen Holland*, Leipzig: Bibliographisches Institut A.G.
VERGOUWEN, J.C. 1964. *The Social Organization and Customary Law of the Batak of Northern Sumatra* [KITLV Translations Series 7], The Hague: Nijhoff.
WOLTERS, O.W. 1982. *History, Culture, and Region in Southeast Asian*

Perspective, Singapore: Institute of Southeast Asian Studies.

WOUDEN, F.A.E. van 1968. *Types of Social Structure in Eastern Indonesia* (transl. R. Needham) [KITLV Translation Series 11], The Hague: Nijhoff [originally published in Dutch in 1935].

... 1977. 'Local Groups and Double Descent in Kodi, West Sumba', in P.E. de Josselin de Jong 1977a [originally published in Dutch in 1956].