

### THREE TYPES OF SOCIAL ORGANIZATION IN INSULAR SOUTHEAST ASIA\*

M. A. CHLENOV

USSR Academy of Sciences

N. N. Mikloukho - Maklay Institute of Ethnography

Moscow

UDK 39: 301. 161 (5)

Izvorni znanstveni rad

Original scientific paper

Primljeno: 31. 07. 1988.

Odobreno: 20. 11. 1989.

*Over a hundred years ago Lewis Henry Morgan, comparing the structures of the kinship terminology systems of the Dravidians and the American Indians, strove to see in the similarity of a kinship classification an argument in support of the idea of the Asian origin of the New World aborigines. Now this thought of the great American ethnographer is cited as perhaps a deskbook example of an ethnographic error. Already in those years he realized that the kinship terminology system (KTS) was derived not from the historical and genetic contacts between peoples, but from the character of social organization. Since then to this day the commonly adopted view of ethnographic (anthropological) science is reduced to the assumption that the kinship systems are, in the final analysis, determined by the social structure.*

This thesis does not have to be disproved or even doubted. The social character of the KTSs is sufficiently clear. This is brilliantly confirmed in hundreds, if not thousands of relevant publications. Nevertheless, it apparently needs some corrections. Oddly enough, no serious attempt has still been made to sum up the entire available KTS material on the pan-oecumenic scale and to clear up the specific areal features of the distribution of the structural KTS types. The only appropriate attempt known to the author is embodied in G. P. Murdock's HRAF, but in fact the data are only tabulated, but not brought together, still less so, analysed, in it. Furthermore, a certain degree of the mechanistic na-

---

\*Paper presented at the 12th International Congress of Anthropological and Ethnological Sciences, Zagreb, Yugoslavia, July 24-31, 1988.

ture of HRAF and the uncritical approach to sources are generally known and have frequently been criticised. In the meantime, the mapping of the KTSs and the areal study of the distribution of structural features make it possible to note the existence in a great number of cases of clear correlations between the typological characteristics of the KTSs and the genetic filiation of a language. These correlations are not always unambiguous and should be considered separately in each individual case. But doesn't the same apply to the correlation between the KTSs and the social organization types? Of course, if the correlations were noncontradictory and absolute, there would be no scientific problem here.

Once the author pointed out the same type KTS are as in Siberia and Central Asia. It will be recalled that the overwhelming majority of the Turkic KTSs are classed with the Omaha structural type and are characterised by what is known as age generation, or sliding generations' variable. The same signs are characteristic of the Siberian-Ugric, Mongolic and Samodian KTSs<sup>1</sup>. The connection between these specific structural features and the linguistic families is clear, considering that there is undoubtedly no detecting a clear correlation with the type of social organisation at the synchronic level. Indeed, what is there in common in the social structures of the Nentsi and the Uzbeks, the Mongols and the Mansi? Theoretical conclusions based on Siberian material were cited by the author in his previous publication and do not have to be repeated here.<sup>2</sup> Their essence was reduced to the statement of a certain conservatism of the KTSs and of their structural change under the influence of extreme social and ethnohistorical factors. Among the latter a reference can be made to a great number of ethnic processes, including migration, the assimilation of alien ethnic population, bilingualism and biculturalism, etc.

The present paper deals with another area, where it seems to the author that the dependence of the KTS structural type on historical and genetic factors, discovered by the author on Siberian material, can also be traced. It is the insular part of Southeast Asia, covering the Malay Archipelago, the Philippines and also Taiwan (naturally, only the aboriginal population of this island can interest the author in this context), i. e., the zone of settlement of the Austronesians peoples.

But before considering the areal regularities of the KTS distribution in this extremely interesting area, the author will make several observations regarding the KTS typology and mapping principles. The research object of an ethnographer, in contrast to that of a linguist, is not the linguistic substance of a KTS, but only its semantic structure. As is known, the previous generations of scholars have developed several typological classifications for its description. In the West the most widely disseminated is a six-member typology, formulated in the clearest terms in the famous book "Social Structure", by G. P. Murdock<sup>3</sup> and based on the principles of categorization of kinship relations in Generation Ø. The author has already written that this typology, in spite of its efficiency, is beset

1 N. V. Bikbulatov. Skolzyashchiiy shchot pokoleniy v uralcaltayskikh sistemakh rodstva. Po dannym areal'nykh nablyudenyi (Sliding Generations'. Variable in Ural-Altai Kinship Systems, According to the Data of Areal Observations). - *Arealnye issledovaniya v yazykoznanii i etnografii. Yazik i etnos* (Areal Research in Linguistics and Ethnography. Language and Ethnos). Leningrad, 1983, pp. 240-247; M. A. Chlenov. Geography of Kinship Systems of the Peoples of Siberia and the Soviet Far East. - *Soviet Studies in Ethnography*. Ed. by Yu. Bromley. Moscow, 1978, pp. 161-169.

2 M. A. Chlenov. Geography of Kinship Systems ..., p. 168-169

with internal contradictions, having no cohesive underlying principle. In particular, the Omaha and Crow types are not identified on the same basis as, for instance, the Iroquois, Hawaiian or Eskimo types. Accordingly, each of them can be regarded as a specific realization of the other.<sup>4</sup> Furthermore, Murdock's typology ignores classification in other generations. In the Soviet science of recent decades popularity has been gained by a slightly modified four-member typology used in Western science in the prewar period.

M. V. Kryukov, who has employed this method for his fundamental theoretical analysis of the Chinese KTSs, has replaced the old names of typological units by new. He refers to the lineal types as English, to the generational types as Hawaiian, to the bifurcative-fused as Iroquois, and to the bifurcative-collateral as Arabic<sup>5</sup> This typology is elegant and free of internal contradictions but frequently too general, making it impossible to reflect a multitude of structural features and confusing clearly heterogeneous phenomena within the framework of one type. It is based on the categorization of kinship relations in Generation + 1.

In spite of these disadvantages, the author based his scheme exactly on Kryukov's typology. It will be recalled that its creator assumed that the KTSs develop from the Iroquois type to the English passing through the Hawaiian or through the Arabic stage, and each of these four types, in his opinion, should correspond to a specific form of social organization. In other words, each type is independent and basically separated from all the other types. Such an approach, however, is found to be justified only as a theoretical construct, as an evolutionary scheme. As an operational principle it is inconvenient since it frequently becomes impossible to class the KTS under study with a definite type. Especially in our case this involves the differentiation between the Hawaiian and the English types.

The simplest and easily solvable contradiction is observed when the relations of collateral kinship are expressed by a term of direct kinship with the addition of a determinative. This will be illustrated by the example of the Singapore Malays<sup>6</sup>:

<i>bapa</i>	F	<i>anak</i>	S, D
<i>bapa saudara</i>	FB, MB	<i>anak saudara</i>	BS, BD, ZS, ZD <sup>7</sup>

Here collateral kinship relations are denoted by the determinative "saudara". Whoever is familiar with the Malay language is aware that such a determinative can be only optional, that its use is situational. Thus, this KTS should perhaps be categorized as the Hawaiian type rather than the English. The latter type here clearly matures within the Hawaiian structure.

There are still more complex cases. For instance, different generations within the

3 G. P. Murdock. *Social Structure*. New York, 1949.

4 M. A. Chlenov. *Geography of Kinship Systems ...*, p. 161-163

5 M. V. Kryukov. *Sistema rodstva kitaytsev. Evolyusiya i zakonomernosti* (Kinship System of the Chinese. Evolution and Regularities). Moscow, 1972.

6 J. Djamour. *Malay Kinship and Marriage in Singapore*. London, 1959, pp. 25-26.

7 The author uses here the Western notation of kinship adopted in the English-Dutch tradition. What is known as the Levin code, which has gained dissemination in the Soviet tradition, is almost unknown outside the USSR. Therefore the author, despite its indisputable advantages, does not use it in the present paper.

framework of the same system are frequently structured in keeping with different typological principles. For instance, in the system of the Sarawak Penans of the Baram Valley generations + 1 and - 1 are structured on the English model and Generation Ø on the Hawaiian model.<sup>8</sup>

Generation + 1	<i>tamen F vi</i>	FB, FZ, MB, MZ
Generation Ø	<i>padi</i>	B, Z, FBS, FBD, FZS, FZD, MBS, MBD, MZS, MZD
Generation - 1	<i>anak</i>	S, D aong BS, BD, ZS, ZD

In this case is clearly a mixed type, which, adopting M. V. Kryukov's point of view, could be described as transitive. It will be noted that, sociologically, transitivity is unclear since the Penans are hunter-gatherers possessing a fairly archaic form of the social organization.

Among some peoples of this area different dialectal systems can be categorized as different structural types. In this respect the KTS of the Malays is indicative. Its Kedah variant shows purely Hawaiian features and its "Indonesian" variant purely English features: Malay KTS

	Kedah <sup>9</sup>		Java <sup>10</sup>
<i>bapak</i>	F, FB, MD	<i>ayah</i>	F
<i>kakak</i>	eB, eZ, eFBS D, eFZS D, eMBS D, eMZS D	<i>uak</i>	FeB, FeZ
<i>adek</i>	yB, yZ, yFBS D, eFZS D, yMBS D, yMZS D	<i>paman</i>	FyB
<i>anak</i>	D, S, BS, BD, ZS, ZD	<i>adik</i>	yB, yZ
		<i>kakak sepupu</i>	eFBS D, eFZS D, eMBS D, eMZS D
		<i>adik sepupu</i>	yFBS D, yFZS D, yMBS D, yMZS D

8 R. Needham. *Penan. - Ethnic Groups of Insular Southeast Asia*. Ed. by F. Lebar. Vol. 1. New Haven, 1972, p. 179.

9 D. J. Banks. Malay Kinship Terms and Morgan's Malayan Terminology. - *Bijdragen tot de taal-, land- en volkenkunde*. 1974, d. 130.

10 M. A. Chlenov. Opyt issledovaniya malayskoy sistmy rodstva (An Essay in the Study of the Malay Kinship System) - *Malaysko-indoneziyskiye issledovaniya* (Malay-Indonesian Studies). Moscow, 1977, pp. 9-24.

<i>anak</i>	S, D
<i>kemanakan</i>	BS, BD, ZS, ZD

On the face of it, it is no wonder that different dialectal systems may be classed with different structural types. But in this particular case, the interpretation by the author of the publication of the initial material plays such a substantial role that it makes it possible to question the very correctness of the basic differentiation of the English and Hawaiian specific structural features in this KTS. The point is that D. J. Banks cites in his publication similar Indonesian terms for the expression of collateral kinship: kakak sa-pupu eFBS|D... etc.; adek sa-pupu yFBS|D... etc.; anak penakan BS, BD, ZS, ZD but regards them as optional with respect to the corresponding classes cited in the table.

The researcher's influence on the classing of KTSs with a certain type is seen still more clearly in the case of the Javanese KTS, which two different researchers have registered in the same dialectal area in two different ways:

## Javanese KTS

Geertz<sup>11</sup>

<i>pak</i>	F, Fb, MB
<i>mas</i>	eB, eFBS, eFZS, eMBS, eMZS
<i>adik</i>	yB, yZ, yFBS D, yFZS D yMBS D, yMBS D

Koentjaraningrat<sup>12</sup>

<i>bapaq</i>	F
<i>uwa</i>	FeB, FeZ, MeB, MeZ,
<i>paman</i>	FyB, MyB
<i>kakang</i>	eB
<i>adi</i>	yB, yZ
<i>naqsanaq</i>	FBS D, FZS D, MBS D, MZS D

The reason for such a phenomenon is apparently the fact that the authors made different interpretations of the situational use of kinship terms and chose from the synonymical series those which they thought could function as representative descriptors.

In the author's opinion, this shows that in the Indonesian area are widespread KTSs which combine in multiform ways the structural features of the English and Hawaiian

11 H. Geertz. *The Javanese Family. A Study of Kinship and Socialization*. New York, 1961.

12 R. M. Koentjaraningrat. *The Javanese of South Central Java. - Social Structure in Southeast Asia*. Ed. by G. P. Murdock. Chicago, 1960, pp. 88-115.

types, so that classing them with one or the other is operationally impossible. Therefore in our case this differentiation becomes meaningless and unsuited for areal mapping.

The English and Hawaiian types are contrasted with the Iroquois and Arabic types. The latter two types are united by the presence of the common sign of bifurcativeness whereas in the former two types this sign is absent. It is exactly this sign which should apparently be placed at the basis of the KTS typology in our situation since the sign of collateralness, as the author has shown, in a great number of cases became neutralized. Thus, the author will distinguish bifurcative (i. e., Iroquois and Arabic) and non-bifurcative (i. e. Hawaiian and English) KTSs.

The conclusions as to the areal spread of these two types are based on the KTS Corpus of Insular Southeast Asia, which the author has compiled and in which he has put together and coded over 200 systems published in various sources. The KTSs have the following territorial distribution: Kalimantan - 29 per cent; Java, Sumatra, the Malacca Peninsula, Bali and Lombok - 28 per cent; Taiwan, the Philippines, and Sulawesi - 25 per cent; and the Lesser Sunda and Spice Islands - 18 per cent. Such a sample approaches the general population of the known KTSs of insular Southeast Asia and is sufficiently representative.

As a result of the mapping of the bifurcative and non-bifurcative systems have been identified three clear areas, whose existence was already noticed in ethnographic and Orientalist literature before.<sup>13</sup> The non-bifurcative KTSs occupy a solid area covering the Malacca Peninsula, northern and eastern Sumatra, Java, Bali, Lombok, Sumbawa, Kalimantan, Sulawesi, the Philippines, and Taiwan. The bifurcative KTSs are divided into two areas located on the two sides of the former. The former includes central and western Sumatra with the adjacent islands; the latter the Lesser Sunda Islands east of Sumbawa and the Moluccas. It is noteworthy that there are practically no gaps within these areas. Perhaps the only exception is the Ngada KTS in central Flores, surrounded in west and east by the Manggarai and Ende bifurcative systems. In the central area bifurcation is not observed anywhere. The only suggestion to it is contained in the KTS of the Sarawak Muruts published by E. R. Leach. His recording contains the following terms:<sup>14</sup>

*kayam* FBS, FBD *isurung* MZS (?), MZD (?) *yaman* FZS |D, MBS|D

The reliability of these data is doubtful. In this KTS bifurcation shows itself only in Generation Ø. On the whole, E. R. Leach's publication is fairly careless, being arranged by kinship relations and not by classes, and abounds in misprints, repetitions and inaccuracies. Furthermore, another recording of the KTS of the Muruts of the Mandalom District in Sabah, compiled by D. J. Prentice, a well-known researcher of the Murut Language, contains no hint at bifurcation. All cousin relations are expressed in his recording by one term "pantukir", which bears a clearly Hawaiian character. Thus, the only bifurcative "spot" in the central non-bifurcative area cannot be regarded as indisputable, so far,

13 R. A. Blust. Early Austronesian Social Organization: the Evidence of Language. - *Current Anthropology*. 1980, Vol. 21, No. 2, pp. 205-206.

14 E. R. Leach. *Social Science Research in Sarawak*. London, 1950, pp. 60-61.

and the solution of this question should be postponed until additional data are obtained.

An interesting and surprising feature of the bifurcative areas is the almost complete absence in our area of the KTSs of the Arabic type. True among these are the KTSs of the non-Austronesian north-Halmahera peoples, the Galela and the Tobelo.<sup>15</sup> Individual Arabic features are also traced among the Sahu of Northern Halmahera and among the Papuan-speaking Oirata of Kisar Island.<sup>16</sup> But among the Austronesian systems completely classed with the Arabic can be only the KTSs of the Mentawai, whose language and culture are known to be in general sufficiently specific in the Austronesian world.<sup>17</sup>

Although the interpretation of these areas goes beyond the framework of this brief paper, the author will express several relevant observations. First, this interpretation should necessarily be compiled with due account of the areal distribution. The early authors, noticing, for instance, the presence of bifurcative KTSs in Sumatra, used this fact to be little the significance of the non-bifurcative systems in the area's central part, and vice versa. The debates centred around the primacy of a concrete model. It appears that the areal approach would be more correct and the correlations should be searched for in the social or ethnohistorical sphere. In this particular case, the Eastern bifurcative area in eastern Indonesia clearly correlates with the Central Malaysian-Polynesian linguistic group identified by R. A. Blust,<sup>18</sup> thus bearing an ethnohistorical character. The central area wholly forms part of what is known as the Western Malay-Polynesian and the Taiwanese subdivisions and also has certain historical linguistic characteristics. The most complex situation is in the Sumatran area since it cuts across the boundaries of linguistic unities and even languages, for instance, Malay. Presumably, it can be fruitfully explained by the use of such concepts as ethnic substratum and contact zone. But then, it is equally applicable to the Eastern bifurcative area. Finally, in the social sphere the bifurcative KTSs correlate with the unilineal forms of kinship organization and the non-bifurcative KTSs with the bilateral. Nevertheless, this correlation needs a more detailed argumentation.

15 K. Matsuzawa. Social Organization and Rites of Passage. The Galela of Halmahera. A Preliminary Study. *SENRI Ethnological Studies*. Osaka, 1980, No. 7, pp. 345-400; J. D. M. Platenkamp. The Tobelo of Eastern Halmahera in the Context of the Field of Anthropological Study. - *Unity in Diversity*. Dordrecht, 1984, pp. 167-189.

16 L. E. Visser. *Mijn tuin mijn kind: een antropologische studie van de droge rijsteelt in Sahu (Indonesie)*. Leiden, 1984, pp. 271-272; J. P. B. Josselin, de. *Studies in Indonesian Culture 1: Oirata, a Timorese Settlement on Kisar. Verhandelingen der Kon. Ned. Akademie van Wetenschappen. Afd. Letterkunde*. Amsterdam, 1937, d. 16-17.

17 H. Nooy-Palm. The Culture of the Pagai-Islands and Sipora, Mentawai. - *Tropical Man*. 1968, vol. 1, pp. 203-206.

18 M. A. Chlenov. Wallacea: *Perspectives of Anthropological Study of a Contact Zone* (in print); R. A. Blust. The Proto-Austronesian Pronouns and Austronesian Subgrouping: a Preliminary Report. *Working Papers in Linguistics. University of Hawaii, Department of Linguistics*. 1977, vol. 9, No. 2, pp. 1-15.

## TRI VRSTE SOCIJALNIH ORGANIZACIJA NA OTOČJU JUGOISTOČNE AZIJE

### Sažetak

U članku se raspravljaju Morganove, više od stotinu godina stare, teze o terminologiji srodstva. Morgan svoje zaključke nije izvodio ne temelju historijskih i genetičkih dodira među narodima već na temelju karaktera socijalne organizacije. Njegove teze do sada nisu bile raspravljane ni osporavane ali ih autor u ovome radu ocjenjuje kao etnološke greške. Raspravljaju se i neke postavke E. Leacha. Donose i nove spoznaje autora o tipovima socijalne organizacije na otočju jugoistočne Azije.