INTRODUCTION

Kinship is the main structuring factor of all human societies and has traditionally interested the anthropologists the most. It is the constellation of principles underlying the social network because of which each human society bears it. It mediates understandings and conceptualisations of closeness and distance, connectedness and disconnection, unity and difference both in social practice and in anthropological theory. The management of each and every aspect of society is possible only by observing the principles underlying the 'kinship'. Not only it holds each bit of their sub units intact, but also establishes an uncompromising field of relationship between them. Kinship is that vital organ of a society, which injects the source of impulse to other social units to mechanize them for the whole society. It has its own beautiful structure, which is evident in various African, Asian and Australian tribes studied by various renowned authorities at different times. Kinship had achieved an almost sacrosanct status in social anthropology as the "physics," if not the "physiology" of social structure. Primary kinship terms were considered elemental or minimal units that combined to form complex typological systems. Such systems could then be expressed abstractly and subjected to mathematical manipulation and formal analysis. Schneider was able to expose the limitations of such techniques by noting critical variations in assumed terms of reference and address, as well as violations of rules of usage.

Kinship has occupied a central position in anthropological discourse for well over a century. Radcliffe-Brown (1950) had rightly focused: "for the understanding of any aspect of the social life of African people- economic, political, or religious- it is essential to have a thorough
knowledge of their system of kinship and marriage". Although the study refers to the African system it is very much true about other societies also and is evident from various studies by different authorities and researchers. Radcliffe-Brown has also suggested that "to arrive at an understanding of kinship systems we must use comparisons and analysis in combination by comparing many different systems with one another and by subjecting single systems to systematic analyses. Thus, the arrangement within the 'kinship' system and the management of the same is to be studied scientifically and systematically so that one can be able to get a clear picture of a particular culture and society. Here the arrangement is referred to the different status position of the relatives, the network involved in it, and also the divergence of sentiments and interests that lead to conflicts. As it is analysed by Radcliffe-Brown (1950) and Malinowski (1948), the various contributions of different social systems and customs are nothing but the social functions. The rights and obligations are structured to be mutual and reciprocal so that the principles involved, will run down the tradition to maintain the same among the next generations to come. So, for the proper understanding of the societal principles one has to go through the vivid picture of the 'kinship' structure of a particular society and then only one can be able to look into other society(s) and its other aspects too.

The anthropologists universally accept the fact that in isolated, homogeneous and non-literate little communities, social relations are informal, close and multifaceted. All kinds of social relations are patterned as per the principles underlying kinship and affinity of that particular society. On the above basis there are several categories of kins and affines including kins through adoption or by ritual incorporation. Kinship not only defines the biological relationships but also the fictive kinship that very often substitutes and supplements the actual kins. On the contrary, in large scale, complex, heterogeneous, stratified and central societies, and
particularly in urbanized and industrialized societies, kinship has rather a small scope to cover up all the principles to control and co-ordinate.

However, “many aspects of social life are implicit, automatic and unconscious, felt rather than expressed, and there may be a limited range of options open to expressions. There is only a restricted number of ways of tracing descent from earlier generations, for instance, residence rules or viable marriage systems. Such aspects occur widely enough to invite comparative effort to establish cross-cultural correlations, but they are still not universal enough to rule out all cultural variation. Conscious, explicit differences, however, may apply more particularly to situations in which the society seeks to stress its own identity specifically. As far as kinship is concerned, we may find here different ideas concerning parent hood, the relations between the sexes or the nature of marriage relations; particular symbols used to denote aspects of kinship; and different ways of rationalizing the existence of particular marriage or descent systems. These all promote variety rather than uniformity among cultures, and at the level of greatest detail, they are likely to be culturally specific. At all events, cross-cultural correlations can only be built up carefully and piecemeal from data collected in the field; and, while theoretical hypotheses may lead the search of data, it is they that must ultimately give way in cases of conflict with it” (Parkin, 1997).

John Beattie aptly observed, “kinship relations are not a special kind of social relationships, like economic relations or legal relations. Rather the categories which kinship affords provide the content and idiom for many different kinds of social relationships. It is field anthropologist’s task to determine, in the culture he is studying, what these are” (Beattie, 1964). Further, Beattie (1964) noted that “the social anthropologist’s task is to try to understand other people’s kinship systems ‘from the inside’ to learn to think in their categories, not to impose his own”. Beattie
finds that study of kinship is very commonly used for two important and related purposes. “First, it provides a way of transmitting status and property from one generation to the next, and second, in some societies it serves to establish and maintain effective social groups”. In social anthropology, succession to rank and status and inheritance on the one hand, and the structure of descent groups, like unilineal (patrilineal or matrilineal), bilateral, cognatic or ambilineal, and double descent groups, have been considered vital for understanding these societies.

1.1 Kinship: definition

Geertz and Geertz (1975) argue that there are basically three types of views to the study of kinship, viz; the affective view, the normative view and the cognitive view. The affective view is traced back to Mallinowski (1913) and Beattie (1964) who argue that kinship is the set of emotional relationships within the immediate family and kinship usages are seen as metaphorical extensions of these. The normative view is exemplified by Radcliffe-Brown (1950) and his associates who define it as mechanism for maintaining social order and serves to define many of the rights and duties of social actors and provides both the means and justification for enforcing these rights and duties. Levi-Strauss (1949) puts it as “A kinship system does not consist of the objective ties by descent or consanguinity that obtain among individuals; it exists only in human consciousness, it is an arbitrary system of ideas, not the spontaneous development of a factual situation”. Further, Levi-Strauss (1969) provides a more grandiloquent version of this approach, emphasizing the role of kinship in forming and maintaining social solidarity on a broad scale. For him “the rules of kinship and marriage are not made necessary by the social state, they are the social state”. The cognitive view, the most recent of the three sees kinship as culturally specific intellectual scheme, whereby ego perceives other persons as standing in particular kinds of relationship to himself. Schneider (1968)’s study of American kinship is a prime example of
this view. Schneider (1965), on the other hand, feels that kinship is no different from other types of social relationship.

According to Murdock, “A kinship system, however, is not a social group, nor does it ever correspond to an organized aggregation of individuals. It is merely as the name implies, a structural system of relationships, in which individuals are bound one to another by complex interlocking and ramifying ties” (Murdock, 1949).

In the way to define kinship, Paul Bohanann opined that “every culture provides a set of concepts or images for reviewing the situations of reproduction, care for the young and the passage from generation to generation. Anthropology has summed all these up as kinship”. It can be defined briefly “As a study of the cultural interpretation of the social relationship, social categories and social groups that are formed among people who stand in biological or quasi-biological relationships or chains of relationships to one another”. Thus, kinship has several referents; they are biological referents, behavioural referents and linguistic referents, which must be kept sharply separated (Bohanann, 1963).

John Beattie in his book “Other Cultures” defined kinship as “Kinship has to do with relationships by blood, or consanguinity: affinity with relationship brought about by marriage”. Beattie again holds that “All culture distinguishes various categories, with their associated patterns of rights and obligations, make up what social anthropologists call kinship system” (Beattie, 1964).

R.H. Lowie (1935) viewed kinship as ‘Kinship is continentally applied to relationship by affinity as well as consanguinity, a procedure all the more permissible because many societies require marriage with a blood relative”. Again he says that ‘Kinship is a veritable institution in
most simple societies. Following Firth’s apt phrase it is ‘the rod in which one leans throughout life”, the regulator of behaviours in innumerable situations (Firth, 1963).

1.2 Concepts

Kinship is central to both to the lives of the people we study and to the theoretical development of the discipline we practice. As a voluntary association, Kinship exercises its role through kingroups, kinship usages and kin terms. Through affiliation to kin groups it confronts upon its members certain rights and duties. Again, it prescribes specific mode of the above for specific kingroups like consanguneal kingroup and affinal kingroup. The kinship usages, it lies down before its members, are for the smooth observances and coordination of different social occasions and interactions respectively. When a woman gets married, she is there in avoidance relationship to her HuElBr (Husband’s Elder brother) and to HuFa (Husband’s Father). Similarly, she is given the facility to be in joking relation with her HuYoBr (Husband’s younger brother) and HuYoSi (Husband’s younger sister). The grand parents and grand children maintain a spontaneous familiarity between themselves.

Regarding inheritance of property and status position, it is volunteered by consanguneal group that has got the identity by the society i.e. Patrilineal/Matrilineal/ Bilineal / Double Descent.

Even the personal names are automatically bestowed upon its succeeding members. Incest Taboo is another tool of social control, which often distinguishes the affinal from consanguneal kins, and greatly affects the marriage rules. As discussed by Lowie (1961) “the Priests of the major Hopi fraternities succeed an Elder brother or maternal uncle. Among the Canella a boy gets his personal name from a maternal uncle, which automatically fixes his
membership in this or that association. In other cases, the grounds for uniting with a particular organization are to be sought not in the inclinations of the persons concerned, but in the wishes of their elders. In Australia, a boy entered a company of other boys for initiation not because they were especially congenial, but because the elders of the horde to decreed. Similarly, a Sherente (Brazil) father determined which of the four men’s club his son should join, and though the lad’s preferences counted for something, they were not decisive.

Thus, kinship abides its members more or less through voluntary principle. It functions for the stability and security of its members, and through its members, it can be connoted under the voluntary association. The following concepts have been discussed while analysing the kinship structure of the Saora tribe.

Adoption: is one of the crucial social recognitions of status of a person not related by blood. It is discussed in the section ‘descent and inheritance rules’.

Affines: are the relatives related through marriage and are different from consanguine. This has been discussed in different sections.

Alliance: gives a clear picture of different groups, principles of groupings, prohibitions etc. and is discussed in the section marriage rules.

Amitate: is the kinship usage which is related to the role of father’s sister on different socio-religious occasions. It is one of the most recognized and respected relationships among Saora.

Birinda: is the family descended from an ancestor from three to four generations and has been discussed as the lineage and kin categories.
Bifurcate merging: members of two descent groups are rigorously kept separate from each other for e.g. Father’s brother is merged with father, while both are distinguished from mother’s brother.

Cognate: A kinsman related through either through father or the mother and has been discussed in the terminology section.

Collateral: a Kinship relation, which is identified across a generation level rather than by lineal descent and has been discussed in the sections descent and inheritance and terminology.

Componential analysis: is the method of determining the units of classification and thus has been attempted here to classify the kinship structure of Saora tribe.

Consanguine: are blood relatives or the kinsmen who are related by descent rather than marriage. This concept has been discussed vividly.

Cross-cousins: cousins whose related parents are siblings of unlike sex, i.e. offspring of a person’s mother’s brother or father’s sister. This has been discussed in kinship terminology.

Descent: The kinship relation between an individual and the individual's progenitors.

Endogamy: Marriage within one's own tribe or group as required by custom or law.

Exogamy: Marriage to a person belonging to a tribe or group other than your own as required by custom or law.

Family: A bilateral kinship group.

Family extended: A group consisting of near relatives in addition to the mated pair and their offspring.
Filiations: The culturally structured tie between the parent and offspring.

Generation equivalence: The classifying of relatives of different genetic relation, but within the same generation level, into a single kinship status.

Genitor: A biological parent.

Incest: Sexual contact between persons who are members of the same culturally defined kinship group.

Kinship system: The customary complex of status and roles governing the behavior of relatives.

Kinship terminology: The set of names applied to the various statuses in a kinship system.

Levirate: Brother-in-law marriage i.e. the marriage of a woman to her deceased husband's brother.

Lineage: A unilinear kinship group that traces decent from a known common ancestor, who lives not more than five or six generations back.

Marriage: The social institution that regulates the special relations of a mated pair to each other, their offspring, the kinsmen and the society in total. Symmetrical marriage in which either type of cross-cousin is permeable or preferred as a spouse.

Mehir: An elongated standing stone raised or kept as a monument or altar.

Merging: Classificatory kinship to group a certain type of relatives.

Patriarchate: A society dominated by the father as head of the kinship group. Characterized by patrilineal descent and virilocal residence.
Patrilineal: Pertaining to descent through the father, children belong to the kinship group of their father.

Patrilocal: Newly married couple provided with a residence in the locality of groom’s father.

Patrinyny: The custom of giving children the name of their father’s kinship group

Polygamy: Marriage of a man or more than one women or vice versa.

Polygyny: The marriage of a man to two or more women simultaneously

Privileged familiarity: A culturally permissive relation of free joking between individuals of certain statuses.

Primogeniture: Inheritance by the first born son or child.

Progeny price: The wealth transferred by the kin of a groom to the kin of his bride in compensation for their release of dowry to the children that are produced in the marriage, also known as bride price or bride wealth.

Property: The specially and socially sanctioned relation of a person or group to the utilization of some object.

Social class: A category of persons within a society who have distinctive status

Social distance: The relative “Spatial position” of two status; generally used to emphasize the limitation on social inferences.

Social Structure: The principle on the basis of which groups and individuals one organized and relate to one another.
Sororate: The practice whereby a younger sister marries the widowed husband of her deceased elder sister. The sroral polygyny - the simultaneous marriage of two or more sisters to one husband.

Taboo: Prohibition of an act, violation of which is punishable by supernatural sanctions.

Transition rites: Ritual complexes associated with important changes in personal status, such as birth, adolescence, marriage and death.

Ultimageniture: The rule of inheritance by the youngest son or daughter.

Unilineal: The rule of descent through one parent only.

Virilocal: The practice whereby a married couple settles in the domicile in the husband's family.

The study of kinship, however, is not the study of mere biology. In the biological sense, all the kinship relationships comprise one link or a series of links either of descent or of sexual union, adoption and other forms of Quasi-kinship like fictive kinship, are made to serve as socially approved substitute for the biological relationship. People being kinsmen in a given group, always aware in one way or another, of at least some of their biological relations. Now the biology of the situation socially and culturally implies two other referents such as linguistic and behavioural. First, all people classify kinsmen into various categories and give these categories names, called "Kinship terms". Secondly, each named category is found to have certain modes of behaviour expected from the people who are filled into it. In other words, a kinship term is a linguistic tag for a role, the role has biological criteria and it also has cultural criteria for performance. Thus, the kinship structure has manifested itself in various groups and categories, for recounting and categorizing kinsman, age mates, leaders and occupational specialists. It also associates plans with actions with a given categories of persons. Members of a society who share
such learned categories and plans are able to enter into “Social relationships” with the prescribed
rights and obligations.

Parkin (1997) defined kinship as “an institution such as godparenthood or blood
parenthood” and referred it more generally as ‘ritual kinship’ (spiritual kinship in respect of
Christian societies). The concept of ritual and ceremonial kinship relates to the indigenous
recognition that the kinship involved is different from that which the society recognizes as real
kinship and has to be created deliberately. Ritual kinship is distinguished from phenomena such
as adoption and fostering, where parental roles vis-à-vis one or more children are taken over
either temporarily or permanently by different individuals or families from the children’s natal
families. Such cases are sometimes called fictive kinship, though, like pseudo kinship this is
often used simply as a synonym of ritual kinship.

1.3 Problem of study

Kinship is the most specialized branch of social anthropology. Every ethnographer,
whether a kinship specialist or not, as expected to come home from the field with a description of
“the kinship system” of the people, he or she use to study. The main purpose is to acquire a clear
knowledge of how this system relates to other aspects of culture and social organization.

A number of great scholars in social anthropology have not only given utmost emphasis
to the study of kinship during their lifetime but also have emerged great because of their
analytical approach to such a specialized branch of social anthropology and have contributed to
theory in social anthropology at the general level. The interesting revelation by Barnard and
Good (1984) about problems in kinship study is that one of them who was about to set off to do
field work for the first time once told by a kinship specialist “forget about kinship for the first
few months; think about why you became an anthropologist". That means a field worker should forget about "kinship" as an academic discipline with its internal theoretical premises and controversies, and to focus instead upon understanding the likes of the people with whom he or she is living.

Although Kinship is widely regarded as a difficult area of anthropology, yet many anthropologists have developed interest to achieve necessary conceptual tools and logical rigour, to penetrate, into the nature of the topic.

It goes without saying that, Kinship is an extremely important aspect of social organization. Moreover, kinship is something, which every society has and therefore lends itself to comparative study.

Among the Orissan primitive tribes, the Saora is considered to be one of the most important tribes especially from the point of view of understanding its social organization. Among the tribes of southern Orissa, irrespective of Dravidian and Mundari linguistic groups, Saora is the only one, which does not have a clan system. During my preliminary field studies, the existing ancestor worship and also worship of each and every object they are living with such as hills, forests, house, and agricultural land made it difficult to have a conclusion that they have no clan deity or totem.

In the process of modernization, change and development, the Saora are getting acculturated and transformed very fast. Therefore, while undertaking research studies on the kinship system of the Saora, one has to bear in mind its traditional structure and its changing structure.
1.4 Objectives

Saora society, being a clan less society, its kinship organization has some peculiarities as compared to other Indian tribes. As such, kinship is an important aspect of social organization, which every society has and therefore lends itself to comparative study. Among the Orissan tribes, the saora is considered as one of the most primitive and important tribes from the point of view of understanding its social organization. There are various other distinctive features, which are only observed in case of Saora but not in other tribes. Thus, the present study has been undertaken with the following broad objectives.

i. To take up the kinship study of Saora in distinct geographical areas in order to achieve the goal of comparison.

ii. To study the demographic composition and kinship structure of a few traditional Saora villages.

iii. To make an in depth study on kinship terminologies, kinship usages, descent groups, different kin groups etc. of the hill Saora or Lanjia Saora.

iv. To study kinship relationships in the changing contexts.

1.5 Importance of kinship study

Kinship is the most esoteric and specialised branch of social Anthropology. Thus, kinship deserves the quality of a unique branch of study. In a given society, it defines the functions of each and every social unit. Also, its ubiquity bears the interest, to find out its variance of structure in different social environment. Societies structure people into categories or positions
according to a number of principles, and the most important principle is kinship. Graburn (1971) has mentioned about the importance of kinship in the study of society which are as follows:

(1) Kinship system are universal;

(2) Kinship systems are always important, though in differing degree in the structure of all human societies;

(3) In the majority of the societies traditionally studied by anthropologists kinship has been one of the major organizing principle;

(4) Kinship systems are relatively easy to identify and tend themselves to fairly simple analysis;

(5) In the history of anthropology the discovery of societies in which kinship was so overwhelm important, and so different from our own structures, provided the stimulus for much investigation;

While anthropologists were losing interest in kinship, scholars in other academic disciplines and ordinary people the world over continued to treat it as a vital concern. Sociologists, psychologists, political scientists, economists, and theologians still examine variations in household organization, making claims about a putative connection between poverty, crime, and allegedly pathological familial forms. Feinberg and Ottenheimer (2001) argued that kin-related issues such as teen pregnancy, children born out of wedlock, and the absence of a "father figure" are held to cause violence, alcoholism, drug abuse, demoralization and despair, urban decay, and rural poverty. "Family values," meaning adulation of the nuclear family, has been a centerpiece of American political campaigns at least since the middle 1980s. Televangelists and columnists continue touting a connection between an alleged moral
breakdown, the elimination of school prayer, loss of personal responsibility, a decline of marriage and the family as the cornerstone of social life, and a plethora of social ills. Meanwhile, in the natural sciences, sociobiology emerged claiming status as "the new synthesis." Treating kinship as a biogenetic fact rather than a cultural construct. E. O. Wilson and his followers introduced such notions as "kin selection" and "inclusive fitness" in their endeavor to account for social behavior in biological terms.

Other kin-related issues have captured popular imagination on an international scale. The women's and gay rights movements have challenged widely accepted definitions of marriage and parenthood, prompting heated conflicts among social policy makers and church leaders over whether homosexual partnerships deserve the religious sanctions and legal protections currently afforded heterosexual spouses. Whether adoptee are "real" or "fictive" kin is an increasingly compelling question as "right-to-lifers" advocate adoption in place of abortion and adopted children, with growing frequency, seek out their "birth parents." Perhaps most dramatically of all, new reproductive technologies—including sperm donation, surrogate motherhood, and, most recently, cloning—have brought to the forefront Schneider's (1968, 1972, 1984) questions: How are relatives to be defined? And "what is kinship all about?" Ironically, such questions are now being argued in the courts more often than in the halls of academe.

So, it can be concluded that, for the in-depth importance in the history of anthropology and its omnipresence in every social system of world population, kinship study is essential. Also, the study of kinship systems enriched the anthropology discipline by contributing different valuable approaches and theories. Moreover, the universality and enduring character of kinship suggests its importance in binding men and women together in society and providing a foundation for the building of more specific social structure. Fascination of kinship is that it appears to be one area
of anthropological discourse where the ground rules are clearly laid down. However, addition of
many cultural representations of kinship is essential to arrive at each society’s view of its own
kinship system, on which its own identity may in turn depend. Therefore, it is the continuing
relevance of kinship that will ensure that anthropologists will continue to give attention to, no
matter what their individual theoretical orientations may be.

Cochrane (1977) while explaining about “What can anthropology do for Development”
cited the classical work undertaken by Malinowski on anthropological analysis of the
accumulation and distribution of a few hundred dollars of shell wealth in the remote Trobriand
Island Group of the western Pacific. He explained to the developed world that Trobriand
islanders were only primitive in so far as technology was concerned, and there was nothing
rudimentary about their mental processes. Thus, similar arguments could be put on the study of
kinship structure of the Saora, one of the most primitive tribes of India. Cochrane (1977) also
confirmed the opinion made by Malinowski half a century ago that anthropologist can provide
their best input only by working in a community of staff members that go to make up a
development institution.

1.6 Kinship theories: Historical Development

The scientific study of kinship system is only a century old, but in that brief period it has
engendered more controversy and a greater variety of theoretical formulations than have more
aspects of human society. The early studies concentrated in the terminological systems for the
most part, and utilized them as evidence for historical relationships or as survivals of assumed
earlier stages of society based on promiscuity and group marriage. The reaction against such
conjectural history led to denial of the sociological significance of kinship terms and to an
attempted explanation in terms of psychological principle. This in return, resulted in a renewed
attempt to understand kinship in terms of the behavioral system and with reference to the ongoing society, more recently; some progress has been made in studying changes in the kinship systems over time. The recurring difficulty has been limited number of societies for which there is adequate information in the kinship systems, but the situation is improving rapidly. A further difficulty has been that the preliminary classifications have been based on limited criteria, and there has been a tendency to study kinship piecemeal and to search for simplified formulations on items of casual relationships rather than to treat the complex whole.

The contributions made by various scholars are briefly discussed below:

L. H. Morgan:

The foundations study of kinship were laid by L.H. Morgan (1871) in his "System of consanguinity and affinity of the human family". Morgan assembled data on the terminological systems, he was able to collect or secure for nearly every major area of the world. He grouped the terminologies into two great classes, the 'descriptive' systems, which he ascribed to Aryans, Semitic and Uralic linguistic families, and the "classificatory" systems, which he thought were characteristic of the American Indians, the Polynesians and many of the peoples of Asia. The classificatory systems merged lineal with collateral relatives in varying degrees, in contrast to the Euro-American systems, which isolated lineal relatives in the terminology. W H R Rivers (1914) noted "No discovery in the whole range of science can more certainly be credited to one man than the discovery of the classificatory system of relationship to Morgan". This implies Morgan's leading role in the kinship study.

Lewis Henry Morgan, often spoken of appropriately as the father of American anthropology, called attention to the subject in his pioneering ethnographic contribution, *League*
by David Schneider that kinship did not exist in any culture known to humankind, kinship studies largely dropped from sight.

W.H.R. Rivers:

W. H. R. Rivers considered four modes by which kinship might be defined, he began in a similar vein by asserting that blood relationship (consanguinity) is inadequate for a definition of kinship because it does not account for adoption and other practices which show that "fatherhood and motherhood depend, not on procreation and parturition, but on social convention" (River, 1968 [1924]). The second mode for defining kinship—the one he decided upon—was through genealogy, which could determine kinship through consanguinity as well as some other social procedure. Next he considered the possibility that kinship is defined through the terms of relationship, but found this mode lacking when he considered that pedigree and genealogy determine the terms of relationship and not the reverse. His fourth mode was by social function, whereby "persons are regarded as kin of one another if their duties and privileges in relation to one another are those otherwise determined by consanguinity". But, as Schneider has pointed out, Rivers' notion of genealogy reintroduced the consanguinity he initially had rejected because in his genealogical method he limited the genealogical terms father, mother, child, husband and wife to "their English sense" (Rivers, 1900). Schneider comments that "all Rivers really does, then, is to say that kinship is in the first instance defined in terms of consanguinity ... and that sometimes social convention alone may confirm a kinship relationship even in the absence of a relationship of consanguinity but that, when it does, it is created in the image of a consanguineal tie". This insistence on a consanguineal tie led Schneider to reject kinship as a domain of study. He asserts "the way in which kinship has been studied does not make good sense" (Schneider,
1984) since "it exists in the minds of anthropologists but not in the cultures they study" (Schneider, 1972).

A.L. Kroeber:

Kroeber, in his “Classificatory Systems of Relationship” (Kroeber, 1909) were the most influential and far reaching. He found the distinction between descriptive and “Classificatory” misleading and suggested that kinship terminology being analyzed, instead, in terms of some eight psychological principle, based on difference of generations, the sex of the relative, the distinction of blood and affinal relationship, and the condition of life of the connecting relative. Kroeber came to the conclusion that terms of relationship reflect psychology rather than sociology and are determined primarily by language- hence this could be utilized for sociological inference only with great caution.

In England, J.F. McLennan, in the process of defending his own evolutionary formulation for society, had dismissed kinship terms as a mere set of mutual solutions. But Rivers who had become interested in kinship during the Torres Strait expedition of 1898-1900, where he had developed the “Genealogical Method” for collecting accurate data on various aspects of social organization, return to Morgan’s basic idea as a result of his studies of Melanesian society. In “Kinship and Social Organization, River (1924) proposed that kinship terminology is rigorously determined by social conditions particularly by forms of marriage and hence can be utilized to reconstruct the recent history of social institutions. These hypothesis and the accompanying illustrations have become one starting point for the modern study of kinship terms.
Robin Fox:

Fox (1967) deals with four basic principles of kinship in his leading introductory kinship text book “Kinship and Marriage”. Those are:

Principle 1: The women have the children
Principle 2: The men impregnate the women
Principle 3: The men usually exercise control
Principle 4: Primary kin do not mate with each other

Principle 1 and 2 are obvious physiological facts, which may well be at the root of all kinship system. By contrast principle 3 and 4 are either wholly or partly sociological in character. Fox’s general principles hold particular appeal for those whose interest in kinship stems from an explicit or implicit quest for universality.

Ward Goodenough:

Ward Goodenough observed that “We anthropologists have assumed that kinship is universal, that all societies have kinship systems. If we are correct in this assumption, if every society does have some set of relationships whose definition involves genealogical considerations of some kind, then genealogical space must be constructed of things that are common to all mankind. These, we have seen, are parenthood and socially recognized sexual unions in which women are eligible to bear and from which women and especially men derive rights in children and thus establish parent-child relationships (Goodenough, 1970)”. Goodenough, following the foot steps of Rivers, takes as self-evident that kinship relations are to be defined using genealogical criteria.
Harold W. Scheffler and Floyd G. Lounsbury:

Harold W. Scheffler and Lounsbury equate kinship and genealogy in comments such as "Relations of genealogical connection, or kinship proper" and "Where the distributational criteria are genealogical and egocentric, we speak of relations of kinship" (Scheffler and Lounsbury, 1971). But Schneider had noted, "the genealogically defined grid is the only analytic device that has been applied to most of the systems which anthropologists have studied. There has been almost no systematic attempt to study the question without employing this device. To put it simply, it is about time that we tested some other hypotheses.

R. H. Lowie:

Lowie has been the most influential American ethnologist concerned with the study of kinship. Accepting River's position that kinship terminology is related to social usages, but influenced by Kroeber as well, he sought to test the hypothesis that had been proposed against the available ethnographic information. His own comparative studies of the plateau Shashoneous and the Hopi Indian led him to the conclusion that the kinship system of the latter is functionally connected with their clan system. He summed up his general position in a statement that is still valid: "Relationship terms are studied by the anthropologist not merely as to many words inviting philological analysis and comparison but as correlates as social custom. Broadly speaking, the use of specific kinship designation, e.g. for maternal as distinguished from the paternal uncle, indicates that the former receives the differential treatment at the hands of his nephews and nieces. Further, if a terms of this sort embraces a number of individuals, the probability is that the speaker is linked to all of them by some set of duties and mutual claims, though their intensity may vary with the closeness of the relationship" (Lowie, 1929).
B. Mallinowski:

In England, Mallinowski and Radcliffe-Brown have been the most influential figures in the development of kinship studies. Mallinowski (1913), as results of his study “The Family among the Australian Aborigines” and his extended field research in the Trobriand Island, emphasized the importance of family “as the initial institution” for the development of kinship, from which attitudes and terminologies could be widely extended. He also called the attention to the significance of “Sociological Fatherhood” in a matrilineal society that did not recognize the generic role, but he was more concerned with the function of kinship and their social institutions in fulfilling individual needs.

Radcliffe-Brown:

Radcliffe-Brown, an early student of W. H. R. Rivers was the central figure in the modern study of kinship systems. He was the first to develop the connection of kinship system as composed of both terminology and patterns of social behaviour and to see kinship as an integral part of larger social structure. As a functionary he was concerned with the significance of institutions in maintaining the society system, but he went further and attempted to discover basic structural principles that were relevant to variety of different terminological grouping and social usages.

By the end of 1920s the preliminary classification of kinship terminologies was well underway. Morgan’s two fold classification was remodeled by utilising Kroeber’s categories for the classification of Califormian Indian terminologies. Sapier’s classification of North American Indian terminologies into eight empirical types, based on the patterns of grouping for cross cousins, was particularly influential. Lowie (1929) proposed a worldwide classification into four
major types, based on the treatment of relatives in the parental generation. These were soon
followed by Radcliffe-Brown’s classification (1930) of Australian social system into two main
types, in each of which kinship; preferential marriage and clan grouping were systematically
interrelated.

During the following decades a number of field studies were carried out by students of
Mallinowski and Radcliffe-Brown in which kinship received more adequate treatment. Firth’s
studies of the Tikopa (1936), Warner’s on the Murgin (1937), Evans-Pritchard’s on the Nuer
(1931), Fortes on the Tallensi (1949), Eggan’s (1950) on the plains and pueble Indian groups are
among those researches that have contributed to the development and modification of the
structural and functional approach of kinship.

The clearest statement of this approach is found in Radcliffe-Brown(1950)’s
“Introduction to African systems of kinship and marriage”, in which he was concerned with the
general comparative and theoretical study of kinship organization as an arrangement, which
enables person to cooperate with one another in an orderly social life. In this discussion he
compared and contrasted the cognate system of the early tetemonic peoples with the agnatic
lineage system of ancient Rome and many modern African tribes, and indicated the relevance of
the principles of “The unity of the sibling group” and “The unity and solidarity of the lineage”
for various aspects of social life. Here he was particularly concerned with the significance of
unilineal descent in bringing about corporate kin groups that continue beyond the life individual
members and may control resources, enact vengeance, regulate marriage and engage in ritual. He
saw marriage as an essentially rearrangement of social structure and discussed in detail the
significance of marriage in various African societies. For a worldwide classification of kinship
systems he proposed four types: Father right, Mother right, cognatic systems, and double lineage systems, each of which has a number of varieties.

Thus, kinship studies were facilitated with the in depth studies by scholastic anthropologists in different times.

1.7 Current developments in Kinship studies

A number of new directions are initiated in the study of kinship, which involve both method and theory. Some of these include cross-comparisons involving statistical and correlational techniques, other involve linguistic analysis building on Kroeber’s earlier categories or utilize models of various types, some derived from linguistics and other from mathematics. Network analysis is an important area of recent kinship study, which is in vogue at many centers of leading anthropological research. The book “An Introduction to Network Analysis of Genealogy and Politics: Social Dynamics in a Nomadic Society” by White and Johansen (2001) demonstrates through an ethnographic case study how computer-based and network studies transform the potential for using traditional community ethnography and genealogical study. The approach taken to studying social dynamics emphasizes how social relations change through time in the context of emergent networks and changing historical and demographic conditions. In transforming the qualitative data collected by ethnographic methods into a more systematic framework suitable for network analysis, this approach alters in fundamental ways the anthropological concepts of social structure and organizational dynamics, of social cohesion, marriage strategies, and of how to study the embedding of community level politics within the dynamics of ongoing personal interaction. One of the key analytic concepts for the network analysis used in the book is a new measure of social cohesion that emphasizes the distributed properties of social networks in defining clusters of actors. This concept is related to insights
from contemporary anthropology that emphasizes principles of social organization in complex societies. The use of new concepts of social cohesion allow us to analyze how the society is integrated at multiple levels that include extended families, lineages, political factions, clans, and the larger world of outside groups. The P-graph approach to genealogical analysis used in this book has a potentially huge popular and professional market in the genealogical audience.

The following are two examples of recent articles on kinship methods, one published on-line and the other describing a computer-based system for analysis of kinship terminologies. The first is a tutorial on kinship, and the second treats only kinship terminology. 1) Brian Scheinder. Kinship and Social Organization: An Interactive Tutorial by (http://www.umanitoba.ca/anthropology/kintitle.html) and 2) Read, Dwight W., and Clifford Behrens (1989): An Expert System for the Algebraic Analysis of Kinship Terminologies. Besides, Augustin (2000a,b), Brudner and White (1997), White and Jorion (1996), White and Housemen (2002), Dow (1999), Godelier et al (1998), Gregory (2000), White and Jorion (1992) and White (1999) are some of the studies focusing on the study of kinship though network analysis. At both the general morphological level and the detailed interpersonal level, network analysis has the capacity to show many of the fundamental structures and processes of the formation, adaptation and potential dissolution or remaking of a society. The intersections and contending principles of multiple networks in history define multiple points of view both the multiplex and heterogeneous relationships among individuals. A network approach allows feedback between system, structures and actors in an environment, viewed in terms of co-evolving dynamics.

The above recent studies have stimulated a great amount of new research and promises to broaden our knowledge of kinship phenomena in various directions. Of particular significance is
Murdock (1949)'s cross-cultural study of family and kinship organization in about 250 societies throughout the world, presented in "Social Structure". Utilizing the postulation method and statistical analysis he found that the kinship terminologies are primarily determined by factors as descent and residence, with marriage rules of lesser importance. Combining six types of kinship terminology with rules of descent and residence, he gave eleven major types of social organization. His study represents a notable advance in the application of social science methodologies to the study of social organization, but there has also been considerable criticism of sampling involved, the statistical technique used, and the data selected for analysis.

The contributions of Levi-strauss (1968) to the study of kinship systems are of a different character and in "Structural Anthropology" he presents some highly original views on the nature of social structure in general and kinship in particular. For him, Social Structure" is in itself not concerned with empirical reality of social relations but with models which give rise to them and he discussed the relevance of mechanical model (on the same scale) and statistical models (on a different scale) for problems particularly those of communication with regard to kinship.

In the recent years, a number of Anthropologists contribute to the study of kinship. Among them are Homane, Schneider and Needham, Leach, Dumont, and Pocock (1957) are noteworthy, in treating marriage alliance. Goodenough and others have attempted their skill and masters on the study of kinship terminology on the basis of Kroeber's analysis of kinship terminology. Blouin (2003) used a DNA based method for pedigree analysis in natural population i.e analyzing kinship relationship from molecular data, and proved that adopting the above method, researchers in ecology and evolution could extract far more information from natural populations than is currently being exploited. Murphy (2004) used SOCSIM microsimulation program to examine the patterns of descent over periods of several centuries of an
initial population using as indicators: the proportion of these people without any living descendants by the end year of the analysis; the mean value and variability in the number of their distinct descendants; and the distribution of genetic contribution (i.e. the expected proportion of the DNA of individuals in the initial population found in the later population) and showed that three-quarters of those born in the past have no descendant, mainly because they did not reach the age of reproduction.

A study on Kinship Networks and Contraceptive Choice in Nang Rong, Thailand showed that Kinship ties at both the household and the village level affect contraceptive choice (Godley, 2001). Dekker (2004) presented a dyadic model that explicitly deals with the dependence of observations, the $p_2$-mode and used the model to analyse the determinants of observed (ex-post) risk sharing networks in four land reform communities in Zimbabwe.

“Kinship care” describes a family situation in which a grandparent or other extended family member is raising a child whose parents cannot. “Informal kinship care” commonly refers to relatives raising children who are not in the foster care system. “Formal kinship care” is used to refer to relatives who are raising children the state has removed from their parents’ homes. (Children Defence Fund, KINSHIP CARE RESOURCE KIT for community and faith based organizations, 25 E Street, N.W.Washington, DC 20001)

Denham and White (2002) studied three Logics of Alyawarra Kinship. Genealogies as a method of social mapping in PRA showed that village-based community organisers trained in the preparation of genealogies are used as an aid to developing an understanding of the structure of local communities, and to help in monitoring the nature of participation in project activities and their social impact.
In a workshop on “Kinship, Distance and Proximity in the Anthropology of Europe” held in the University of Cambridge, Monica Bonaccorso, University of Cambridge and convenor of the workshop explored the viability of the notion of ‘Euro-American’ kinship in South Europe, an area kept geographically and culturally distinct in much literature on European kinship. Various other studies on kinship presented in the conference were “Continuity and Discontinuity, Closeness and Distance: ‘Euro-American’ Kinship and South Europe”(Monica Bonaccorso, University of Cambridge), ‘Same or Different? Kin Resemblance and Kinship Models in the Anthropology of Europe”(Paola Filippucci, University of Cambridge pf107@cam.ac.uk), “A Society of Virtual Kin: State, Family and Children’s Homes in The Russian Far East”(Elena Khlinovskaya Rockhill, University of Cambridge.evr20@cam.ac.uk), “Ossifying Kinship Through Politics: A Study of Kinship ValuesAttributed to the Body in Post-Conflict Serbia”(Maja Petrovic, University of Cambridge.mp333@cam.ac.uk), “The Validity of a European Kinship Model: Dowry, Agnation and the Anomaly of the South Slavs”(Violeta Schubert, University of Melbourne.violetas@unimelb.edu.au) and “European Kinship Ties as a Source of Social Security – One System or Several?”(Patrick Heady, Max Planck Institute for Social Anthropology, Halle/ Saale,heady@eth.mpg.de).

In the anthropology of Europe, an area close to many anthropologists as their own and/ or their discipline’s birthplace, kinship models have been used historically to distance certain regions (e.g. ‘the Mediterranean’, ‘the Balkans’) as suitable objects of ethnographic and anthropological enquiry. Atkins and Denham (1981) made significant contributions on Genealogical Structures and Consanguineous Marriage Systems. Denham(1978,2002,2003) prepared extensive data base on Alyawarra kinship, group composition of band societies and Ethnographic Archive. Houseman and White (1998) studied on Marriage Networks and
Dravidian Kinship in Lowland South America. Scheffler (1982) developed theory and methods on the structures of systems of Kin Classification. White and Schweizer (1998) studied the Kinship of Java tribe and explained about the property transmission, and stratification in Rural Java. Read (2001) made an extensive analysis of “What is Kinship” and quoted many anthropologist and their view points about kinship. Read also gave a Biological Model and showed that the relationships determined by genetic father and genetic mother can be modeled by specifying that genetic father and genetic mother define a local structure that can be extended recursively. This model is defined locally by the fact that biological reproduction links one person (a node in the structure) with two persons (two other nodes in the structure), with the stipulation that two of the persons have opposite sex and each contributes directly to the genetic makeup of the focal person. Read Concluded that the genealogical tree is more abstract than the genetic tree because genealogical father and genealogical mother are symbols with rules of instantiation that are not constrained by biological facts, whereas genetic father and genetic mother refer to persons with a specified biological relationship to the focal person. Further, Read (2001) gave broad based conclusions on the definition of kinship and kin terms which are as given below:

1. The genealogical grid is defined as the structure represented in the form of a standard genealogical chart and presumed to have indefinite extension.

2. Kinship be viewed as a "multiple slotting system" of classification.

3. That kin terms can be related to the genealogical grid is evident and is the basis of Rivers's genealogical method for eliciting kin terms. The algebraic modeling demonstrates something more, namely, that the terminological structure can be generated without reference to the genealogical grid and the mapping of kin terms onto the
genealogical grid can then be predicted from the terminological structure. The prediction can be verified by Rivers's genealogical method.

4. In accord with J. A. Barnes (1961) and Ira Buchler and Henry Selby (1968), the following distinctions will be made: (1) genetic father/mother—the person providing the spermatozoon/ovum, (2) genitor/genetrix—the culturally defined person(s) (if any) who is (are) culturally recognized as, or asserted to be, the physical father/mother and (3) pater/mater—the person(s) recognized as the social father/mother.

5. Although in some cultures genealogical tracing may be conducted on the basis of genitor/genetrix, the process requires only that a single male person and a single female person be associated with ego in such a manner that the association can be done recursively with respect to the two persons so identified. Whether or not the male person is genitor and the female person is genetrix is irrelevant from the viewpoint of the logic of genealogical tracing. One can also trace using a cultural specification such as the male person is the husband of mother. In this case the genealogical "tree" so identified would not be the pedigree of ego, but would be ego's culturally relevant genealogical tree structure.

6. Kin types are usually viewed as abstractions of genitor and genetrix, but genealogical tracing need not be based upon such notions. Yet it is evident that the genealogical grid, even if defined in terms of kin types based upon genitor and genetrix, is supposed to represent an idealized genealogy based upon the idea of genealogical tracing. To avoid inconsistency, then, the basis for genealogical tracing and the basis for the genealogical grid must be the same. Hence Read (2001) used genealogical father and genealogical mother as the common basis for genealogical tracing and the genealogical grid.
Genealogical father and genealogical mother can, but need not, be genitor and genetrix, respectively. Identification of genealogical father and genealogical mother with genitor and genetrix depends upon cultural specification rather than an assumption that genitor and genetrix are universally recognized as the basis for genealogical tracing.

7. From the perspective of genealogical tracing, ego's father's son could be ego if ego is male. However, the genealogical grid represented by the genealogical chart seems to assume that ego's father's son is ego's brother; that is, some tracing paths are not allowed in the genealogical grid.

1.7.1 Componential Analysis

Kinship has taken a new trend after the employment of “Componential Analysis” on analytical procedure first employed by Ward Goodenough (1955) and later in Yankeen society (Goodenough, 1965). It is devoted to the formulation of the rules by which semantic domains are logico-empirically ordered. Goodenough’s componential definition of an American grandmother’s second husband goes something like this: “A kinsman at less than two degrees collateral distance; at two units of genealogical distance; in lineal relationship; in a senior generation; a male sex; in presence of marital ties; senior party involved; senior party being the first person to become known to the junior party (Harris, 1968).

David Schneider (1961)'s cultural approach to kinship, which culminated in his influential work on American kinship, most notably componential analysis, a subject whose reality he later came to question. One of his best works is his relentlessly, talmudically argued analysis of the distinctive features of matrilineal descent groups, which comes out of theoretical concerns of British structural-functionalism. At a 1969 Wenner-Gren Symposium on Cognitive
Studies and Artificial Intelligence, Schneider produced a paper entitled "Componential Analysis: A State-of-the-Art Review" (1969a). Four years earlier, Schneider had fired his first salvo against componential analysis in his critique of his friend Goodenough's analysis of Yankee kinship terminology (1965). In that paper, he disagreed with Goodenough's rules for inclusion or exclusion of relatives by marriage.

To quote Schneider:

"Componential analysis made its appearance on the anthropological scene in 1956 in the first number of the 32nd volume of the journal Language, in the very same issue as Y. R. Chao's important paper on Chinese Terms of Address. That issue contained, side by side, Goodenough's Componential Analysis and the Study of Meaning and Lounsbury's A Semantic Analysis of the Pawnee Kinship Usage."

Those two papers have since been regarded as a sort of Year One for Componential Analysis in Anthropology, and justly so. Chao's paper, on the other hand, has been ignored by anthropologists; at least I have seen no references to it in either the literature of componential analysis or of kinship terminology generally (1969a)."

Schneider goes on in this caustic essay to debunk componential analysis for resting on unwarranted assumptions, for failing to deal with both terms of address and terms of reference, for avoiding affinal terminology, for erecting premature boundaries and refusing to consider metaphoric kinship extensions or so-called fictive kinship, for neglecting issues of polysemy in kin terms, and perhaps most fundamentally, for failing to offer satisfactory definitions of kinship terms and to say what kinship itself is all about—a topic Schneider addresses in later essays (1970a, 1970b, 1972). He also sharply criticized the componential analyses of American or
Yankee kinship. Wallace (1969) also offers an extended analysis of cousin-marriage and "kissing cousins" that Schneider neglects in his cultural account.

Schneider's American kinship project was an effort to examine critically the domain of kinship. The move that he and Raymond Firth made to study kinship in modern urban settings was motivated less by a desire to prove the value of anthropological approaches to the modern world and its problems, and more by a wish to break out of the functionalist paradox that challenged the separate reality of kinship in so-called "primitive" or simpler societies. In such societies, kinship could not be clearly differentiated from other institutions in the political, economic, and religious realms.

However, Schneider argued that even in complex urban societies, kinship could not be neatly compartmentalized as a separate domain, recognized as such by the natives. He questioned the reality of the boundaries separating kinship from nationality and religion (1969b). While one can assume a certain amount of categorical leakage through metaphorized extension and logical anomalies, one can also legitimately question whether it was useful to throw the kinship baby out with the leaking bath water. By the time of his final magnum opus, *A Critique of the Study of Kinship* (1984), kinship no longer exists for Schneider as a valid, translatable, human cultural universal. Pericliev and Valdes-Perez (1998) showed that componential analysis is a powerful tool to study the kinship, particularly in tribal communities where the structure is very complex.

1.7.2 A New Representation of Kinship Networks

In a group with extensive relinking, relatives on one side of a given ego's family (e.g., ego's father) will typically be connected to the other side (e.g., ego's mother) prior to the parents'
marriage (i.e., independently of the marriages in ego's sibling group). When this type of situation is prevalent, it is easier and more efficient to represent kinship and marriage relations in a graphic form where it is not individuals but the marriages themselves that are the nodes of the graph (along with unmarried individuals). This kind of structure is known as a P-graph, with the mnemonic "p" for parental graph or graph de parenté (White and Jorion, 1992).

**P-graph**: A P-graph consists of a set of nodes that represent marriages, couples, or unmarried individuals, together with two kinds of directed links (lines) between nodes. The lines or edges represent each distinct individual's links (as either the sole occupant of a node or co-occupant along with a spouse) to the node representing the marriage of his or her parents. The parental links of males constitute one kind of link, and the parental links of females constitute the other.

**O-graph**: An o-graph is a P-graph in which adjacent nodes are ordered by generations, and arcs from children's to parents' nodes are always from lower to higher generations. An o-graph is a special case of a directed graph or digraph in which arcs may or may not be reciprocated.

**Cutnode**: A cutnode of a connected graph G is a node whose removal from G (removing the node and its edges) will disconnect the graph.

**Subgraph**: A subgraph of a graph G is a subset of the nodes in G plus any of the edges that connect these nodes.

**Maximal**: A characteristic or property is said to be maximal for some subset of elements in a set E if there is no larger set of elements that contains this subset that has this property.

**Endnode**: An endnode of a graph G is a node that has a single edge. If the node incident to that edge is removed, the endnode becomes disconnected from G.
**Cycle:** A cycle is a graph $G$ in which for every two nodes $u$ and $v$ there are exactly two ("independent") paths from $u$ to $v$, neither of which passes through the same node $w$, but one of which passes through at least one other node $w$. Hence a graph $G$ contains a cycle if it has two nodes $u$ and $v$ such that there are at least two ("independent") paths from $u$ to $v$ that pass through none of the same nodes, and at least one of which passes through at least one other node $w$.

**Tree:** A tree is a graph $G$ in which each of its nodes is either a cutnode or an endnode.

**Index of relinking:** The index of relinking of a kinship graph measures the extent to which marriages take place among descendents of a limited set of ancestors. A relinking index of 100%, given a common set of independent ancestors, indicates that every known link to ancestors of the structurally endogamous group ends with those of the common set.

### 1.7.3 Hammel's Principle of Status Bias

Hammel (1976) and others have shown through simulations that inequality of age or status at marriage markedly decreases the likelihood that FaSiDa cousins will be of an appropriate age to take as a spouse and thereby increases the relative likelihood of marriage with MoBrDa cousins, other things being equal. Thus relative rates of cousin marriages are unreliable as an indicator of marriage preferences.

Hammel's principle can be illustrated by a geometric P-graph emphasizing status or age differences. Suppose $s(m)$ is the measure of the status of males and $s(f)$ the status of females. For example, $s(m)=45$ and $s(f)=15$ might represent markedly unequal average ages of marriage of males and females, respectively, in a gerontocratic society where older men monopolize younger women through polygynous marriages. White and Jorion (1992) review the utility of P-graphs
for the analysis of marriage systems with different age or status skewing between husband and wife.

Hammel defines status or age difference between males and females at marriage as a quantitative variable, \( d = |s(m) - s(f)| \). Assuming that these differences are roughly constant over generations, Hammel's rule for consanguineal marriages is that the sums of status or age measures in the husband's lines \((a, c)\) to the common ancestor must on average equal the sum of status or age measures on the wife's lines \((b, d)\) to the common ancestor, \( s(a) + s(c) = s(b) + s(d) \). This applies to cousin marriages in general, where each edge \(a - d\) is either an \(f\) (female) or an \(m\) (male), and contrastive types of cousin marriage differ in which of the lines \(a\) to \(d\) are male and which are female. For MoBrDa marriage this represents no particular constraint, since this equality is satisfied for any values of \(s(f)\) and \(s(m)\) by the fact that in every case \(s(f) + s(m) = s(m) + s(f)\). MoBrDa marriage can accommodate any extreme of status difference between husband and wife. For FaSiDa marriage however, the requirement that \(s(f) + s(f) = s(m) + s(m)\) requires that the age or status of husband and wife at marriage are equal. This model, however, applies only to average differences.

\textbf{formula for averages:} \( s(a) + s(c) = s(b) + s(d) \)

MoBrDa marriage constraint FaSiDa marriage constraint (age or status differences allowed) (entails no age or status differences). Hammel (1976) shows that the greater the average status differences between husband and wife, the more likely MoBrDa will be of the right age for marriage as opposed to FaSiDa cousins. Hammel's principle applies as well to any relinking relationship in terms of the symmetries or asymmetries in distribution of male and female links on the husband's and wife's side in connecting to common ancestors.
1.7.4 Theories of Alliance and Avoidance

Clarification of the units of measurement of behavior makes unification possible of two approaches that characterize kinship or marriage systems when taken as models of and for behavior: the study of rule-governed preferences (Lévi-Strauss, 1949), and the study of rule-governed avoidances (Barry, 2000). Elementary systems avoid key relatives in contrast to prescribing marriage with other categories of close relatives such as the MoBrDa or FaSiDa (with different implications for affinal alliances or exchange). Complex systems prohibit close relatives and lack definitive prescriptive rules but have statistical tendencies such as, for example, homogamy or relinking. Levistrauss opined that marriage systems are semi-complex, if a multiplicity of special rules about avoidance of many different stacks of relatives act "as if" there were prescriptions for marriage with certain classes of distant relatives.

Barry's argument is that, in many societies with residential and descent-group emphasis on the agnic line, the prevalence of an 'Arab' marriage pattern is not so much a preference for patrilineal parallel cousin marriage as it is an emphasis on avoiding marriage with the uterine line. In his view, the uterine line is as important, if not moreso, in establishing social identities of common 'blood' or other substances. For Barry, as opposed to vertical extensions (filiation) of kinship through descent, there are additional prohibitions based on lateral extensions of social or gender identities. Barry identifies four logical principles of prohibition:

1) prohibitions on the uterine line
2) prohibitions on the agnic line
3) prohibitions on both uterine and agnic lines (parallel cousins), with cross-cousin marriages allowed
4) prohibitions on both the parallel- and cross-cousins
In Barry's view cases 1 and 2 are asymmetric in that the privileging of female identity is never exclusive of a complementary male principle, but not the contrary (male descent group exogamy does not usually entail a complementary uterine principle). Hence while case 1 (uterine exogamy) allows a male-based preference for 'Arab' marriage, case 2 (agnatic exogamy) seems to imply an invariable exclusivity of a male descent-group identity principle that does not allow an opposing female-based preference for matrilineal parallel cousin marriage. Case 3 can give rise to elementary types of marriage alliance, and case 4 to "complex" marriage rules.

1.7.5 Computers and Kinship

Kinship-related computer applications represent the earliest efforts by anthropologists to use computers in research. (Kunstadter et al, 1963; Coult and Randolph, 1965; Gilbert and Hammel, 1966; Hackenberg, 1967). Anthropologists have shown considerable interest in the use of computers for analysing kinship and genealogical data. Everyone seems to have 'too much' kinship information and computers have been suggested as a means to make this intractable quantity of data do some work. Just as kinship is one of the most complex areas of social anthropology, the computing resources required to assist in the analysis of kinship data are relatively complex and varied. Anthropologists have used computer-based methods in:

1. Creating and maintaining databases;
2. Analysing genealogical data or models in connection with other data or models
3. Presentation of kinship and relational diagrams.

Computer based databases of relationships have been developed to draw out specific examples of relationships or to establish relationships between two or more people. This has been an application on the wish-list of many anthropologists for some time (Coult and Randolph, 1965;
Gilbert, 1971; Chagnon, 1974). There have been significant difficulties; issues include constraints on the size of the database (how many people and relationships can be represented), and how to specify the kinds of relationships in which you are interested without being 'swamped with types of relationships which do not interest'you (Gilbert, 1971). Computers have been used to help analyse genealogical data or models in context with other data or models. Relationship databases support further analysis based on other variables associated with the group or unit under study. This may be further supported by computer-generated diagrams or incorporated with simulation modelling. Surprisingly, there has been relatively little published work (Ottenheimer, 1988; White and Jorion, 1992). A notable exception has been the use of computer-based modelling to examine how demographic structure influences marriage behaviour and vice versa (Kunstadter et al, 1963; Randolph and Coult 1968; Hammel et al, 1979; Dyke, 1986). It may be that the apparent difficulty intimated in the past (Gilbert, 1971; Findler and McKinzie, 1969) with using computers for flexibly analysing genealogical data has limited speculation in this area. Computers have also been sparsely used for theoretical work in kinship, either with terminologies, or structure. Examples of such work include Read and Behren's kinship algebra expert system (Read and Behrens, 1992) for terminologies, White's (1992) P-Graphs for examining larger structural connections between individuals and groups, Ottenheimer's work on modelling, applications derived from graph theory or statistical studies aiming to develop behavioural correlates. A number of programs have been written by anthropologists which can assist in the preparation of kinship diagrams for most computers (White, 1992). Two basic approaches to automatic diagram support have been developed. Theoretically motivated diagrams present in principles of kinship structure using imaginary individuals. Actual kinship diagrams present examples of relationships and diagrams between the people in an area of study.
It is easier to present an idealised kinship chart than to deal with actual populations. Computers are useful tools for integration. Kinship-related studies satisfy (and are easily shown to satisfy) most of the requirements for computer-based analysis. Most computing methods require relatively clear schema for successful application, and many of the models and methods anthropologists have used for analysing kinship meet this criterion.

1.8 Kinship studies in Urban Settings

Firth et al. (1968) long ago remarked on the paucity of studies of kinship in Urban, Industrial societies. Generally speaking, the kinship system is less central to society as a whole than in isolated or small-scale communities, because other kind of institution regulate for example-economic and political affairs. “The kingroups outside the delinatory family are not structural groups but organizational groups”. They are assemblages’ adhoc from among the total kin. In short, once you moved beyond the individual family or household you are likely to be dealing not with quasi groups or kinship network.

A. L. Epistein (1969 and 1981) has network analysis to show how urban migrants utilize a wide variety of kinship ties to gain some measure of security and stability in the fluid, unpredictable environment of a burgeoning Zambian township, as well demonstrates that this happens even in Lusaka, particularly at times of crisis, such as bereavement. Bott, working in central London, used network studies as the basis for her hypothesis that, the degree to which a British Urban couples segregate their conjugal roles, is proportional to the density of their social network in research practices in study of kinship.

Schneider's American kinship project was an effort to examine critically the domain of kinship. The move that he and Raymond Firth made to study kinship in modern urban settings
was motivated less by a desire to prove the value of anthropological approaches to the modern world and its problems, and more by a wish to break out of the functionalist paradox that challenged the separate reality of kinship in so-called "primitive" or simpler societies. In such societies, kinship could not be clearly differentiated from other institutions in the political, economic, and religious realms. Schneider argued that even in complex urban societies, kinship could not be neatly compartmentalized as a separate domain, recognized as such by the natives. He questioned the reality of the boundaries separating kinship from nationality and religion (1969b). While one can assume a certain amount of categorical leakage through metaphorized extension and logical anomalies, one can also legitimately question whether it was useful to throw the kinship baby out with the leaking bath water. By the time of his final magnum opus, *A Critique of the Study of Kinship* (1984), kinship no longer exists for Schneider as a valid, translatable, human cultural universal.

However, many new trends have taken place in the study of kinship structure. Among those, the new headings are marriage and politics, kinship and cosmology, domestic economy etc.

1.9 Study of Tribal Kinship and its importance

Kinship is widely regarded as a difficult area of anthropology, yet many anthropologists have developed interest to achieve necessary conceptual tools and logical rigour, to penetrate into the nature of the topic. Study of tribal kinship is even more difficult as the tribes inhabit the areas that are not easily accessible and establishment of rapport with the tribal people is all the more difficult. Therefore, in order to bridge the gap in our understanding about the kinship in general, it is essential to undertake study on tribal kinship, an important and primitive component of social structure.
Main features of tribal kinship, particularly those speaking "Munda" language or "the Munda Tribe" has been discussed in the ongoing section. Figure 1.1 depicts the structure of Munda speakers. The Santal are the largest Munda tribe, with a population of perhaps four million, found scattered throughout Bihar, West Bengal, Orissa, Assam and other eastern states, Bangladesh and Nepal. The Saora tribe is mostly found in Orissa and southern part of Andhra Pradesh with a population of about 1,50,000. Most Munda are cultivators.

Descent, family organization and inheritance are all patrilineal for Munda Tribes. Women may join their husband’s descent group in marriage. Residence is usually virilocal, but sometimes the husband lives with his wife’s father, especially if the latter has daughters but no sons. Such ‘son in law at home’ marriages are basically designed to provide an interim heir for
the father in law, whose grand sons will carry on his line in the following generation, but via his daughter, not via his sons (Parkin, 2001).

Joint or extended families are common among Santal, Khoria and Munda, though the family composition changes with the cycle of successive births and deaths. Inheritance of property is very common among the tribes, for the youngest son among the Saora, Santal and for the eldest son in other tribes. There is also inheritance of clothes and ornaments by and through females, especially from mother to daughter.

Saoras have clans which are usually totemic, i.e. they are associated with a particular animal species which may play a part in the clans origin myth and should not be harmed or eaten by the members of that particular clan. Clans are usually exogamous and therefore play a key role in the regulation of marriage, death rituals etc. Clans are divided into lineages, named after village offices. Lineages may be closer to being units of mutual genealogical recognition than clans, where relationship are not always traceable as such but are recognized on the basis of having same totem. Saora, Gadaba, Bonda, Diyayi, Parenga and Juang have phratries, a larger unit than clan, into which they are grouped further. These are often totemic. There are restrictions on intermarriage between some clans. There are sub-classes in some tribes (Santal). However, it is unclear what roles the sub clans play in exogamy or ritual.

The Saoras have only lineages called Birinda, which are exogamous but not totemic, usually confined to a single village, and divided into further sub units called tega and tapp-rungkun for purposes of ritual activity and labour.

There is therefore a basic distinction between clans and lineages, with sub clans in some groups and phratries in others. Genealogical memory is generally shallow, three or four
generations at most, so totems are essential labels for the regulation of marriage. Karve (2002) while depicting the kinship map of India focused on tribal kinship and stated that ethnic groups between various tribal communities of Orissa are affected by one another and copy each other practices.

There is little child marriage among the tribes. Brides are mostly younger than their husbands, except among the Bonda, where wives are regularly elder. Bride price is almost universal. Majumdar (1950) reported it to be very high among the Ho, to extent that many youths could not marry. Forms of marriage are provisionally classified as regular, exchange, elopment, intrusion, capture, widow marriage and ghar-jawae. Saoras prefer cross cousin marriage, which is objectionable in other tribes. Most tribes also allow polygyny, often to an actual or lineage younger sister of the first wife, a practice called sororate. Among north and central Munda, no cross cousin marriage is allowed in most tribes.

All recorded Munda kinship terminologies are basically prescriptive in pattern. Munda of South Orissa in Koraput and Ganjam districts are closer to south Indian than the central and north Munda ones. Certainly, cross kin are not the targets of affinal alliances among the various tribes, which is linked to the delays in alliance renewal of one and, more usually three, generations.

A diachronic or historical approach is more suitable for north and central Munda system than the synchronic approach of Dumont and others in respect of attempts to compare the two more standard models, with the seemingly unbridgeable gaps between them. Thus, one of the ways in which the study of tribal kinship would be made easier is to bridge the gap in our understanding of their social values and in bringing to lime light the practices and social systems of one of the unexplored tribes such as Saora or Hill Saora of southern Orissa.
1.10 Studies on Hill Saoras

The Hill Saora or Lanjia Saora is one of the most primitive tribes of Orissa. A few earlier studies in Saora have accorded a distinctive status to its culture and social strength as compared to other tribal societies. They inhabit most of the parts of the lofty hills departing mountains, stream and gapping valleys.

1.10.1 The Saora in History and literature

The term Saora appears to have two connotations. One derived from ‘Sagories’ the scathian word for axe and other from ‘Saba Roye’ the Sanskrit term for carrying a dead body (Patnaik, 1989). Both of them fit well with their habit of carrying dead and axe always on their shoulders with their primitive occupation of hunting and leaving on spoils chase.

The word Saora (Sabarah, Saorah) or something like it was used in ancient times much as people in India today use the words “aborigine” “Bhunjan” or “Adibasi” for it seems to have been synonymous with such names as Matarya, Kirata, Jananghna, Pullinda and Bhilla and can hardly employed in ethnographic sense. In early times when the Saora name was used it covered all the different division of Kols, as they are now called, kurkhs and Bhilla in the west, with Santhals and Bhuyans, Munda and Hos, Bhujnij and Juangs in the east. In later times when Somadev wrote the katha Sarit Sagar , the name of “Saora” used as synonymous with the Pullinda and Bhilla, and therefore , means a man of an aboriginal tribes. Saoras are called by various names such as Savara, Sabara, Saur, Sora etc. and show their racial affinity to the Proto-Australoid group.

According to Cunningham (1884), there seems good reason to believe that the Saoras were formally branch of great Kolaman family, and their power lasted down to a comparatively
late period when they were pushed aside by other Kolman tribes in the North and East, and by
the Gonds in the South. B. C. Majumdar (1927) is of the same opinion that all the kolarias are
brought branches of Saora people. The Pana Saoras mentioned by Varaha Mihir (A.D. 550) are
supposed to be the leaf-clad juangs, another tribe of the same group, then they may equally be
the leaf-clad Saora.

The earliest reference to the Saora is found mentioned in the cast and tribes of the southernn India by Thurston (1909). He says Saora, Sawara or Saora are one important hill tribe
of Ganjam and Vizagpatnam, they have derived their name from the Scegethian Sagar an Axe in
reference to the axe, which they carry in their hand. Referring to the origin of tribe he has cited
the Rigveda, which cites that Saoras have descended from Viswamitra while in the Ramayana
they have emanated from the body of Vaisistha's cows to fight against Viswamitra. Referring to
the Grierson he says their language is included under Mundari family. Fawcett (1888) says
Saoras are most industrious. They show remarkable engineering skill in constructing paddy
fields but are physically inferior to Kondhs. They give half of their products to parasitic Bisoies.
Ramanath Pantutlu on the other hand holds the view that the Bisoies were originally a feudatory
chief under the authority of Jamindars, who were authorized to collect rents from the Saoras. The
immigration of Saoras to assure work in tea garden is also noticed.

Thurston (1909) has divided Saoras into two divisions depending on the habitation. They
are hill Saoras and Saoras of low country. Hill Saoras are subdivided into six categories such as:
Jati Saora, Lanjia Saora, Mulli Saora, Kindal Saora, Jaddu Saora and Kurbi Saora. Jati Saora is
regarded to be superior most, do not eat flesh of cow but Buffalo. Lanjia Saoras are weavers as
well as agriculturist. The Muli Saoras are the iron workers where as Kindals are basket makers.
Jadu Saoras group reside beyond Puttasing where as Kurbi Saoras are potters. The Saoras of the
low country on the other hand has been subdivided into two groups such as: Kupa and Sudha. The former is a cultivator group whereas the latter is a good section of Saoras. While comparing these two subdivisions i.e. Kupa and Sudha, Ramamurty says Kupa Saoras have retained many of Saora customs whereas Sudha Saoras have adopted the language and custom of neighboring Oriya caste.

Saoras built home in upland hills and which they desert on the events of disagreement with the Jamindars regarding the payments of land rents. They usually escape their homes to the jungles through some secret routes when invaded by Jamindars. The invaders in turn set fire their houses, which are again, build up on the same sites by the Saoras after reaching an agreement with the Jamindar for providing him necessary assistance at the time of need.

Fawcett (1888), while referring to their houses, says that the huts are built in two rows facing each other. The houses are usually one room and thatched roof. The number of hunting implements is usually more than the agricultural. The house sites are shifted following the attack of tiger, caprice of woman and death or diseases of cattle. They do not dare to have numerical above twelve superstitious menaces of the tiger.

Referring to physical character, Fawcett stated that Saoras are below the middle height face, rather flat, lips thick, nose broad and flat, chick bone high, eyes slightly oblique. The face is distinctly Mongolian (Thurston; 1909). He had also referred to dress and ornaments, marriage and family institutions, death ritual, taboos, leisure and recreation and religion.

Ramamurti (1931) has dealt with the political organization of Saora. Each group of Saora is under the government of two chiefs, one of whom is Gamango and other close in council is Bhuya, who not only discharge in connection with Gamango the duties of Magistrate but holds
the office of the high priest. On referring to the economic activities, Thurston says besides cultivation they also collect leaves for preparation and selling of leaf plates and other minor forest product like honey and wine. He has also referred to the different schemes of government for the improvement of education of Saora.

Russel and Hiralal (1916) mentioned “the Saoras are found in large number in Madras presidency in Ganjam and Vizagpatnam and in Orissa”. Cunninghams referring to the origin of the tribes says the word Saora is believed to have been derived from “Sava” a corpse, which is outside of the Aryan Language. In the classical story of their origin, the ancestor of Saora is some times described as a Bhil, a Munda tribe who were driven out by the Gonds, the present occupants tract of the country, their origin is related to the exile period of Ramachandra in Ramayana. When he come across an aboriginal women “Saora” accepting fruits from her. In Mahabharata, Jara Sabara is accepted to be the original ancestor of the present Saora who killed Krishna in form of deer. So far Jagannath culture is concerned the Saoras were engaged to carry stones for the construction of the temple at Puri and dragging the Car of Lord Jagannath. Another story relating to the Jagannath culture is through “Seorinarayana” the previous form of Jagannath who was being worshiped by the Saora king.

Russel and Hiralal(1916) discussed the sub-divisions and political organization, exogamous groups through which marriage institution is regulated, the procedure of marriage ritual, disposal of the dead, religion, dress pattern and economic. While referring to the economic he says they live in the jungle, produce cultivation and are very clever in tarring honeycombs. The Saora have been referred in text including two great epics of India i.e. Ramayana and Mahabharata. The Saora or Sabara and Sauri or Sabari are seen to be connotation of present Saora, are also found in several Sanskrit text in different periods. Census operation of 1931 says
that the population of Saora was 2,11,781. In the same census operation the Basin of Bansadhara River at Gunupur and Paralakhemundi was said to the homeland of Saora, which was a part of Madras presidency till 1935, when formation of new Orissa province was made. Russel has tried to give brief account of the tribe from the history and migration from the Vedic time to the present day but the task is very difficult because of the non-availability of the authentic material. He had tried to give a brief description of the Saora habitat, material culture and economy. Referring to the Saora Lord, Sitapati says the Lord of Saora has to some extent married the nature beauty of the green field by learning them “Podu” or extensive cultivation but on the other hand richly enhanced, the picture queens of the sloping hills and Valleys by his terrace paddy fields which rise one above the other and are supported by the pavement of the stones, all along their edges and side and profusely irrigated by the over flowing waters of the sportive waterfalls at the top.

While referring to their marriage and relation between the sons of the Saora it has been said that they practice both child and adult marriages. Different types of marriages such as capture, elopement and payments of bride price are also dealt by him. He has delineated the selection and choice of mates through different stages. The stage of marriage presentation and counter presentation in the marriage ceremony are also narrated properly.

Russel has analyzed the ceremonies and festivals deities and spirit including the ideas of supreme deities in his subsequent writing in the year 1940-41. In the year 1943, he has published a brief account of Saora religion. He has also attempted to study the diseases and their treatment in the Saora society.

Pattnaik (1955) has tried to present a soft ethnography of the tribe. Referring to the language he agrees with Grierson’s linguistic classification. He has presented a brief description
of the economic life with special reference to shifting cultivation. The traditional exploitation of ‘pano’ neighbour is another interesting aspect of the article. He has also classified the ‘Saora’ into eleven types depending on their habitation and locality. They are: 1: Jada Saora (highlanders) whose habitat is Gumma and Kolalota. 2: Mane Saoras live in Ojagodo and Serongo. 3: Tejathi Saoras or the Lombo Saoras live in Gumma, Ojajodo and Serongo. 4: The Kindlli Saoras or the Saroda Saoras live in Rayagada and Jirango muthas. They are the people who did the basket weaving in the areas. 5: The Luara Saoras and Muli Saoras are found in every important place in one or two houses. They are the blacksmiths. 6: The Mulla Saoras are found at several places and do basket weaving. 7: The Bhimo Saoras are found in Leobo, Engersing, Jirango and the Mandasa malias, 8: The Sudha Saoras are found in Ramagiri and Udayagiri. They are not tribes in strict sense and they live on agriculture only. They have adopted the oriya habits, customs, manners and also Oriya religion partially. 9: Kumba Saoras live in the down hills of Paralakhemundi agency. 10: The based Saoras are also a class, which live down in the Paralakhemundi taluk. 11: The Mutha Saoras are particularly the Sudha Saoras down in the hills. They are found in the plain muthas of Paralakhemundi agency. He further says that the first three classes of Saoras are the original Saoras, preserving their traditional habits, manners and customs. (Pattnaik, 1955)

Verrier Elwin (1955) has presented a vivid picture of Saora ethnography account in his famous book ‘The Religion of an Indian Tribe’. He has given a clear picture of their religion and the culture in and around it. The relationship of ‘soul and the living Saoras’ can be visualized from this book which speaks many things beyond religion but everything concerning it. The Saoras follow the practice of Hindu religion and categorize the Gods into males and females. Each male god is suffixed by ‘sum’ and the female goddess is suffixed by ‘boi’. According to Elwin ‘kittung’ is in the highest position in the hierarchy of gods and goddess. Each god and
goddess has its own abode like sky, hill, forest, houses, cultivating land and everywhere. He has also mentioned about the religious practitioners who also act as medicine man. Along with the above he has also given details about the different shrines, the objects offered during the worship. As per his writings Saoras also name different types of diseases after different gods and accordingly try to please them, to cure themselves. Whether it is a name giving ceremony or community congregation at the death ritual like 'karjya' animal sacrifice takes place even today after almost more than seventy years V. Elwin had surveyed. U.N. Patnaik (1964-65) has given some details about social institutions, leisure habits, food pattern, dress and ornaments, musical instruments, love for drinking of palm juice, hunting activity, death rituals, different ways of acquiring mates and a demographic picture where females outnumber the males. Chowdhury (1963-64) has given a brief ethnography of Saora population, the division of tribe, the social institutions, the religion, the settlement pattern, the economic organization, the consumption pattern, and the material culture of these people. According to him their change to Christianity has changed their life tremendously. Chowdhury (1964-65) has also attempted to go through their religious practices and the various ceremonies practiced to treat the deities. He termed practice as the 'Magico-religious' among Saora. He has also mentioned about the reason of discontent between the lovers of the tradition due to the change of religion. Das (1965-66) has discussed about the 'Birinda' organisation of Lanjia Saoras. According to him the maximal lineage is the Birinda and the primary function is to regulate marriage. It also maintains brotherhood, which is observed during the life-cycle rituals and the different economic activities. It also helps to decide the inheritance rules. He has also studied about the unchanged Birinda of the married female. It makes them to feel that the children of the married female 'brother and her husband are not of same Birinda' and hence the cross-cousin marriage is
allowed. He has also made a reference to the Saora death ritual and the Guar ceremony, which is observed to pay final tribute to the deceased. On the whole he has emphasized upon the role of Birinda, consists of descendants, which is used as a regulating force in discharging day-to-day duties and obligations in the Saora society.

Tripathy (1965-66) has attempted to make serological study on Lanjia Saora of Orissa by collecting blood samples. He has studied the ABO blood group pattern and tried to trace the racial affinity of the tribe with other tribal groups of Orissa. He further proposed for racial affinity of cliff types of Saora tribes by adopting general study.

Watts (1970) has given a brief picture of hill Saora. He begins his discussion by referring the work of Shaman and position in healing process. He has narrated how the Shaman acts a middle man between the deity and the sick and also narrates the reason and processes of sacrifice. The hierarchy of chief ritual functionaries and their work assignment along with officiating to the office are split out in the monograph. The world of Gods and spirits, which is difficult to catalogue because of their composition and kaleidoscopic pattern of their pantheon, are briefly mentioned. The disposal of the dead and the final ceremony of Guar are also briefly touched. The Doms are the neighbour of Saora. The Saora socio-economic relationship between them is another striking factor of ethnography. Although the relationship is mainly described as exploitative in nature, yet it is mutually dependant because of social, economic and political reasons. He then described the ecological and scenic beauty of the hills and communica
tional hazards to the Saora villages. The Saora settlement pattern and the keeping of domestic animals are also dealt with. The Saora economy, particularly the cultivation of terrace land in drying situation in spite of low produce have been dealt with. He mentioned that status of woman is higher than the man because of her industriousness. The dress pattern and ornaments specially
large ear rings are the peculiarities of tribe. Another peculiarities lie in the absence of their clan system. The social instruction of marriages, family, political organization, leisure and recreation and headgears of Saora are clearly spelt out. Different musical instruments including the fiddles, which are very popular in the marriage ceremony, and provides company in lonely evenings as some of the interesting and important instrument of Saora.

Patnaik and Mishra (1976) have attempted to study the pattern of election of leadership of Lanjia Saora. They have outlined the traditional leadership pattern along with the hierarchical order. They have also outlined the pattern of revenue collection in the Saora country by taking two samples from Lanjia Saora villages. They have attempted to mark an assessment of the political awareness and participation in the domestic election vis-à-vis traditional political organization. Their observation revealed that the Saora still attach more importance to their traditional leadership pattern and is least influenced by the modern democratic process.

Patnaik (1980-81) has presented a changing scene of Lanjia Saora village. By studying a village called Jagannathpur in Chandragiri of Ganjam district, he has said that Saora can be changed economically and culturally if provided with Proper avenues. Changes outlined by him were in the field of traditional political system verses modern political system, traditional values verses modern values and traditional rituals verses modern rituals. He has concluded that Lanjia Saora are fascinated towards Hinduism and came to be identified as a Sudha Saora as they accord some cultural traits of Hindu neighborhood.

Barala and Sahoo (1980-81) have presented an antagonistic relationship between Pano and Saora of Ganjam district. The two groups identified as schedule caste and schedule tribe respectively, are neighbour of each other. They are dependent on each other for economic and social purposes. The conversion of Pano to Christian and with development of socio-economic
status, the enemy relationship has developed. Subsequently, the local caste has become instrumental in increasing tension between Pano and Saora. In number of cases the humiliation, physical beating, forcible possession of crops and even struggle against economic exploitation ventilated in a number of time. Even after the conversion of Saora and Pano to Christianity, local did not change. The Lanjia Saora is considered to be Hindu section of Saora. At the same time Sudha Saora, the hinderd gang for retaining their traditional culture, hates them. The economic exploitation by the Panos to the Saora has also been reflected in the political scene of the locality. The national party of the country has supported one group or other at the time of general election. The underlying economic cure act as a major force in influencing the political decision making process of the locality.

Mohapatra (1983) has attempted to analyze the Lanjia Saora society from development prospective. He has compared their categories of Saora such a “Lanjia Saora” taking into account their view of Good life, Happy life” and development. It is meant for leading a charitable life and after death life is refreshed in good housing, well dressed and regulation of sex, where as the development aims at satisfaction of desire and goal. On the basis of their parameters of comparison, Mohapatra has concluded that if Lanjia Saora are in Marginal grade where as other two categories of Saora such as Sudha and Christian are marching towards the assimilation with national system and Hindu peasantry. Broadly he reduced the three categories as Marginal, associative and assimilative within which three categories of Saora can be placed.

Singh (1984) has prescribed a brief ethnographic note on Saora. He had made a systematic approach on their economy, ecology and also the Dom neighbor. His studies were directed towards the amazingly traditional leadership pattern and the mechanism responsible for the maintenance of the same, instead of demoralization of political affairs. On referring to the
political structure he has mentioned how the traditional leadership pattern has been continuing to promote the inter development structure. Their participation in the process of economic development is another significant area of study. His research findings conclude that the village development score of Christian Saora is the highest while it is lowest for the Lanjia Saora. The Sudha Saora is in between.

Das and Pattnaik (1984) have tried to present the comparative picture of traditional and Hindu Saora. The traditional Saora is otherwise known as Lanjia Saora. By taking adequate sample size from both the categories they have concluded that in spite of higher educational and economic standard more expense to modern family planning programme and medical facilities, Sudha Saoras are still in the beginning of demographic transition. On the other hand Lanjia Saora having little exposure, exhibit lower fertility rate compared to their advanced counter parts. It was further concluded that exposure to the modern health and educational facilities do not affect the demographic behaviour.

Mohanty (1988) has presented a brief outline of Lanjia Saora. He has discussed about the ecological conditions of Saora land, which is in high altitude with dense forest and with hot and humid climate. He then analyzed the settlement pattern and shifting cultivation. The following period of shifting land is about three years. He also mentioned on the social organization and life cycle rituals of the Saora among which death ritual is most important. By referring the Saora religion he said that Saora have long been worshiping Lord Jagannath the prime deity of Orissa, India. The Shaman (Kulon) act as the ambassador of God and Goddess through whom the news of good and bad passes through. On the whole, Mohanty (1988) has presented the picture of Lanjia Saora in the traditional form.
Pattanaik (1989) has presented an ethnographic account of the Saora, where he has attempted to analyze Saora in ethno history. He has narrated the association with Lord Krishna from epical reference and the prevalence of village deity in the coastal areas eventually as its origin in Saora society. Apart from their contribution to Saora religion particularly in the form of Nilamadhava a part of little tradition has been magnified to Lord Jagannath of great tradition. Also, he said the present district of Dhenkanala and Sambalpur of Orissa once upon a time was established by Saora chief. He has also provided an interesting calendar, which is based on economic activities cycle rather than any Lunar, and Solar calendar. They are mostly affected by malaria disease, which is prevalent in this area. Their religion is so elaborate and complicated that it is beyond comparison of any other tribe of Orissa. The mechanism of social contract is very long. On the issues of Saora development he has mentioned how they are exploited by the Dom neighbour. In order to remove barrier of exploitation he has suggested the ouster of Dom from the Saora land the doms be rehabilitated in colonies in different places. Secondly, these Doms be trained with modern employment scheme so that they will not strict to their traditional occupation.

Mohanty (1989) has briefly presented the material culture of the Saora. He compared the dress pattern of the Saora with the Bondas, which live in the Malkanagiri sub division of Orissa. Referring to Elwin he has said that the Saora do not wear good ornaments. The drum, flutes and Sarangi are the various types of musical instruments, which are used, in different occasions by the Saora. However, his discussion is mainly restricted to the material culture more specifically the ornaments and musical instruments. Mohanty (1989) again made an ethnographic presentation of the Saora and suggested that the term has two connotations. One of them derived from the scythes land Saora means axe and the other from the sustain term “Sabaraja” which
means carrying a dead body. He also pleaded about the applicability of both the terms that are justified for Saora. Physically they are not as strong in comparison to other tribes of Orissa. The Saora villages do not conform to any settlement pattern. Their house are in shape and fairly high. The well to do section of Saora has bigger houses with spacious varanda which signifies their status. The economic life of Saora primarily rests on shifting cultivation to a large extent and terrace and wet cultivation to some extent. Apart from occasional buntings and forest collection he has elaborated the terrace cultivation and different crops grown in different parts of land. He has also explained about the agriculture calendar, their food habit. He has divided the hill Saora into six different categories based on their occupation. They are unique due to absence of clan organization and non-existent of supreme God concept. Marriage procedure for daughter with natural uncle is widely prevailed. They are famous for their worship, which is done to flatter and appeal the Gods and their festival is related with the crop cycle. While commenting the problem of Saora he said that the poor sanitation provides the excellent breeding ground for mosquitoes and flies which are the main causes of vector diseases like malaria, gastrointestinal disorder and allied infection. Besides, they suffer from malnutrition. Sharma (1991) has presented a brief account of hunting pattern of Saora and its position in the Saora economy. The tactics of hunting at different periods of time depend on the nature and availability of the animal. After analyzing different type of hunting / trapping he says the meat of the hunted animal carries economic and social values which they get from non Saoras.

Nayak (1992) has made an observation on the changing economic scenario of Saora by taking into account three Lanjia Saora villages in different ecological regimes. He has concluded that population presence and exposure of village community have resulted declining trend of man forest relationship. The presence from the outside is higher than the inner presence of the
tribal. More over the income from the shifting land has resulted in diminishing trend and in its place the produce from the wet land has gone up which is a silver line of Saora economy.

Various authors have presented the mechanism of social contract and development of Saora and emphasized on their strong belief on supernatural powers as the main mechanism for maintenance of traditional and social culture apart from the Taboo and Sacrifice which are performed for reward and situation work as agent of social center. Thus, Saoras have accepted the modern educational system, leadership pattern, modern economy and experienced industrialization to some extent. More over, the spread of Christianity have accelerated the pace of contact and modernization. In the process, the Saora are in transition and heading towards an enlaced world.

1.11 Methodology

The following methods have been followed in order to collect data on the topic "Kinship structure of the Saora".

1.11.1 Rapport Establishment

One of the prime necessities of each and every research work in social anthropology is to establish the rapport with the natives. The success of researcher largely depends upon the degree of rapport establishment with the people, for acquiring information.

On the first day when I met the Saoras, I had some communication difficulties due to their different language. They behaved me as a stranger. Some of them thought me as political party people to campaign for the Election and other thought that I am from police department. They continued to ask why this data is collected about them; whether they will get any benefit from the Government or not. Temporarily I was in trouble to convince them about my aims and
objectives. In the fear of doing them harm they did not give detailed data for some days. But school teacher Raita convinced some of the villagers of Bhabani with the help of Isac Bhuya, Galanti Bhuya, and the educated Saoras. Then, we got some Saora interpreters and they helped me in collection of census data on Saoras of Angada. Similarly, in Puttasing area I used to take help of Child Development Programme Officer (CDPO), Anganbadi workers to stay there, as there was no Lanjia Saora Development Agency (LSDA) guesthouse till 1996. I took help from Anganwadi workers of respective villages like Snehalata of Sagada village and Sandhayarani of Puttasing. Laxman Sabara of LSDA, Puttasing helped me a lot in the rapport establishment and collection of information from various villages such as Dungdunger, Rejingtal and Kereba. Besides, Magusira Gamango and Gobinda Gamango of Rejingtal and Magusira Gamango of Jungjung helped me a lot in introducing the villagers, telling them about my intention of visiting frequently to the villages of this area. When I was collecting Census they were expecting any Govt. help and regularly asking me. But when I was collecting Genealogy, they were more interested; gradually make a larger gathering by calling different people of the lineage groups. Their happiness and glad faces often wiped away my tiredness and withdrawal attitude which resulted out of helplessness and lingering work. People of Rejingtal village even learned the technique to keep records of their lineage members and gave me the word to keep on the work as far as possible. The people of “Jungjung” and Dungdungar villages also helped me a lot in confirming kinship terminologies and kinship usages along with some rules following their patrilineal group.

As most of the villagers are engaged in agricultural work, they remain busy during the daytime and hesitate to give information. But after they became familiar they devoted some hours at morning and evening. In the process, I used to give some rapport materials like
Chocolates; Bidies etc. and took photographs of them, which convinced them about my harmless presence, aims and objectives.

This rapport establishment helped me in collecting reliable data regarding the topic. Sometimes, I participated in their domestic activities, which too played a vital role in developing rapport with them. However, at the time of farewell, they bid farewell with deep grief in their heart. The affection which has developed during my stay with them and the help they have rendered will be in my mind for ever.

1.11.2 Observation

For the investigation of the actual kinship behaviours, participant observation is required. Therefore, during my field studies, I have given emphasis to participant observation besides following non-participant observation.

1.11.3 Interview

Interview is the one of the systematic methods for intensive and extensive study of the social structure of a society. It has been extremely helpful to me to collect data on every aspect of their society and culture, which are beyond the possibility of my observation. For the collection and confirmation of data on the whole kinship structure of the Saora, interview method helped me much in my fieldwork.

1.11.4 Interview Guide

As a part of interview, I have adopted this method to get information on the social life of Saora. Through interview guide method, it becomes easier for me to make my informants understand the questions better. The method helps me to get their appreciations and detail response to my questions.
1.11.5 Census schedule

For the demographic study, census is essential. I have filled up census forms of Saora, which later helped me to make different statistical and demographic analysis such as educational, occupational, marital status, distribution of Birindas of the Saora tribe. Thus, the above methods have helped me immensely to collect data on different aspects of Saora kinship.

1.11.6 Case Study Method

I have taken some case histories regarding kinship usages, categories and ritual kinship etc. Through this case-study method, I am able to validate some of my observations and data collected in other methods.

1.11.7 Selection of Village

Saora tribes deserve an in-depth study, specifically for its clan less nature. Studies on Saora tribe are fragmentary and the information available on the kinship of Saora tribe is sporadic. Certain criteria were adopted while selecting the specific villages to undertake the particular study. First and foremost criterion is that the villages are mostly inhabited by Saora. Second point is that the villages under study were easily accessible as the villagers were cooperative in nature and the villages were situated within 5km distance from the Grama Panchayat (GP) headquarters. Further, establishment of rapport with the villagers of the particular studied villages could be made possible through their kinsmen working in Lanja Saora Development Agency, Puttasing. But in case of village Angada in Serango Gram Panchayat of Gajapati District, rapport was established through the Anganwadi workers who were well aware of the people. Further, homogeneity of the villages was also taken into consideration while selecting the villages.
Fig 1.2: Village map of Rejingtal
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Fig 1.3: Village map of Jongjong

On the Hill top at an approximate height of 3000 ft above M.S.L.
The primary study, which concentrated in village Angada of Serango GP in Gajapati district, is a traditional Hindu Saora village. It is at a distance of 3 km from Serango, the GP headquarter. Similarly the villages Kereba and Dungdunger, under Sagada GP, are within 3 km and 1 km distance respectively from Sagada. Villages Regingtal and Jungjiung under Puttasing Grampanchayat are also situated within 1 km and 4 km distance respectively from Puttasing, the GP headquarter. Out of the four villages under Rayagada district, village Jungjiung (Figure 1.3) is a traditional Hindu Saora village while other three villages have both Hindu and Christian Saora tribes. Figure 1.2 and 1.4 depicts the village map of Rejingtal and Dungdunger respectively.

Since my study is mostly focused on the kinship of Saora tribe for which drawing the Genealogy is a pre requisite, the four selected villages were ideal.

1.11.8 Nomenclature

The village Angada of Serango GP in Gajapati district where primary study was conducted derived its name from its natural surroundings. The village is surrounded by sour mango trees. The word “Angada” refers to sour mango in their traditional Saora language.

The village Dungdungar in Sagada GP of Rayagada district derived its name from its physical setting. Dungdung means slope and gar means house. The houses in village Dungdungar are situated over highland having slope and hence the name of the village.

Village Kereba derived its name from its natural setting. Meaning of the word kere is flowering trees. The village was created by removing lots of flowering trees “Kere” and hence the name ‘kereba’.
The village Rejingtal derived its name from its historical evidence i.e. "two feet together over an uneven stone". "Rab" means together, "jing" means feet and "tal" means uneven stone. Since there was a signature of two feet together over an uneven stone prior to the establishment of the village, the village got its name as Rabjingtal or Rejingtal as it is called now. The meaning of the word Jungjung in Saora language is measurement of land and thus the village is named as 'Jungjung'.

1.11.9 Genealogical Method

For the proper study of "kinship organizations" genealogical charts are highly necessary for a researcher. I have collected the genealogical charts of my base villages. It helped me in ramifying interpersonal relationships and interactions, succession of property, descent, family and lineage like structures and nomenclature.

1.12 Scope of the thesis

Scope of the present study has been described under this section with a brief note on the contents of various chapters.

Concept clarification, definition, theories and current developments in kinship are vividly presented in Chapter-I. Besides, importance of tribal kinship and the historical development of Saora tribe are thoroughly discussed. Further, methodology and broad objectives of the present study are also outlined in Chapter-I. Chapter-II describes the Saora ecology, demography and culture. A vivid picture of the physiography of Saora villages, flora and fauna, house pattern, population, literacy, marital status and different cultural activities of Saora people are given. Chapter-III delineates the social organization of Saora tribe. Marriage, religion, language and political organization of Saora tribe are discussed in this chapter. Saora Kinship terminology is
discussed in Chapter-IV. An attempts has been made to make the componential analysis of Saora kinship terms. Chapter-V discusses the descent group of Saora tribe where property inheritance and rules of adoption are depicted clearly. Kingroups and kincategories are described in Chapter-VI. The discussions are focused mostly on consanguneal Group, affinal group and residential group. Kinship usages and behaviour are described in Chapter-VII. Various usages of kinship and the kinship behaviour among the primary, secondary and tertiary kins are presented. Chapter-VIII deals with the analysis of genealogy of Saora tribe. Role of kinship in socialization, economic cooperation, rituals and ceremonies as a political unit and in social stability are discussed in Chapter-IX. Pattern of obligation relationship and changes are presented in Chapter-X. Chapter-XI embodies the summary discussion and conclusion of the present study.