CHAPTER IV
AN ETHNOGRAPHIC FRONTIER OF
MEITEI KINSHIP

In the previous chapter, it is seen that, terminologically cross cousin marriage is an approved form of marriage in the society. But in reality, the present Meitei society, any form of cousin marriage is not practically prevalent. Here questions arise in regards to the kinship terminology and its system in the society, such as, is the Meitei kinship terminology a composition of superfluous terms and whether the Meitei kinship does not have a link with the social system?

The Meitei society has changed a lot. Because of the die-hard conservative nature of the kinship structure, traces of the past system exists mainly at far remote and isolated areas. Besides, diffusion of culture reaches in these areas in a slowly. So, it is needed empirically to collect first hand informations from these sections to discuss the conservatively long lasting kinship terminology and its validity in the study of the structure of the concern society.

Regarding the crossness and relative age, there is a relationship significant in the society. Husband and wife, for example, may be of the same age category, but a little older by the husband is generally preferred. It is reflected in the kinship terminology also. The husband-wife or the couple is described as itei and inao in the Meitei terminology. *Itei* is the person older than the female ego whereas *inao* is the person younger than the male ego. Some other terminological considerations related to the relative age of spouse can be of the following norms.

i) Existence of both FZD and MBD marriage: This is to be empirically examined in the following section.

ii) Age of husband older than wife: The itei is older than the inao/inaomui.
iii) Sororate is permissible, since an *itei* i.e., the husband of a woman’s elder sister can marry an *inao* i.e., the younger sister of his wife. Polygyny as well as sororate are socially allowed in Meitei society.

iv) Sister exchange is suggestable. For a male ego, *iche* (cZ)/*ichan* (yZ) is marriageable to *ibai* (cZH, WeB)/*isen* (yZH, WyB); *iyamba* (cB)/*inaonupa* (yB) is marriageable to *iteima* (eBw, WeZ)/*inaonupi* (yBw, WyB). For a female ego, *iche/inaonupi* (Z) is marriageable to *itei* (eZH, HeB)/*inaonupi* (yzH, HyB) while *ibung/ipwa* is marriageable to *ina* (eBw, HeZ)/*ichan* (yBw, HyZ). Sister exchange is in practice at Andro (Fig:4.9). More detail about the sister exchange is discussed later.

v) In case of levirate, senior levirate is exclusively supported by the terminology. *Itei* can marry *inaonupi* but *inaonupi* is not marriageable to *iteima*. At present, levirate is no more prevalent. During my study, Tayenjam Amutho
Singh, the oldest man of Yambem Khunou, Imphal East district, Manipur expressed that “manaonu pi (younger brother’s wife) may be taken as wife of a man; it is supported by kinship terminology”. But he denied the possibility of junior levirate. (I did not put any question to him about kinship terminology). But in the old manuscripts as ‘Poireiton Khunthok’, a case of anticipatory levirate was mentioned. Poireiton was given Lenaotabi, wife of his elder brother Thawarel, by the husband of Leinaotabi himself. He sent his younger brother to a great mission and gave his wife to be his brother’s wife. And it is written in the old manuscript Panthoibi Khongkal that if a widow wishes to remarry she has to repay the bride price called mangkat given by her husband to her family, otherwise, she has only to remarry to her husband’s younger brother. As I can not find any case of levirate, it is not considered seriously in my study.

Some cases of cross-cousin marriage in Manipur

1. Phayeng:

Located in Imphal West (I) District. It has a population of 2071 distributed in 391 H.H. (Census of India, 1991). They believed to be descended from the Selfoi Langmai who settled at Nongmaiching hill. There are only two social groups at Phayeng.

1) Angom
   i) Angom
   ii) Lupalak Pam
   iii) Naotam
2) Ningthoujam
   i) Achombam
   ii) Khullak Pam

There is the rule of village endogamy. Engagement is the ideal form of marriage. There is the absence of levirate and sororate but there is the prevalence of MBD marriage. But FZD marriage is not prevalent and is likely to recede by the belief that FZD marriage brings damage and reduction to property and wealth. The restriction is expressed in the local sayings that hui yen puside i.e., ‘dog-hen do not last long.’

2) Khurdhul:

It is a scheduled caste village in Imphal West (I) district, Manipur. The village has a total population of 3,344 souls living in 565 households. The village is believed to have
been named after the legendary episode of Chingjin Naren Pangalba. As soon as his mother Yaibirok gave birth, he as a matured man went out for a mission, still with the umbilical chord. The place where his umbilicus (*khoiri*) fell down was known as Khorikhun or Khurkhul. Another version is related with a mythical story ‘Khongjomnubi Nongarol’. According to this romantic myth of six girls of Luwang and six lads of Haokhu, the village-name was given as Khoiren Khul, meaning the village where the tragic story was marked to remember with a dao. Regarding the affinity of the people of this village, Mc. Culloch (1857) described them as Khoorukool Shan.

There are 15 lineages (*Konsam* lineage is excluded from attending the merrymaking of village deity). Many of the Konsam were the aliens or new comers in their history. That is why they were not fully accepted by the society.

In the village matrimonial alliance is established socially either through the ritualistic ceremony of *njaba* (engagement) or through the simple social contract of *ahong leithonba* (or *keinya katpa*).

The Khurkhul people, though not occur at present, allow the practice of MBD type of cross-cousin marriage by describing its acceptance as ‘*marie matung inba*’ meaning ‘following the aunt’. But FZD is not socially sanctioned here.

3) **Sekmai:**

![Diagram](image)

*Fig: 4.2 A case of FZD at Sekmai*

- Kin groups are written in italicised words whereas personal names are written in normal letters.
It is situated at about 30 km from Imphal in Imphal West District. It has a population of 1659 persons residing in 861 household (1991 census). The people are known as Chakpa but they are alien to Andro Chakpa people. They perform the rite for the disposal of death at a certain place called Luwangphum. Within the bound of this place, there are again specific sites of disposing dead for different clans.

The ideal type of marriage is ‘engagement’. Though another type, that is, ‘elopement through mutual love’, exists in the village, it gets no place for ceremonial marriage. Mate acquired by capture is prohibited and if it is so, the women is not allowed to pray the family deity which is the necessary aspect of a new coming in-law. But there still exists cross-cousin marriage in the society. A case is given (Fig: 4.2). Yaima of Yumlembam lineage was first engaged to his FBWBD. But she already had her own choice, and she eloped with the boy for setting up their family of procreation. But later he was engaged to a distant paternal cross cousin and then married.

Thus the paternal cross-cousin separated by three generation is marriageable as the case produced here is the marriage through the ideal engagement. MBD is not preferred now-a-days as a mate but they do not think the relationship as ‘a’ not marriageable tie.

4) Kwatha:

Kwatha is the only antique Meitei village in the hills of Manipur. It stands on the top of a spur of a range that extends from the Lokchao to the Indo-Myanmar border. It is located within the jurisdiction of Tengnoupal Sub-division in Chandel district, Manipur. It is about 11 kilometres from the border town, Moreh in Manipur. A myth tells that it was a very old village established at a time when man and god (mee and lai) lived together. The people of Kwatha can not tell the name of the person who founded the village. There is a restriction to disclose the original founder to the outsiders. So their forefathers retold only the second person who settled and handed the village. The oral tradition points to the Ningthoujam Punsiba as the founder of the village. The first founder is thus forbidden. It is said that the chief of the village, the founder, was one of the brothers of the thence Meitei King. Another version relates the founder of the village to two brothers who came from west possibly from Gujarat. King Kiyamba sent one of them to grow betel at this village while the other was placed to remain as Lairikyenga (record keeper). As betel (kwa) was grown (thaba), the settlement area came to be known as Kwatha.
My field data of 1999 reveals that, there are 103 men and 99 women forming a total population of 202 distributing in 42 households. The lineages found at Kwatha are 1) Laishram (Khuman clan) 2) Kshetrimayum (Kha-Nganba, claimed by them) 3) Takhellambam (without clan) 4) Ningthoujam (Mangang clan) 5) Angom (Angom clan) 6) Wahengbam (Luwang) and 7) Moirangthem (Moirang). Of the families found at Kwatha 80% are nuclear type, 10% each for extended and broken families.

The marriage by service for 3 years which is locally known as ‘Kroidou kaba’ is prevalent. *Kroidou*, here refers to the son-in-law.

Cross-cousin marriage is not restricted in the Kwatha society. However, parallel-cousin marriage is prohibited. But a case of marrying of a women from the same lineage of mother is found. *Angom* Amu married Chongbi of *Ningthoujam* lineage. Their son Biren also married a girl from *Ningthoujam* lineage. Her name is Memchoubi. Hence, there is the ‘assumed’ MBD marriage at Kwatha.

Levirate is unknown and property is inherited through ultimogeniture. Other than the restricted type, sororal marriage is not prescribed.

5) *Kamu Yaithibi/Yambem Khunou:*

It is a village of the Yaithibi (a scheduled caste) situated at about 30 km from Imphal and at about 5km from the nearest town, Yairipok. It is included in the Imphal East-I C.D. block of Imphal East District. It has a small population of 52 people in 9 households according to 1991 census. But I found 10 houses when I visited in the month of August, 2000. The smallness of population is related to their migration to other places.

The Yaithibi are said to be descendants of a handful of Meitei individuals, who were excommunicated because of their earlier incestuous behaviour. Till the reign of king Budhachandra, they were treated as untouchables. They were distinguished from other groups of people who are to wear compulsorily blue clothe.

Mate is acquired either by *hajaba* -engagement or by *chenba*-elopement. Senior levirate is tabooed but younger leviate is not restricted. Regarding cousin-marriage, FZD is prohibited by the current interdictory phrase ‘ee hanjinba thok-i’ meaning ‘it causes
the return of blood'. MBD is not restricted but I could not count any case during my staying period. The breach of marriage norm is subject to pay a fine of two pigs measuring 5-6 wai in girth at belly region (wai= breadth wise distance when the two hands are put touching each other) and country-liquor.

6) Leirongthel:

This village having 1403 population with 255 households (1991 Census) is situated at about 7 kms away from the nearest town Yairipok. It is situated in Thoubal district. The village name was given as the village looked like a floral plateau (leirong=bunch of flowers; thel=plateau). Another version is that the place where the flower from the ear of Panthoibi’s was fallen, was named as Leirong thel. It is said that people who belonged to two lineages, Sarangthem and Yangambam were the first inhabitants of the village.

An interesting feature of this village is that bride can not wear potloi—the common bridal attire. She has to adorn with chamra; kajenglei (head gear), mapan naiiba (a kind of lower garment). She is not allowed to go to the groom’s house on palanquin or elephant. Once, at her marriage, one Tamubi went on elephant en route the house of her groom. Her husband Naran Singh died shortly after their marriage. The cause of his death was then pointed to her misdeeds plundered on her marriage-day. In addition, the groom can not sit on luhongphal—the traditional seat of groom.

The villagers of Leirongthel do not prefer the cross cousin marriage of MBD. FZD is not thought to be fit for choice of mate. But when someone elopes with his MBD, the spouse can retain their matching without any social punishment. The concept of mane matung inba is still well working on theoretical level though approaching towards the abandonment in practical reality.

7) Kakching:

Kakching is a town area located at a distance of 45 kms from Imphal and it lies within the Thoubal district, Manipur. According to 1991 census, it has a population of 24,437 persons in a space of 7.02 sq. kms thereby forming density of 3,481. The sex ratio is 999 females per 1000 males.

They are not the autochthons of this soil but the assimilated people who became part of the Meitei. The tradational administrative head is known as Budhiraj.
These people inhabit dispersing to the villages—Kakching Khullen, Kakching Wairi, Kakching Khunou, Kakching Kameng and Kakching Awang.

Fig: 4.3 Indirect MBD marriage norm that exists at Kakching.

Regarding the cross-cousin marriage, the question of FZD is not need to rise. Direct MBD is not suitable to select for connubial tie. Sh. Mangi Singh, an elder man of Kakching draws the possibility of indirect MBD marriage as prevailed at Kakching.

8) Andro:

The Andro settled within the Andro N.A.C. area and Torongthel (Andro Khunou) constitute a population of 6764 souls as calculated from 1991 census. They are the Chakpa people who depend mainly on agriculture and subordinately on pottery, basketery, piggery and wine-brewing. The village is well-known for the sacred fire burning from immemorial times. They are continuing their ethnic traditionalism in their own terms, and conditions. When the Meitei converted into Hindu in the 18th century, they denied to take the new religion and become the retainers of old tradition. But, at present, Hindus are traceable at Andro Khullee. This is one of the causes for the mass of the Meitei who think that there are many relics in Andro. Today, there are some Christian converts also.

The sacred fire kept burning perpetually by the Chakpa Andro since time immemorable. It is very much related to the traditionalism of the core Meiteis. R.K. Jhaljit
Singh (1976: 20) described the fire of the Chakpa Andros to be an earlier than the fire brought by Poireiton, the progenitor of Luwang and Khuman clans. He reproduced the character of the fire by quoting the verse of Atombabup Vidyaratna in Pakhangba (published year not given: 21)

“O Fire brought by Poireiton
Thou Fire maintained by Poinaota
Twin Fire of the Chakpas
O brightly burning Fire
Thou Representative of the Sun

The Chakpta group of Meitei are one of the earliest settlers in Manipur. The Chakpas were subjects of Pyu (Ibohal 1986: 149) who had capital called Srikshtera, north of Prome in Irrawaddy valley. The Pyus were Tibetan immigrants who had an Indianized Culture and they inhabited just to the north of the Mons (Steven Warshaw 1975: 31).

In mythical literature, as reported by the villagers, two brothers—Haleng and Hanjok (the former was the elder), searched for a place which would be adequate for their settlement. At Wangkhei (in Imphal) they held for lunch. Haleng cooked ngakha—fire fin barbed fish, and when its eyes turned white he ate it as he considered the fish to be well cooked. The younger brother cooked prawn. When he looked the fish remained red in colour. He thought that the redness was due to bloodyness, and still not properly cooked. The elder brother lost the patience of waiting for him. He proposed to go ahead of the younger brother. He would leave marks on tree so that Hanjok could trace and follow him. Even though it was cooked for a quite long duration, it was always red in colour. At last, he took it as an uneatable one, threw it away and set out tracking his brother’s way. At Kakwa Lamdaibung (in Imphal) he lost the engraved marking as a boar happened to shadow the mark. The helpless Hanjok had to return to his former place. As he came back and settled, the place was known as ‘Handro’. From ‘Handro’ was derived Andro.

Later, the people of Andro dispersed to other places in groups under one leadership. They were—1) Andro led by Hori 2) Sekmai—led by Horo 3) Awang Sekmai led by Yawa and 4) Phayeng led by Konsang.
In course of time, there had further movements. Still today, the Andro are leading more or less a kinship-based society. It is seen that in every aspect of social systems, such as political and religious, clan or lineage involvement is significant.

In the socio-political sphere, there are two panas to which all the people are assigned. The panas are ahallup pana and naharup pana.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sagei (Lineage)</th>
<th>Yek (Clan)</th>
<th>Pana</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sarubam</td>
<td>Angom</td>
<td>Naharup</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phanjoubam</td>
<td>Mangang</td>
<td>Naharup</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chingakham</td>
<td>Chenglei</td>
<td>Ahallup</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Khunungmayum</td>
<td>Ningthouja</td>
<td>Naharup</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Samjetsabam</td>
<td>Kha-nganba</td>
<td>Naharup</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sarungbam</td>
<td>Angom</td>
<td>Naharup</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salam</td>
<td>Luwang</td>
<td>Ahallup</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yumkhaibam</td>
<td>Khuman</td>
<td>Naharup</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heikrujam</td>
<td>Khuman</td>
<td>Ahallup</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sagolsem</td>
<td>Mangang</td>
<td>Naharup</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Puthem</td>
<td>Moirang</td>
<td>Ahallup</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aseibam</td>
<td>Angom</td>
<td>Naharup</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thokchom</td>
<td>Moirang</td>
<td>Ahallup</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ningthoujam</td>
<td>Mangang</td>
<td>Naharup</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leisungbam</td>
<td>Khuman</td>
<td>Ahallup</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hijam</td>
<td>Luwang</td>
<td>Naharup</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maibam</td>
<td>Recently come; not recognised in Andro</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mutum</td>
<td>new; merged to Khunungmayum</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laishram</td>
<td>Recently come; not recognised in Andro</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laitonjam</td>
<td>new; merged to Khunungmayum</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Fig: 4.4 Distribution of Lineages in the Pana System**

This pana system has also its role in the operation of temporary dormitory system. There are ahallup koso (koso is the temporary dormitory) and naharup koso, which are competitive to each other. In the traditional administrative organisation, the pana takes a great role. There are offices which is to be held by the members belonging to a particular pana. There may be differences in the affiliation
of the lineages to the clans as compared to the lineages of the core Meiteis. But the affiliation of the lineages to clans is given here according to the version of the Andro (Fig: 4.4).

In the religious aspect, there are 13 deities in Andro. The priestly duty is allotted to the members of certain lineage and other lineage members cannot substitute them. The deity-lineage relationship is significantly manifested at occasions such as merry-making festival of village deity which is expressed locally as Andro haraoba (Ratankumar 1995: 181).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Deity</th>
<th>Lineage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pureiromba</td>
<td>Sarungbam</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Panam Ningthou</td>
<td>Aheibam</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chingsomba</td>
<td>Sarungbam</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sanahonba</td>
<td>Phanjoubam</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Korou hanba</td>
<td>Thokchom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chaning Leima</td>
<td>Yumkhaibam</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thong-bu-lakpa</td>
<td>Chingakham</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sanglen lakpa</td>
<td>Chingakham</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soraren</td>
<td>Heikrujam</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peng-khu-lai</td>
<td>Sagolsem</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meira-thanbi</td>
<td>Ningthoujam</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uran lakpa</td>
<td>Puthem</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pena Khongba</td>
<td>Salam</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Fig: 4.5 Deities and lineage relationship in Andro culture.

In the circle of rites-de-passage, clan and lineage play a big role. Marriage is based on the exogamous rule of lineage and clan. Deviation of the norm is controlled by the imposition of fine or excommunication or banishment to places as Thoubal Khunou. The disposal of death is obviously attached to the system of maksa which will be described later in detail.

They have the lone idealistic marriage- lyhongba through engagement- hainaba. Otherwise, they have to accomplish the status of marriage through a simple function of
Thus, elopement—chenba, for instance, needs laitin thaba for the social recognition of the union of the spouse. But interestingly enough, chenba is, at present, the statistically dominant mode of acquiring mate and in the meanwhile hainaba is shrinking. Financial unsoundness, great arrangement involving time consuming process in engagement, etc. are the reasons behind it. In other word, in the reality scene, easier means is now-a-days sought by most as alternative for the spectatorial agreement, but it is not aptly pulled towards the evacuation of idealism. Remarriage is allowed. Levirate is permitted.

1st case of MBD
Locality: Kangjeibung Leikai

2nd case of MBD
Locality: Mamang Leikai

Cross-cousin marriage is sanctioned by the custom of the Andro. Both MBD and FZD are still existing. MBD is more frequently seen than FZD. The MBD marriage is described
asmance maturg inba whereas FZD is described as ningol hanjinba. As MBD is either theoretically or practically allowed in other Meitei localities, only 2GT are produced. The cases are noted from Andro Marnang Leikai, and Kangjeibung Leikai.

![Family Tree Diagram]

**Fig: 4.7 First FZD marriage case at Andro.**

For the present study, the 1st case of FZD is noted from Andro Khunou leikai. This case shows that the women whose name is commonly addressed technonymously as Tanouma, was born at Phayeng and she has three daughters of her first husband. At Andro, she remarried to Leisungham Gulapchand, a resident of Andro village and Cheiteino is their son. Later, Cheiteino's son Ibugo married his father's step sister's daughter Tharik. He begets the sons called Malemnganba and Leisemba out of this wedlock.

![Family Tree Diagram]

**Fig: 4.8 Second FZD marriage case at Andro.**
The 2nd FZD marriage case of the Andros is also drawn in G.T. form. The case is taken from Kangjeibung Leikai, Andro (Fig: 4.8).

FZD marriage is retarding in number. The Andro mention that by FZD marriage, the relationship between the families last for generations. The onus strength help the two very much. But when there breaks a conflict, it brings disastrous affect. Apart from this, in the past, the Andro strictly followed the ethnic endogamy, that is edogamy within the Chakpa people. But at present, the Andro girls and boys ramify their search of mate outside this section to other parts of the Meitei society. In a word, modernisation and growing trend of social complexity impact on cross-cousin marriage. This is not a subjective view but the deduction of their intellectuals’ view.

Not only the cross-cousin marriage, there is the intermarriage of brother-sister set or in the other word, sister exchange. Some instances of such marriage are shown in G.T. to represent the validity of this marriage norm. The first case occur between siblings (Tomba and Tombi) at Champraching (at present shifted to Kangjeibung) and siblings at Machengpat; the 2nd case occurs between the residents of Khuman Leikai; and the 3rd is the exchange of sisters from the respective residences at Mamang leikai and Khuman. This sampling is taken to represent the whole Andro society.

All the three G.T.s show no relation between the parents of couples. But, the Andro elders confirm the rightfulness of inter sibling marriage of cross-cousins.

Before going on further, it is important to observe the system of maksa prevailing

Residence: Champraching

\[\text{Chingakham}\]

- Tomba
- Tombi

Residence: Machengpat

\[\text{Heramani Puthem}\]

- Thamshwori
- Mohonsing
- Tomba
- Surchandra
- Tombi

1st case of sister exchange
at Andro. The main role of *maksas* is to do the disposal duty of death along with one *ningol matung inba*. *Maksas* is a permanent social character. Every lineage of Andro
have a *maksa* lineage. *Maksa* is not an individual but refers to the members of a lineage who have to perform the assigned duties of a certain lineage member.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lineage (clan)</th>
<th>Maksa (clan)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Phanjoubam (Mangang)</td>
<td>Chingakham (Kha-ngaamba)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yumkhaibam (Khuman)</td>
<td>Puthem (Moirang)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salam (Luwang)</td>
<td>Phanjoubam (Mangang)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Puthem (Moirang)</td>
<td>Chingakham (Kha-ngaamba)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chingakham (Kha-ngaamba)</td>
<td>Yumkhaibam (Khuman)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heikrujam (Khuman)</td>
<td>Sarungbam (Mangang)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leisungbam (Khuman)</td>
<td>Puthem (Moirang)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sagolsem (Mangang)</td>
<td>Hijam (Luwang)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sarubam (Angom)</td>
<td>Salam (Luwang)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sarungbam (Mangang)</td>
<td>Yumkhaibam (Khuman)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ningthoujam (Manganag)</td>
<td>Puthem (Moirang)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aseibam (Angom)</td>
<td>Ningthoujam (Mangang)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Khunungmayum (Mangang)</td>
<td>Chingakham (Kha-ngaamba)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hijam (Luwang)</td>
<td>Phanjoubam (Mangang)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Samjetsabam</td>
<td>No maksa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maibam</td>
<td>No maksa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laishram</td>
<td>No maksa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thokchom</td>
<td>No maksa</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Fig: 4.10 Lineage and *maksa* inter-relationship prevailing at Andro.

The last four lineages have no *maksa* lineages. They are said to be the new comers. Other than these four lineages, every lineages have a corresponding *maksa* lineage. But, there are lineages which are not *maksa* to other lineages, for instance, *Heikrujam* has *Sarungbam* as its *maksa*, but *Heikrujam* is the *maksa* of none. *Maksas* are believed to be the son-in-laws of the first settlers. The lineage of the first son-in-law of Andro settlers became *makas*. Neighbouring people as Kom, Aimol, etc. and people of Phayeng also recognise the term *maksa* of a family or lineages as the husband(s) of married girl(s) of the family or lineage.

*Ningol matung inba* is the man from the family of orientation of the wife. So, ‘he’ is the man from a woman’s natal family and ‘he’ is the man from the family of mother’s father or mother’s brother of an unmarried person.
Maksap assisted by ningol matung inba perform the rite of dead. They also get the materials used in this rite, but maksap gets more than ningol matung inba.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items used in dead rite</th>
<th>Share of Maksap</th>
<th>Share of N.M.J</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gold+utensil</td>
<td>gold</td>
<td>utensil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gold+currency</td>
<td>gold</td>
<td>currency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Currency+utensil</td>
<td>currency+utensil</td>
<td>currency</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Why do we study about maksap? Is it relevant in the study of the system of kinship and marriage? On the first look, it seems to be a topic apart from the present study. For it, let us bring the symmetrical and asymmetrical systems of kinship.

Symmetrical system is the ‘direct exchange’ and ‘delayed direct exchange’ as the consequence of ‘sister exchanges’ and ‘patrilateral’ cross-cousin marriage. It is because that the exchange of wife takes place in the same generation in case of the sister exchange or bilateral cross-cousin marriage while that exchange is delayed to the next generation in case of patrilateral cross-cousin marriage.

Asymmetrical system, in Robin Fox’s (1966: 208) felicitous phrase, is characterised by ‘indirect exchange’ involving ‘matrilateral’ cross-cousin marriage. It may be simply stated: wife-givers cannot be wife-takers; a group can not give women to a group from which it has taken women. This appears to be the radical opposite to the symmetrical direct exchange principle.

1. A rule of bilateral cross-cousin marriage states that a man shall marry his MBD or his FZD.

2. A rule of matrilateral cross-cousin marriage states that a man shall marry his MBD, but not his FZD.

3. A rule of patrilateral cross-cousin marriage states that a man shall marry his FZD, but not his MBD.

It is from the mate’s point of view that matrilateral cross-cousin (MBD) acquires a name; but to that person the male in question is her patrilateral cross-cousin (FZS) and vice versa. This, however, concerns only the anthropologist’s choice of terms and say nothing of the indigenous way of looking at things.
Fig: 4.11 Genealogical schematisation of cross cousin marriage.
When we apply the term *maksar* ignoring its fixed status on the structural implications along with *ningol matung inba*, we find both the terms in the same descent line of affinal relative in the case of MBD and bilateral rule. Here we use the term *maksar* as "daughter's husband", while *ningol matung inba* (N.M.I.) is the "wife's brother". In case of FZD, both *maksar* and *ningol matung inba* belong to the same descent group but alternation of both personals to another descent in the next group generation is seen. Thus, in MBD case, lineage A has its *maksar* and N.M.I. in lineage B; in FZD rule B has its *maksar* and N.M.I. in A in the first generation and in C in the next generation; and in bilateral rule, A and B are one another's both *maksar* and N.M.I. But, in its actual form, *maksar* is fixed for every lineages.

Now, it is required to see if the system of *maksar* is appropriate to the earliest and basic form of cross-cousin rule. I do not mean to test the soundness of *maksar* in its developing phases. I wish only to point out that as all cases of the three rules are observed at Andro, the most basic form is the bilateral rule from which the other two could be directly derived. It is according to Trautmann (1981: 206) who studied the Dravidian kinship. The inter sibling exchange of Andro is not found in the present cases, to be continuous more than one generation. The *maksar* of Andro is not contradictory with the bilateral rule and it has the significant validity in establishing the affinal relationships. It has the lineage exogamy intact. As well the binary relationship of kinship in the bilateral rule has been strengthen. So, it can be concluded from the study of both the Andro cross-cousin cases and *maksar*, that at least, a section of Meitei, has experienced bilateral rule of marriage perhaps before the emergence of other exclusive cousin rules.

**Particular daughter's marriage in relation to cross-cousin rule**:

The custom of particular daughter marriage is a secondary derivative of the basic cross-cousin rule. *Angom* and *Mangang* are two clans of the Meitei Society. There is a peculiar marriage rule between the two clans. The marriage rule with the socially accepted terms is illustratively described here. When the *Sija*-princes born by Meitei leima-queen, (of *Mangang* clan) becomes the queen of *Angoms*, she is known as *Khurai leima*. Her daughter is the *Angom sija*. When she is married to Meitei king, her daughter is known as *Tampha* and her son is known as *Sanamahi*.

This relationship of the two royal families prevails boldly, though FZD is prohibited, among the other sections of the Meitei society.
Comparision of empirical study of cross-cousin

It is now required to recapitulate the above discussion and infer a logical and
distributional reasoning. It is well assured about the terminological matching with
the cross-cousin marriage. Nevertheless, at present, in the mainstream there is not the
actual cross-cousin marriage.

Again, the rule of cross-cousin marriage as we find within the Meitei kinship region
is bilateral in Andro, matrilateral in some and patrilatral as in royal sectional families (though
the literal source mentions about the FZD marriage, there is the logical indication of bilateral
cross cousin. The prince of Angom may marry delayed MBD). We should like to know
the reasons for this variation. We would like to know how these variants are distributed in
the same language family.

Such study has concerned co-variation between the rules of marriage and the
configurations of unilineal institutions within the societies in which they occur. Levi-Strauss
(1949: 13) states that in harmonic regimes, that is, societies that are both patrilineal and
patrilocal, or both matrilineal and matrilocal, a rule of cross cousin marriage will take the
matrilateral form, whereas in disharmonic regimes, that is patrilineal descent and matrilocal
residence, or matrilineal descent and patrilocal residence, the bilateral rule will be found.
He gives it as a general law, which is universally valid, and that gives the cross cousin
marriage. Dumont has tested it under a more or less modified form in a part of the Dravidian region (Dumont 1957: 1966). None of the six Tamil castes of his study have a bilateral rule. So his version is that where succession and inheritance, descent and residence have exclusively paternal; or exclusively maternal features (i.e. harmonic regimes) the marriage rule is matrilateral, and where paternal and maternal features are mixed (disharmonic regimes) the marriage rule is patrilateral. Homans and Schneider (1955: 51) establish different correlates for the variation as societies in which marriage is allowed or preferred with mother’s brother’s daughter but forbidden or disapproved with father’s sister’s daughter will be the societies in which jural authority over ego male, before marriage, is vested in his father or father’s lineage, and societies in which marriage is allowed or preferred with father’s sister’s daughter but forbidden or disapproved with mother’s brother’s daughter will be societies in which jural authority over ego male, before marriage, is vested in his mother’s brother or mother’s brother’s lineage.

That is, given the existence of a unilateral cross-cousin rule, paternal authority is the concomitant of the matrilateral rule and avuncular authority of the patrilateral rule. The argument is, rather, a psychological one, which is concerned with individual preferences under contrasting social configurations: “a man seeks affectionate relationships where authority does not lie”. Presumably the weight of these socially constrained individual preferences eventually leads beyond an objectively observable statistical trend to a socially recognised rule, and the contrasting configurations (paternal/avuncular authority) constitute the efficient causes of the rules in question. The fact that these contrasting configurations correlate, very roughly, with societies that are predominantly patrilineal and matrilineal, respectively, and helps to explain why the patrilateral rule is so much more rarely found than the matrilateral, when we remember how comparatively rare are matrilineal societies.

Coming back to the Meitei kinship, the Meitei have the patrilineal descent and virilocality or patrilocal residence; inheritance and succession are also through male line. Despite the question of actual occurrence, matrilateral cross cousin is more accepted form of marriage than the patrilateral one. But there is one psychological drawback for patrilateral cross-cousin effecting returning of blood concept and the close blood tie is regarded to break out defects to offsprings. There are elements of matrilineal such as reckoning of descent from a mother ancestress, giving accounts of genealogies under the name of female, taking role of organising of clans by mythical mother-deities, etc., which are not sufficient enough to ascertain that there was a matrilineal system or matrilocal residence. Will it be sufficient to
call a disharmonic regime? Whether or not, the Meitei kinship is significant to the theories given by Levi-Strauss, Dumont and Homans and Schneider, that there is the patrilateral cross-cousin (which might be the part bilateral cross-cousin rule) as evidenced by the alliance relationship between the Angom and the Mangang clan. After all, the practice is still existing at Andro. The Meitei kinship having the elements of matrilineal, and that might have tended to disharmonic regime, had the experience of patrilateral and matrilateral cross-cousin marriages. Thus, having both the types of cross-cousin, bilateral cross-cousin rule was the most elementary, that preceds the other two types.