CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

The study of Kinship

I

The cycle of life passes through the phenomena of copulation, birth and death. Copulation is a basic need of life. It produces union of mates which reproduces offspring. Death creates gap in the chain of reproduction. The natural process of eternity of life demands replacement of the gap in the chain through copulation. Thus the cycle moves on.

Man in common with other mammals experiences these basic facts of life. But he distinguishes himself from other members of his immediate animal world in the mode of responding to these needs of the eternal chain of life. While the other mammals are absolutely controlled by the impulses of instinct he exercises on his endowment of rationality whereby explores the possibilities in responding to the needs of life. His acts assume a cultural character. As such, his copulation gets transformed into marriage as distinguished from mating of the lower animals. It is not, however, that mating is altogether unknown to human beings, and quite often they have recourse to mating in its original animal form while fulfilling their basic urge of sexual gratification. What is in play in the process of metamorphosis of original animal form of mating into the human form of marriage is the cultural factor
of collective social acceptance, approval and recognition of only those matings deemed proper.

Establishment of propriety of those matings for them to assume the status of marriage takes care of social groups and their organizations, within and without. In the primitive stage of the evolution of human societies relationships to ancestors and kin are the bases of group formation. These are the relationship around which social interactions, claims and obligations, loyalties and sentiments turn. Social structures in these societies are structures of relationships of such kin-based groups. In that stage of human history loyalties to kin supersede all other loyalties. Kinship was then the hub of the entire social organization at that stage of human development. And, certainly for the longer period of human development, mankind lived for the most part in societies of which kinship-based groups were the constituent units.

Psychologically, kinship refers to the feelings of oneness among certain individuals simply because they are of the same blood. By kinship relations are meant relationships to an ancestor or ancestress or as many ancestors and ancestresses as so claimed in certain cases or still to both an ancestor or ancestress, and relationships among their descendants. And these relations are derived from the feelings of oneness of the members of the kin groups, based on the theory of the same blood.

It is perhaps basic in human nature to trust the familiar and fear the strange. If it is so, then those who share one's blood share part of oneself, and so are by definition the most familiar of all. Thus the sense of security lies at the fountain-head of kinship, to interpret it in its psychological terms. As such, kinship bonds are the most fundamental and original of all bonds.

The kinship principle of social organization was not completely abandoned when human development reached the stage of civil society with the formation of state. In most cases the territorial principle of state organization functioned rather as
the content of the new formation while its form still lingered on assuming kinship character in that process of state formation. Kinship does not die out in history. It survives in the present era too. In the modern developing countries bureaucratic rationality often loses out to kinship loyalties: it is all too apparent in such countries that recruitments to pubic services are often based not on the criterion of ability to do the job, but on the closeness of relationship. From Clifford Geertz, we know that kinship works as one of the primordial sentiments in raising obstacles to the bounden concern of the new states in the modern developing countries to install integration in such states which are composed of diverse ethnic elements. He reports, "...the new states are abnormally susceptible to serious disaffection based on primordial attachments. By a primordial attachment is meant one that stems from the 'givens' - or, more precisely, as culture is inevitably involved in such matters, the assumed 'givens' - social existence: immediate contiguity and kin connection mainly..." (1963: 109)

The concept of 'folklore of corruption' developed by Gunnar Myrdal in digging out the causes of corruption in Asia also explore the causal relationship of the factor of kinship in the phenomenon of corruption in the developing Asian countries. What he writes in this context runs thus, "This folklore has a bearing on how people conduct their private lives and how they view their government's effort to consolidate the nation and direct and spur development. It easily leads people to think that anybody in a position of power is likely to exploit this in the interest of himself, his family, or other social groups to which he feels loyal." (1972: 167)

Even in the modern western enlightened and rational societies kinship ideology looms large and pervades most corners of political and public life perhaps except in the case of the less conservative and more mobile middle-classes among whom kinship is seemingly of little relevance beyond the level of parent-child relationship. And, in noble families the length of genealogy has been a measure of
relative prestige. Robin Fox concludes the point while saying, “Thus, even our relatively kinless society can not throw off this slowly accumulated, almost innate wisdom of the blood” (1964:15-16).

Kinship is tenacious. To the materialist grand theorists of society it holds on at the very core of society. Historical materialists hold it to be a part of the determining factor of history. Thus, in his preface to the first edition (1884) of his The Origin of the Family, Private Property and the State, Frederick Engels says, “According to the materialist conception, the determining factor in history is, in the last resort, the production and reproduction of immediate life. But this itself is of a two fold character. On the one hand, the production of the means of subsistence, food, cloth and shelter and the tools requisite therefore; on the other, the production of human beings themselves, the propagation of the species. The social institutions under which men of a definite historical epoch and of a definite country live are conditioned by both kinds of production: by the stage of development of labour, on the one hand, and of the family, on the other. The less the development of labour, and the more limited its volume of production and, therefore, the wealth of society, the more preponderatingly does the social order appear to be dominated by ties of sex…” (Frederick Engels 1977: 191-192).

This materialist theory clearly places both economy and kinship in the base-structure of a society as the two-fold character of the determining factor in history. Marxist anthropologist like Maurice Godelier (1978) also evaluates the basal importance of kinship along with economy in the deterministic factor. To him kinship is the conditioning factor within the base-structure of society.

These grand theories of society suffice to testify the supreme importance of kinship in human social affairs. Certainly, it is so. Accordingly it has been popularly held that kinship is to anthropology what logic is to philosophy or the nude to formal
logic. Kinship is so the basic discipline of anthropology. What is more, after exploring the universal basic dyadic structure, true of all human societies, on the analysis of the Purum kinship and marriage system, the Oxford anthropologist Rodney Needham (1971) commends that the Purums are what the whole of social anthropology is all about. Here, Needham’s “the Purum” should be construed as referring to Purum kinship and marriage system. This remarkable comment of Needham implies that kinship is the epitome of the entire social organization. It is definitely a logically elegant understanding of the thing under discussion. Methodologically, one may observe a more critical and deeper concept of social structure in Levi-Strauss’ structural thought as compared to Needham’s formalist and non-dialectical conception of social structure in terms of a naïve non-dialectic dualism. Odd to the current trend of assessing the amazingly dominating status of kinship in anthropology, Levi-Strauss has, however, relegated it to a realm of social reality by which alone one can’t discover the inner structure of the human mind which he hopes to unravel in the study of mythologies. Levi-Strauss departs at this point from empirical anthropology. The point is that within the limit of empirical anthropology the theoretical significance of kinship study stands large unswerving still in this discipline.

Admittedly, there are differences among human societies of different times and different places in respect of the intensity with which kinship ties are utilized to induce social bonds; no society so far has managed to dispense with an irreducible minimum of kinship-based social relationship. However, from the point of view of the comparative nature of the science of empirical anthropology even the society with the least intensity of kinship bonds is not less important than one obsessed with kinship. Anthropology is interested in the comparative study of societies and culture at all times and in all places.
II

What has so far been reflected on above obviously hovers round the significance of kinship and its study to the extent of its indispensability in the discipline of anthropology. Seemingly, almost all the established professional anthropologists of the world obtained Passport to their professional establishment through kinship studies at certain stage of their academic careers. As such, certain extent of training in this part of human culture is compulsory for every young recruit to anthropological academy. This idea stands behind the interest in the present piece of work.

The anthropological interest in the study of kinship may be traced far back to J.J. Bachofen whose work The Mother Right (Das Mutterrecht, 1861) influenced the later cultural evolutionists of the nineteenth century like the Scottish Lawyer McLennan and the American businessman Henry Lewis Morgan, all of which joined the chores of explaining the prior evolution of matriarchal kinship system with the beginning of humanity and its later transition to the patriarchal system. At the advent of the early part of the twentieth century the evolutionary approach to the study of kinship was abandoned on the grounds of its imaginative scheme and that it did not represent a universal process. It was, however, that evolutionary anthropology of that time was based on certain facts. The only problem with it was its wrong interpretation of those facts. In certain contemporary societies there still linger on a few residual elements of kinship culture in the form of historical fossils that can not be explained other than in the light of the experiences of those societies in point with matriarchal kinship culture at certain stage in their past. Explanation of how, when and in what way these societies had the said experiences, and these elements have survived in the new cultural milieu would belong to the province of history.
Sick of the pseudo-historical, speculative and, for that matter, unscientific approach of cultural evolutionism of the preceding generation, the leading early twentieth century anthropologists R. Lowie and Franz Boas in America, and B. Malinowski and A.R. Radcliffe-Brown in Great Britain, influenced, directly or indirectly, by Sigmund Freud's psycho-analysis, particularly his theory of Oedipus Complex, sought to adopt a new approach which may be phrased as 'introspective' approach in place of the old retrospective approach of evolutionism. With the new approach, anthropologists also started explaining social phenomena in the context of the culture to which they belong, thereby introducing in anthropology holistic approach of study. The contemporary anthropological theory of structural-functionalism was given its birth in this academic atmosphere through the intellectual toils of Malinowski and Radcliffe-Brown who had, however, a vital difference of far-reaching consequences between them in giving focus of interest: psychology for the former, and sociology for the latter. The present-day dichotomy within anthropology into American cultural anthropology and British social anthropology had its root in that Malinowski – Radcliffe-Brown polarization of anthropological thought. The present work follows the line of the British social anthropological tradition.

The turning point in the study of kinship along the line of the British social anthropological tradition may rightly be attributed to Meyer Fortes' work *The Web of Kinship among the Tallensi* (1949) where, as Robin Fox expresses, "...he looks at kinship from the point of view of the way individuals and groups are tied together in a web of relations of marriage and descent" (1966:22). This focus importantly differs from looking at the total society and examining how it forms its descent groups and how they function in relation to the total social network, which many British social anthropologists adopted in Africa under the influence of the meritorious pioneering work of E. E. Evans Pritchard on the Nuer of Sudan, and which Meyer Fortes himself apparently followed in his earlier work among the Tallensi i.e. *Dynamics of*
Clanship among the Tallensi (1945). The former implies something like kinship-centered study of kinship i.e. study of kinship with reference to its own several principles, such as descent, marriage, inheritance, succession, etc., whereas the latter, matrix- or culture-centered study of kinship i.e. study of kinship in relation to its larger cultural context. Quite a good number of anthropologists have opined that only the first study should be truly called the study of kinship. The present work on the kinship and marriage of the Meitei society of Manipur, too, is framed in this way of studying kinship.

Differing from each other in giving focus though the two ways of studying kinship may be, it is aptly remarkable that they have a common interest in recognizing the descent groups as the unit of central value of kinship structure in so far as African societies are concerned. It is Evans Pritchard who discovered first this pivotal importance of descent groups from his work on the Nuer, which appeared in 1940 for which achievement he is credited as having opened an important turning point in kinship study, particularly in Africa. Anthropologists of the British school specializing in Africa emphasize descent as the principle of formation and recruitment of kin groups. Segmentary lineages are linked to clans on the basis of their real or assumed common ancestry. Members descended from a common ancestor or ancestress, individuals or groups, are integrated into bigger kin groups, clan or phratry, as the case may be. One initial problem of genetic model of integration is to see how individuals and smaller kin groups of different descent are held together in the structure of kinship system. Meyer Fortes overcomes this situation by means of his concept of 'complementary filiation'. He explains it: in a patrilineal society, for instance, although a man gets membership in his descent group through his father, he is still his mother's child, because he is filiated to both parents. He therefore has a 'complementary' relationship with his mother's descent group, in particular his mother's brothers. In these ways, individuals and groups are, according
to this theory, integrated into the final kinship order of a society. In this theory, descent is evidently the principle of integrating the kin groups into the kinship structure of the society. Marriage is not regarded as one such principle; it is rather held to be simply the residue of exogamy. Hence the popular name of this theory of kinship as 'descent theory'.

Side by side with the development of descent theory of kinship as above, there emerged in the middle of the twentieth century a change of focus of interest in kinship studies at the advent of the publication in 1949 of two books: Murdock's *Social Structure*, that revised evolutionary interest, and Levi-Strauss' *Les Structures Elementaires de la Parente (The Elementary Structures of Kinship)* that focused attention on kinship as devices of arranging marriage relations between groups. Both Murdock and Strauss put great stress on kin terminology which had been initiated by H.L.Morgan but had almost been totally neglected for a long time under the onslaught of functionalism. Before delving into the revived anthropological interest in the terminological aspect of kinship, it is necessary of understanding Levi-Strauss' conception of kinship system as a system of marriage alliances. Influenced by Marcel Mauss' exchange theory and Emile Durkheim's idea of organic solidarity, Strauss understands kinship system as one of exchange of woman between kin-groups in societies, it thereby emphasizing the role of exogamous marriage as a structural principle of integrating the various kinship units of a society into its system. Exchange of extremely valuable gifts of one kind or another by doing which creation alliances are created is a universal phenomenon. It is true from exchange at the personal level up to exchange between nations. Levi-Strauss classifies marriage systems into elementary and complex ones. Elementary systems strain towards the perpetuation of alliances over the generations. Complex systems, on the other hand, do not vouch for constant renewal of links, but distribute people widely around the society. Elementary system works in its purest form in true bilateral cross-cousin
marriage where children of brothers and sisters continually remarry each other over
generations. Strauss calls exchange in this purest form of elementary marriage system
direct or restricted or symmetrical exchange. In its simplest form direct exchange
involves sister or daughter exchange between two given kin groups. Direct exchange
of sisters may again be immediate or delayed. The immediate type is sometimes
called the Kariera system, as this particular Australian tribe is the best known
representative of it. This system is based on the rule that a man marries a woman who
is his ‘double or bilateral’ cross-cousin. Since there have been exchanges of sisters
over his ascending generation, ego’s wife is both his mother’s brother’s daughter and
his father’s sister’s daughter i.e., bilateral cross-cousin. Perpetuation of this sister or
daughter exchange would classify one’s kins into cross and parallel. All are kins;
there are no affines because the marrying people are already related. Delayed direct
exchange occurs when there is practised only patrilateral cross-cousin marriage i.e.
marrige with father’s sister’s daughter. This follows from the rule, as prevalent
among the highlanders of New Guinea, that a woman should marry into the group her
mother came from. In this type in the first generation, A gives woman to B and in the
second generation, B gives to A and so on, alternately down the generations.
Different from the circulation of women around three or more groups in one
generation, and then back circulation again in the next generation, the indirect
exchange type of marriage, also known as asymmetrical or generalized exchange,
works on the movement of women in each generation. In this type, women can never
move the other way round. This is often also called matrilateral cross cousin marriage
i.e. marriage with one’s mother’s brother’s daughter. This type is best represented by
the Purum, a tribe of Manipur on the eastern border of India, as described by T.C.
Das, and analyzed by Rodney Needham. In this case, the mother’s brother’s daughter,
whom an ego is prescribed to marry, may be real or any other woman of the same
generation belonging to the alliance group of the mother’s brother’s daughter. The
wife giving group and the wife taking group are separate, discrete kin groups unlike in the case of direct exchange in which two exchanging groups are wife taking group and at the same time, wife giving group. The matrilineal Crow and the patrilineal Omaha system were a curious mixture of ‘direct’ and ‘indirect’ exchange.

All these elementary types of exchange occur in kinship systems where the alliance units are corporate, exogamous and unilinear kin groups like tribe, phratry, moiety, clan or section or lineage. There are, yet systems in which the exogamous groups are not discrete kin groups such as lineages but ego centered bilateral groups of kinsmen, whether with or without unilinear kin groups. In such systems the cousins are not differentiated as cross and parallel; they are children of ego’s own siblings and then are the collateral equivalents of ego’s own children; nor are the nuclear families of the mother and the father differentiated as consanguines and affines to one another. Members of both sides are all regarded as consanguines, similarly the children of brother and sister, too are not differentiated from one another. Such a unit is always exogamous. If such a kin group of perfect bilateral symmetry tends to form a kind of extended family or cognate descent group, it is known as the Hawaiian type, whereas if it is organized around the hard core of a nuclear family the name Eskimo type is given thereto. The Hawaiian type consists of horizontal layers of kin whereas the Eskimo type is much more like layers of skin around a central hard core. Another important point of difference between the two would be that the Hawaiian type more clearly pronounces generational differentiation of the members. The English system comes closer to the Eskimo type. Anyhow, both are complex systems of kinship.
III

All these diverse systems of kinship are reflected in their respective kinship terminologies, particularly kinship terms of reference. Terminology does not, however, cover the intensity of a given kinship system. A kinship system is analyzable in three spheres: concepts, rules and behaviour. Terminology corresponds to the conceptual or cognitive part of a kinship system. It constitutes the semantics of the system as a whole. Kinship rules refer to the normative content of the system. The rules are there in the system for purpose of organizing it in its particular type; different rules generate different types of kinship system. There is a correspondence between the rules and the cognitive sphere of the system, because the latter provides the concepts in terms of which the rules are expressed. However, the ultimate source of the cognitive, semantic sphere of a system lies in the culture of a society whereas the rules bear social content in as much as these function when the society is organized on their basis. In this way the semantic, cognitive components and the normative components are the cultural and social environment for the acts and behaviours of the human beings. These are then community property and socio-centric whereas human behaviours are ego-centric and individualistic. Individual behaviours are meaningful as these are always framed in reference to the cognitive and normative contents of the actor's culture and society even when their acts violate the rules. Behaviours are the strategies appropriate to individuals (as defined by the social structures rather than the biological individuals) and small groups interior to the society.

There is still need to elaborate the role of terminology, the cognitive, semantic sphere in a kinship system. Kinship terminologies are ways in which people classify
their kinship universe into several categories and sub-categories expressed in specific terms or words.

Classification is a human proclivity, deeply embedded in human nature. Kinship terminologies are a part of a whole language which is an elaborate system of classification and within it there are sub-languages which classify various aspects of the universe. Kinship terminologies obviously form a sub-language that classifies the kinship universe. However, these terminologies sometimes correspond to the reality of the kinship system and sometimes not. Reality changes faster than the language which is very conservative. Again, sometimes distinctions are built into the language which has no bearing on the reality. Systems of kinship terminologies are therefore implicit classifications of an ideal kinship universe.

Henry Lewis Morgan was the first anthropologist to see that the terminology was a method of classification and as such its study led to the understanding of kinship systems. But he took interest in understanding the evolution of kinship system and accordingly held that the terminology was the clue to the past state of the kinship systems. Both anthropological structuralism and historicism find their fountain head in Morgan’s anthropology. His legacy is still very much in contemporary anthropology; later anthropologists have by and large treasured its structuralism on the one hand, and anthropologists like Irawati Karve, Louis Dumont, N. Yalman, Thomas R. Trautmann, etc. have revigorated its historicist approach to the study of kinship by developing a comparative historical semantics to meet the needs of historical study of kinship terminologies on a rigorous basis. Even in the synchronic, structural study of kinship terminologies there come across certain situations that call for historical explanation.

The anti-evolutionist B. Malinowski and his followers reacted against Morgan’s historical study of kinship terminologies by showing distaste for the study
of terms, which Malinowski called kinship algebra; instead he insisted that we should study kinship behaviours and rules, and not language. But, to some other anti-evolutionist anthropologists, led by A.R. Radcliffe-Brown, a contemporary of Malinowski, appreciated the study of kinship terminologies because the native semantic categories are treasured in terminologies. This means to say that one can understand a kinship system only by understanding first the semantic categories thereof. They, therefore, rate high the terminologies as the starting point of kinship analysis.

Radcliffe-Brown studied kinship terms as parallel reflections of ego’s rights and duties. His explanations are mostly in the context of unilineal system of kinship. True, in such a system the father and his brothers on the one hand, and mother’s brothers on the other are quite different categories of relatives. Ego’s rights and duties towards his father and father’s brother differ markedly from those towards his mother’s brother. Hence, there are different kin terms for these two categories of relatives. From the observation he derives his concept of the unity of the lineage group i.e. kin terms are there to emphasis this kinship principle by which is meant that a given term classes together under it all the men of the father’s lineage, in a matrilineal society, and another term, the mother’s brother and all other men of his generation in a patrilineal society and so forth. Obviously, this is the interpretation of kin terms of descent theorist. But in many other systems certain terms are used in lumping relatives of both sides - patrilateral and matrilateral, together in one single category. The English uncle and cousin are clear examples. The term ‘uncle’ covers both father’s brother and mother’s brother who are men of both lateral sides of an ego. Similarly ‘cousin’ classes together children of both father’s brother and mother’s brother.

Levi-Strauss and other alliance theorists, on the other hand, argue that what the terminology does is to classify people into marriageable and unmarriageable ones.
In the system where there is prescriptive alliance terms apply to categories of people who are respectively ‘marriageable’ and ‘unmarriageable’; but where one does not get this form of alliance the terms refer to specific genealogically defined kin types.

Now, it is felt demanding to draw on how the terminologies classify kins into categories in typical cases of the diverse kinship systems.

One may take the Kariera case as the typical one of the most elementary systems of kinship. In this system an ego marries in his own generation (this is sister-exchange rule) while doing which he distinguishes his own generation from his first ascending and first descending generation. Grandparents are referred to with a term meaning ‘grandrelative’. He need not distinguish their lineage or sex as they are not involved in the alliance relationship with him. In such a system there are no terms for affines as distinguished from kinsmen. All the English in-laws are people to whom the ego is already related. This non-differentiation of affines from kins is the defining characteristics of this system. Sister or daughter exchange goes on through all generations. Corollary, the ego classifies his kins into cross and parallel, marriageable and non-marriageable. Accordingly parallel-cousins and siblings are terminologically distinguished from cross-cousins. Ego’s FZ marries his MB in all generations. As results thereof, FF and MMB are terminologically classed together; so is the case of MFZ and FM, FZH and MB, and MBW and FZ.

As has been said already, the Crow-Omaha systems are a mongrel form of direct and indirect exchanges, thus being a half-way house between elementary and complex systems. Terminological equations of F with FB as distinguished from MB, M with MZ as distinguished from FZ and classification of parallel-cousins with siblings as distinguished from cross cousins are all features reminiscent of direct exchange of elementary system of kinship both in the matrilineal Crow and the patrilineal Omaha systems. Resulting from the above equations and distinctions, FZD
is terminologically differentiated from MBD, and further both of them are distinguished from FBD, MZD and Z in these systems. However, alien to direct exchange, yet characteristic of complex kinship type, classification of cross-cousins clearly does not tally with direct exchange of elementary kinship system. Thus, among the Crow Indians FZD is equated with FZ and MBD with BD, and in the Omaha system FZD is classed with ZD, and MBD with MZ. MBD and BD of the Crow, and FZD and ZD of the Omaha belong to different generations, but in the two systems they are terminologically lumped together, which violets the principle of generational differentiation of kins in direct exchange.

In the typical Hawaiian terminological system all the men and women of each generation are called by the corresponding classificatory terms. Because the Hawaiian terminology stresses the identity of members of a generation, it is also often called generational. In this system an ego should not marry a woman in the category of father’s sister’s children, and mother’s sister’s children in his generation. Accordingly, FZD, MBD, FBD, MZD are terminologically classed together with sister. The actual range of prohibited degrees, however, varies a lot, but it is always bilateral covering members of both sides - patrilateral and matrilateral, of the kinship network equally. Another characteristic of this system is that sex differences may be ignored in the grand parental and grand children’s generations.

In the complex Eskimo kinship system first the nuclear family is given special emphasis, and then stress is put on equal balance between the two kindreds united by marriage – the matrilateral and patrilateral kin of the ego. Accordingly, kin terms for members of the nuclear family, father, mother, son, daughter, brother and sister, are not used for anyone outside the family. FZD, MBD, FBD and MZD are terminologically lumped together, as distinguished from sister, unlike in the case of the Hawaiian system (as already shown above), and as different from the Iroquois
Indian case where terminologically FZD is equated with MBD whereas FBD is classified with MZD, and both of them with sister.

Symmetric prescriptive marriage i.e., bilateral cross-cousin marriage is widely distributed in Asia, Oceania and the Americas, but not in Europe and Africa, of course, with local variations. In South Asia it prevails among Dravidian, Munda, Tibeto-Burman and Singhalese kinship systems.

The practice of eZD/ MyB marriage reported by Anthony Good ("Elder Sister's Daughter Marriage in South Asia" in Journal of Anthropological Research 36 1980, 474-500) reproduced in Thomas R. Trautmann (1995, Preface p: xiv ) from the Tamil- and Kannada- speaking region and some cases from the Marathi and Telegu region is not at all incompatible with the normal marriage pattern for Dravidian-speaking South India; eZD/MyB marriage wherever it prevails is always found in company with cross-cousin marriage. Trautmann takes eZD/MyB marriage as a further (i.e., later) variation on the basic (earlier) theme of bilateral cross-cousin marriage.

As regards the position of Munda kinship system Trautmann bases his observation on Parkin’s work (The Munda of Central India: An Account of their Social Organization, 1922). He observes that Munda system has departed from the classical form of symmetric prescriptive marriage in that in this system there are merging of cross and parallel-cousins with siblings, separate terminology for affines, prohibition of marriage with first cross cousin, with some exceptions, and possibility of renewal of a marriage alliance only after a delay one or three generations. This system, however, remains to be symmetric in that there is no systematic distinction of wife-givers and wife-takers and repeating of symmetric affinal alliance only in alternate generations, not adjacent ones. Only on the fact that it lacks marriage of first cross-cousins does the Munda system differ from the Dravidian system.
In the light of his works: "Byansi Kinship Terminology: A Study in Symmetry" *(Man [n.s.] 10 1975: 80-94)* and "Sherpa Kinship Terminology in a Diachronic Perspective" *(Man [n.s.] 11 1976: 569-587)*, N. J. Allen propounds that the Tibeto-Burmans too had originally Dravidian-like system of symmetric prescriptive marriage and it grew more complex by the breakdown of the original equations of the system, such as the equations of the consanguines and affines. Laura Ahearn’s study on the changing marriage practices of a Magar village of Nepal adds to the literature of the Tibeto-Burman kinship system. According to this author, the Magar (who now no longer speak their ancestral Tibeto-Burman language, but speak Nepali, an Indo-Aryan speech) follow a matrilateral cross-cousin marriage rule such that wife-givers and wife-takers who are merged in the symmetric prescriptive form, are now distinguished, as in Nepali and Indo-Aryan system generally. But their kin terminology consists of a large vocabulary, mainly Nepali and partly Magar, one gets in symmetric prescriptive systems. The semantic structure of the Magar terminology evidently shows a change from a symmetric prescriptive form to an Indo-Aryan form (reproduced in Thomas R. Trautmann 1981, Preface xvi).

Beyond South Asia one sees a classic variant of the prototype of the symmetric prescriptive marriage form in the kinship system of the Kariera of Western Australia. A well established literature on this system exists. In view of this position of the Kariera ethnography as well as the importance of this system for comparative purpose a synoptic overview of the system is presented here below.

In this system the tribe is, first of all, divided up into moieties, A and B. The Karierans practise sister (real or classificatory) exchange over generations, it resulting from reciprocal exogamy of the two moieties. Let us adopt the notation: the men of the moiety A are Ax and its woman ax in the first generation X; and the men of moiety B in the same generation are Bx and its women bx.
An Ax marries a bx and their children are Ay (males) and ay (females), and a Bx marries an ax and their children are By (males) and by (females). Thus, Ay and ay of moiety A, and By and by of moiety B are in the second generation Y. Now, according to their scheme of arrangements of generations, children of marriage of an Ay with a by i.e., in the third generation, are classed with the members of generation X of moiety A. Similarly, children of marriage of a By with an ay are Bx (males) and bx (females) of the X generation of the moiety B. And following this pattern, children of sister exchanges of the third generation, who now form the fourth generation, are Ay (males) and ay (females) of moiety A, and By (males) and by (females) of moiety B, thus being classed with members of the corresponding two moieties of the generation Y. (see Diagram 45 of Robin Fox 1966:189)

This pattern of classification repeats in the subsequent generations. Following this pattern, the Kariera system of classification of kins creates four sections, two for each of the two moieties, placing together members of the alternate generations into the corresponding sections of the two moieties. Structurally there are only two constant generations, X and Y, in this system; all other generations are correspondingly reduced to these two. This is to say that each of the two moieties will have a pair of sections corresponding to the two basic, structural generations. All this points to the fact that there are four sections in the system, which we might name AX and AY of moiety A, and BX and BY of moiety B. This is what is popularly known in kinship anthropology as the four-section system of the Kariera.

Now, the questions arise as to who are members of these four sections and whom the ego has to marry in this system. Here, it is to be borne in mind that the Kariera follow the rule of reciprocal exogamy and its derivative sister exchange, marry in their own respective generations and avoid adjacent generations for marriage alliance. Suppose ego belongs to section AX; then, in his section he has as his section agnates FF, FFB, B, SS and the like; F, FB, S and the like in section AY; in section
BX he has MF, MFB, WB and the like; and his MB, ZS and the like are agnates of section BY. Robin Fox (1966: 189) applies the native term Burung for section BX, Karimera for AY, and Palyeri for BY.

According to their marriage rules, a Burung man, for example, can not marry in his own section, nor in Karimera section; both belong to the same moiety. He has to avoid also women of Banka and Palyeri who belong to his adjacent generations. The only women these rules leave for him are those of his grand parental and grandchild generations and those of his own generation, yet, of the opposite moiety. He avoids the first group of women, apparently on the principle of generation differentiation of kin; the Kariera ethnography, however, seems to be silent on the working of this principle. From the appropriate generation, i.e., his own generation, again, his opposite sex parallel-cousins, i.e., his mother’s sister’s daughters are ruled.

Equations shown in this diagram are:

- MB (3) = FZH (3)
- MBW (6) = FZ (6)
- MZ (7) = FBW (7)
- MZH (8) = FB (8)
- MZD (2) = FBD (2)
- MBD (1) = FZD (1)

Fig: 1.1Diagram showing kin term relationship of bilateral cross-cousin rules
out; this leaves his female cross-cousins only as his marriage partners. A Kariera man thus marries his first cross-cousin, actual or classificatory, as so governed by the reciprocal marriage alliances previously formed between the two moieties. Reciprocal alliances entails sister exchange under which condition the cross-cousin, the man marries his first MBD who is at same time his FZD. Thus, the Kariera practise bilateral cross-cousin marriage. The given diagram aptly illustrates the point.

These and other structural categories of equivalences of kins are well reflected in the Kariera kin terms. A few key kin terms arrayed here below, with the respective kins they denote, stand to substantiate the point. These terms are drawn from A.R. Radcliffe-Brown’s article “Three Tribes of Western Australia” published in *Journal of Royal Anthropological Institute of Great Britain and Ireland*, 43 1913: 143-194.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Kariera kin</th>
<th>Class of kins denoted</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Maeli</td>
<td>FF, FFB, MMB, EFF, male ego’s SS, SDC, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kandari</td>
<td>MM, MMZ, FFZ, EFM, female ego’s DS, DD, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kabali</td>
<td>FM, FMZ, MFZ, EMM, female ego’s SS, SD, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tami</td>
<td>MF, MFB, FMB, EFF, male ego’s DS, DD.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mama</td>
<td>F, FB, MZH, EMB, MBWB, ZHMB.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nganga</td>
<td>M, MZ, FBW, EFZ.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toa, Yumani</td>
<td>male ego’s FZ, MBW, WM, female ego’s BS, DH, HZS.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yuro</td>
<td>female ego’s FZ, MBW, HM.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nuba</td>
<td>female ego’s MBS, FZS, H, ZH, HB, male ego’s MBD, FZD, BW, WZ.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Bungali = female ego's MBD, FZD, BW, HZ
Kumbali = male ego's MBS, FZS, ZH, WB.
Kaja = eB, eFBS, eMZS.
Turdu = eZ, eFBD, eMZD.
Margara = yB, yFBS, yMZS.
Mari = yZ, yFBD, yMZD.
Mainga = S, BS, female ego's ZS.
Kundal = D, BD, female ego's ZD.
Kuling, Yaraja = male ego's ZS, DH.
Ngaraia = male ego's SD, SW, female ego's BD, SW.

This Kariera list of kin terms, each denoting a category of various kins, shows their scheme of classification of relatives according to their modes of descent, section principle, generation principle, bilateral cross-cousin marriage rule, etc. The term maeli merges the senior male members i.e., those of male ego's alternate ascending generation with his DS, DD, etc., who are members of his alternate descending generation, who are all the members of his section. Double/bilateral identity of a single relative of the ego in the semantic sense is also indicated: his patrilineal kin FF and FFB are simultaneously his MMB who is his matrilineal relative, they being classed together by the single term maeli; his matrilineal relatives MF and MFB (both referred to as tami) are also his FMB (tami), a patrilineal kin; his matrilineal relative MM (kandari) is again his patrilineal kin FFZ (kandari), and his patrilineal kin FM and FMZ (kabali) are semantically his matrilineal relative MFZ (kabali). In ego's adjacent ascending generation his patrilineal kins F and FB are his matrilineal
relatives MZH and MBWB, all being put together under the term *mama*; and his M and MZ are equated with his FBW, all being referred to with the term *nganga*.

In ego’s own generation his relatives are divided into unmarriageable siblings and parallel-cousins, and marriageable cross-cousins. His male parallel-cousins are terminologically distinguished from his *kumbalis* (MBS, FZS, ZH, and WB). The single term *nuba* is applied by egos of both sexes in referring to the opposite sets of cross-cousins: male ego to MBD, FZD, BW and WZ, and female ego to MBS, FZS, H, ZH and HB. But, as reflected by the terminology, the Kariera system, characteristically of its type, does not distinguish between wife-giving group and wife-taking group. Concomitantly with the bilateral first cross-cousin marriage/sister exchange, the two groups are merged. That is why a member of ego’s section, a basic unit of the Kariera system, is related to him patrilineally as well as matrilineally.

The elements of the structural dimension of the Kariera system of kinship and marriage and structural analysis thereof, shown above, apart, there is perhaps a logical temptation, as so induced by the nature of the Kariera cross-cousin rule and their marriage – class/section system, to ask under what historical circumstances elements of the two social complexes, matriline and patriline got intersected and juxtaposed, resulting in shaping the present form of the system in question.

The Kariera four-class system is found working in a slightly varied form in the eight-class system of the Aranda, another Australian tribe. The Aranda system operates between any four patrilineal units: two from moiety A and two from moiety B. Different from the Kariera marriage into mother’s lineage or clan, an Aranda ego must not marry his first MBD/FZD; he is to marry a second cross-cousin i.e., his MMBDD who is also his FMBSD. This marriage comes to effect when, in the first generation, unit A¹ exchanges women with B¹, and A² with B² whereas in the next generation A¹ marries into B² and vice versa, and B¹ and A² exchange women, and in
the third generation and in the fourth generation, marriage alliances are reverted to
those of the first generation and the second generation, respectively. This pattern of
alliance relationship repeats in the subsequent generations. While following this
pattern the Aranda system differs from the Kariera counterpart in that in the latter
alliances of the first generation would continue over the generations. That the Aranda
marry their MMSDD/FMBSD is well illustrated in Robin Fox’s diagram 48 (see
Robin Fox 1966: 196).

As the Aranda system works with its four units $A^1, A^2, B^1$ and $B^2$ (the first
two of moiety A, and the latter two of moiety B) each of these four units functions
twice as two different alliance segments, one in the first generation and the other in
the second generation. Functionally thus there are eight marriage segments or classes
in this system. This is so because ego marries his second cross-cousin. If one marries
the third cross-cousin in such a system, it would produce sixteen marriage classes or
sections and so on up the geometric scale.

of a recent evolutionary theory of kinship, namely the tetradic theory, propounded by
N. J. Allen. For this he gives references to Allen’s articles (“Tetradic Theory: An
Approach to Kinship”, Journal of the Anthropological Society of Oxford 17 1986: 87-
Allen’s hypothetical tetradic system consisted of only four terms for each sex as the
starting point away from which were occasioned evolutionary paths by the gradual
breaking of the equations on which the system was based. In Allen’s opinion the
symmetric prescriptive structural type lies close to the originating tetradic system. In
as much as Dravidian, Munda and Tibeto-Burman systems have certain similarities
among them, their starting point would have been, Trautmann believes, more or less,
the same in semantic structure though not in lexicon. Complementary to this
observation, the Russian scholar M. V. Kryukov (in Sistema Rodstva Kitaitsev,
Moscow, Nauka, 1972, reproduced in Trautmann, Preface xvi) posits a symmetric prescriptive starting point for Chinese kinship terminology, too, thus suggesting a wider Sino-Tibetan horizon for this pattern in ancient times.

Prescriptive terminological system finds expressions in varied forms: symmetric one a synoptic discourse of which has been dwelt upon above and asymmetric which may again be classified into patrilateral and matrilateral. Where sister exchange does not prevail, and the father’s sisters have to marry people other than the mother’s brothers, ego will have two lots of cross-cousin: children of his paternal aunt and those of the maternal uncle (it is to be remembered that under sister-exchange principle either cross-cousin is a bilateral cross cousin to the ego: the child of his father’s sister and, and at the same time, of his mother’s brother). Under these circumstances some societies prescribe either of these two cross-cousins for ego to marry, thereby resulting in the two forms of asymmetrical prescriptive marriage: patrilateral cross-cousin marriage and matrilateral cross-cousin marriage.

The rule under the patrilateral form is that a girl should marry into the group from which her mother came. This means to say that A receives a woman from B in one generation, and gives one back to B in the next generation and so on down the generations. Exchange of woman is indeed involved in this arrangement, but not in the same generation. The exchange is yet direct in the sense that it is between only two groups at least in alternate generations. This form of exchange is what has been known as delayed direct exchange. Accordingly, some anthropologists prefer to take it as a form of direct exchange. But, unlike the immediate form of direct exchange that rests on sister-exchange i.e., exchange in the same generation, the alliances in the delayed form are not restricted to only two groups in the same generation. Here Robin Fox’s explanation of the point may be aptly quoted; “we have to marry off all the people in A and B who are not married. If in the first generation A gives a woman to B, then A males can not take B females and so they have to marry elsewhere;
similarly B females must marry other than into A" (Robin Fox 1966: 204). Thus, a
third group should be there from which A males take women and into which B
females must marry. Exchange of indirect kind thereby inherently occurs in the
system. Hence, patrilateral cross cousin marriage may ultimately fall in the scale of
indirect exchange, whose pure form is matrilateral cross-cousin marriage. The
symmetrical character of patrilateral cross-cousin marriage can however be defended
as, if at all this system is an historical reality; direct exchange of women takes place,
delayed though it may be. The question to the real existence of this form of
prescriptive marriage as an elaborate exchange mechanism is so inspired by the
nature of the material on which basis the form of marriage among the Highlanders of
New Guinea is reported in the literature of kinship anthropology – a situation which
Robin Fox (p.206) apprises as: "The trouble with this whole issue is that material
from the Highlands of New Guinea where symmetric forms of such marriages are
reported, is sparse and contradictory". This problem on the issue of patrilateral cross-
cousin marriage as a systematic swapping of women in alternate generations between
groups does not, however, arise in the case of this marriage in its preferential form
which is too common elsewhere. Robin Fox regards occurrence of this marriage in
the later form simply as a statistical trend in those societies of its occurrence. He
further indicates that aristocratic sections of societies, particularly historical societies,
are the favourable social contexts of the practice of patrilateral cross-cousin marriage
wherein dynastic marriages are mostly of this form of marriage whereby, to use
Robin Fox's expectations, noble or chiefly lineages will play the alternating-status
game with each other, using just a few of their women as pawns. This is really an
interesting piece of analysis that would veritably be useful in the proper
understanding of this social practice in the historical perspective in cases where it is
called for.
Now, we turn to the pure form of asymmetric exchange which Levi-Strauss calls "generalized exchange" or "indirect exchange". This mode of exchange rests on the positive rule that one should marry one's mother's brother's daughter, real or classificatory, i.e., his matrilateral cross-cousin, and the negative rule that he can not marry his patrilateral cross-cousin, i.e., his father's sister's daughter; hence the elementary character of the kinship system built on it. The basic model of exchange involved in this case is: $A \rightarrow B \rightarrow C \rightarrow A$. A gives women to B, B to C, and C in turn to A, thus closing the cycle. Women are transferred obligatorily and, for that matter, irreversibly in one direction. Many more groups could join the cycle; but this mode of exchange works on the division of the total society into at least three groups: (1) lineally related descent groups, (2) wife-giving groups, and (3) wife-taking groups. This is the tripartite conception of a society having this mode of exchange at its organizational level. The structural logic would, however, reduce the trio-group organizational relations to the dyadic relations of two basic units, wife-giving and wife-taking. Certainly, ego's lineal descent group is ultimately a wife-taking group to its wife-giving group, and a wife-giving group in relation to its wife-taking group.

The Purum of Manipur of the northeastern border of India offers an excellent example of the tripartite form of social organization working on the basis of asymmetric prescriptive exchange of women with its associated positive marriage rule, i.e., matrilateral cross-cousin marriage. The Purum need no new introduction. One simply needs reminded of the long drawn debate during the entire period of 1960s on the working of the people's marriage rules. Crucial to the said controversy was Rodney Needham's gross exposition of the theoretical potentialities of the Purum social and cultural system, his analysis being based on T.C. Das's original ethnography on this people (T.C. Das, *The Purum: an Old Kuki Tribe of Manipur*, 1945), in his bid to consolidate Levi-Strauss's "prescriptive alliance theory" put forward in his *Les Structures elementaires de la Parente*, 1949). Indeed, the Purum
were order of the days during the said decade of time. To use Needham’s own expression, “the Purum are an established order” and “what the whole of social anthropology is all about.”

A confusion of grave concern in the Purum ethnography is identification of the Purum actual alliance groups. Ch. Budhi Singh observes in his article, “The Purum Kinship and Marriage an Ethnographic Re-study” (in Kinship and Family in the North East, (ed.) J.S. Bhandari, vol. I, 1996:193-223) that the Purums have two historic-cultural traditions, following which have established among them two patterns of marriage alliance relationships. This internal cultural cleavage within this community is a thing of pretty long time depth. The original ethnographer T.C. Das somehow missed to take notice of this important fact of the people’s life, it leading to misidentification of some of the Purum alliance groups and their alliance relationships. Any way, the Purum of both the two traditions, after all, follow in their own ways their common positive rule of marrying matrilateral cross-cousin, and the negative rule of prohibition of patrilateral cross-cousin marriage, their women moving thus in one direction only in a closed connubial circle. This is at least the normal pattern of all the Purum marriage behaviours. The given diagram on the marriage relations of the lineages of Marrim and Makan, two of the five clans of Purum Khulen tradition suffices to neatly show the prevailing common pattern of the Purum indirect exchange marriages.

The diagram (Fig. 1.2) reveals at the first instance occurrence of direct exchange at the clan level: Mk\(^1\) and Mk\(^2\) of Makan clan give women to M\(^2\) and M\(^3\) of Marrim clan, and M\(^2\), M\(^3\) and M\(^4\) of the latter clan to Mk\(^3\) of the former clan whereas M\(^1\) alone of Marrim gives women to all the three lineages of Makan. However, at the level of the lineages women on marriage all move in one direction only. Thus, M\(^1\) gives women to all the lineages of Makan, but none of the latter three lineages give in
turn to $M^4$; and since $M^2$ and $M^3$ take women from $Mk^1$ and $Mk^2$, they give women to $Mk^3$. $M^4$ is a wife-giver of $Mk^3$, as such $M^4$ does not take women from $Mk^3$.

\[
\begin{array}{c}
Mk^1 \quad M^1 \rightarrow \quad Mk^1, Mk^2, Mk^3 \\
Mk^2 \quad M^2 \rightarrow \quad \times \quad \times \quad Mk^3 \\
Mk^3 \quad M^3 \rightarrow \quad \times \quad \times \quad Mk^3 \\
M^4 \rightarrow \quad \times \quad \times \quad Mk^3 \\
\end{array}
\]

Notations:

$M^1 = 1^{st}$ lineage, Rimkung of Marrim clan  
$M^2 = 2^{nd}$ lineage, Rim-phun-chong of Marrim clan  
$M^3 = 3^{rd}$ lineage, Rim-ke-lek of Marrim clan  
$M^4 = 4^{th}$ lineage, Pilling of Marrim clan  
$Mk^1 = 1^{st}$ lineage, Kan-kung of Makan clan  
$Mk^2 = 2^{nd}$ lineage, Laisiof Makan clan  
$Mk^3 = 3^{rd}$ lineage, Makan-te of Makan clan  
$\rightarrow = \text{“married to”}$

Fig: 1.2 Common pattern of Purum indirect exchange

[Reference for this diagram and its notations goes to Ch. Budhi 1996: 193-233]

The Purum system of terminological classification of kins aptly reflects the same pattern of their normal marriage behaviours. The following few Purum kin terms of reference suffice to show this correspondence:
Purum kinship terms

\textit{Ka-pu} \quad = \quad \text{FF, MF, FZHF, MB, WB, MBS, WBBS, WF, WBS, WBSS}
\textit{Ka-pi} \quad = \quad \text{FM, MM, FZHM, FZH, ZHFZ, MBW, MBSW, WM, WBSW, MBSW, MBSSW}
\textit{Ka-u} \quad = \quad \text{eMBD, eWZ, eBW}
\textit{Ka-naonu} \quad = \quad \text{yMBD, yWZ, yBW}
\textit{Ka-rang} \quad = \quad \text{FZH, ZHF}
\textit{Ka-ni} \quad = \quad \text{FZ, ZHM}
\textit{Ka-upa} \quad = \quad \text{eFZS, eZH}
\textit{Ka-shel} \quad = \quad \text{yFZS, yZH}
\textit{Ka-tunu} \quad = \quad \text{SD, FZD, FZSD, ZHZ, ZD}
\textit{Ka-tupa} \quad = \quad \text{SS, SSS, FZSS, ZS, DH, DS}
\textit{Ka-ou} \quad = \quad \text{eZ, eFZSW}
\textit{Ka-samu} \quad = \quad \text{yZ, yFZSW}
\textit{Ka-terpa} \quad = \quad \text{eFB, eMZH}
\textit{Ka-pate} \quad = \quad \text{yFB, yMZH}
\textit{Ka-termu} \quad = \quad \text{eFBW, eMZ}
\textit{Ka-nute} \quad = \quad \text{yFBW, yMZ}
\textit{Ka-mou} \quad = \quad \text{SW, MBSD, WBD}

The above kin terms show that wife-givers and wife-takers are clearly distinguished. MB's group is ego's wife-giving whereas FZH's group is his wife-taking group. MB and MBW are terminologically differentiated from FZH and FZ respectively; FZH is a core member of ego's wife-giving group, and MB that of his wife-taking group. Hence MBD is equivalent to W, and WZ to BW. And, FB is MZH, and, therefore, FBW is MZ. Hence springs up another set of equation, i.e.,
equation of SW with MBSD and WBD. On the other side, FZS marries Z, hence ZHF is FZH and ZHM is equated with FZ and Z is FZSW.

In the grandparental generation all the ego's relatives, lineal and collateral, are merged, and the terms ka-pu and ka-pi refer to the male members and female members, respectively, thereof. These are honorific terms appropriate for the members' senior positions. All the members in ego's third descending generation are all referred to as grandchildren; ka-tunu for female members and ka-tupa for male members. But, what is interesting of the Purum kinship terminology is their classification of all the members of ego's wife-giving group, regardless of their generation and age, with all the honorable grandparents under the kin terms ka-pu for male members and ka-pi for married female members. Hence, even MBSS or WBSS is ego's ka-pu and MBSW or MBSSW is his ka-pi. All these ego's relatives are assigned higher and superior status than their genealogical counterparts on the opposite side, i.e., on the side of ego's FZH's group (his wife-taking group); all the members of this side right from FZ's children down to their children and grandchildren are also ego's grandchildren, ka-tupa for males and ka-tunu for females. Thus, the social hierarchical difference of the wife-givers and the wife-takers find its correspondence in their terminological difference.

Above, we have seen typological differences of direct exchange and indirect exchange, being examined in the contexts of typical societies of the two modes of exchange. But, some other societies are found to have both forms of exchange operating simultaneously at different levels of their organization, as it were, certain elements of direct exchange linger on as vestiges of the past in those societies as they advanced into the subsequent stage of their historical development. Direct exchange system can grow by splitting the moieties into four, eight, sixteen, thirty two, etc., sections, however, to sustain growth of the size of population only within the moieties involved in the exchange. It can not run organization with large and complex
societies. The indirect exchange, on the other hand, can expand indefinitely, and as such it fittingly and suitably meets the historical conditions necessary in organizing a society changing demographically and what not from its earlier small isolated population to a large and complex one. In the process direct exchange ought to break down; yet, no wonder some of its elements continue in the new social set-up such that these elements and indirect exchange work together, however, at different levels within the same system of the new complex society. Let us now see the results of the process occurring in a few exemplar societies.

The five clans of the Kachin of northern Myanmar are ideally exogamous, but this exogamy is not strictly observed. This says that a Kachin clan has been exposed to direct exchange within it. However, within each of the three classes of the Kachin – chiefs, aristocrats and commoners, the patrilinage marry on the asymmetrical model without involving superior-inferior relationship between mayu (wife-givers) and dama (wife-takers). The same model of marriage exchange works in between their stratified classes, obviously in a hierarchical scheme. Thus, chiefly lineage A will be mayu to at least one aristocratic lineage in its own domain, and at least one of the aristocrats will be mayu to a commoner lineage, thereby establishing an alliance link between the classes whereby women pass down the system and wealth (bride-price paid by dama groups to their mayu) passes up it, not the other way round of the alliance.

The Murngin of northern Australia have traditional system of exchange between particular pairs of clans which they divided up between two moieties in eight sections. The system is linked with sister exchange, i.e., direct exchange like that of the Aranda. But, whereas in the Aranda system a man marries a second bilateral cross-cousin who is ego’s MMBDD and FMBSD simultaneously, in the Murngin system a man should marry a real or classificatory MBD (FZD is banned to be his spouse). That is to say, the Murngin system is an asymmetrical one.
All these and other identical cases are a kind of half-way house between direct exchange and indirect exchange, in which these two modes of exchange go on at the clan and lineage levels in the same system. What is more, among the Crow and Omaha American Indians, we get the two forms of exchange simultaneously at the same level. In the matrilineal Crow system, a man may not marry in his own clan, nor in his father’s clan, nor in his mother’s father’s clan and in the patrilineal Omaha system; he may not marry in his own clan, nor in his mother’s clan, nor in his father’s mother’s clan. In the Crow system ego’s clan gave a woman to his father’s clan and before that to his mother’s father’s clan. That is to why ego can not take his spouse from either of these wife-taking clans. This is seemingly a feature of asymmetrical exchange. But, at the same time, this system assumes the semblance of symmetrical exchange in that the asymmetrical rule pertains only to individuals, not to whole groups. Thus, when A gives a woman to B, it is only the children of that woman who can not marry into B; other A’s will be similarly governed by their mother’s marriages. In that system, however, some of those other A’s men may marry into B. Now, the overall picture is that of direct exchange. Same is the case with the Omaha system in this respect of the application of the marriage rule of prohibiting a man to marry in his mother’s clan as well as his father’s mother’s clan, only to the individuals, not to whole groups. In this case, too, therefore, both direct exchange and indirect exchange prevail simultaneously at the same level. Thus, we find in these systems a synthesis of direct exchange and indirect exchange. Terminological evidences of this phenomenon may be drawn from the Omaha system as our example. F(e-da-je) and FB(e-da-je) are classed together but distinguished from MB(be-ja-ga); M(e-naw) and MZ(e-naw) are classed together but distinguished from FZ(be-je-me); and FB’s children and MZ’s children are classed together with ego’s own siblings, but distinguished from FZS(be-chose-ka), FZD(be-che-sho) and MBS and MBD(e-naw). These terminological features are decidedly reminiscent of direct exchange.
But, at the same time, the patrilateral cross-cousins, FZS and FZD are terminologically distinguished from the matrilateral counterparts, i.e., MBS and MBD. This feature has nothing to do with direct exchange. Cross-cousin marriage of any kind can not occur in the Omaha system; FZS is terminologically classed with ZS and FZD with ZD, and on the matrilateral side MBS is classed with MB and MBD with M, and their standing marriage rule prohibits him to marry into the group wherefrom his mother came.

Over and above the elementary phase of the Crow-Omaha system, wherein elements of direct exchange and indirect exchange have been combined, has been superimposed certain elements of complex system too. As such the Crow-Omaha system stand half-way between elementary and complex systems. Their negative rules: banning a man to marry into his own clan, his mother's clan and his father's mother's clan in the case of the Omaha systems, for example, suggest the elementary half of the systems. But these systems do not have positive marriage rule, and as such their marriage behaviours hover round the probabilistic model. This feature would classify them as complex system wherein marriage links are not renewed and people are distributed widely around the society.

We find in the Crow-Omaha systems a type of systems that has rules of exogamy, but not all pervading rules of alliance. There may be still some such societies as having exogamous clans, but every such a clan will in all probability be linked to every other such clan. At most, some of these clans may make pairs between which the frequency of marriages is remarkably greater than between others. The network of marriage relationships in such pairs of clans may tilt towards setting up alliances. This phenomenon certainly arises in the marriages of royal houses of history. Such a system self-speaks of its considerably complex character, but it differs in degree, though not in principle, from a truly complex system which we come
across among the Hawaiian and the Eskimo as the typical examples of the pre-literate societies.

Hawaiian kinship and marriage systems are concentrated mainly in areas of Malayo-Polynesian speakers. It has been stated above that in this system the exogamous group is not a discrete kin-group such as a lineage but an ego-centered bilateral group of kinsmen. It stresses the separateness of generations; for this reason it is often referred to as generational system. Being ego-centered, ego’s primary relationships are used as the basis of the system, and collateral consanguines are brought within one or the other of these primary, base relationships. This system is marked by the absence of unilineal descent groups. And, as its another feature this system makes no concession to systematic exchange. Lastly, it seems that sex is not differentiated beyond ego’s generation. Let us now observe how these features of the system are fittingly reflected in their terminologies reported by Ludge Andruos, reproduced in Lewis Henry Morgan’s Systems of Consanguinity and Affinity of the Human Family, 1970:452-456 (reprint of 1871 edition).

Ego’s FF, FM, MF, MM and all their brothers and sisters are kupuna (grandparent). This term is extended also to the several ancestors above grandparents and their siblings of the second ascending generation. These members are distinguished from each other in order of their generational difference. The Hawaiian apply the term makua to refer to parent, either father or mother, FB, MB (in the sense of F), and MZ and FZ (in the sense of M). Brothers are distinguished into elder (kaikuaana) and younger (kaikaina), by the males, but not by the females; likewise sisters are distinguished into elder (kaikuwahina) and younger (kaikuwahine) as said by the males, but not by the females. All cousins, parallel or cross, are brothers and sisters, all the terms for eB, eZ, yB, yZ apply to them according to their sex and age in relation to the ego. Keiki (literally signifying child) is used in referring to S, D, all children of B’s, Z’s and collateral B’s and Z’s. And, moopuna is the term for
grandchild of either sex, not only of the second descending generation but also of several downward degrees. Evidently, Hawaiians do not have definite terms for grandfather, grandmother, father, mother, uncle, aunt, brother, sister, cousin, nephew, niece, grandson and granddaughter. They apply kana or kaina or kane and wahina or wahine to mark off the males and females, respectively as the suffixes of the terms for these several categories of relatives. All these members constitute ego’s exogamous discrete kin-group. The system is a bilateral one, covering both sides of the kinship network equally, but the actual range of prohibited degrees varies from one case to another.

The Eskimo call FBS, FBD, and MZS and MZD by the term il-lung-a (male speaking) and il-lo-a (female speaking). The same terms apply also to FZS, FZD and MBS and MBD. Thus, terminologically the parallel-cousins are classed together with cross-cousins. But they are distinguished from ego’s siblings, i.e., brothers and sisters (ang-yu-ah and na-ya used by the males for eB and eZ, respectively, and an-ning-a and ang-a-yu-a used by the females for eB and eZ, respectively; a single term for yB, nu-ka, used by both sexes; and two terms for yZ, na-ya, used by the males, and nu-ka-ha, used by the females. This terminological differentiation of the siblings from the parallel and cross-cousins indicates that the nuclear family terms are not extended beyond the pale of this type of family among the Eskimo. This does not mean to say that kinship network in the Eskimo system is confined to the nuclear family; it is rather expanded on the sides of the two parents. Thus, the nuclear families of mother and father are not differentiated, as is so pointed out by their terminological classification of parallel-cousins and cross-cousins together in one category of ego’s kins. In short, the perfect bilateral symmetry of the Eskimo system of kinship is reflected in their terminology.
What is more, in strict logical correspondence with the classification of the above kins, a male ego calls the child of his cousin (male or female and parallel or cross) *we-yo-o-gwa* and a female ego calls the child *nwo-a-ga*.

**IV**

Toward accomplishing the above cursory survey of the various forms of kinship and marriage systems and their terminological manifestations, it is now felt indispensable to examine and review a question of equally grave concern in the study of kinship and marriage, i.e., the existence of relationship with relatives other than those in one's own descent group in societies with strongly established unilinadal descent system.

Anthropologists have defined various methods of recruitment of the individual members in a society with respect to the formation of what is called descent groups, namely unilineal (patrilineal and matrilineal), double, parallel and cognatic. The early evolutionary anthropologists mistakenly imagined these forms of descent to be mutually exclusive, and thus thought that patrilineal descent system emerged from a previous matrilineal stage as if the two could not exist together. Things of the past do not die out overnight; the past, rather, continues in the present in one form or other. For instance, in a patrilineal society a man has matrilateral relatives with whom he has important relationship in his life, as in the case of the Tallensi, a society well-known for its strong patriliney. These relationships outside the patrilineal group do not, however, create a parallel matrilineal descent, in which condition existence of double descent system in such a society is ruled out straight. Similarly, among the Hopi Indians a man has important relationships with the members of his father's matrilineage. Thus, in any society with established unilineal descent groups a member usually has important relationships with relatives other than in his own descent group,
particularly with the relatives of the parent other than the one through whom his descent is traced.

This being the state of affairs in which a unilineal society exists with its descent principle, patrilineal or matrilineal, *vis-à-vis* the system of relationship with relatives of the parent other than the one through whom one's descent status is reckoned, it is now felt imperative to examine the expressions of the two components of such a society in its kinship terminologies. A quotation from Thomas R. Trautmann (1955: 75) aptly illustrates the situation. He says: "Kinship terminologies are necessarily egocentric in that they classify the various kinds of relationship in reference to a particular propositus, so that the same individuals are differently classified for relationship from one ego to another. In this way a kinship terminology is like a kindred, an egocentric category of relatives within a stipulated degree of proximity that fulfills certain functions, such as helping ego raise a bride price or wergild, or avenging or mourning his death. Unilineal relationship, on the other hand, characteristically relate to descent groups that are sociocentric, in that from any point of reference all individuals are classified in the same way. Unilineal relationships, further, make possible the existence of classes that may be discrete and exhaustive, as in a system of matrilineal or patrilineal clans into which the individuals of a community are classed sociocentrically and without remainder. Finally, kinship terminologies are necessarily bilateral or cognatic, in that they exist to classify all those with whom a kinship relation of any kind is recognized and not just those of one's unilineal category, which is another way of saying that cognatic relationships are recognized in all societies and where unilineal categories or social institutions exist by abstraction from cognatic relationships they are limited to certain functional contexts." What may be underlined in this argument is the bilateral or cognatic feature of kinship terminologies. The kin classes in a unilateral society do not remain isolated from one another. The order of the society rests on the integration of
autonomous classes of relatives, i.e., the clans. As such, all individuals of the society are related to one another through kinship, regardless of their different descent affiliations. This all embracing character of kinship network is well documented in the kinship terminologies.

All what is posited above is not, however, to say that there are no kinship terminologies which express the influence of strong unilineal institutions. On the contrary, the Crow/Omaha systems characteristically have kinship terminologies reflecting the strong influences of their unilineal kinship structures. For instances, among the matrilineal Crow FZS and FZDS are terminologically classed with F and FB, and FZD and FZDD with FZ; and among the patrilineal Omaha MBS and his sons are terminologically clubbed together with MB, and MBD with M, and children of the mother are ego’s brothers and sisters. These classificatory kin terms serve the function of emphasizing the ‘unity of the lineage’ of the father in the first case, and that of the mother in the second case. But, side by side with this strong force of the unilineal descent principle in both the Crow and the Omaha terminological systems FB’s children and MZ’s children are merged with siblings, all showing the bilateral character of the systems. It is held that in most terminological systems clear indications of the impact of unilineal institutions are few or altogether absent.

It may be reiterated that the bilateral category comprising ego and ego’s own siblings, father’s brother’s children and mother’s sister’s children, and the like; and their corresponding non-marriageable relationships as so reflected in their kinship terminologies, do not create double descent system in the societies of unilineal descent system. How to explain this bilateral feature of kinship and terminological structure?

Meyer Fortes’ theory of ‘complementary filiation’ is inapt to explain the question. For his theory Fortes argues that in a patrilineal society a man obtains his
descent membership through his father, but he is still his mother’s child; he therefore has a complementary filiation with his mother’s agnates, and in particular with his mother’s brother. Evidently Fortes’ ‘complementary filiation’ is theoretically designed to formally recognize a man’s kinship link with the patrilineal members of his mother. It has little to do in explaining a man’s negative marriage (non marriageable) relationship with his matrilineal relatives: Z, MZD and the like in his own generation; M, MZ and the like in his parents’ generation; and ZD and the like in his children’s generation, as so prevailing in the Toda, Dravidian, Kariera and the like patrilineal societies. Any concept and theory that tries to examine the category in point in the light of recruitment of individuals on any model of descent would remain irrelevant, for the said category is an egocentric one, and not a sociocentric descent group, whose members are relatives of an ego, patrilineal as well as matrilineal, within a stipulated degree of proximity. Membership of a person in this category is determined by his or her specific kin position in relation to the ego who is also its member, not by the principle of descent of the members from a common ancestor or even from sub-groups descended from a common ancestor.

We may now try the concept of ‘double unilineal exogamy’ to cope with the phenomenon of the non descent bilateral exogamous category of relative’s existent in unilineal societies. This concept widely applied since the early decades of the twentieth century, holds that the bilateral nature of kinship terminologies are functionally related to it. According to this theory cross-cousin marriage is consequent upon the exogamy of both patrilineal and matrilineal kin, i.e., exogamy of bilateral relatives of certain degrees. Thus a man is prohibited to marry his father’s brother’s daughter, to whom he is related patrilineally through exclusively male linking relatives, and his mother’s sister’s daughter, to whom he is related matrilineally through exclusively female linking relatives; and his sister, to whom he is related in both ways simultaneously. This is the rule of double unilineal exogamy,
and it delineates in this way the class of opposite sex parallel-cousins (male ego’s Z, FBD, MZD, and the like; and female ego’s B, FBS, MZS, and the like); and the marriageable residuum of the opposed class of cross-cousins (male ego’s FZD, MBD, and the like; and female ego’s FZS and MBS, and the like) who fall outside the non marriageable category of parallel-cousins.

M.B. Emeneau (1937: 103-112) gives a good exercise of this theory of double unilineal exogamy in his ethnography of the Toda, whereby he pointed out the failure of W.H.R. River’s classic monograph on this people to bring to notice the exclusively matrilineal character of potyo, an ego’s category of matrilineal relatives. Mado is ego’s category of patrilineal kin. A Toda man can not marry within his own mado as well as his own potyo; his female relatives in his potyo are, in his generation, Z, MZD, MMZDD, and the like; in parents’ generation, M, MZ, MMMDD, and the like; in his children’s generation, ZD, MZDD, and the like. Male relatives in this category are MS, MMS, ZS, and the like. The son of any woman, but not the child of any of the male members of this category, is a member of the same category. In this theory the positive rule of cross-cousin marriage occurs in the Toda society as a residual to the negative rule of prohibiting marriage within one’s own mado and potyo, patrilineal and matrilineal categories of non marriageable relatives.

The question of validity of this theory, however, becomes the source of a debate since Nur Yalman (Under the Bo Tree: Studies in Caste, Kinship and Marriage in the Interior of Ceylon, 1967: 337ff.) has criticized Emeneau’s version of the theory as applied to the Toda. The debate applies equally to the Singhalese as well as the other Dravidian systems: all these are variations of the Dravidian generic model of terminological system. Thomas R. Trautmann (1981: 77-82) critically reviews the debate and posits the observation that the theory of taking bilateral terminologies as functional expression of double unilineal exogamy of which cross-cousin marriage is the effect is confronted with certain limitation in the Dravidian
systems and the like where there are more than two patrilineal groups and more than two matrilineal groups, and as such, only in a Kariera type system that has two-by-two intersection of exogamous patrilineal and matrilineal categories (following Robin Fox 1966:192 : Burung and Karimera form one patrmoiety, and Banaka and Palyeri the other; Burung and Palyeri form one matrmoiety, and Banaka and Karimera the other), not found in the Dravidian systems, does cross-cousin marriage logically follow the exogamy within the patrilineal and matrilineal relatives of non marriageable category.

Certainly, it has held sway that the cross-cousin marriage and marriage class system of the Kariera results from there being in fact two sets of moieties, matrimoieties as well as patrimoieties. Each of the two moieties has a patrimoieity and a matrimoieity; an ego simultaneously belongs to a matrimoieity and patrimoieity, both of which are exogamous. He must marry someone who is of neither his own patrimoieity nor his own matrimoieity, but of the pair of the patrimoieity and matrimoieity of the opposite moiety. Robin Fox (1966: 190-192) neatly constructs this system in his diagram 46 where ego is taken as a member of matrimoieity D and patrimoieity A, and therefore must marry some who is of patrimoieity B and matrimoieity C (assuming that there are two patrimoieties A and B, and two matrimoieties C and D).

The Kariera type kinship and marriage system can arise in a matrilineal social background wherein emerged the rule of patrilocal residence as a result of change, thereby acquiring patrilineal kin groups without, however, losing the original matrilineal descent groups. This type of system obviously works with double descent and Iroquois type of kinship terminologies which class together FZD and MBD, and differentiate them from FBD and MZD, and from Z as well. G.P. Murdock (1949: 244) identifies this system, along with the Toda of South India, Dieri and Aranta of Australia, as the Duo-Iroquois sub-type of his Iroquois type.
Now, what assumes relevance and significance of the Kariera type systems in the present context is the bilateral terminological classification of FBD, MZD and Z, and correspondingly of FBS, MZS and B, into one non marriageable category, by which arrangement only cross-cousins (first cross-cousins in Kariera system) are left for an ego to marry. This scheme of classification definitely presupposes the theory of double unilineal exogamy; the patrimoieties as well as the matrimoieties are exogamous, and both maintain their respective unilineal principles. A person belongs simultaneously to one patrimoiet and one matrimoiet. This says that the person’s patrimoiet and matrimoiet are merged into one single exogamous super category, i.e., marriage class in respect of regulation of marriages of its members, who, therefore can not marry among themselves. Hence the Kariera marry their first cross-cousins who are members of the pair of patrimoiet and matrimoiet of the opposite moiety. Thus, their cross-cousin marriages are directly resulted from the double unilineal exogamy operating in their society.

The Kariera system offers a case of perfect and exclusive functioning of double unilineal exogamy in its background of having two-by-two intersections of two pairs of exogamous patrimoiety and patrimoiety, direct exchange of women, i.e., sisters exchange between the two pairs of exogamous units, and marriages with first cross-cousins, real or classificatory. The Kariera case is thus the model of the concept of double unilineal exogamy. There would be no logical flaws in this theory of exogamy itself, and it would be found working quite sound empirically too when it is applied to the Dravidian type systems so far as it confines to the first cousin range albeit there may be more than two groups of patrilineal relatives and more than two groups of matrilineally related people, and there are sisters exchange marriages between any two marriageable groups in such systems. The range of first cousins may vary from one case to another. It has already been reported that even eZD/ MyB marriage confined to the Tamil and Kannada speaking regions could be held simply
as a kind of anticipation of patrilateral cross-cousin marriage, and it has nothing special about it and thus forms a variation of the general pattern of cross-cousin marriage of the Dravidian systems.

Any possible report of marriage with the second cross-cousin (FMBSD/MMBDD) in such systems while following double unilineal exogamy within the range of first cousins, may, therefore, have been fortuitous, not directly derived from the locally instituted double unilineal exogamy. Such cases of marriages, if there be any, should perhaps be examined in the light of change which is taking place in the systems where these occur. Changes in the system may prevail even to the extent that while the rule of double unilineal exogamy still goes on prevailing its corollary, i.e., prescribed marriage with the first cross-cousins has been abandoned completely or at least marriage with the first patrilateral cross cousin may be banned and even the remaining half of cross-cousin marriage, i.e., matrilateral cross-cousin marriage may not be found in actual practice though it may subsist only in principle; yet, there may linger on unaffected the co-efficient kin terminologies of the earlier practices of sisters exchange marriages (direct exchange of cross-cousins of the first degree, real or classificatory), terminologies that bear semantic, though not lexical, equivalences of husband with FZS/MBS, and wife with FZD/MBD, with all of which the system is changing towards a complex type of kinship system. Explanation of all these changes as well as the initial conditions of the system, of course, calls for a historical approach.

The above question of non-correspondence of terminologies to reality of a kinship system, and viewing it as a result of the faster change of the reality than the more conservative part of the system, i.e., language that expresses its conceptual or cognitive and, for that matter, implicit ideal universe in terms of certain specific rules does certainly entail another equally important question, i.e., question of the role of another aspect of kinship system, namely behaviour whose explanations ultimately
call for also the role of history in the processual existence of the system, understanding whose psychological dimension is equally imperative.

Behaviours primarily pertain to individuals. Individual behaviours may abide by the rules of the system or violate these. The innate psychological mechanism of the individuals definitely motivates their responses, conforming to, or violating, the existing rules. But in the social setting in which they exist we are concerned with individuals as defined by the given social structure, rather than the biological individuals as their appropriate strategies individuals in the mass adapt, through such mechanisms as trial-and-error learning and imitation, over time to the changing external stimuli and conditions of existence, i.e., the social environmental conditions. In the process individual behaviours become habitually adaptive to these conditions and later develop into the established pattern of behaviours of the reacting individuals. Now, the dividend accumulated over time is transformed into a thing cultural that accrues to the social collectivity as a product of its change. And, in the said process of the functioning of the individual psychological mechanism it is history that provides the material to work with, as the factor of its external stimuli, for the psychological mechanism, i.e., the products of the prior social events and the existing social conditions of the particular local social context.

In the absence of these necessary historical material the innate individual mechanism alone would remain inactive of interpreting or reinterpreting any new cultural phenomenon. Granted that both psychology and history are at play in the process of culture change, there is yet a sphere of explaining the process for which resort alone to psychology is a must, i.e., in answering the question of “how” the change comes about. For the other questions of the same problem of explanation, i.e., “what”, “when”, “where” and even “why”, we must look to history. What is of greater concern relates to examining the relevant relative historical variables for the
study, with genuine sociological interest, of the problem of the changing reality of a kinship system.

**Terms of Analysis of Kinship Terminologies:**

Kinship terms are lingual expressions of differentiations and classifications of kinsmen. Literature of kinship anthropology recognizes six inherent distinctions, namely, generation, sex, affinity, collaterality, bifurcation and polarity in terms of which relatives are terminologically differentiated. To these may be added G.P. Murdock's relative age and speaker's sex as two subsidiary criteria in this regard. His third subsidiary criterion, namely decadence is of less extent of applicability. Classificatory kinship terms arise out of ignoring one or more of these criteria of differentiation of relatives.

The Hawaiian stress on the separateness of generations has been observed above, where *kupuna* stands for grandparents and their siblings, *makuna* for parents and their siblings, *kaiku* for siblings, *keiki* for children (lineal and collateral) and *moopuna* for grand children (lineal and collateral). This system is evidently a typical case of generation differentiations of kinsmen. On the other hand, the Crow and Omaha cross-cousin terms ignore generation differentiation: in the Crow type FZS is terminologically classed with F and FB, FZD with FZ and FZDD; and MBD with D, and MBS with S, while in the Omaha type FZS is terminologically clubbed with ZS, FSD with ZD; and MBD with M, and MBS with MB.

Differentiation of kin along the sex line is rooted in the biological distinction between males and females. The above Hawaiian terms, as an example, may be deemed as ignoring sex distinctions of relatives; as has already been said, the Hawaiians do not have separate terms for grandfather, grandmother, father, mother, uncle, aunt, brother, sister, son, daughter, nephew, niece, grandson and grand
daughter. It is held to be the original feature of this system before this people applies *kana* or *kaina* or *kane* and *wahina* or *wahine* to mark off the males and females, respectively as the suffixes of the terms for these categories of relatives.

The relationship of affinity arises between two persons or groups out of marriage of one in the other unit, who are not already related. Separate terms are assigned to such affinal relatives. Thus among the Iroquois, MBD and FZD are terminologically differentiated from W; and FZS and MBS from H. Similarly, HF, HM, WF, WM, HB, HZ, WB, WZ are clear affinal relatives whose separate terminological identities are well established. The Kariera terminologies, on the other hand, offer the exemplars of ignoring the criterion of affinity: in both cases MBD and FZD are terminologically put together in the category of W, and corollarily MB is terminologically classed with FZH and WF.

Non application of the terms for F, M, S, D, B, and Z to anyone outside the nuclear family in the Eskimo and the Eskimo type terminological systems is a typical examplar of recognizing the principle of collaterality. The Eskimo terms *il-lung-a* (male speaking) and *il-lo-a* (female speaking) to denote FBS, FBD, FZS, FZD, MZS, MZD, MBS and MBD are different from *ang-yu-ah* (eB) and *na-ya* (eZ) used by male speakers, and *an-ning-a* (eB) and *ang-a-yu-a* (eZ) used by female speakers; and *nu-ka* (yB) used by both sexes, and *na-ya* (yZ) used by males and *mu-ka-ha* used by females. Collaterality of the above Eskimo tertiary relatives is, however, ignored in the Hawaiian terminological system where, as an example, FBS, FBD, FZS, FZD, MBS, MBD, MZS and MZD, i.e., all cousins, parallel or cross, are put together with brothers and sisters.

The above Hawaiian classification of all cousins in the category of siblings while ignoring the former’s collaterality is what is known as merging in kinship anthropology. If, however, those Eskimo cousins were terminologically differentiated
into those who are related to the ego through his father and those related through his mother, thus recognizing both bifurcation and collaterality what is called bifurcate collateral terminology is produced in which paternal and maternal uncles and aunts are terminologically differentiated from both parents and from one another; and again, if the Hawaiian cousins who are classed with brothers and sisters were terminologically differentiated according to the sex of the primary relative of the ego, father or mother, through whom they are related to the ego, the resulting terminology is referred to as bifurcate merging, a type of terminology that recognizes the principle of bifurcation yet ignores that of collaterality, in which case F and FB are called by one classificatory term, and M and MZ by another such term, while MB and FZ are denoted by distinct terms. And, the system in which collaterality is recognized but not bifurcation yields lineal terminology, in which case FB and MB are grouped under one classificatory term, and FZ and MZ under one classificatory term, but with separate denotative terms for F and M. According to the criterion of polarity, a pair of relatives use two terms, one by which each member of the pair denotes the other. This criterion can be ignored only by applying a classificatory term with which one addresses the other.

A pair of relatives belonging to the same generation is rarely identical in age; one is biologically older than the other. This relative age of a person is widely taken into account in kinship terminologies. Many of a system terminologically differentiates between elder and younger siblings of both the same and opposite sexes. This criterion works in stronger force usually in the generation terminologies. Relative age of a person may also be sociologically recognized according to his or her genealogical position in relation to that of any other relative, regardless of their differences in biological age, in which affair a person of minor age in the biological sense is referred to with a kin term for a biologically much older person provided that he or she occupies a much senior genealogical position.
Some kinship systems prescribe two terms for a single relation, one used by a male speaker and the other by a female. This is specially common in sibling terminology where one term may be used by a male to denote his brother and another used by a female for that brother, or one term applied by a male to his sister and other by a female for that sister. Thus in the Eskimo system a male speaker calls his elder brother by ang-yu-ah, and his elder sister by na-ya while an-ning-a is her elder brother, and ang-a-yu her elder sister for a female speaker. In this system younger siblings are terminologically distinguished, too; nu-ka for younger brother by speakers of both sexes, na-ya for younger sister by a male speaker, and nu-ka-ha for younger sister by a female speaker. The Haida uses two terms for father, one by the son and another by the daughter. The English term ‘father’ would appear classificatory to the Haida.

Murdock (1965: 135) posits the assumption that in every kinship system at least some of the six inherent distinctions must be inoperative in at least some secondary and tertiary kin types, and he locates collaterality and bifurcation to be the cases in which distinctions are mostly inoperative.

Terminological Classification:

Classification of kin terms refers to reduction of extended kin types to certain limited focal kin types, i.e., merging of the former to the latter. This reduction/merging follow certain rules, of which the following ones are commonly important:

1. The same-sex sibling merging rule
2. The opposite-sex cross cousin-spouse equation rule

1. The same-sex sibling merging rule:
This rule rests on the equivalence of same-sex siblings. F and FB form one same-sex sibling pair while M and MZ, another such sibling pair. Siblings within one of these pairs are cross-cousins to those of the other, because M and MZ are the daughters of F and FB's MB: the former are sons of the sister while the latter are her brother's daughters. According to this rule, F and FB being of the same sex, the latter may be reduced to the former; similarly, MZ may be merged with M. The same-sex children of such sibling pairs, the parallel-cousins, are also related to one another as siblings. Hence it follows that FBS and FBD may be reduced to FS and FD, respectively; similarly, MZS and MZD to MS and MD, respectively. They are all equivalent to brothers and sisters, who are their focal kin. The children of these two foci are not parallel-cousins and hence not siblings, but cross-cousins; the rule does not, therefore, apply to them. However, FBSS and MZSS are parallel cousins as well as siblings, and as such they may be merged to their focal kin S; and FBSD and MZSD are in a second sibling pair whose focus is D, and hence they may be reduced to D, whereas children of FBD and MZD are again cross-cousins to one another.

This rule may have a number of corollaries that are its logical equivalents. But, beyond three medial generations and beyond one's secondary relatives its working probably varies with the local social contexts.

2. The opposite-sex cross-cousin-spouse equation rule:

This rule works in societies with cross-cousin marriage practices. According to this rule, MBD and FZD are semantically equivalent to W, these forming foci of a single class where bilateral cross cousin marriage prevails. In case of matrilateral cross cousin marriage only MBD will be equivalent to W, and only FZD will be equivalent of W where patrilateral cross-cousin marriage is the rule. There may be specific terms for H and W, quite distinct from those for the cross-cousins; there are semantically redundant, however.
In case of bilateral cross-cousin marriage, let alone W, WZ, BW and HZ (i.e., spouses' siblings and siblings' spouses) are equivalent to, and hence are merged with, MBD and FZD who are terminologically one and the same. In the other set we have Fzs and MBS (who also are terminologically one and the same) being semantically equivalent to H, HB, ZH and WB.

The rule has its first corollary in ego's first ascending generation in these equations: MB=WF, MB=HF, FZ=WM, FZ=HM; and in ego's first descending generation: QZ=QDH; QZD=QSW, QBS=QDH, and QBD=QSW.

The rule finds its third corollary in these equations:

\[\text{QBW}=\text{QZH} = \text{QWB}=\text{QZH}, \quad \text{QBW}=\text{QZH} = \text{QHB}=\text{QZH},\]
\[\text{QBW}=\text{QZH} = \text{QWB}=\text{QZH}, \quad \text{QBW}=\text{QZH} = \text{QHB}=\text{QZH},\]

Above, one finds a brief survey of the kin terminological systems, such as Eskimos, Hawaiian, Iroquois, Crow and Omaha, which are considered to be the five types of terminological systems. In the light of this system any other kinship system could be examined for its characterization. The present work attempts to reconstruct the characteristic features of the Meitei kinship system by analyzing the first hand materials on the kin terminology of this people with reference to the basic elements of these five classic typical kin terminological systems.
Methodology

The Meitei society bears impressions of various cultural superimpositions in it over the ages. This very fact suggests the necessity of examining the present kinship system of the people also by giving indispensable references to certain related historical material. Conjectural historical reconstruction is the approach usually adopted in anthropology while dealing with pre-literate societies. The Meitei are a literate people in the sense that they have sufficiently rich treasure of written records of their past compiled in their several ‘Books of history and culture’ (locally expressed as Puyas). Many of these puyas veritably offer a great source of the necessary historical material of the present study. However, using material from these ancient manuscripts is confronted with two major problems. First, the indigenous scripts of the people in which these documents are written are today obsolete and as such legible and intelligible only to a couple of local professional scholars of these documents. True, a good number of these ancient texts are now found in new editions in Bengali scripts that have gained currency in Manipur for the last two or so centuries. But, as and when one is compelled to refer to the original sources the problem of inaccessibility still looms large; inaccessibility in two senses, restricted intelligibility of the scripts and restricted availability of the same only in the hands of a few on fingers’ count. The other major problem in using these source material relates to the anonymity of the same. This problem of the authors of these puyas is reportedly a purposed design which is, however, unknown to most people. The writer of the present thesis got over the first problem with much time taken in getting help from a few local scribes in reading and interpreting the contents of the few relevant
puyas referred to in this work. For the second problem involving the question of authenticity of these sources for want of authorship, since necessity of the material from these puyas prevails upon conventionality, these are enlisted in the bibliography of the present work, short of the names of the authors of the same. The same clarification applies equally also to the lack of years of publications of the puyas, in which case again the Meitei traditional historiography conceals the year of compiling any such manuscript for the reason which is not disclosed. The pages of these texts are not numbered, too. Under these circumstances references to these texts used in the present work are not in the conventional form i.e., without mentions of the authors, year of compilation and specific pages of the texts.

Most of the necessary materials on the descent organization of the people used in the present work are drawn also from the local puyas. The grand genealogies of the major kin groups and diagrams showing kin relationship herein are reconstructed on these materials with unfailing discussions with the few local professional scholars of these texts. The unrecorded materials are collected by adopting interview and genealogical techniques in which cases the heads of the lineages are employed as key informants; the lineage heads (locally called sagei pibas) are the custodians of their respective books of lineage and minister all the rituals performed while worshipping their respective ancestors enshrined at their houses. Case studies, cross-checked in a multiple versions on a single case, narrated by the individuals directly involved in the cases as well as by the nearby individuals well acquainted with the cases, were collected whenever necessary.

The universe of the present study, i.e., the Meitei is linguistically a wide-embracing community, cutting across the socio-religious differences within it. Thus the Meitei under this denotation includes not only the core Meitei, majority of whom are officially Hindus, but also the Meitei Pangals (who profess Islamism) and the Loi who are the major chunk of the local Scheduled Caste population. Here, another
ethnologically interesting fact is that the core Meitei, the Meitei Pangal and the Loi are all marked by uniformity not only linguistically but also in respect of their kinship organizations to the extent of acceptability of their classification under the single Meitei system. The present study incorporates these peripheral versions of the core system. Inclusion of these versions rather broadens the horizon of the study with certain marriage and kinship practices explored there from which may be deemed to be vestiges of those practices once time prevalent in the past in the Meitei core society.

For the collection of materials on kinship terminology, marriage rules, kinship attitude of the people under study field work was conducted in fifteen villages, fourteen of which are distributed in the valley of the state and the rest one located at a hilly area of Chandel district. The villages are selected as random sampling areas for the study. These are:

(i) From core Meitei population – Chanam Sandrok in Imphal East district; Wabagai, Sugnu, Chairel, Leirongthel and Kakching in Thoubal district; Bishnupur Mamang Leikai in Bishnupur district; and Moreh Meitei Leikai in Chandel district.

(ii) From the peripheral Meitei community - Andro and Yambem Khunou in Imphal East district; Sekmai, Phayeng and Khurkhul in Imphal West district; and Kwatha in Chandel district. And

(iii) From Muslim community – Bengoon village, Mayang Imphal in Imphal West district.

In addition to these localities the Brahmin community and members of royal families are also represented in the sample by selecting some of their individuals from the urban localities of Imphal East and Imphal West districts.
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Thrust area of the work

Typological studies of kinship like the present one gives focal attention to terms for cross cousins for using these as the basis for establishing classification of terminological systems. An individual tends to have strongest and most enduring relationship with his or her cross-cousins, and in most societies female cross-cousins are either tabooed or preferred or even prescribed as sex and marriage partners. In the Meitei society, as will be observed in the body of the present work, terms for cross-cousins suggest marriageability among these kins; but, in actual practice occurrence of this type of marriage is very far and few between. Whether the few cases of its occurrence are deviant cases from the established rule or these are vestiges of its pristine prevalence in this society is a question that draws major thrust of this piece of work.

The present kinship organization of the Meitei society embeds in it certain elements of matrilineal social organization which are perhaps inexplicable other than as the remnants of one time exposure of this society in one form or other to this form of social organization. Without getting involved in the anthropological controversy of priority of matriliny to patriliny in history, the present work cannot but exert its exciting interest to the too-much occurrence of several elements of matriliny in the kinship organization under the present study at least in exploring these elements observed in it.

This piece of work also gives its thrust on the changing trend of kinship organization over history in the society under study.
The Meitei: the People under study

The Meitei are the people who inhabit mainly in the north eastern states of India, viz. Manipur, Assam, Meghalaya and Tripura, and in some parts of the neighbouring countries, Bangladesh, Myanmar. The cultural centre of the people lies in the soil of Manipur which at present is located between 23°5' and 25°41' N latitude and 93°02' and 93°47' E longitude and has a territorial area of 22,356 sq. km. Walter Hamilton a famous English historian who prepared a report on Manipur and submitted it to the British Parliament in 1820 A.D., stated that Munnipoor [Manipur] province was bounded on the north by Cachar, on the South by Arracan and the rude tribes bordering on that country; on the west it had the Bengal Districts of Tipperah and Silhæt; and on the east it was separated from the original Birman territories by the river Keandwen which taking a south-eastern course, unites its water with those of the Irrawaddy, a short way above the town of Sembewghean. Inhabitation in other parts of the world is, therefore, effect of centrifugation owed to historical circumstances.

The Meitei settlements in Myanmar relate to the disastrous raid by the Burmese in the nineteenth century, who subsequently occupied Manipur for seven consecutive years (1819-1826 A.D.). The disaster was culminated in the great depopulation of the then country of Manipur when the Burmese soldiery took with them into captivity enormous number of Manipuri of all ages and of both sexes. This event led to the flee of a number of Manipuris to Cachar, Sylhet and Dacca (Dhaka) and settled there since then. There are a few colonies of Manipuris also at the sacred places in West Bengal (Nabadweep) and in Uttar Pradesh (Brindaban and Radhakunda) where there led an ascetic life.

The origin of Meitei is obscure. But it is certain that they are predominantly Mongoloid with some strains of other racial types. The people speak a Tibeto Burman language. The heterogeneity of the people in physical traits suggests that the Meitei population originating from different exogenous sources, with most probably, a section of aborigines of this soil.

The Meitei community is a product of amalgamation of those various groups of people from different sources in the long course of history. And, the greater Meitei society that exists today was formed at later stage of history under the leadership of the core population of this greater society namely, the Meitei (the greater composite people was
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named after the Meitei core population thereof). This greater Meitei society was organised into a kingdom. The formation of this civil society was admitted by an earlier historical stage when the ancient peoples of the valley of Manipur lived as subjects of seven chiefdoms, viz., Meitei (the core Meitei), Angom, Sarang Leisangthem/Chenglei, Khaba Nganba, Luwang, Khuman and Moirang. After long battles for supremacy among these chiefdoms, the Meitei ultimately emerged successful and keeping all the other sojourny - an historical process that finally led to the formation of the larger Meitei state occurred that the earlier chiefdoms were relegated after the status of being component exogamous kin groups (clans) of the larger Meitei society emerging as the societal base of the new political system. Meanwhile it would be historically interesting to have a flashback on the certain aspects of the political history of this state kingdom.

The Khaba Nganba was once a very powerful political community. It is reported in Panthoibi Khungul and Chakpa Khunda. They were ruling at Kangla. But their power ceased very early following their devastation by Nongda Laien Pakhangba with the help of the Moirang. Sequel to that event many of them got merged to the Tangkhul tribe, some to the Kabui tribe whereas some of them took shelter under the patronage of Pureiromba and the rest surrendered to Nongda Laien Pakhangba. Pakhangba deputed Taoringkha as the ruler of the defeated Khaba at Leishangkhong while Tumhaba was appointed as the leader of the Nganba at Leitang Lairam (R.K. Sanahal, 1997:21). The Khaba Nganba could not thereafter rise again. The Khaba Nganba were given final blow by king Naophangba (428-518 A.D.).

The Chenglei Sarang Leisangthem ruled at Takenkha. According to the Meitei Royal chronicle, Cheitharlo Kumbaba, this community was shattered into pieces in 1512 A.D. Thus, the community was brought under the political ambit of the Ningthouja (the core Meitei) in the 16th century A.D.

Mythically the Angom and the Ningthouja are descendants of two ancestral brothers, Kuptreng and Senteong. But they emerged in history as two independent political communities. They established their rule in the eastern divide of the present Imphal valley with their capital at Kôngba. The Angoms entered into conflict with the Ningthouja on many occasions. Meidingu Ura Konthoubia, the Ningthouja king (568-658 A.D.) captured the Sellol Langmai (the then leading section of the Angom) on their way back from a victorious expedition against another autonomous local community of that time, named
Khunpham Ngangcheng. The Angom king Kiyamba dethroned the Ningthouja king Nongyinphaba and drove him along with his mother in 1524 A.D. This defeat of the Ningthouja was, however, retaliated by their king Charairongba (1697-1709 A.D.) by causing the assassination of the then Angom ruler Sangai Punshiba. Consequently, the Angom leader was injured by Kuphen Luchingba and his group was driven out. The Ningthouja ceased the most symbolic Sekpin of the Angom (Sekpin was the nine layered canopy which the Angom kings possessed as their most prestigious emblem). This defeat of the Angom marked the termination of the independence of this chiefdom, following which the Angom chief was humbled down as he was subsequently given a subordinate office under the name of Angou Panba in the court of the Ningthouja king.

Certain written historical documents traced the history of the Luwang community to one Poirolon who, according to the said sources came to the land of present Manipur to rule it under the request of the then people of the land. He was a contemporary of Nongda Laien Pakhangba who spoiled his whole mission by causing heavy loss on him. His descendants and followers later became known as the Luwang. They gradually built up a chiefdom in the area covering the modern regions of Langjing and Lamphel upto the foothill of the Koubru. Later the Ningthouja king Naotingkhong gave the Luwang a crushing blow and subsequently annexed their territory under his rule. Outside the aforesaid territory of the Luwang these people had been scattered also in other places like Phantek (present Lamangdong and region of present day Uchiwa and Kakching). When Phantek Soknaiba was the Phantek ruler, Chingkhong Thonraiba and Nganobi Pongjenha Ura Khundaba were the chiefs of the Khuman and Moirang, respectively. The combine force of the latter two chiefs shattered the Phanteks. This marked the final disappearance of the Luwangs as people of an independent political existence.

Genealogy of the Khuman traced their descent from Luwang Ningthou Punsiba of Luwang community. Of his sons, Lungba and Nungthonngai, the former founded Khuman family which gradually grew up and finally came out successful in carving out a powerful chiefdom with its earlier capital at Thoubal and later at Phenta Leikoipung (present day Mayang Imphal). At the time of their chief Adon Punsiba, the power of Khuman chiefdom rose at par with that of the Ningthouja chiefdom under the chief Thawanthaba (1196-1231 A.D.). Thawanthaba and Adon Punsiba were the leading chiefs of their time in the then Manipur valley. These two chiefs entered into mutual matrimonial alliance, obviously, as a diplomatic deal with each other. But the alliance soon broke down resulting in killing their
respective wives each of which was the other’s daughter. The conflict ended in a fierce battle between the two groups, at which event the Khuman were humbled down in the hands of the Ningthouja.

The Moirangs came by the southern route and settled on the hills lying to the west of the Loktak lake before they moved down to the valley settlement. The hill where the Moirangs once inhabited became known as the Thangjing hill after the name of their chief Thangjing Koirel Lai. According to the literal source, Moirang Ningthourol Lambuba, the Moirangs came down on the valley and carved out a chiefdom by amalgamating with the Keges and the chiefdom became to be known as Kege-Moirang. Later the name Kege was found to have been dropped. The Keges were believed to have settled near present Ithai and expanded up to Ngangkha Lawai. In the above mentioned Moirang chronicle, it is stated that while the Moirangs were moving down to settle on the valley, they were received by one Haomuba, son of a lady named Irai Leima who belonged to the Kege, indicating an invitation by the latter. The invitation might have connected to the defeat of the Keges by the Poireis (the Meitei). A peculiarity of the Moirang was the silk culture and rearing of silk worms, more particularly the Kege-teel (Kege-worm) and the Keje plants for feeding the Kege worms was believed to be brought and introduced in this land by the Keges. The Kege were earlier known as Moriya by the Meitei (Ibohal 1986: 140). In the manuscript, Poireiton Khunthok it is mentioned that a man named Ngangoi Yoimongba who was the chief of the people called Ngangoi was a prominent figure of that time. It is also mentioned that the Ngangoi chief while clearing the course of a river, possibly the upper course of the Thoubal river, met Poireiton who came to this land under the request of the Meitei to rule as their chief. The Ngangois later on merged to the Kege-Moirang and the Ngangois occasionally ruled as the chief of this principality. Another aborigine group of people known as Khuyon also merged to the Moirang under their kin group called Moirang Ariba Khwang.

The Moirang chief called Urenhanba had two sons Nganghunthok and Ngangningsing. Nganghunthok went to the Koubru hill while his brother Ngangningsing was left at Moirang. The descendants of Ngangningsing were known as Moirang Ariba Moirangthem while that of Nganghunthok became Koubaron. Many years later, after the death of a Moirang chief called Chothe Thangwai Pakhangba there was no heir to succeed as the chief. So, the Moirang who were reigning at Koubru, were recalled. Accordingly the chief Kouba Angang’ nga sent two of his sons to inspect the condition and extent of the
Moirang. Afterwards he came to the land of the Moirang. However, after leaving his two sons, Khoinai Imitangba and Iru Kouthiba to rule there, he went back to his former land with his other three sons called Khoinai Ahanba, Yukokthongthong Yaimaba and Naorumtol Atolba. In the meantime, the Moirang chief Chothe Thangwai Pakhangba regained live and came back naming himself as Kege Thingri Nachaoba. So, he along with the two sons of Kouba Angang’ nga rule the Moirang. Kouba Angang’ nga passed away en route his return journey. Then, the two groups of the Moirang lived together at Moirang.

They called the place of their capital Moirang Kangleipung. They became the most powerful group. But in later period they were merged to the supremacy of the Ningthouja or Meitei as the last of all the groups. The Ningthouja state was enlarged day by day. Meidingu Punsiba of the Ningthouja (1404-32 A.D.) invaded at Lam Thelou that lied within the boundary of the Moirang. Meidingu Punsiba was defeated and killed. His successor Meidingu Ningthoukhomba (1432-1467 A.D.) took the help of Kabo to avenge. The allied force devastated the Moirang who were led by Sanahongba. The massive killing of the Moirang took place at Moirangkhom, Imphal. Since then, the Moirang had been under the control of the Ningthouja. The post of Moirang Ningthou was nominated by the Ningthouja king. Thus the Ningthouja became the real head of all the Meitei universe.

From the above brief histories of the chiefdoms recorded in the several Puyas dealing with ancient historical accounts it is clear that the Meitei chiefdom conquered the other chiefdoms one after another. Side by side with this process of the expansion of the Meitei chiefdom the conquering Meitei society became enlarged with the addition of the conquered peoples. It is generally held that the greater Meitei society that exists today was formed as a result of that process of amalgamation of peoples from those various local communities. And in that process of societal formation of the greater Meitei community peoples from those different sources were mixed up and shuffled such that certain sections of one chiefdom got attached to the other, and so on.

Immigrations of peoples from the east as well as the west of Manipur also contributed to the demographic expansion of the ongoing process of formation of the greater Meitei society. The traditional historical text of the Meitei referred to the immigrants in the then valley of Manipur from the east and west as Nongpok Haram and Nogchup Haram respectively. The history of the arrival of the Nongpok Haram is traced to the reign of king Mungyamba (1562-1597 A.D.). During his reign the Chinese war captives (Khagi)
were given settlement at Kameng and Susa Kameng villages. King Khagembha (1597-1652 A.D.) also caught many Chinese war captives and made them settled at Susa Kameng. These war captives were given Meitei wives and their descendants were affiliated to Meitei lineages. King Kiyamba (1467-1652 A.D.) received gift from his Shan counterpart in the form of attendants and he gave them settlement at Kabo leikai, Thangmeiband in Imphal (Nongpok Haram, manuscript). These peoples and the like coming from the east and absorbed in the Meitei population in that way are identified in local written records as Nongpok Haram (Bahadur, 1974).

The historical text classify the Nongchup Haram people who came from Western neighboring states into three categories, namely i) K(h)ar(ic)s(ha) ii) Bamon and iii) Pangal. A brief note on them is furnished below. Before their convergence to the larger Meitei social system, the Manipuris addressed them by the collective name Mayang.

i) **Kharicha** - In the 7th century A.D., the Khuman king Thimg’ngol Hanba fought a victorious battle against the Takhel (Tripuris) on the Bank of the Khuga river. The war captives were the people called Mayang Kalisha Pangal, as so recorded in the said ancient text. They were given settlement at Mayang Imphal. The last part of their name i.e., Pangal became detached from their name later. Thus they are the people later on referred to as Mayang Kalisha. This people have been known as Bishnupriya because of their favourite worship of the Hindu god Vishnu. Once they settled in this valley they were not allowed to intermarry with the indigenous peoples. At the event of seven years devastation (1819-1826 A.D.) they fled to Bangladesh, Assam and Tripura. After this devastation period, some of them came back in Manipur. Later, they scattered at different places as Ningthoukhong, Nachou, Ngaikhong Khullen, Ngaikhong Khunou, Wajing, Heirok, Khangabok and Nungu. When they became resettled the Kalisha (Bishnupriya) got divided into two groups - Ningthounai (slave of king) and Leimanai (slave of queen).

ii) **Bamon (Manipuri Brahmin)**: The Brahmins of Manipur are locally expressed as the Bamon. The term was derived from the Assamese word Baman. There are certain historical sources of the presence of individual Brahmins during the reigns of king Loyumba (1074-1112 A.D.) and king Kiyamba (1467-1508 A.D.). Only in 1485 A.D., they were recognized as an emigrant group. In 1608 A.D. king Khagembha treated them as citizens of the Meitei country. But their priestly status was not recognised until king Charaioungba (1697-1709 A.D.) who was the first to convert into the Sakta faith of Hinduism bestowing after the Hindu name Pitambar Singh under guru Raj Bananali. In
1725 A.D., Hinduism was declared a state religion by king Pamheiba alias Garibniwaz (1709-1748 A.D.). But he was initiated into Sakt Cult in 1709 A.D. under the religions gunship of Gangadhar Chakrabati, son of Ray Banamali. Under Guru Gopaldas, he became a believer of Nimandi Sect in 1717 A.D. The king, however, changed his faith into Ramandi cult under Shantidas Gosai in 1729 A.D. (Sakt cult is the devotion of Devi while Nimandi or Nimbaditya Sect is the worshipping of Radha Krishna. Ramandi is the section of Hinduism introduced by Ramanda who was a devotee of Rama and Sita.). These Manipuri Brahmins came from various parts of India. Many of them set up their families here with local wives. Thus, for instances, the Bamon lineage – Kongbrailatpam is descended from Yanggangba who came from Gouradesh and married Kshetri Sanjimayum Heri. The descendants of Gangaram who came from Takhel and married girl of Sekta Kei, Maimubi, became Sijagurumayum. Sanitadas, the monk, married Lukhoibi, the widow from Andro and his descendants became Sanjukimayum. Mangkhar who migrated from Gambhila Nagar married Maimubi, a girl of Kharam tribe. He was the founding ancestor of the Brahmin lineage Mangkharmayum. Bimal, an emigrant from Mathura married Taya, a Manipuri Muslim and his descendants later on were attached to Hangoibam. However, once the process of their absorption into the Meitei social system became established, they started occupying the apex stratum of this society, thereby transforming the system of this society along the Hindu caste line; as a result they became more or less, an endogamous community within the larger Meitei social system.

During the period of King Garibniwaz, there was instituted a separate office of the Bamon. The socio-religious development of the Meitei Bamon was in full swing during the reign of king Chingthangkhomba (1759-1762, 1763-1789 A.D.). The dignified office of Panch Ratna (five jewels) was introduced during the reign of this king. King Chourajit (1803-1813 A.D.) transformed the office of Panch Ratna in to Nav Ratna with the addition of four more posts. Thus, Nav Ratna comprised of Byabasthakari, Bachaspati, Bidyalangkar, Bidyanidhi, Bidyasundar, Bidyabages, Tarkalangkar, Bamon Hanjaba and Bamon Hidang. In addition, there were Purohits appointed by the king and the queen. Sri Govindaji Seva Loisang, Sri Govindaji Pujari Sanglen are the other offices also held by Bamon. And, before 1831 A.D. Brahma Sava office had been established. (Ibochou1995: 8) All the religious perfonnments and enforcements of socio-religious sanction were then effected through this office. Recording of the account of Bamon under the title Bamon Meihourol, was started on the 18th November 1878. It
was during the reign of king Chandrakriti (1850-1886 A.D.) This *puya* approved sixtyfive lineages of the Meitei Bamon.

**Pangal (Manipuri Muslim):** At later history of Manipur the word Pangal became used to refer to Muslim population of the state. This word is a corruption of “Bangla”, it thus originally meaning the “people of Bengal”. Immigrants from the west of Manipur under the ethnic name Pangal (Bangal) came to Manipur at an early date. Their first immigration to this land can be traced as far back as, as so evidenced by the *Puya, Sakok Lamien Ahanba*, the time of Meitei king Naophanba (428-518 A.D.). The same source also indicates about the arrival of certain Muslim (Pangal) immigrants to this land during the reign of king Irengba (984-1074 A.D.) But, the historic appearance of the Pangal immigrants in Manipur occurred during the celebrated Meitei king Khagembha (1597-1652 A.D.). The history behind this historic phenomenon is: Khagembha’s brother Sanongba who fled from Manipur as a royal scion to the then king of Kachar named Sopradas Narayan for his aid in invading Manipur. The Kachari king sent a force with a number of Muslim mercenaries headed by one Prasena who was a Muslim mercenary from a locality known as Taraf (of Eastern Bangladesh) to Manipur along with Sanongba. In this battle in 1606 A.D., the Mayang army suffered defeat at Yangkoi (near present day Bishenpur village). The defeated Muslim soldiers were captured and given settlement at various pockets in this valley by giving these Muslim war captives local Meitei women. They were assigned to certain lineages in the same manner as prevailed in Meitei society. Under the secular rule of Khagembha there set up the office of Kaji. Sheikh Chuneet/Junet held the office under the supervision of his elder brother Prasena alias Md. Sani.

The Pangal settlers in Manipur were given a rather respectable place in the larger Meitei society. The greater Meitei society during the historical kings was broadly divided into *Pana* Meiteis and Lois. As Pana Meiteis, members of this social category had to render *Lallup* service to the state. *Lallup* was compulsory state service given by each and every male adult Pana Meitei for 10 days in a time unit of 40 days. Like other Pana Meiteis, these Pangal who were divided into two groups viz., commoners and artisans, were obliged to render *lallup* services. The commoners would voluntarily be soldiers and should render *lallup* service whereas the artisans were liable to follow *lallup* norm and in the meanwhile, they were to produce artistic articles. In the nick of time the latter would be soldiers. The Lois, on the other hand, were debarred from *lallup* service; instead, they, as members of social category of labour social status, had to pay annual tribute to the kings.
kings. Again, as members of the Meitei Pana system the Pangals were divided and distributed amidst the other Pana Meiteis, into two of the four Panas of the Meitei, namely Ahallup Pana and Naharup Pana. Indicative of their status of respect in the then Meitei society, separate offices for dealing various affairs of this part community were set up, namely Pangal Sanglen, Pangal Inkhol, Pangal Singa Loisang, Pangal Phundrei Loisang, Pangal Kumar, Pangal Mall and Pangal Likli.

In 1679 A.D. these Pangals of Manipur were addressed also as Mangkan/Mangal to denote the Mughal from Makak. In 1686 A.D. Mangal were divided into four groups. Commoners locally called Khunja was splitted into Lannee - soldier and Moulavis - pious man while Sinnaiiba- artisans was sub grouped as Khutheiba - craftsmen and Ingkhol sangba - kitchen gardener. The Moulavis were the religious preachers and ritual reciters. They occupied the highest class among the four. The Lannee dedicated for guarding the nation. They were regarded next to Moulavis The Khuthehaba made weapons; sewed, embroidered the cloths of war and day-to-day use. They secured third in the hierarchical class status. The Ingkhol Sangba were cultivators. But there was status mobility by changing profession.

During the reign of Meitei king Bheigachandra (1759-1761, 1763-1798 A.D.) when the Vaishnav cult of Hinduism in the Manipur valley became very prominent and stabilized, the earlier status of the Pangals became lowered down. It is equally remarkable to take note of the historical fact that during the Burmese occupation of Manipur for seven consecutive years many of the Pangals from Manipur migrated to other places like Bangladesh, Cachar, Tripura and Burma. Till 1873 A.D. there was no mosque in Manipur. The present Pangals living in those outside areas are the descendants of the Muslim emigrants from Manipur on that event. However, under the British rule in Manipur after 1891 A.D. the people became to be known as the Manipuri Muslim.

The Bamon and the Pangal are at the periphery of Meitei universe. But Bamon being the priests of Meitei Hindu are treated with respect. Pangal being Muslim become far remote in comparison to the Bamon.

Loi: Loi is the ethnonym of a degraded, historical group in the valley of Manipur who were socially segregated and denied to enter the palatial quarters of the king and to inter marry with Meitei population. All the men are employed in salt making, silk manufacture, fishing, etc. The name seems to have emerged in the local history first around the 10th
century A.D., when the Meitei king Irengba was reigning. The most reliable historical indication of the term is that it was there applied to refer to the earlier occupants of the valley of Manipur whom the said Meitei king vanquished in the course of his military operations for his territorial aggrandisement. The earlier settlers before the Meitei in the valley had been the people recorded in the local historical annals under the name Chakpa. Granted the acceptability of these historical premises, the name Loi was first applied to those Chakpa people who were subdued by the early Meitei king, it thus obviously assuming its political connotation in its origin.

Later in history, during the time of king Khagembha (1597-1652 A.D.) the villages of these subjugated subjects became used as the places of detention for prisoners. Thus, king Khagembha, sent rebels from Angom section to Sugnu in 1607 A.D. (Lairrellakpam 1989: 39) and war captives, taken on a raid against Naga in the neighbourhood of Maram village in the north, to Sugnu in the south in 1645 A.D (Lairrellakpam 1989: 41). It further reports that ten years later, Khagembha’s successor king Khunjaoba transported a number of the local Meitei people who, under the leadership of the local chief of Angom community, had raised the standard of rebellion against him, to Irai loi village.

The most historic wholesale deportation of people to Loi villages, however, took place under king Garibniwaz’s (1709-1748 A.D.) religious adventuresome of replacing the traditional Meitei animistic religion by a Hindu religion faith at which advent he banished a large number of the reactionaries to the new faith to many a Loi villages. From that onward local sources constantly makes mention of ostracising several categories of criminals to Loi villages as punishment.


Besides, T.C. Hodson (1908: 9-10) gave the affinity of the some Loi People to the Meiteinised immigrants. For instance, the Lois in the south east of the valley at Kakching,
who were immigrants from Takhel lived by iron smelting, were once under the rule of the Heirok king, whose dominions stretched from Kakching to the Imphal river. Mc Culloch states, that the appointment of an official with the style and title of Budhiraj to govern Kakching dates from the reign of king Garibnawaz.

An identifying mark of the free Meiteis was that they rendered compulsory services to the state for ten days for every unit of forty days, an institution of labour management, locally known as *Lallup*. The Loi were denied *Lallup* services; instead, they were compelled to pay tributes, cash or kind, to the Meitei kings. J.C. Higgins, (1998, 95) taking source from Palace Pandit-1926 wrote about the Loi villages which were exempted from *Lallup* but were necessary to pay tribute to the Maharaja.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Loi Village</th>
<th>Tribute</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(1) Chandrakhong</td>
<td>Salt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2) Ningel</td>
<td>do</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3) Sikhong</td>
<td>do</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(4) Waikhong</td>
<td>do</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(5) Kakching Khullen</td>
<td>Iron</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(6) Kakching Wairi</td>
<td>do</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(7) Kakching Khunou</td>
<td>do</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(8) Wangoo</td>
<td>Timber, especially pine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(9) Nungu</td>
<td>do</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(10) Sugru</td>
<td>do</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(11) Tangjeng</td>
<td>Pinewood for Govindaji</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(12) Thaga</td>
<td>Fish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(13) Arong</td>
<td>do</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(14) Moirang</td>
<td>do</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(15) Ningthoukhong</td>
<td><em>Sel</em> (coin) and grass</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(16) Ngaikhong</td>
<td>do</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(17) Nachou</td>
<td>do</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(18) Leimaram</td>
<td><em>Sel</em> and Silk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(19) Kumbi</td>
<td><em>Sel</em> and cleaned cooking pot</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(20) Kha Thongjao</td>
<td>Pots and silk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(21) Bishnupur Thongjao</td>
<td>do</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(22) Chairen</td>
<td>Pot</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
(23) Kumbi  
(24) Sekmai Awang  
(25) Phayeng  
(26) Khurkhul  
(27) Sagolmang  
(28) Waikok  
(29) Andro  

Fig: 1.5 Tribute of the Loi to Maharaja (based on Higgins 1993:95-96 who again took the source from Palace Pandit-1926)

Thus, the Loi are the people who are (1) detained for rebellion or as war prisoner (2) banished for breaching customary law as incestuous mating (3) a group of people known commonly known as Chakpa and (4) some groups of immigrant.

Yaiithibi, another section of the Meitei are people once discriminated by the Hindu rule and looked after the sweepers to keep the palace clean and connected servile Naga sweepers and mochis (Hodson 1908: 70), wore blue cloth distinguishing from others. Yabirok, mother of Nonogta Laien Pakhangba first introduced Yaiithibi. Khagemba brought others from Sylhet (Higgins 1993: 83) They are still included in the list of scheduled caste distinct from Loi (Table 1.1)

The Loi villages included in the list of present scheduled castes are Awang Sekmai, Leimaram, Leimarm Khunou (Tairenpokpi), Kouruk, Kwatha, Andro, Phayeng and Khurkhul. But the present scheduled castes of Manipur are (i) Dhupi/Dobi (Hodson 1908:69 - The duties of the Dobi and Napat class are obvious at once) (2) Lois (3) Muchi, Ravidas (4) Namasudra (5) Patni (6) Sutradhar and (7) Yaiithibi.
Table 1.1

Districtwise distribution of Loi and Yaithibi in Manipur
(according to 1991 census report)

Total S.C. population in Manipur

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Both</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>37,105</td>
<td>18,806</td>
<td>18,299</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total Loi population in Manipur:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Both</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>29,037</td>
<td>14,409</td>
<td>14,628</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>10,949</td>
<td>5,425</td>
<td>5,524</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>18,088</td>
<td>8,984</td>
<td>9,104</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total Yaithibi population in Manipur:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Both</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1,101</td>
<td>635</td>
<td>466</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>231</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>870</td>
<td>488</td>
<td>382</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

i) Senapati District

Loi:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Both</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Yaithibi:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Both</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ii) Tamenglong District

Loi:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Both</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Yaithibi:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Both</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

iii) Churachandpur District

Loi:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Both</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Yaithibi:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Both</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

iv) Thoubal District

Loi:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Both</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>9,353</td>
<td>4,618</td>
<td>4,735</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>1,003</td>
<td>494</td>
<td>509</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>8,350</td>
<td>4,124</td>
<td>4,226</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Yaithibi:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Both</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>989</td>
<td>564</td>
<td>425</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>858</td>
<td>476</td>
<td>382</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

v) Bishenpur/Bishnupur District

Loi:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Both</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>2,224</td>
<td>1,094</td>
<td>1,130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>2,170</td>
<td>1,069</td>
<td>1,101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Yaithibi:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Both</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### vi) Chandel District

### Loi:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Both</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>209</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>208</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Yaithibi:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Both</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### vii) Imphal District

### Loi:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Both</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>16,785</td>
<td>8,325</td>
<td>8,460</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>7,111</td>
<td>3,494</td>
<td>3,617</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>9,674</td>
<td>4,831</td>
<td>4,843</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Yaithibi:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Both</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### viii) Ukhrul District

### Loi:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Both</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>205</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>205</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yaithibi</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Some other classes in the historic past of Meitei state were Kei, Phunganai, Tengkhal, Ayokpa, etc. Kei etymologically means granary. These villages of slaves which supplied rice and paddy for the Maharaja, was instituted by Khagemba (J.C Higgins 1993: 82) Their duty was ascribed as Keiroithou, their duty also include the supply of any article chosen by the Raja. The Kei villages and their own in charge are Thinungkei, Changangei, Mongsangkei, Wakchingei, Lansonbiki, Charangpat kei, Sekta kei, Koirengei, Tingrikei, Yairipok Ningthoumai Kei, Tampakmayum (in which there were fourteen minor subdivisions entitled Sanglen, Haomacha, Sangai Sanglen, Arongba, Akhonba, Loukhumla, Khudong, Sagon Sang, Pukei, Laikhong Siphai, Mapanthong, Brindabon Chandro Pujari, Duhol and Bhandari). The Keis of Chargaing Pat and Wangban Ningthoukhong, Thinugei were employed in the service of Govindaji (J.C. Hodson 1908: 70)

Phunganai or Minai Phunga (Mi = man, Nai = slave, Phunga = hearth) were bought slaves. The Phunganai of Maharaja were free slaves. The Phunganai was divided into Hidakhalba and Potsangba. Hidakhalba was called from his duty to attend the Raja’s hooka. The Potsangba spread the cloth for sitting on.

Tengkhal (Tenha = finish, Khanba = serve) were descendants of slaves. Of the Tenkhal, the chief duty was gardening. They sometimes hewed stones and made vessels of that material.

Ayokpa (or maintained) were described as Naga slaves who worked in the Maharaja’s garden. They had been settled in the valley by various Rajas, and supported by them for a time. They were allowed to cultivate one Pari (2.4 acres) of land and performed Lallup just as the Manipuris do.

At present, all the mentioned castes and classes are included in the Meitei Universe expect Ayokpa. However, Bamon and Pangal do not follow the seven clan system. But the Gotra relationship of Hindu embrace the Bamon and other Meitei. Pangal are at the periphery of Meitei universe as they follow Islam by religion. Besides, they speak Meitei Language as well as practise much of Meitei customary laws. So, in the present study, I include the Pangal also.