CHAPTER - I

PROLEGOMENA

1.0. Kinship: Definition

Kinship is the bondage of rights, obligations, privileges and restrictions with the members of the family of orientation and the family of procreation in an individual's span of life. The study of kinship relates several aspects of marriage, family and the expanding kinship circle in correlation with a person's maturational stages of growth in which language of kinship (kinship terms) plays a significant role. In India the kinship profile presents diversified cultures and kinship organisations, yet with defined specific features.

1.1. Marriage

Marriage marks the beginning of kinship organisation which is a preparatory union for procreation and subsequent lineal expansion of the concerned couple in progeny. A multipurpose view of marriage is expressed as 'a socially sanctioned relationship between a man and a woman involving economic cooperation and residential and sexual cohabitation' (Murdock et al, 1963/1965: 81). This harmoniously blended union involves prescribed allowances of behaviour patterns and makes up the household (without children in the initial stage). The primary function of marriage is reproduction and building up of nuclear family of cardinal kins and its recurring function results in the widening of kinship circle. As a group concept marriage is the reciprocal exchange
of two consanguineal kins of opposite sex of marriageable status in two families resulting in the mutual linking of the families by affinal relation and the specific kins by spousal relation.

1.1.1. Some basic concepts of Indian/Hindu marriage: Impact of religion on marriage, family and kinship.

Hinduism, the major religion in India is moulded out of the Indo Aryan, Dravidian and Austrloid contact of long duration. The Hindus as we know the people today represent the several invading tribes in the past such as Mediterranians, Negroids, Austrloids, Dravidians, Huns, Mongols, etc. and hence form a complex racial mixture. Quoting Schwitzer, Gopal Krishna (1972: 32) says that Hinduism proclaims 'reverence for life'. It is the codified law of reverence for manes, parents, husband, brother etc. under prescribed contexts, reverence for nature, food etc., i.e., for everything, viewed as a gift of God. In this ideal set up evolved out of primitive promiscuity Hindu marriage is ideally set.

1. Affinal relation - relation established through marriage of self or one's kins. Spousal relation in the narrow sense indicates husband-wife relationship, in the broader sense in addition, includes the affinal relation also.
2. Chatterji (1960) and Iyer & Bala Ratnam (1961) say that a pure race cannot be found in India or elsewhere in the world.
3. In India promiscuity was prevalent in the past. During vedic times adultery was not considered as a sin. The institution of marriage is attributed to Svetaketu (Gopal Krishna, 1972). The codification of the laws of marriage, family and kinship was fairly in line with the moulding of Hinduism and other religions in subsequent intervals of time.
under the caption as 'a religious sacrament in which a man and a woman are bound in permanent relationship for physical, social and spiritual purposes of Dharma, procreation and sexual pleasure' (Vatsyayan, 1971: 65).

The Hindu life or Indian life is governed by the laws found in the Sutras and the Smrtis. The Sutras are Srauta Sutras (laws for the Vedic ritual), Grhya Sutras (laws for the house holder), Dharma Sutras (laws for general human conduct) written mainly by Apastamba, Baudhayana, Asvalayana, Gautama etc. Smrtis which are also called Dharma Sastras were written by Manu, Yajna Valkya, Parasara, Katyayana, Apastamba, Vasishtha, Brahaspati etc. (Ghurye, 1932/1979; Kapadia, 1947; Karve, 1965; Gopal Krishna, 1972; Misra, 1982). The Sutras and Smrtis consist of minute details of religious sacrifices, familial rituals and rules of behaviour for different castes in different contexts (Karve, 1965; Kapadia, 1966). Some of the rules were related to hypergamy, inheritance rules for sons of intercaste unions (given by Baudhayana). Dharma Sutras and Vishnu Smriti (described by Brahaspati) give details on rights of women of polygynous unions (Ghurye, 1979).

1.1.2.0. Principal rules of marriage

In most of the communities of India some or other type of allowance is made for marital union, in the selection of spouse, which largely depends on 'kinship concept'. The individual represents a group of - family, clan, phratry, moiety, horde, tribe, caste, sect and religion (all groups may not be represented in
some cases). Hence in all communities with extreme cases of exceptions, some measure of exogamy or endogamy is found to exist. Kirkapatrik (1912) has stated that group exogamy originated from marriage by capture from another camp. Karandikar (1920) mentions 1359 distinctions of exogamy among the lowest Hindu castes in northern India.

The various levels of exogamy and endogamy described in Indian communities present a complex system giving rise to the 'Indian kinship area'. The following types of endogamy and exogamy are found to exist: (1) religion, (2) caste, (3) tribe, (4) sect, (5) moiety & phratry, (6) clan, (7) totem, (8) devak, (9) locality, (10) house name, (11) surname, (12) kingroup (inter and intrafamilial), (13) nuclear family.

1.1.2.1. Religion endogamy and exogamy

Religion endogamy is the universal rule. Currently inter-religious marriages are rarely taking place. During Mughal period a number of Rajput princes were married to Mughal emperors. Akbar's principal wife was Jodha Bai, a Rajput princess of Ambar.

1.1.2.2. Caste endogamy and exogamy

Caste endogamy is the current rule of marriage in India. The Aryans after moving from Punjab to the Gangetic plains evolved the four-fold caste system based on occupation as Brahmins, Kshatriyas, Vaishyas and Sudras as a full-fledged

system. Caste exogamy was widely prevalent as early as 500 B.C. (Ghurye, 1979). Case studies of hypergamous marriages were reported even in medieval period. One level hypergamy was widely practised during the Vedic period. It is reported that when the Aryans came to India there was scarcity of women and this might have given rise to hypergamous and hypogamous unions. Intercaste marriages of hypergamous nature were practised. Thus a daughter of a sage could marry a prince or vice versa. An individual belonging to the lower most caste could raise her caste status in a series of hypergamous marriages through the descending filials. Rajputs, Patidars, Kunbis (Nambudiris (till recently)) practise hypergamy. Hypergamous unions have ruined the families of Bengal where they had to pay heavily for each visit of the son-in-law, whereas such unions have enriched the Nair families in Kerala.

1.1.2.3. Sect endogamy and exogamy

Sect exogamy is prevalent in many communities. Intersect marriages are not permitted among the Saraswaths and the Gowda Saraswaths, among Protestants and Catholics and Shias and Sunnis among Muslims. Sect exogamy is practised among Rajputs, Banias, Patidars of Gujarat, Bhats of Himachal Pradesh where there are divisions to indicate hierarchical order such as / visas /,

---

6. Caste system apparently did not originate in India. Its origin can be traced back in Iran such as / athervas /, / Rathasthas /, / vastriya fshoyanta / and / Huiti /. (Gopal Krishna, 1972).
Among the Khatris, Kayasthas, Banias and Brahmins of U.P. the subdivisions are known as /dha:yi gh2R/, /ca:R gh3R/ and /ba:van ja:ti/ (Ghurye, 1979; Parmar, 1975).

1.1.2.4. Tribal endogamy and exogamy

Intertribal marriages are not common. A few cases such as Mudugas marrying Kurumbas (Nair, 1976), Muduga girls marrying Irula boys in Attappadi in Kerala are reported.

1.1.2.5. Moiety endogamy and exogamy

A community with two exogamous groups, each gives rise to a moiety (Piddington, 1950). There are multiclanal moieties which are equivalent to phratries. The patrilineal Todas in Nilgiris have dual organisation with exogamous moieties – the patrilineal paternal /tartarol/ and the maternal /teivaliyol/ (Rivers, 1903; Emeneau, 1967). Kanikkars have two exogamous phratries named /anann tambi/ and /maccambi/ with five clans in each group (Iyer & Bala Ratnam, 1961). Kurumba moieties are known as /tammayan tambi/ and /ma:man macca:n/. The two communities mentioned above distinguish between consanguineal and affinal kingroups linguistically though it is not possible to state with certainty whether linguistically and kinologically also they are aware of the same feature, especially moiety division. The Mudugas have two exogamous moieties each with two exogamous groups what may be called as phratries. Thus the /veluttiga/ marry from the /kaRuttiga/ and the /kuppuniga/ from the /a:ru:ra/. Angamy of Assam earlier had exogamous moieties.
and /pefuma/ now largely practise moiety endogamy. The weakening of the moiety exogamy is attributed towards widening of kin circle.

1.1.2.6. Clan endogamy and exogamy

The concept of clan is viewed differently by different scholars. English scholars consider it as a unilateral group totemism being added to it some time later. In some communities it is related to tribe. In America it is related to matrilineal clan and patrilineal gents (Lowie, 1951). Murdock (1960) isolates three features of clan as 1) unilineal rules of descent, 2) residential unity, 3) actual social integration. Of these the first one is the ideally fitting feature. The third feature is best suited for the caste group or larger kingroups. Hsu (1963: 61) considers clan is incompatible with families organised on conjugal principles, an extension of family and unilateral descent. He isolates features of Chinese clan as 1) name, 2) exogamy, 3) unilineality, 4) the core of sex (matri/patri), 5) use of kinship terms, 6) common property, 7) joint responsibility, 8) patrilocal residence, 9) shift of spousal clan for a woman after marriage, 10) benefits of education and public welfare, 11) ancestral worship, 12) clan ancestral halls, 13) codified rules for behaviour and 14) council of clan elders.

Of these many features pertain to whole community joint families rather than to a clan. Piddington (1950) opines that a clan should be necessarily a consanguineal kin group real or fictional.
In India the origin of clan is attributed to totem influence of non-Aryan people. The earliest names used for clans were probably *illam* in non-Aryan groups and *go:tra* in Indo-Aryan languages, denoting a house and cow-shed (Karve, 1965) respectively. It appears that local exogamy was the general rule before the introduction of clans in the northern zone before the influence of non-Aryan people (Karandiavar, 1920; Karve, 1965; Prabhy, 1958). In the northern zone the earlier forms of kin groups were termed as *kula*—the whole of patri family with residence at one place, *vamsa*—a successive link of descent from father to son (Karve, 1965). When the Brahmins moved from one place to another and learnt many practices of non-Aryans they might have adopted the clan system. A few centuries before Christ the whole of Brahmin gotras were formed into exogamous clans after the code of clan system formed by Baudhyana. According to Baudhyana 'a gotra is the whole group of persons descended from any one of the /sapta rsi/ 'seven sages' or Agasthya' (Karve, 1965: 52). Thus the eight gotras were named after Jamadagni, Gautama, Bharadwaja, Atri, Visvamitra, Kasyapa, Vasistha and Agasthya. Where Kula was a smaller kingroup, vamsa indicated princely clan and gotra—the priestly clan in their labels.

**pravara and gana:** As allied concepts of clan are pravara and gana. The term *pravara* originally meant reciting the names of spiritual saints in the yagas by brahmins who were later treated as lineal ancestors (Vatsayyan, 1971: 75) up to three generations
from ego which is continued till today. The earlier concepts of pravara later laid prohibitions for marital unions (Karve, 1965) though the saints were not real ancestors (Vatsyayan, 1971). This system was later accepted by the Kshatriyas also (Kapadia, 1947: 81-2). In Bengal pravara may be recited by Brahmins during the upanayana ceremony, sandhya (morning and evening prayer of a brahmachari) and sradhas (funeral rites) (Hsu, 1963: 81). This practice is also found among KG under study, during the upanayanam, marriage and sradha ceremony. Karve (1965) takes gotra, pravara, and gana as hierarchical descending subdivisions given by Bau-
dhayana. Not all of them are group concepts, gana is the last member (usually) of the pravara group, sometimes seniormost of the pravara, as can be seen from the listing in Karve (1965: 52-53). It can also be inferred that pravara also meant gotra ancestor. The reference to intercaste (aboriginals) marriages of Brahmins can be inferred from the gana names, as Yaksha, Vainya etc. Thus kula, pravara etc. were redundant features of clan (subunits) gana apparently indicated either case descendents or intercaste divisions of the gotra progenitor.

During the course of time clan organisation in India became more complex. The Brahmins were named after rshis, Rajputs mainly after sun, moon, snake and fire, kayasthas

7. Vatsyayan (1971) refers to this point by citing Kane, P.V.
8. Some of the gotras of KG suggest this intergroup mixing. (vide 2.1.2).
after territories, occupations and gotra (Karve, 1965) and Balahis after local names (Russel, 1975). The number of Brahmin gotras also increased up to 900 (Baudhayana, 500 B.C.) and even 1600 in 18th Century A.D. Gujars in U.P. and Punjab have 1178 gotras. Most of them are named after territories (Ghurye, 1979). In Dravidians areas clans are named after /bali/, /betta/, /bedagu/, /keri/, /kola/, /kilai/, /gatta/(Koya), /gumpu/(Kurumba), /manRam/(Adiyas), /illum/(Paniyar, Koravar, Malayarayar, Nambudiris etc). Clans are named after animals such as /a:ne/, /a:vu/ metals like /bangar/, gold, /belli/, silver, /intipe:ru/ house name, (Andhra) (Karve, 1953/1965; Hsu, 1963; Thurton, 1909/1975; Nair, 1976).

Clan Agamy: Clan agamy is the result of transition from endogamy to exogamy or the exogamous localised groups or localised lineage organisations due to dispersed clan organisations on account of expansion of population. Riang of Tripura were practising clan endogamy and marriage among children of two male sibs i.e., parallel cousin marriage, now practise clan exogamy and cross cousin marriage (Mukherjee, 1981).

1.1.2.7. Totem endogamy and exogamy

According to Niggemeyer (1933) totemism is present where definite group of human beings is set in certain relations to an animal or plant, a heavenly phenomenon or an object after which they are named and in connection with which views prevail that members of this group as such may not marry each other.
Ferriera (1965: 51) refers to four stages of totemism as 1) proto totemism, 2) clan totemism, 3) epical totemism, 4) formal social totemism. Totemism is traced back to Proto-Australoids (ibid: 129). Central India (Patrilineal), South India and Assam (matrilineal) are centers of totemism. Gonds are said to be the oldest bearers of totemism. Among Asurs totems which are of exogamous types, changed after three or four generations resulting in the removal of bar in marriage. However totems are fast disappearing in the tribal communities. It is said that in India the clan system originated from these totem concepts. Some of the totems bearing tribes are Ho, Kharia, Santhals, Birhor, Munda, Bhumiji, Savara, Gadaba etc. Gond totems are derived from flora and fauna, totem descent is noticed, totem taboo is observed and mourning for totem is also observed (Ferriera, 1965). Totemism which was prevalent in Kerala has now almost disappeared (Nair, 1976).

1.1.2.6. Local endogamy and exogamy

Local exogamy apparently is the earliest type of exogamy found among Aryans. In the epic periods distant consanguinal marriages took place which were locally exogamous in nature. Local exogamy which apparently was practised originally by princiely classes (Karve, 1965) later spread among other classes. In India in many cases a single area forms a single consanguinal group. Thus the Jats near Delhi in 20 villages form a single consanguinal group /dabas/, similarly Kayasthas of Bihor form
a single group /kul/; so also Ahirs of Punjab and U.P. (Ghurye, 1979). Munda in Madhya Pradesh, Nagas of Assam (Vatsyayan, 1971), Bhumiji of Orissa, Bihar and Bengal (Ferriera, 1965), Gujars in Khandesh (Karve, 1965), Khasis of Jaintia hills (Shanta, 1980), Kanikkars in Kerala (Mammen, 1942), Vishavans, Mannans (Iyer & Bala Ratnam, 1961), practise local exogamy. However, local exogamy is not a salient feature in marital relations as a rule in most of the communities in Kerala.

1.1.3. Kingroup endogamy and exogamy

Below the level of clan, pravara, gana etc. there are the typical kingroups or central kin-groups, the union of which is allowed or restricted in marriage. Under this category several subcategories are found. The subcategorisation on generational basis is done into two. The concept of division on generational basis of marriage rules suggests that there is a generation gap between kins in consideration for marital union or there is no generation gap between kins in marital union (parallel generation). Thus the two main sub categories are 1) intergenerational marriages and 2) intragenerational marriages.

1.1.3.1. Intergenerational marriages.

Intergenerational marriage i.e., between parent or equivalents with child or equivalents, either cross or parallel, is a union generally disfavoured or prohibited in many communities in India. Extreme promiscuity is reported among Alars and Arandans between father and daughter (Nair, 1976). Marriage with MB
is the prescribed rule in Tamil Nadu, Karnataka, Andhra Pradesh but prohibited in Kerala (Karve, 1965; Sreedhar, 1980; Prabhoo, 1981). Cross uncle niece marriage is also practised by Maharashtriyans, Nagars (Karve, 1965), Saraswaths (Katre, 1970), Jains (1980), Mharatha Raos (in this study). The Mharatha Raos in this study form a sample comprising two exogamous clans /cava:n/ and /doRkaR/. Inter generational secondary marriage as an inheritance is practised among Sema Nagas, as the son marrying the widows of his deceased father except his mother, a person marrying his son's widow, marrying FBW etc., (Sreedhar, 1983).

1.1.3.2. Intra generational marriages

These types of marriages involve sibligual marriages such as cross cousin marriages and parallel cousin marriages. As remarriages the main types are levirate (junior/senior) and sororate. Of these cross cousin marriage is the widely prevalent form in south India. In north India marriage outside the kin group is the present prescribed rule.

1.1.3.3. The system of no cousin marriage in North India

In north India within the range of seven degrees from father and five degrees from mother of the kingroup marriage is prohibited. The four gotra rule (F, M, FM, MM)/the three gotra rule (F, M, FM)/one gotra rule (ego's gotra) lays the barriers of consanguineal kins and prohibits marriage unions (Karve, 1965).
1.1.3.4. Cousin marriages

1.1.3.4.1. Cross cousin endogamy & exogamy.

Cross cousin marriage is the general rule in South India. Bilateral cross cousin marriage is practised among Todas (Emeneau, 1967), Kurumbas, Gowda Saraswaths (Lalitha Bai, 1977, Prabhoo, 1981), Kurmis (Bahadur, 1977). Marriage with MBD is the most preferred union among Dravidians in general as among Nairs, Cholanaickans (Nair, 1976), Aruvas (Thurston, 1975), etc. The Bagdis (Bahadur, 1977), Bhandaris (Thurston, 1975) prohibit cross cousin marriages. Bisexual siblingual (exchange) marriage is obligatory among Vishavans, Ulladans and Uralis (Iyer & Bala Ratnam, 1961).

1.1.3.4.2. Parallel cousin marriage

Parallel cousin marriage is generally disfavoured among many communities. Parallel cousin marriage is favoured among Muslims especially on paternal side, is the most preferred union. Marriage with MZO is practised among Jews and Gowda Saraswath Brahmins (rarely) in Kerala (Lalitha Bai, 1977).

1.1.3.5. Nuclear family endogamy & exogamy

Nuclear family endogamy is considered to be a most sinister practice. Mythical case of the sungod marrying the morning or Ushas is reported by Karve (1965). Real case of brother marrying sister is reported among Alars and Aranadans in Kerala (Nair, 1976).

9. Karve (1965) cites Summer & Keller reporting twins marrying in Bali. Manu, the father of mankind is said to have married his daughter. Lowie (1961: 104) refers to brother-sister (Sib marriages) in the Pre Columbian Peru, Hawai and Egyptian Royal families. Hopkins (1980) refers to uterine sib marriages in Roman Egypt as early as 2000 B.C. which later spread among the commoners by about 3rd C.A.D. Greeks allowed uterine sib unions while Athenians allowed half sib unions.
1.1.3.6. Widened circle of sexual freedom

Some communities living as a group have no specific rules for sexual behaviour. The Yanadis of Andhra Pradesh have no significance attached to kinship. Their marital union is of mating type. They do not mourn on the death of their near kins. Lapcha and Rong (Bahadur, 1977) allow extreme sexual freedom. Nayak women in the Himalayan countries lived a life of prostitutes and recently only they have started adopting regular marriage practices. (Kapadia, 1966).

1.1.3.7. Premarital unions

Premarital unions are prohibited in most of the communities in India. However tribal people under prescribed conditions in some cases allow premarital unions. Ulladans, Valluvappulayans, Irulas etc. allow premarital relations (Iyer, 1981). Among the Bison Horn Marias marriage takes place when the girl becomes pregnant. Dormitories (mixed or separate) are found in many tribes of eastern, central and southern India. The dormitories of Nagas are known as /morung/ (for boys), /yoo/ (for girls), /kinchuki/ (Angamy Nagas), /gitora/ (the dormitories of Mundos and Ho of Madhya Pradesh), /gotul/ of Gonds, /khotul/ of Marias, /dumkhuria/ of Oraons (Vatsyayan, 1971), /ca:vadi/ of Muduvans and /ambala/ of Kurumas (Nair, 1976). The dormitories not only serve as a sexual training centre but also and more than that as a 'University for tribal socialisation and military training' (Iyer & Bala Ratnam, 1961, Vatsyayan, 1971).
1.1.4. Types of marital relations

1.1.4.1. Monogamy

In regarding the evolutionary aspects of marriage, the initial stage of marriage is envisaged in a group of males marrying a group of females (Wester Mark, 1921). Modification resulted in the reduction of the number of contacting individuals resulting in the formation of customs of polygyny, polyandry and finally to monogamy, the most widely spread practice among civilised people. Though plural unions were reported in ancient India, monogamy was held in high endeavour (Kapadia, 1966). Among primitive people monogamy is practised among Andamanese (Mukharjee, 1981), Cholamaickans, Eravallans, Nayadis (Iyer, 1981), and also among Paniyars of Kerala (Nair, 1976). Lowie (1961) while referring to monogamy among Hopi and Canella says that the exact reason for monogamy is still a dilemma.

1.1.4.2. Polygyny

In India polygyny marks male power and prestige and polyandry (either in matrilineal or patrilineal communities) marks female power (Majumdar, 1961). Religious factors also favour polygyny, for example absence of male children may necessitate remarriage without divorcing the first wife. Muslims also favour polygyny on religious grounds. In ancient India polygyny pre-

10 C. Sreenivas (1984: 50) opines that wealth promotes polygyny and poverty, prompts remarriage. This assumption is largely true but depends on attitude and culture of people.
vailed among princely and priestly classes. In Indian tribal situation 81% are polygynous. (Mukherjee, 1981: 41). Naga tribes Kuricyas, Mudugas etc. practise polygyny. Miris, Dophlas, Khamtis, Singhpas, Mishimis also practise polygyny (Dutton, 1960). However polygyny is fast disappearing in India.

1.1.4.3. Polyandry

Early references to polyandry are made in the Rig Vedic hymns (1600-1000) (Singh, 1978), Vedas and Brahmanas (Karve, 1965; Kapadia, 1966). Parmar (1975) says that polyandry was practised among Aryans and Meads. In Himalayan countries polyandry is attributed towards poverty (ibid; Majumdar, 1961). The polyandrous unions often cut the barriers of caste and religion by the establishment of pseudo kinship /dharma atmya/ 'god relative' (Parmar, 1975; Sarkar, 1980). Parmar also refers to groups of brothers marrying groups of sisters, brothers marrying individually and sharing the wives collectively. Vatsyayan (1971) erroneously reasons inability of woman to the practice of polyandry. In India polyandry indicates undoubtedly female power and in the Himalayan countries where women are a tremendous help to men economically, as a hard working group. For this single reason Sherpa girls are married very late (Ortner, 1979). Polyandrous unions arose also due to scarcity of woman (ibid) due to female infanticide as among the Todas (Riverse, 1906). The principal regions of polyandry in India are north eastern and south western where this practice is pre-
valent among Bhotias of Laddakh and Sikhim, Bhtags, Kanets, Rajputs and Koli of Himachal Pradesh, Khasa and Kolte of Jaunsar Bhavar in U.P., Monpas of Komeng and Gallongs of Sinag districts in Arunachal Pradesh, Chakmas of Tripura (Dubey, 1980); Todas, Kopas and Coorgs (Karve, 1965; Kapadia, 1966; Sreenivas, 1980; Dubey, 1980) Uralis (Iyer, 1981), Aranadans, Malayarayans (Louiz, 1962). Mukherjee (1981) however says that polyandry is insignificant in India (apparently when the Indian population is numerically considered). Polyandry however confused with the practice of lending the wives as found among the Eskimos (Lowie, 1961: 114) or lending wives to entertain the guests as among the Kurumbas or sequential marriages practised by the Nairs often labelled by various scholars as polyandrous unions (Prabhu, 1981).

1.1.5. Termination of marriage and remarriage.

In India divorce and remarriage are generally discouraged. Among Muslims where divorce is relatively frequent, the following types of divorce are found, viz., talaq-e-Ashram, Talaq-e-Hasan, Talaq-ul-widst, jihar, ita, uyan, Khula mubarat. Muslim divorce though liberal makes distinction between men and women (Vatsyayan, 1971). In many castes and tribes divorce is frequent. Among Labanas, Swangalas etc. divorce is affected by breaking the thread, wool or cloth (Bahadur, 1977).

1.1.5.1. Remarriage.

Two types of remarriages are found: 1) remarriage due to spousal death, 2) remarriage due to divorce.
1.1.5.2. Remarriage due to spousal death

In India in many communities remarriage due to spousal death is prohibited. As a rule remarriage is allowed for men after the wife's death. Widow(er) marriages in India reflect two factors of kinship: 1) remarriage as an inheritance, 2) remarriage as a re-establishment of kinship.

1.1.5.3. Remarriage as an inheritance

Many tribes in India inherit the widows of their father (except the mother) along with other properties. e.g. Sema Nagas (Sreedhar, 1983). Remarriage with the brother's or the son's widow is also commonly practised. 11

1.1.5.4. Remarriage as a re-establishment of kinship

As a re-establishment and retention of terminated marital union due to the spousal death in a family levirate and sororate are practised, Levirate is largely a practice of northern India. Levirate is practised among all castes in Gujarath (Karve, 1965), Jats, Gujars and Ahirs (Sreenivas, 1980), Kanikkars in Kerala practise both types of levirate but prohibit sororate, whereas Eravalans, Kanaladis, Cihhittans etc. prohibit levirate but allow sororate. Adiyas prohibit both types of remarriages (Nair, 1976).

11. Remarriage with the son's wife was practised in Medieval Mongol period. Inheritance of widows is found among African tribes also (Lowie, 1961).
Muslims (UM) in this study allow junior levirate but prohibit senior levirate.

1.1. Eternal wifehood

/sati/ the practice of woman burning alive on the funeral pyre of the dead husband especially by the Rajputs originated in the third century A.D., raised the status of women. This practice also known as /jauhar/ was abolished by the British Government in 1829. (Kapadia, 1966). In the above case and a women died when her husband alive is considered to be bestowed with eternal wifehood /sunnanéali /status.

1.1.7. Celibacy

Celibacy is an opposite concept of married life. People on one's own accord may rarely choose a life of sanyasi. Celibacy as required by particular caste or creed is found all over the world. Among the KG in Kerala, the Swami - a member of the caste is selected on prescribed requirements (who has a sanyasi yoga on his horoscope and who willingly accepts this honour) leads a life of celebacy which indicate complete detachment from his kinfolk.

1.1.8. Extra marital relations

Three types are found: 1) concubinage, 2) prostitution, 3) cisisbelism.

1.1.8.1. Concubinage

Concubinage is a legalised form of cohabitation which differs from marriage in that it implies a considerably lower
status of the female partner and her offspring than enjoyed by the legal wife (Malinowski, 1964: 942). In India in many societies concubinage was allowed till recently and even now the custom exists in many communities. Among KG keeping concubines was a prestige marker among rich people. However children were not accepted in the family. Among the KG the origin of concubines is attributed towards the outcaste of girls who were not given in marriage before puberty.

Another type of concubinage /devadasi/\(^{12}\) prevalent particularly in South India was in relation to the dancing and singing girls. The /devadasi/ system in India encouraged the concubines of temple deity who were known as /tevadiya:/ in Tamil Nadu /basavi/ in Karnataka, /bo:gam/ in Andhra Pradesh and /devadasi/ in Kerala who generally excelled in music and dance. In some temples in Coimbatore the /tevadiya:/ live as wives of temple god and the temple god observes pollution on their death (Thurston; 1975). The devadasis were highly honoured in some places.

The Raj Gond wife is accompanied by two or three girls who are later kept as concubines of her husband (Bahadur, 1977).

\(^{12}\)Despite the prohibition of devadasi cult, over 4500 devadasis are dedicated to the temple Goddess Ellamma in Karnataka this year (Qureshi: 1983).
1.1.8.2. Cicisbeism

Cicisbeism or tolerated extramarital relation of a married woman (Piddington: 1950) as a marker of friendship, kin intimacy, hospitality or sexual tolerance is practised among Todas (Rivers; 1906), Khasas, Gurkhas — selling their wives (Kapadia, 1966), Aranadans (Nair, 1976), Kurumbas (Lalitha Bai, 1977). Of all these tribes, the Himalayan tribes exhibit a loose moral system.

1.1.8.3. Prostitution

Marriage and prostitution stand poles apart, the latter subject to criticism, contempt and prohibited by law. Concubinage and prostitution are both practised as professions which are generally hereditary in nature. Nayak women in the Himalayan countries (Kapadia, 1966), Beria women of central India (Russel & Lal, 1975) live(ed) a life of prostitutes. In Kumbabā in Kerala there is a separate temple for prostitutes where a large number of prostitutes on festival occasion gather around to pray for the smooth running of their business (Divakaran, 1968).

1.1.9. Modes of marriages in India

The following types of marriages were and are current in India (Karve, 1965; Ghurye, 1955; Iyer & Bala Retnam, 1961; Sreenivas, 1980; Singh, 1981).

1. Brahma marriage — the ideal type where a girl is given in marriage to a learned and gentle bridegroom.
2. **Prajapatya marriage:** A daughter given in marriage to a bridegroom with simple blessings.

3. **Arsha marriage:** In this case a *rshi* (sage) marries the girl usually a kshatriya.

4. **Baiya marriage:** Girl is given in marriage to a yajna purohit.

5. **Ausra marriage:** Bridegroom pays money and other articles and marries the girl. This custom is the widely current one in lower castes and tribes in India.

6. **Gandharva marriage:** As the name indicates the custom of gandharvas marriage, the ceremony performed after the sexual relations or with the knowledge of couples only which was later adopted by the humans.

7. **Rakshasa marriage:** Women as a prize of war captured forcibly from the relatives and married.

8. **Paisacha marriage:** Most sinister type of marriage where sexual relation takes place with a sleeping or drunken woman without her knowledge.

Of these only 1 and 5 are widely prevalent. The present day modes many of which are found among tribals are also of the following types.

9. **Probationary marriages:** In this case relation will be only temporary and after sometime will be made permanent as found among Kukis (Majumdar and Madan, 1956).
10. **Temporary marriages**: While the Sunnis among Muslims admit permanent marriages, Shias accept a temporary form of marriage called *muta* which requires the fixing of the period from one day to several years and fixing the mahar of which the first is important. According to this system males are permitted to enter into inter-caste and interreligious marriages. The *muta* marriage do not permit succession of offsprings thus born but the children may have share on their parent’s property. The *muta* marriage prohibit /talaq/ (divorce) for women. *Muta* marriage was practised by the Kerala Muslims with Arab traders in the past (Puthan Kulam, 1977).

11. **Marriage by service**: In this case bride and groom serves at the bride’s house for sometime. This type of marriage is found among many tribes like Kuvi Kandh (Banerjee, 1969), Paniyar, Paliyar, Mannans (Nair, 1976), Kurumbas etc.

12. **Marriage by elopement**: In this case marriage takes place only after the elopement of the couple to some place. eg., Irulas of Kerala.

**11.10. Group marriages**

The early concept of group marriage is said to have evolved from a state of promiscuity. In the early concept of group marriage all members of a generation married all female
members of the same generation forming the 'typical concept of polygamy (fusing of polygyny and polyandry). The present reference to group marriage relates to the system where a group of couples undergo the marriage ceremony in a single gathering often comprising a single local or communal group. Among the Vaniyas in Kerala group marriage takes place on fullmoon day after the Pooram festival once in a year (Rama, 1976). Agaria marriages take place once in five or six years (Russel, 1975). Among the Dhimars of Central India marriage takes place once in several years where the couples are said to have to undergo the ceremony once in their life (Russel and Lal, 1975). Among Mharatha Raos and Muslims in this study sometimes two or three marriages take place at a time. Among the Raos it decrease the rate of dowry.

1.1.11 Age of marriage

Adult marriage was the rule in ancient period. Later after the rise of caste system early marriages preferably before puberty for the girls became a strict observation. Among KG girls who remained unmarried were declared as outcasts together with her family till the beginnings of this century. Even now prebirth and child marriages take place in some of the tribes of the Himalayan countries. In Kerala among the lower castes early marriage after puberty is the current rule. However among the educated and civilised communities adult marriage is the rule. Sherpas, Nagas etc. marry late (Dalton, 1960; Ortner, 1974; Haimendorf, 1976).
1.1.13. Emblem of marriage - wifehood

Among the Brahmans vermillion and the marriage badge is the principal emblem of marriage and wifehood. Among the Nairs, Ezhavas etc., there are no specific emblems for marriage though they have the marriage badge. Among the Koravas the tali is tied for the first marriage only. For Nambudiris bronze/brass bangles are markers of wifehood. Iron bangles among the Gadabas, a small stick of 6 inches' height on the head among the Banjaras (Russel, 1975) serves as the marriage emblem. Black bead marriage badge is the most widely prevalent type among many castes and tribes of Maharashtra, Karnataka, Tamilnadu even among the Muslims (Tamil and Urdu speaking group).

Girls with closely cut hair represent the unmarried Naga maidens (Haimendorf, 1976). Nambudiris (girls) are prohibited from using jasmine flowers before marriage.

1.1.14. Marriage reform acts in India

Due to the social disapproval some marriage practices have been abolished in India.

The long practised custom of child marriage was abolished by the Sarada Act of 1929. Hindu Marriage Act of 1955, 'the most far reaching reform......a self contained code on the subject of marriage.......affects more than 83 percent of population-Hindus .......(Iyer & Bala Ratnam, 1961: 153) prescribing several pre-vilages in marriage within reasonable limits. The salient
features of this Act are classified Hindu marriage into a) void b) voidable and c) valid.

2) Fixed the minimum age of marriage as 15 for girls and 18 for boys.

3) Provision for monogamy.

4) Divorce under prescribed conditions.

5) Prohibited uncle niece marriage and allowed cross cousin marriage.


1.2.0. Family

The word 'family' is derived from the Roman word 'familia' denoting fellow lodgers of a hotel or labour camp (Lowie, 1961: 215). A family is a social group consisting of two adults of opposite sex, who are married to one another with their own children or adopted (Murdock, 1965: 83). Minimal unit of family concept is the nuclear family consisting of one or more children with their parents. A recently married couple living under the single roof without a child does not constitute a family but is a house hold (Murdock, 1950). A family without children at all can be called a null family (Lalitha Bai, 1977), since it lays barriers to the expansion of kinship through descent. A family without a father or mother (deceased) is known as a defective family. A substitute may fill the gap (ibid.). For sub nuclear and polygynous families refer to chapter on link component (Ch.5).
1.2.1. General traits of the family

Instability distinguishes it from lineages. When considered in relative measure of intensity of bondage, the nuclear family undergoes frequent additions, deletions and sometimes replacements, expands and thus loses its identity resulting in the formation of secondary, and sub nuclear families. Two or more families nuclear constitute the secondary families, the widely prevalent type in India.

1.2.2. The concepts of lineage, residence, and inheritance located in the family set up

The kinological concepts such as lineage, residence, inheritance, and family are closely connected.

1.2.2.1. Lineage

Lineage is closely or specifically related to descent. In clanless communities they roughly relate to lineage system. Thus a whole village form a lineage group among Garos (Burling, 1963:23,176) have two lineage groups in a village among Kuvi Kandh (Sanerjee, 1969), Ho (Das, 1953:12-3) with their own burial ground and meeting places.

1.2.2.2. Residence

One of the extra familial, but interlinked features redundant with family features is that of residence and inheritance/succession. Broadly speaking patrilineal families are predictively patrilocal and patriarchal and the matrilineal
families are matrilocal and matriarchal. Males have lesser power in the matrilineal families and the females have lesser power in the patrilineal families.

Mukherjee (1981:12-3) gives the following five combinational structure in his study of the tribal communities in India.

1. Patrilineal structure with patrilineal residence and descent.
2. Matrilineal structure, descent, inheritance and matrilocal residence. eg., Garo (any daughter), Khasi (youngest daughter). Married children move out of their house.
3. Matrilineal structure, matrilineal rules of descent and inheritance on avunculinal or patrilineal line, eg.; Rabba of West Bengal, Kadar, Kanikkar, Urali etc.
5. Patrilineal structure inheritance and residence and bilateral descent. eg., Dhimasa of Kachari, Patri clans (seng fong) and matri clans (jaddi) for males and females (Ghosh, 1965). Other types are parilineal structure, descent residence and dual inheritance as found among the Muslims in Kerala. The matrilineal Khasis of Jaintia hills adhere to neolocal residence except the heiress daughter (Shantha, 1980:143). Sherpas (Orther, 1979), Dhimasa (Ghosh, 1965), Apa Tami (Haimendorf, 1962) follow neolocal nuclear family residence pattern.
1.2.2.3. Inheritance rules:

Varied and curious types of rules of inheritance are prevalent among the different communities in India. Among the Sanghpos eldest son receives the estate with titles and the youngest son personalities but the middle sons have no right on the property but serve only as assistants (Dalton, 1960:12). Among the Brahmins the rights connected with familial ceremonies goes to the eldest son in the absence of his father provided he is married. Inheritance of widows of father except the mother is found among Miris and Sema Nagas (Dalton, 1960; Sreedhar, 1983). Among the Khasa in the absence of male issue under the Otali system in Tehri state the property of the deceased person along with his daughters goes to the Raja (Kapadia, 1966). Among Coorgs group inheritance is the rule, okka being the patrilineal agnatic group and joint family (Sreenivas, 1965). The GSB females inherit the spousal clan after marriage and subsequently adopt a name (Lalitha Bai, 1977). The Kuvi Kandha male and female change their name after marriage (Banerjee, 1969). The youngest son of the Sherpas (Ortner, 1979) and the Badagas (Thurston, 1975) inherits the house. Muslims in Laccadives inherit on maternal line /valliya:yca sottu/ and also father's self owned property /vya:ya:yca sottu/ (Ittaman, 1976). In Epic days men were known after their ancestors and woman after place names. Biological seniority is also a parameter in inheritance where in Ammini Islands either the uncle or the nephew become the successor (Ittaman, 1976).
1.2.2.4. Codified laws on inheritance: Ancient rules

Hindu law of inheritance administered by the British was based on the commentaries on Smriti and Sutra literature by Vijaneswara from Andhra Pradesh and Jimutavahana from Bengal, on Yajnavaalkya smriti and Manu smriti (Karve, 1965). The commentary of Vijaneswara is called /mita:ksara/ or measured words and that of Jimutavahana is known as /da:ya bha:ga/, or division of inherited property. /mita:ksara/ is the rule followed in the whole of India except in Kerala, Bengal and eastern Bihar where /da:ya bhaga/ rule is followed. Ownership in the sense of inheritance is related to the 'principle of ownership by death' as laid down by Jimutavahana. As a correlating principle a man can give away his property when he is alive. Vijnaneswara spoke on the principle of /janma swatava:da/ 'ownership principle by birth'. Kapadia (1947) gives a compact account of the inheritance laws laid down by various ancient scholars like Visveswara, Madhava, Nilakanta, Balambhatta, Devanabhatta, Kautilya etc. which includes various types of kins for the rights on their predecessor's property.

It can be seen that the two rules of inheritance were based on the concepts of kinship. Vijnaneswara might have considered wife as the sapinda because as she is adopted in the family of the husband after marriage and thence she is treated as the ascendant by the agnatic members of the family.
1.3.0. Kinship

Levi Strauss's (1945:45) evaluation of kinship terms as an arbitrary concept is envisaged in that a kinship system does not consist of the objective ties by descent or consanguinity that obtain among individuals, it exists only in human consciousness, it is an arbitrary system of ideas not the spontaneous development of a factual situation and is psychological in nature. The lifelong dependence of nature of kinship is reflected on Firth's statement that 'kinship is the rod on which one leans throughout one's life. According to Barnes (1964: 403) two persons are considered kin to each other when they are recognised by the bonds of descent or marriage whether real or fictional which is a caption with a fairly wider coverage.

1.3.1. Category of kins

According to the linking nature of the cardinal kin, kins may be categorised as primary, secondary and remote. The diversity of terminology and the intensity of intimacy is inversely proportional to the increasing number of links in the kinship establishment taken for granted as a general convention. Kinship ties are strengthened by the organisation of joint family due to several reasons as attaining higher education and thus getting better jobs outside the native place, has created a sort of

feeling of independence and a like to build nuclear families even if chances otherwise are given. It has also helped on the other hand to strengthen the kinship bond between the members of the nuclear family. The concept of tribal communities are also fast vanishing since all societies have a crave for better conditions and independent living in life.

1.3.2. Puberty ordeals as related to kinship

In many societies in India even now a puberty is an important event in the girl's as well as her kins' life. Puberty ordeals are celebrated with pomp perhaps with greater importance than marriage among the Mharatha Raos and the Koravaa of Kerala (the communities under study). The GSB and the UM at present do not give much significance to the event. Among the MR if the betrothal takes place before the girl attaining the expenditure in connection with this ceremony has to be met by the fiance.

As regards males the ritual initiation ceremony is obligatory but with differing modes among many communities especially among the Brahmins, Muslims, Jews, Kshatriyas etc.

1.3.3. Birth and death as related to kinship

One of the obligations and restrictions related to kinship is in relation to birth and death by way of the observation of the pollution by the prescribed kins and other persons of society. Kapadia (1947) gives the rules laid down by
ancient scholars like Sureshvara, Asvalayana, Gautama, Manu, Vishnu, Ya:jnavalkya, Vasistha etc. with their diverse opinions on the inclusion of the category of the deceased for kins and non-kins as the guru or a student and also on the sex, marital status and the age of the deceased kin. The Nambudiris observe pollution on the death of kins on maternal side where for KG the pollution is observed for the death of agnaric kins only, purely reflecting patrilineal structure. The Nambudiris reflect a wider circle of consanguineal group by the observation of pollution on maternal kin's death. The duration for death/birth pollution in the IA communities and especially among the Brahmins are the same, for ten days and 16 among Dravidian people. The impurity of the birth as related to the child and mother and sometimes father changes in different communities for its duration usually three months in most of the Brahmin communities and 28 days in the Dravidian communities. Mala Pandaram father and the Bison horn Maria father observes pollution on the birth of a child. Apart from the observation of the pollution complex cultural practices are prevalent among communities in India. In the patrilineal communities the son and in the matrilineal communities the nephew or the niece is the chief mourner on the death of the deceased person. Among the KG the after rights of the deceased could not be done by a consanguineal if the father or the mother of the particular person, or equal status to the deceased, is alive. Among the Nair the deceased are buried if their
parents are alive, against the general rule of cremation. Among the Kurumbas, the eldest widow of the deceased ties a lock of her hair to the toe of her deceased husband. Group burial rites are performed for all dead tribal members once in 10-12-years. Among the Kurumbas, the eldest widow of the deceased ties a lock of her hair to the toe of her deceased husband. Group burial rites are performed for all dead tribal members once in 10-12-years. A Gamalla father brings the fire for the cremation for his son. On the death of the kin, among the Bishnois in Central India and many castes and tribes of Kerala, the kins put a piece of cloth on the corpse before cremation. Among the Gonds in Mandla the brother-in-law and the sister-in-law of the deceased shave off their head after ten days of death of the kin. Gifts are to be made by the kins at the time of birth, death and other important functions of familial life of an individual by the kins. Among the KG presentations are not obligatory by the consanguineals at the time of marriage, and at the time of death affinals make presentations of cloth to the chief mourners, a custom found among the Coorgs also (Sreenivas, 1965).

1.3.4. Language of kinship: Its relation to kin relations

A world-wide peep into the terminology of kinship will convince the reader how amazing is the diversity of language of kinship with community specific patterning yet exhibiting the terminological universals. Thus very limited number of terminology may be found in English, an elaborate system of terminology may be found as in Japanese or Indo-Aryan languages.

---

14. Information availed from the talk given by the Tribal Development Officer in the Department of Linguistics.
Sex distinction of the ego may not be a specific restriction in the IA languages but sex of the ego is a distinctive feature in the selection of the terms in many languages of South India (Dravidian), Japanese, Australian, African, Central American and South American languages and also in the languages of eastern tribes of India. The distinction of the selection of ego as male for some tribes as in Mikirs, Dravidian, Australian is found in ascending generation of kins and sex may be between kins of parallel generation or it may be a reflection of ego as father and child as in the Australian languages (Scheffler, 1976, Bhattacharya, 1970). Distinction of the terminology for kins according to sex category of the same type is the general feature of many communities. In many communities like Australian and two instances in this study of Mharatha Raos and MN, MK and MM sex neutralisation of the opposing kins is generic feature and also found in Persian generic terms, Dravidian, Australian, African and Malayan languages (Batoni, 1973). To indicate generation levels some terminologically use numerals as in Latin and Greek while some others use other modifiers. In many communities terminology is correlated with kin organisation but some of the terms are deceiving which in many cases can be historically explained.

1.4.0 A brief account on the works done in the field

There are a number of studies done in the field of sociology and anthropology without giving importance to the
terminology of kinship or treating them only as a supplementary data at the end of the work, in India and abroad. About these studies a number of references have been already made (about kinship) in the earlier discussion.

1.4.1. Anthropological and sociological studies of kinship terms

The terminological study of the kinship within the perspectives of anthropology, sociology, psychology, or linguistics is only a century old. Different scholars attributed the terminology of kinship either as compartmentalised phenomena as purely sociological, psychological, biological, linguistic etc. or a complex of reflecting the multicomponental structure of terminology. The foundations for the terminological study of kinship was laid down by Morgan (1871) in his paper of 'systems of consanguinity and affinity of the human family'. He grouped the terminological system into classificatory characteristic of the American Indians, Dravidians and the Polenesians - the so called uncivilised terminology, and the descriptive characteristic of the Aryan, Semitic and Uralic communities - the stock of civilised terminology. This division was later criticised by scholars like Krober (1909), Murdock (1949) etc. but clarified by the Radcliffe Brown (1952). The greatest contribution of Morgan to the field of terminology of kinship which still live green even to this day are 1) a suggestion for a common point of departure for the two great families of the world, 2) the compact kin network with ego as the locus
point with types of kins around him, 3) the structural evolution of kin terms from the descriptive to compound terms. He however had not noticed a further structural evolution into simple terms (which has been explicitly discussed in the present work in the historical component). It becomes also doubtful that whether a community can be said to be as civilised or not on the basis of terminological structure as in the sense given by Morgan. Kroeber (1909) isolated eight principles which he labelled as psychologically conditioned. The principles isolated were 1) generation, 2) collateral & collineality, 3) relative age, 4) sex of the speaker, 5) of the kin, 6) sex of the transitional kin, 7) consanguinity & affinity and 8) the condition of the relative as dead or alive. Though he held the view strongly that kin terms are primarily a psychological and then a linguistic phenomenon, a major portion of the paper deals with the sociological or kinological aspects. He also assessed that long term inferences cannot be drawn from kin terminologies. The psychological component in the present study explains how the kin terminology is conditioned by psychological factors and how it elaborates the ideas put forward by Kroeber. His conclusions on historical aspects however have been found to be not valid and Morgan's statement that kin terms are linguistic fossils stands for the truth has also been proved in this study in the historical component. Kroeber later (1952) admitted sociological forces also in the kinship terminology.
Rivers (1914) supported Morgan's view and modified his dichotomous division to descriptive and denotative which were related with family, kindred and clan respectively. He proposed that kin terminology mirrors social phenomena and refined the information on cousin terminology social structure and genealogical approach. Kroeber's earlier principles were later started appearing in the label of social set up (rather kinological set up) in the works of succeeding scholars. Sapir (1916) pointed out that bifurcate merging terminology results from the operation of livirate and also pointed out that multifactors are responsible for kinship nomenclature and thus only partly explainable on the sociological grounds. Lowie (1917) pointed out that a recently borrowed custom may not have a proper term and a term may survive even if the custom is lost. Lowie also pointed out the correlation of residence change and terminological change. Similarity to terms also correlated with terminological partial equivalence (Lowie, 1929), may indicate coincidence, proximity (M=MZ), participation (Z=FBD), analogy (M=M) or immateriality (Murdock (1960:136).

In England Malinowski and Radcliffe Brown were the founding fathers in this field of study. Malinowski (1913), (1935) emphasized the family as the basis of kinship organisation. He considered sexuality, marriage, family and clanship are interrelated in one integral institution - the procreative institution of mankind and parenthood as the basis of social structure. His studies on the Australian tribes and
the Trobriand Islanders made him to believe that the concepts of genetic father and sociological father changed as per the needs of the societies in concern. This made him to become a strong functionalist and to consider that language is mere a tissue of words and realities are different. His extremist psychological approach, Freudian in nature has been criticised by Fortes (1971). His most frequently referred book on 'Psychology of kinship' never appeared. Later studies were mostly on the sociological aspects. Early dichotomous divisions were modified into several types of kingroupings. Lowie (1929) and Kirchoff (1932) classified the terminology on the parental basis or generational basis. While Lowie named them after the regions Kirchoff merely gave them symbolic signs such as European (E), Hawaiian (C) Seneca (D) and the first category unnamed (A). This was based on the equivalence of terms. Later Spier (1925) gave 8 types of cousin terminologies. Murdock (1960) further categorised this system on the cousin terminologies. Lowie and Kirchoff's model was followed by Radcliffe Brown (1931). Taxon Fox (1937) said that methods of classification differ not only in the tribes of the same linguistic stock but even in those which are closely related where the actual terms are practically identical. A number of studies followed in England by the students of Malinowski such as Firth on Tikopia (1936), Warner on Murngin (1930), Eggan on the plains of Pueblo Indian groups (1932), Hallowel on Ojibva (1937), Fortes on Tallensi (1942), Spoeehr on South eastern
tribes (1941, 1942, 1944) contributed to structural and functional approach. The influence of residence for the emergence of unilateral organisation was earlier pointed out by Titiev (1943).

Levi Strauss (1944) approached the system of kinship from different angle. He considered kinship relations between brothers-in-law is the axis around which kinship structure is built and thus adds the wife's family also to the family unit. All kinship structures are constructed on this kinship atom primarily by the organisation of a series of opposites between attitudes of familiarity and reserve. It is an arbitrary system of representations not a spontaneous development of real situations (Lowie (1963:52). Murdock (1949/1960) surveyed 250 families of the world. His conclusions appeared in the form of a set of postulates and a set of derivative theorems (30) with four synonymous propositions based on 12 assumptions (pp.138-76). His study covers a multicomponental structure of the earlier studies. The term sociological as applied to the study is used in a narrow sense as applicable to the kinship organisations.

Emeneau (1954/1967) discusses on the Toda terms and dual descent, and persons as named after clans as in AO Nagas (Sreedhar, 1983) isolates the features of relative age, generation, sex, etc.

Karve (1950) dealing with the kinship terms of Karnataka says that while the northern system of kinship makes an extension and expansion of kinship terms in India, the southern system—the Karnataka system stands for the strengthening and consolidating the already existing system. The kinship structure which is patrilineal and patrilocal prefers uncle-niece marriage as the most preferential union, which is supposed to be a pre-Dravidian culture, possibly Austric. Other studies on Dravidian/Munda kinship are also done by Dumont (1953), Radcliffe Brown (1953), Moody (1959), Bhattacharya (1971) which are not directly referred by this author. Information was collected by cross reference. Same is the case with respect to the studies on kinship by the authors Das (1955), Goswami (1960), Bose (1962), Kocher (1963), Kar (1974), Bernstein (1975). These studies were referred in Mukherjee (1981).

Fortes (1957, 1971) reviewing the studies of Malinowski consider him as an extreme functionalist and his psychological approach rather unfavourable to sociologists.

Reduction and change in terminological system attributed towards sociological changes have been one of the outcomings of many studies as in Kodama (1962), Prindle (1973), Peng (1975), Lalitha Bai (1977), Prabhoo (1977), Claus (1978), Prabhoo (1982), Öster (1982), etc.

Kinship terms in the community life and family life were of central concern of study in Friedrich (1964, 1967). Intergene-
rational marriages and cross cousin marriages with two degrees removed have been found to be typical of some Australian tribes as revealed by the studies of Falkenberg (1962), Munn (1965), Scheffler (1978). Partial studies on the anthropological outlook are done on Kuvi Kandh by Banerjee (1969), on Garo by Burling (1970). Burling (1970) for the English kin terminology takes H/W as the basic terms with ego taken as zero. Some of his categorisations seem peculiar such as taking grandfather as the basic term on the fitness of derivational capacity.

Katre (1970) deals with the Konkani speaking Chitrapur Saraswaths (a subset of KG) refers to one degree removed uncle-niece marriage, the influence of Kannada and Tulu on the terminology and different types of kin terms as address endearing terms. Thampuran (1973) makes a sociolinguistic study of the six communities (Nambudiris, Kasatriyas, Nairs, Ezhavas, Christians, Muslims, Harijans) and measures the relative affinity of the communities in terms of terminology, where Nairshad the highest percentage frequency of terms (78%) and least shared terms for Brahmins and Muslims. Other preliminary studies on kinship are made by Thampuran (1975), Nair (1975) on Adiyas, partial study of Paniyas (1976), Rajendran (1981) on Irulas in the anthropological outlook.

Claus (1978) in a study of the Tulu speaking Billavas and Bants isolates sex of the speaker and the kin, generation, etc, parallel and cross kins cover terms in the terminology of kinship.
Joseph (1980) on the Konkani Kudumbi terminology says that the terminology is infected by neighbouring terms. Nair and Velappan (1980) makes a sociological study of kin terms of the Muduvas in Kerala. Sreedhar (1980) in a study of Dravidian terminology in Kannada, Telugu and Malayalam ascertains that because of the merging relations due to cross cousin and uncle niece marriages, merging terminology emerges out. Mukherjee (1981) in the study of Indian tribal kinship organisation of 68 tribes found that denotative systems are typical of the tribes of Gujarat, Uttar Pradesh and Bihar, Orissa, Madhya Pradesh, Nagaland and Kerala are specifically classificatory. The terminology of Arunachal Pradesh, Meghalaya and Mizoram have a mixed system. Average number of terms was found to be 27.82%. 85% of the tribes are clan exogamous, 80.39% follow polygyny. Tribes are also classified according to residence inheritance and descent. Terminologically the tribes are classified as belonging to the Eskimo, Crow, Omaha, Iroquois, Hawaiian etc. Suseendira Rajah (1983) in a sociolinguistic study deals with the Jaffna Tamil kinship terminology. Sreedhar (1983) found correlation of kin terminology to marriage practice among Sema Nagas & clan exogamy among Ao Nagas. The earlier classification of the communities on the basis of terminology with the nature of similarity or dissimilarity of terms and kinds, first on parental generation & then on in
cluding further generational levels for the suited cases had gradually given way to another method of analysis based on Krober's (1909) principles → the technique of componential analysis. The general work of the componential analysis is derived from the linguistic theory and the kinship vocabulary is regarded as constituting paradigms which can be analysed in the same manner as the paradigmatic sets in the language. Good enough (1956) says that a significatum of a linguistic form is composed of those abstract contextual elements with which it is in association, without which it cannot properly occur. Its connotata are the contextual elements with which it is frequently but less than perfectly associated. Significata are pre-requisites while the connotata are probabilities and only the former have definite value. He further explains that a paradigm as any set of linguistic forms whatever their shape, which signify complementary sememes, may be said to belong to the same paradigm. It can be seen that the cases of multiple complementation are even (without the narrow analysis of semantic interpretation) more than in the linguistic analysis (Lalitha Bai, 1977:26).

Launsbury (1964) adopts generative grammar model approach. The resulting formal account specifies a set of primitive elements and a set of rules for operating them to generate a generative model which represents the empirical data. Thus the equivalence rule system was introduced which he tested for the Crow and Omaha kinship terminologies. The basic rules posited by him of the generative nature were 1) skewing rules,
2) merging rules, 3) half sibling rule. Both Lounsbury's (1956) and Buchler's (1964) work is based on the strict genealogical data. Conklin (1964) illustrates the steps which may be taken from ethnographical description to final analysis. The sequence from specific, general, abstract correlational sub statements are described in the Hanuoo ethnography. Greenberg (1966) in a partial study while discussing the language universals takes the contrastive features as marked and unmarked for the isolation of the kinological features. The unmarked category indicates the neutralisation of the sex category. He enumerates that there are 2 possible enumeration of terms with speaker and hearer as male/female or both. Romney (1965) takes an analogous approach parallel to that of phonemic analysis as the three step procedure viz., 1) listing all the geneological kin types in the special notational form, the list of all the kin types all following each kin term may be each called the range of that term, 2) reduce the range of each term to a single notational system – this is equivalent to the phonemic analysis, 3) define the significant and minimal difference among the reduced ranges of kernels. This method was later adopted by many scholars like Tyler (1972) on Koya kinship terminology, Brown (1973), Casson (1973). Lounsbury's equivalence rules were modified later by scholars like Scheffler (1978, 1980) with increased number of equivalence rules. Breitborde (1979) also followed a similar approach. Shanta (1980) in the terminological system of kinship of the Khasis in the Jaintia hills has
attempted a study in the componential framework. The main parameters are: 1) lineage, 2) generation, 3) nuclear/non-nuclear families, 4) cover terms, 5) vocatives indicative of respect, 6) the distinction between the kins of self and others 7) relative age difference. In addition many distinctions are drawn for the terminology as those used by stars. Many types distinction for a single kin, synonyms for kins, third level of birth order found in relative age as indicated in the Japanese terminology (Prindle, 1973) and also in the present study in the U. Lounsbury extended his study of kin terms to the metaphorical extension of the terms in (1969), and Kronenfeld (1973) also made a study which involve the non-kin categories also. Kronenfeld (1976) following the methods of Romney has modified the generative structure by the reduction rules which were found to be effectively workable on the computers. His work has also made use of the insights of Harris (1951) and Chomsky (1957). Longacker (1969) approaches the problem in a transformational framework. Kay (1974) also adopts a similar method and says that it bridges the gap between the generative and the anthropological approach.

1.4.2. Mathematical studies in kinship terminology

Earliest Mathematical approach to the study of kinship terminology was made by Galton (1889). Later White (1963) tackled the problem in the axiom forms. Shukla (1971) on the kin terms in Ashtadhyayi of Panini takes up a generative model
with sex, mode of relation and generation in the bundle of basic features. Peng (1975) has made a statistical analysis of Japanese kin terms. Siromony (1976, 1979) in a partial study deals with the kin terms in the framework of matrix. Prabhoo (1977) used a distinctive feature analysis represented in the deep structure in a preliminary study of the KG. Lalitha Bai (Alias Prabhoo, 1977) in the study of the kinship terminology of KG in Kerala in a sub communal study adopts a mathematical model for the generation of links designated by the respective terms in which the eight cardinal kins linked in ordered levels are generative of all the chains permutative and combinatory type characterized by reciprocity, duality and pattern congruity. The numerical value of possible generation of chains of links for the generation of terms are also represented. Separate rules are given for the generation of chains of links named as 1) rules of link, 2) role shifting rules 3) expansion rules with their subcategories. Lambe & Lambek (1981) on the terminology of the Malagasy of Mayotte adopts a mathematical approach with sex category kept distinct.

1.4.3. Linguistic studies on kinship terminology

Linguistic terminological studies within the framework of the structure of kin terms also have been made. Kroeber (1909) first pointed out that kin terms are a linguistic phenomenon also. Gifford (1922) expressed a similar view. Lowie (1932) and Davis & Warner (1937) structurally divided the
terms as elementary, derivative and descriptive. Emeneau (1953) says that Dravidian kin terms primarily occur as syntactic constructions - the inalienably possessed ones. Inalienably possessed kin terms are also found in Mikirs (Pakrasi, 1955), Guinea (Spears, 1972). The inalienably possessed terms are derived from body parts in Dravidian (Caldwell, 1913) and also in Guinea. Inalienably possessed terms are also found in Tsimshian society (Tlingit, Haida, Kwatiku) where terms are also distinguished for the sex category of the kin (Dunn & Dunn, 1972) as in Many Dravidian languages like Tulu (Claus, 1978), Malayalam (in this study), among the Mikirs, Malay speakers (Greenberg, 1966) and widely spread among the Australian tribes (Scheffler, 1978). Neutralisation of the sex category of the terms is characteristic of Sema Nagas (Sreedhar, 1983), African Bantu speakers, Malay speakers (Greenberg, 1966), Japanese (Prindle, 1973) and also in Kitkatla (Dunn & Dunn, 1972). Levi-Strauss (1958/1964) compared kinship terms as analogous to phonemes in Linguistics, that like phonemes they are elements of meaning, acquire meaning only in integrated systems and are arbitrary units. Madan (1963) said that Kashmir kin terms are so lengthy at times and hence can be effectively generated though he doesn't give any method for generating the terms. Morphological studies of kinship also done by Thampuran (1973), Bateni (1973), Prindle (1973), Lalitha Bai (1977) in the linguistic component made a correlative study of kinological markers and linguistic markers developed from Lowie (1932) and Davis and
Warner (1937). Kala (1981) also did a similar analysis.

1.4.4. Psychological studies on kinship terms

Though the psychological aspects of kinship have been pointed out earlier scholars like Kroeber (1909) studies in this line are negligibly few. Apart from Melinowski discussed earlier, in 1937 Tax pointed out that psychological mechanisms are involved in the grouping of the kin terms by the process of reasoning and association. Hull (1943) pointed out that the psychological processes such as discrimination and generalisation underlie the mechanisms of terminological distinction and partial or full similarity. Murdock (1960) said that the extreme psychological aspects of kinship and terminology is not of much concern in a sociological study.

1.4.5. Historical studies on kinship terminology

Karve (1953/1965) has made an extensive study on the kinship organisation of India a multipurpose study on the sociological/kinological/etymological and historical aspects of the kin terms in India from informations based on the Vedic data to the present. The categorisation made on the regional basis as northern, central, southern, and eastern covering the Indo-Aryan and the Dravidian to a larger extent and the Austro-Asiatic languages to a lesser extent. Ghurye (1955) examines the sociocultural and linguistic aspects of kinship of the Indo-European and the Indo-Aryan with special reference to the Greek Latin and Indian culture. Gates (1971) examines
the Greek terminology of Homeric period and reconstructs the PIE terms and society. Historical study of Dravidian kinship is made by Trautmann (1979).

1.4.6. Multicomponental studies on kinship terminology

Multicomponental studies in its earlier forms appeared in Murdock (1960). Lalitha Bai (1977) has approached the problem in the multicomponental set up beginning with the link component system giving the skeletal frame work of kinship structure, then the feature component dealing with the basic features of kinship largely developed from Kroeber (1909), Lowie, Murdock etc. The sociological component dealt with the extensional use of kin terms and also the historical aspects. The linguistic component dealt with the correlation of kin terms to extralinguistic kinological aspects the units isolated to indicate extra linguistic aspects. In the present study the components are neatly isolated with extensive modification of the chapters in 1977. The present work clearly isolates the link component, kinological component, sociological component, psychological component, historical component and linguistic component. The biological component and the ethnosemantic component in the deeper sense however are not incorporated in this study and hence the scope of the study is limited to this range. These aspects are referred in other chapters (Ethnosemantics here in the deeper sense means the ethno-diversity of the terminological system such has how communities view the world
linguistically in different structures such as in some communities the term for husband is that for a male, in some other communities it means the householder, and in some communities it means a caste name. Such details are not dealt in the present work in detail).

Review of studies on kinship terminology have been made by Lowie (1929), Lowie & Eggn (1964), Barnes (1968), Shapiro & Schiffman (1975). General account on Indo-Aryan and Dravidian kinship and terminology has been made by Prabhoo (1981).

1.5.0. Aim of the present work

Aim of the present work is to give structural descriptions to:

1. Skeletal frame work of the kin links as to the formation of various kin relations, in chains for the terminology;
2. Basic kinological features;
3. Sociological features;
4. Psychological features;
5. Historical aspects and
6. Linguistic aspects of the kin terms, within the set up of the six communities, viz., Konkaní speaking Gowda Saraswath Brahmins, the Mharathi speaking Raos, the Urdu speaking Muslims, the Malayalam speaking Nambudiries, the Karavas and the Muslims in Kerala mainly in the traditional set up which is still survived to a greater extent.

The first three communities are linguistically and culturally
migrant communities in Kerala, and the second set of three communities form the native stock (though the Nambudiris are a migrated community long back, they have adopted the native language and are now known as Malayali Brahmins). The categorisation is roughly made into Hindu/Muslim and further subcategorisation as Brahmin and non-Brahmin. The study is not strictly a comparative one on the one to one correspondence sense but comparison is made wherever possible. The study aims to bring out the structure of kin terms in various disciplines as applicable to the six communities under study.

Details of methodology and procedure are given in separate chapter and inclusive of the details of selected informants. The mode of collection, transcription of terms etc.