CHAPTER 2

ETHNOGRAPHIC PROFILE OF SETTLEMENT
IN KERALA AND MINANGKABAU

2.1 BASIC PROFILE AND SOCIAL STRUCTURE OF KERALA

2.1.1 Environment

Kerala is the smallest state in the southernmost tip of India. It is bordered by Arabian Ocean to the east and Western Ghats mountain ranges to the west. It is a straight strip with an elevation of 63m/ 205ft high of from sea level. William Logan (1901)\(^\text{19}\) called it Malabar, which meant land between Mountain (Mala -Sanskrit) and Sea (Bar-Arab). Politically it is administratively bordered by Karnataka State to the north and Tamil Nadu State on the east.

Kerala is drained by 44 rivers, backwaters and canals. The ranges of Western Ghat mountains that block the south-western winds flowing from Arabian Ocean to mainland causes frequent rainfall, and providing suitable climate for cultivation. The soil is laterite which is good for agriculture and building construction.

\(^{19}\) William Logan (1901) was the British Governor for Madras Presidency who wrote "Malabar Manual", which has been main reference for researches and discourses about Malabar area in Kerala.
2.1.2 Dweller Characters

Most of authors writing about Kerala agreed that by legend the native people of Kerala are identified as the “Naga”. The Kerala Maahaatmyam, written in Sanskrit and the Keeralolpatti (Keerala Ulpatti = origin of Kerala) written in modern Malayalam, contained the traditions, story and history of the people and places, with regards to the legend of Parasurama (in Logan, 1901). The legend itself implied multilayer clues for some possible scheme of evolution of people and places. Earlier Kerala was inhabited by the indigenous people, the Naga, who were clustered in hamlets
presided by a chieftain. They designation of “Naga”, as native of Kerala, highlight the union of new comers which were depicted as Brahman-Aryan lead by Parasurama with the native people. When the Brahmin came to Kerala, they started an organization which operated in such a way that these hamlets with their hereditary chieftain submit their allegiance to the Brahman, and established tenure relations (kannam) between the villagers and Brahman. This structure made up two classes of society, the janmies or proprietor of land and the kudiyans or tenants or slaves (Iyer 1968; Aiya 1989). The coming of these Brahmin is supposed to be observed as narrations of social migrations which later brought about conceptual understanding of origin and social structure of the settlement and culture of the Malanadu.

The legends of migrations had been supported by historical facts and findings on trade routes between the east coast from Kaveripumpatanam and Ponammi River on the west coast and evolved urban centers such as Calicut, Palakkad, Coimbatore, Kanchipuram.

Anthropologically, the principle of tribal social organization, as explained by Kerala Khrisna Iyer (1968), was a reaction toward natural response. Each family or clan had been established into a separate political unit, depending on their own natural sources, and on which base they develop their culture. After a length of time, the scattered enclaves of habitation perform competitions and reconciliations that consequently established polarity of the more powerful society and the inferior society; the leading society and their groups. The institution of “man of prowess” is reflected in

---

20 The descriptions was elaborated in state manuals in Kerala (Aiya, 1989, Logan, 1901, A Menon, 1901) the studies has been elaborated by Khrishna Iyer, (1968) and Geneviève Lemercinier (1979).
22 The discussion regarding Agrarian Territory in South India has been thoroughly studied by David Luddens (2002) and morphology of settlement analysis based on toponym of places by NM Nampoothiri, (1998).
23 Matison Mines (1990) elaborated and called it as phenomenon of “Big-Men” or “men of Prowess” as central to South Indian politics.
the roles of karanavar (taravad care taker). Some common names for chieftain were kannikars, pannikars and moopan.

2.1.3 Settlement Formation

Historically the formulations of settlements in Kerala were an evolution of clan-habitations. The characters of the clan-habitation follow the environmental characters of the places. The basic premises of clan-based village or congregation of villages leaded by hereditary chiefs had not been changed since 9th Cent.-19th. The final traditional set up of early stabile settlement was a congregation of several villages governed by a chieftain, usually assisted by council of dignitaries of the village. Iyer described this set as model of pre-Aryan settlement. The structure was unlike classical composition of Indian village which was based on caste groupings, but by natural enclaves and later professional distinctions formed in each enclave (Kerala Khrisna Iyer 1968). Traditionally they sat in the common hall of the villages, Chavadi, which sometime functioned as dormitories for the male members.

Among all clans, Maduram has been described as matrilineal. Authors writing about earlier formulation of settlement generally did not differentiate Kerala and Tamil Nadu, except Namputhiri (1988). He stated that due to different environmental situation the social-spatial groupings or clustering in Kerala had been more sufficient of the Tamil Nadu.

Genevieve Lamencier (1978,1981) and G Arunima (1978) articles provide the transformative logic of villages organizations.

Topological code which took the natural regions, such as: Kurunji, Palai, Maduram, Mullai, and Neythal, had been discussed by Shreedara Menon, 2005, K.S. Sing, 2002, Lamencier, 1979

The settlement formation and the parallel position of chieftain and council of elders is discussed thoroughly by Khishna Iyer K Iyer, (1968), pp. 118-12S

The studies on clan-base social formation in Kerala had been elaborated by Lemercinier based on poetry and literatures during Sanggam period (1979), and historical review on Kulasekharma during 9th century, (1981)
Anthropologically, Khrisna Iyer explained that the first tribes who laid the foundation for an organized society had been the Neolithic period or the Dravidian who, either alone or by long isolation, had developed distinct humanity (Iyer 1968). Iyer explained that the earliest villagers in Kerala were those founded by Dolichocephalic Austroloids, who called themselves the “son of the tree (Iyer, 1968).

Geneviève Lemercinier (1981) explained that the formal formulation of settlement had been set up during the raise of Chera kingdom as polity in the first Sangam period kept the existing clan type organization, but seems to be advanced for security needs. It was described as military-based organization standing parallel with organization called desham (village) headed by a desavazhi and its larger sphere of confederation, nadu (confederations of villages or provinces) headed by a naduvazhi. Later this formulation had been disrupted by the conquest of Chola Empire in the 11th AD on Chera. Chola was by then attempting a vast empire which would unify all elements and remains of Pandyan kingdom, the Ceylonese kingdom and the Chera Empire or all the political units which were engaged in commercial activities. With this as a basis they established trading posts all along the coasts of the Bay of Bengal, Malaysia, Indonesia and Indo-China. The intermittent wars made their power more vulnerable.

Lemercinier explained that during the 12th C, the old Chera dynasty had completely disappeared and over-layered by small principalities (swaroopams). It made the fourteenth and sixteenth centuries as critical phase of polity formation in Malabar. From the 12th to the 18th century Kerala appeared as agglomeration of more than forty swaroopams, more or less united by ties of vassalage to three larger political units, the kingdom of Venad (later known as Travancore), the Perumpadappu swaroopams (later known as Cochin), and the Nediyiruppu swaroopams –later known as
Zamorins of Calicut. By the end of the 13th Century on the ruins of the old Chera dynasty the Nambuthiris who had been initially responsible for the temple lands (oorala), proceeded to establish themselves as single landed proprietors with hereditary rights - the jenmis. It developed a structure where illam, or extended Nambudiri family, had been the jenmi, and the Nayar taravad had been the tenant. Initially the function of oorala had operated as an assembly rather than single role individual or family. The Historians agreed in seeing in this as the final success of Aryanization (Lemerciner 1981)\textsuperscript{28}.

William Logan noted that in 15\textsuperscript{th} -17\textsuperscript{th} century the selling and buying land were common in Kerala thus change the social profile of Kerala villages. The roster of items had included canals, washing places, roads used by persons, streams, forests with deer, desham, desadhipatyam (authority over the desham) amsam, thanalam (title), ankam (battle wager), chunkam (customs duty) with everything else\textsuperscript{29}. This indicated an extreme partializing process from the earlier more integrated set up.

2.1.4 Social-Spatial Organization of Clan in Kerala

Tara is practically a term for indigenous Dravidian village nevertheless some accounts and studies associated tara with certain community and caste, the Nayar\textsuperscript{30}. In the case of Nayar community it has been called tara-Nayar. Nayar been introduced in general as ruling and martial group. They maintained kavu (temples) and kalari (martial training centre) institutions which was traditionally inaccessible for the non-nayar

\textsuperscript{28} The elaborations on monarchical regime which was overcome by the structural model of the Nambudiri had been discussed by Lemenciner (1981)

\textsuperscript{29} Elaborated by William Logan, in Malabar Manual (hereafter Malabar ), Madras, 1887, Deed 15, 1622, II, appendix XII, xxxii-iii), as cited by Lemenciner (1981)

\textsuperscript{30} The concept of tara as settlement unit has been described briefly by Panikkar (1918, in Mencher 1969, p. 145), A. Menon, (1995, pp.62,262); and Logan (2000, p. 88). And it has been discussed at length by J. P. Mencher (1969)
community. The social unit of the Nayar is taravad. Taravad is people sharing common traceable ancestress through mother’s line (Gough 1973).

Basically whether the Nayar is a caste, a community or caste had been so far regarded as vogue by scholars. The doubt regarding the constituent of Nayar people was exposed by Joan P Mencher (1969). KS. Singh (2002) introduced various categories of Kerala people which did not put Nayar as a general category. Velalla community migrating from Tamil Nadu to Kerala has been also considered to be Nayar. They had been described as paddy-farming clans who had been expert in irrigations. Some authors observed that the Nayar represented intermediary community between the Brahmin and the non-Brahmin society which characteristically practice matrilineal descent rule (Rajeevan 1995). They had been in general indigenous landowners and rulers. Widely accepted social category under the Nayar represents traditional professional group. Kiriathil Nayar, Sudra Nayar, Charna Nayar, Athikurussi Nayar, Velakkatala (barber), Velutedat Nayar (washer). Under the Charna Nayar there are Akath Nayar (the accountant, generally distinguished by the title Menon), and Rurath Charna (army)\textsuperscript{31}.

2.1.5 Social-Spatial Organization, Tara and Taravad

Uchiyamada drew a Model of symbolic space to conceptually describe spatial hierarchy in a Nayar Village, on base of village organization that operated subservient exchanges where the society of the lower stratum rendered services to the superior one. The model describes overlapping spatial hierarchy between: 1) the Nayar or taravadi, 2) The Brahmin, and 3) the low worker community, or taragas or the mainstream society. Landscape is arranged in hierarchical way and concentric configuration, the

\textsuperscript{31} Interview with Dr.PRG Mathur, Mathur village, Palakkad, Kerala, September 2009
periphery land where paddy is cultivated, gradually to the center is the landholder lease and the apex landlord.

**Table 2.1. Hierarchy of spatial organization of settlement and house**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scope of Organization</th>
<th>Territory</th>
<th>Social Institution</th>
<th>Leader</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>house</td>
<td>Veedu/ taravad</td>
<td>Tavazhi</td>
<td>Karanavar (male)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Household</td>
<td>Taravad compound</td>
<td>Taravad</td>
<td>Karanavar (male)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Settlement unit</td>
<td>Tara</td>
<td>Tattakam</td>
<td>nattukutam</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Confederation of settlement</td>
<td>Desham</td>
<td>Taras</td>
<td>Desavazhi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Confederation of larger</td>
<td>nadu</td>
<td>Desham and tattakam</td>
<td>naduvazhi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>settlement / kingdom/</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>spiritual sphere</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Summarized from Panikkar (1918), Menon (1995) and Logan (2000) and Mencher (1969)

Conceptually the model stand on a sequence that has been argued by Uchiyamada (2000) and Nampoothiri (1988). The first native had been aborigine was considered as community of the lower class or polluting caste when the various immigrant castes came to settle in the region. At the initial stage, these communities had been established individually but scattered in loose proximity. The new migrants came filling up the gaps in between these aborigine communities, including the Brahmins. This has been one reason the Nambuthiri Brahmins habitations always laid on fertile plain, while the aborigine lived in higher platform. Traditional institution of social spatial organization can be described as Figure 2.2.

---

32 The thorough discussion had been done by Uchiyamada, 2000
33 Elaborated by Uchiyamada (2000), and Nampoothiri (1988)
Tara-Nayar as a settlement could not be seen in isolation from other settlement units or taras. There is structure that connects a tara with its larger and its sub-level organization, and bound them as a corporate. A tara performed a tribal government under a council – natukuttam or kuttam. A kuttam is congregation of male-leaders (karanavar) each representing a joint-family house-hold (taravad).

A tara is composed of matrilineal joint-family compound (taravads) representing a clan unit sharing common ancestress. The term taravad refers to an un-partitioned matrilineal family group and to common traceable ancestress (see also Gough I96I: 307-308). Each taravad represents a clan and is led by a maternal male leader (karanavar). Physically it is composed of ancestral house and supported by architectural structure such as kulam and kulapura (bathing pond and its shelter), nelpura (detached granary), cowshed,

---

34 The concept of Kuttam has been elaborated by Aiyama (1981, p. 249).
35 Discussion at length has been done by Gough, Mencher 1966, pp. 141-143 with reference to Kuriyan and Menon in Mencher, 1968)

---

Figure 2.2 Model of symbolic hierarchical space of Nayar settlement with regards to gift-giving paddy production and distance Pollution.

Source: Uchiyamada (2000)
pattipura (gate-house), kalapura (additional house), family shrine, naga worship and kavu\textsuperscript{36}.

Over-layering the tara had been the organization of tattakam. It is believed to be a spiritual sphere under the custodian of a Bhagavaty kavu (temple), metaphorically described as “sphere under the gaze of Bhagavaty”\textsuperscript{37}. The boundary of tattakam is not territorially clear, because in principle a community generally belongs to a particular temple (kavu) which had been the landmark of their cluster, but due to migrations the community could be dispersed to different places. The custom is that each taravad traditionally observed regular attendance to a particular temple which can be in the neighborhood or somewhere distant from their domain. Therefore member of taravad is considered the “slave of the temple” (adimakavu). The state of Adimakavu legitimates social affiliation of the family to particular location of mythical origin or ancestor. There were usually one or two temples in each tara-Nayar, and often in addition a kalari for military training (Mencher 1968, p. 144).

Desham was described as the territorial unit of the larger administrative and military system centered on functions of high-court, assembly hall and treasury building\textsuperscript{38}. It was an administrative organization that over-layered the traditional organization. Several taras belonging to different communities had been generally organized under a desham. However the extent of desham and tara had been dynamic. Generally a desham contained one or more tara but some accounts noted that several desham could constitute tara\textsuperscript{39}. Each desham had certain ceremonies,

\textsuperscript{36} The study regarding spatial configuration of landscape in Kerala village centered in Kavu and its caste-based hierarchy has been studied by Yasushi Uchiyamada (2000).
\textsuperscript{37} Interview with local informant, N Ravi Shanker (March, 2009)
\textsuperscript{38} Interview with local informant, N Ravi Shanker (March, 2009) in reference toward Aythiamala text explaining Chittur Desham
\textsuperscript{39} The discussion about the sphere or desham and tara and their relation has been elaborated by Mencher,( 1966).
institutions and traditions. The organization of desham had historically undergone through many transformation in scope and size, followed by changes of terminologies. Lastly the term desham was altered into ansam by British government.

If taravad is maternal joint family compound, veedu is residential building. Veedu has various typologies. Single hall structure (ekasala) is the most common, found almost 80% all over Kerala (Thampuran, 2001). Thampuran also postulated that single hall house or ekasala was the elementary structure from which the more complex structure is designed.

Nalukettu is the most well-established structure of veedu. In nalukettu the quarter which contains ara, generally laid on western or southern corner is considered auspicious. All living activities such as dining, learning, reading, sleeping, relaxing and praying is done around the courtyard (nadumittam). The interior is physically centered to a courtyard and a middle room of the western or southern quarter. This room is called ara and was used for storing grain store. In front of ara daily prayers were conducted. Generally, the female quarter, water source and kitchen are located in the most auspicious positions, the north-east corner.

In the nalukettu quarter of sala which contain ara-kalavara is considered to be auspicious. Courtyard or front yard is the navel of house for the ritual marked by basil plants- tulasi. It became point of reference in placing particular functions and utilizing particular spaces. Nalukettu (single-courtyard house) could be multiplied to make double courtyard house or ettukettu and quadruple courtyard house or Patinjarukettu.

40 The accounts and observations regarding residential architecture of Kerala has been supplied by William Logan, (1887); Samuel Mateer, (1883); K.P. Padmanabha Menon, (1914); Stella Kamrich,(1953), Ronald Bernier, (1986), and Miki Desai (2002). The more analytic studies and observations has been done by BTS. Prabhu (1998), and Ashalatha Thampuran (2001).
Practically, *ara* is a raised structure, standing on a 4-5 feet high platform. In a large compound, granary could stand as singular building, namely *Pattayapura* – granary-house. It also functions as storage for temple property and or treasury. It can be situated among paddy field, as collective storage near village temple, outside the *taravad* compound or somewhere in south and southwest side of the compound.

### 2.2 BASIC PROFILE AND SOCIAL STRUCTURE OF MINANGKABAU

#### 2.2.1 Environment

Minangkabau a region and ethnic located in West Sumatra province on the western side of Sumatra Island, Republic of Indonesia. West Sumatra is a province with 42,297.50 square kilometer. It lies between the North Sumatra province to the North, Riau province to the East, and Jambi and South Sumatra to the South. It is located on the island of Sumatra which is one among 13,000 islands that makes up Indonesia. Its most distinctive feature of Sumatra Island is the Bukit Barisan mountain range, which stretches from the north-western to the south-eastern tip dividing the island into two unequal parts: the narrow western coast and the wide eastern half comprised of hills and the alluvial lowlands from where, short rivers run down the steep western slopes toward the Indian Ocean and Strait of Malacca.

The asymmetrical location of Bukit Barisan mountain range and the dissimilar relief of the western and eastern halves of Sumatra (Figure 2.3) brought effect to Hydrology. The high mountains form the watershed of Sumatra. The communities with the greatest economic advantage and the largest settled population from the later prehistoric period onwards were the highland farming groups, in this case the Minangkabau people.
In early century of Christ, Sumatra had been main destination for gold source for the trans-Oriental Mediterranean and Indian trades, and much later since 5th Cent AD became well developed into transitory ports of trade and missionary traffic between India and China. A Hindu kingdom of Srivijaya had been established in Palembang, Sumatra and reached its full cultural development in the seventh century after Christmas. Joel Kahn (1981) suspected that when the ancient trading empire of Srivijaya flourished and Minangkabau peasants had combined subsistence agriculture with market network controlled by Srivijaya kingdom for centuries. Later the kingdom of Malayu arose as rival of Srivijaya on the site of the present Minangkabau land. It later appeared as Minangkabau kingdom when viceroy from Java came and established it.
By middle of the sixteen century, Minangkabau had been under Mohammedan influence, and the kingdoms had been through upheavals that finally reestablished as Pagaruyung kingdom. This kingdom still symbolically exists as reference to cultures of the Malay’s world, which covers territory as far as the nation of Malaysia and Brunei Darussalam.

2.2.2 Dweller Characters

People of Sumatra are by nationality, Indonesia; by ethnic the Malays\textsuperscript{41} and shared more or less same anthropological features with native Western part of Indonesia, Malaysia, Singapore, Brunei South Burma and South Thailand. Minangkabau regions has been dwelled by the people of Austronesian ethnic (Old Melayu, Proto-Austronesian or Proto-Malay) from mainland Southeast Asia, who had advance Bronze and Megalithic prehistoric industry during Neolithic age (2000-1000 BC)\textsuperscript{42} with the aborigine, Negroid. Originally they were said to be inheritor of ancient South China, notably the Dong-Son Culture, a Neolithic culture developed in North Vietnam since 2000BC.

Minangkabau people belong to the highland farming groups and have been since Neolithic age by nature seafarers engulfed in overseas exploration tradition from South-China and Pacific up to East Africa. They were well known of its paddy-farming-based cultural traits, overseas sailing traditions, house-granary type and Bronze technology, while bringing with them paddy-farming agriculture and its institutions including matrilineal-descent-rule and technology\textsuperscript{43}.

\textsuperscript{41} The description of Malay ethnic has been provided by Cf.John Tiffany, and Roxana Waterson (1989)
\textsuperscript{43} Characteristic of pre-Indian Southeast Asia had been elaborated by Coedes (1968) and Belwood (2005)
The cultural constitution of Minangkabau as ethnic territory was instituted by Tambo Alam Minangkabau (text on Minangkabau land), or generally and for the purpose of this research it would be called “Tambo”. Tambo exposes the culture, people, origin, organizational principles, and the territory of the Minangkabau. It covered principles of social stratifications, cultural traits, economic and corporate managements. The author was anonymous and historical context of its writing was unknown. But the constitution is so strong, widely accepted by the people that every nagaris in Minangkbau claimed to have their local version of tambo.

![Figure 2.4 Map of Nagari Pariangan](source)

**Figure 2.4 Map of Nagari Pariangan**

Source: Archive of Department of Architecture, University of Bung Hata, 2009)

Legend has it that the founders of Minangkabau had come from a local volcano, Merapi Mountain. According to Tambo, they were descendant of Alexander the great who sailed and settled in Southeast Asia, before finally
they made their way to Sumatra, went through Kampar River and rested and settled to establish the Minangkabau regions on volcano. It was said that when they found the island the summit had been described as of the size of an egg. As the water decreased the surface spread from the apex running downward slopes to the valleys. The area covering the slopes and the intervening valleys and plains had been traditionally called as the heartland, (or darek, literally means "high land above water"). On that feet of the mountain, the first nagari in Minangkabau had been established, namely nagari Pariangan (Figure 2.4.). It had been later referred as ancestral and cultural region for all nagaris and people of Minangkabau in and out of Minangkabau regions.

2.2.3 Settlement Formation

The obscurity of historical accounts note that the development of settlement formation made Tambo appear as main sources for tracing the constituent of Minangkabau ethnicity and their territory. As prescribed in Tambo, the core-ancestral region of Minangkabau is called darek (interior). It was divided in three social units that constituted large well-watered rice-plains surrounded by mountains and foothills. Each unit is called luhak (literally means spring water) or ancestral origin and land of the people of Minangkabau. There were supplementary smaller area, geographically located on the fringes of these three but linked with them economically and politically, called rantau (migrant land). The rantau which is situated in the hinterland of darek, and generally is in the coastal area where trading activities take place is called pesisir or pasisia. Therefore there are at least three larger geographical segmentation of these cultural regions; namely the pasisia (migrant land in coastal area, the darek (original land) and the rantau (migrant land in hinterland). The nagari within darek has been generally

---

44 The geographical history of land enterprises in Minangkabau has been elaborated by Christina Dobbin, (1977)
associated with nagaris of the primary ancestor. Luhak Tanah Datar is one of the three core-segments considered to be the oldest one.

Figure 2.5  Map of Luhak (cultural Zone) and Darek (Heartland)

Source: ITB (1979) and Kato (2005)

Figure 2.6  Distribution of Rantau outside Sumatra Island and abroad

Source: Chadwick (1991)
Regarding Settlement formations, spatially the Tambo prescribed the nagari settlement as part of the defining feature of cultural area of Minangkabau. Selma Nakamura (1997) explained that originally Nagari is spatially formed through a natural process of spatial growth of the individual self-sustained pocket, tatarak, or a small hamlet, with a couple of huts for resting while doing agricultural work. Later it developed into agglomeration of many tatarak and called dusun. Dusun constituted larger scale of hamlet yet still had no system of government and consequently no ancestral house (rumah Gadang). Koto constituted a state of growth ready to be called village and finally Nagari which was the final growth of equilibrium settlement comprising several villages. A nagari has been at least one central mosque, council hall (Balai Adat), common place for meeting and other activity (galangan).

2.2.4 Social-Spatial Organization of Clan in Minangkabau

There are two overlapping organizations in nagari, based on spatial organization (guguak) and clan organization (suku). Basically the territorial coherence is more social rather than physical or spatial. Guguak is a topographical confinement on which stands settlement organization called in local terminology as jorong (lane of houses) and in political division as koto (fortified area). However the guguak (table land) or jorong is not a control unit therefore does not have traditional leading roles. The leading roles are therefore bestowed to clan leader (kepala suku or datuk pucuk) or nagari assembly (ninik-mamak or officially called kerapatan adat nagari) which is situated beyond the scope of guguak. Nevertheless it has physical reference (lambasan). In Tambo the property of koto was described as a coherent

---

45 Selma Nakamura (1998) referred her study to case of Pariangan village of Nagari Pariangan-Padang Panjang and its local text (Tambo), about spatial organization of Nagari/ village. But it should be corrected that what is meant by tatarak is taratak.

46 Datuk Sanguno Dirajo, HMA (nd), pp.20

47 Chadwick (1991), Selma nakamura (1997)
settlement configuration but not yet established as polity and therefore does not have council hall (balai adat), common place for meeting and other activity (galangan) and mosques. Therefore guguak organization is more a topographical unit within which several maternal joint families from various clans stand as a configuration.

Suku is clan organization or clan group which means a mythical origin of the community\textsuperscript{48}. A suku is led by male-leader called kepala suku or datuk pucuak and they sat in community council or Kerapatan Adat Nagari (KAN). Suku is a control unit and they have hierarchy of organization. The suku (or pasukuan) are: Bodi, Caniago, Koto, Piliang, Patapang, Koto Anyie, Melayu, Bendang, and Mandahiliang. It is prescribed in Tambo that the suku/clan group are occasionally set in pair, namely suku Bodi Caniago, suku Koto-Piliang, suku Patapang-Kotoanyie, and Bendang-Mandailiang\textsuperscript{49}. This trait of four clans or pair of clans is seen in the Kurumba tribe in Nilgiri mountain ranges between Kerala and Tamil Nadu\textsuperscript{50}.

The four nagari’s clan group leader s or kepala suku assemble in Kerapatan Adat Nagari (KAN). The member of assembly are chieftain (wali nagari), elder member of the village (ninik-mamak), senior women of the community (bundo-kanduang), the male-heads of each maternal joint family compound (penghulu), and the clan leaders (tuo-kampung, kepala suku or datuk pucuak). Its role has been supervising executive functions of law and customs in Nagari. Some decisive roles that hold are: deciding the start of planting seeds in sawah or rice field, maintaining irrigation, market and any other judicial practices including settling family disputes. Under the clan leader (kepala suku) there are also levels of traditional officers which has

\textsuperscript{48} The elaborated discussion on suku has been done by anthropologist Kato (1987), and architect Syamsul Asri (2002) and Eko Alvarez. et. al (2009)

\textsuperscript{49} This discussion of structure and history of Suku has been discussed by Kato (1988), Mahyuddin, et.al. (2002, pp.79); ST Mahmood (1988, 1978); and Amanan Rajo Penghulu (1978)

\textsuperscript{50} This description about Kurumba tribe and the four-wise paired clans in South India has been elaborated by anthropologist PRG Mathur (19..)
People of a particular suku (clan-group) do not necessarily concentrate themselves in single spot. It can be spatially dispersed in different settlement units (jorong/ koto/ guguak) within the larger settlement unit Nagari. It nade each jorong/ koto/ guguak always consisted of more than one sukus. But it would be obvious that each maternal joint family (kampung) adheres tone of this suku or pasukuan and each has a male-leader, called penghulu who run dual organization, the kin (kaum), household (kampung) and its corporate unit. In executing this authority he has to obtain sanction from assembly of married ladies of the clan group (bundo kandung).

Penghulu, or male-leader is distinguished by the title in front of his name, Datuk. He is a traditional sub-clan leader responsible for the corporate management of family estates which would have multi-dimensional values, i.e. spiritual, religious, functional and social obligation the blood related kin (kaum) and non-blood related kin (warga). The title Datuk, does not attach to the person but to the land which is with his mother. Therefore his attribute and symbol has been kept with his mother. In executing his authority he always has to obtain sanction from the married female members of the family (bundo-kanduangan). In case of the death of penghulu, the people of kampung could still refer to his title. His important role has been metaphorically described in Tambo as a “tree'. In every inauguration of Penghulu, they have been always reminded that a good tree is that which grows up spread branches and have strong roots.

---

51 This discussion of structure and history of Suku has been discussed by Kato (1988), Mahyuddin, et al; (2002 pp.79); St Mahmoed (1988), ST Mahmoed BA and Amanan Rajo Penghulu (1978)
Table 2.2  Levels of clan organization and its territory of Minangkabau land

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level of Social-spatial-territory</th>
<th>social organization</th>
<th>Ancestral unit</th>
<th>Male-Leader</th>
<th>Geographical</th>
<th>Spatial</th>
<th>Social</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>House (Rumah or Rumah Gadang or Rumah Adat saparuik)</td>
<td>Sekandung (a social unit sharing one mother) inhabit inside rumah Adat, in a bilik (room) Seninik or saparuik (a social unit sharing grandmother) inhabits Rumah Gadang</td>
<td>Tungganai (literally means column) is caretaker of the households for maintenance duty.</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One or more House compound or a local-clan unit (Kampung or Rumah Adat sehindu)</td>
<td>Sapayung (a unit of clan descendants among which intermarriage is prohibited) they can covers a house compound (kampung) or more than one kampung.</td>
<td>Mamak or Penghulu (which are male-head of a maternal joint family) by the sanction of eldest female member (Tuo) and higher clan leader (kepala suku)</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collections of house compound or sub-clan units scattered within territory of Nagari</td>
<td>Sasuku (a social unit of one clan) inhabits settlement in a form of taratak, dusun, koto or Nagari</td>
<td>Tuo kampung or penghulu pucuk (clanleader) of confederation and consent of inter clan assembly</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Confederation of several Kampung or sub-clan units within or across nagari</td>
<td>Jurai (a group of several clan descendants which is distributed within or across several nagaris)</td>
<td>Penghulu suku by sanctions from member of jurai</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level of Social-spatial-territory</td>
<td>social organization</td>
<td>Ancestral unit</td>
<td>Male-Leader</td>
<td>Geographical</td>
<td>Spatial</td>
<td>Social</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2.2  (Contd…)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level of Social-spatial-territory</th>
<th>Ancestral unit</th>
<th>Male-Leader</th>
<th>Geo</th>
<th>Spa</th>
<th>Soc</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Laras (traditional clan federation) in the darek | Kotopiliang  
Bodi Caniago  
Lareh nan panjang clan | No formal or central apex but its trait is governed in Tambo | ✓   | ×   | ✓   |
| Confederation of Nagari, luhak and rantau | Luhak agam, tanah datar, limapuluh koto and rantau area | No formal or central apex but its trait is governed in Tambo | ✓   | ✓   | ✓   |

The table is concluded from Mahyudin (2002, pp. 76-77), and Syamsul Asri (2004).

2.2.5 Social-Spatial Organization of Luhak, Nagari, and Kampung

Nagar in Minangkabau has been regarded as indigenous concept of settlement\(^{52}\). A nagari as prescribed in Tambo must have the following properties (Kartikawening 2001, Alvarez and “Pusaka” 2009) Syamsul Asri (2004): basosok bajurami or boundaries which distinguish darek (core land) and rantau (land outside the territory); tanah pusako or the inherited land); public bath or balabuah batapian ; households or barumah batanggo; main street or bakorong kampuang); agricultural land or basawah baladang; community center or babalai bamusajik; and village cemetery or bapandam bapakuburan. Some nagaris would share markets following the market’s weekly schedule. Anthropologist, Clifford Geertz described the relationship between mosque and market as being very typical of the Islamic world (Geertz in Dobin 1977)\(^{53}\). The cultural unity in a nagari is institutionalized in

---

52 The concept of Nagari as a social organization has been explored by Kato (2005), Nasroen (1957), Mahmoed et al (1987) and Datoek (1987). Its spatial and architectural concept has been discussed by Syamsul Asri (1996), Vellingga (2005), and Waterson (1989)

53 Explanations about the role of economic transformation and islam in Minangkabau Islamic is discussed by Clifford geertz (in Dobbin, 1997)
a collective customary norm that is called adat. The social-spatial hierarchy of settlement can be explained as in Figure 2.7.

Figure 2.7 Diagram of hierarchy of space of settlement according to Tambo Alam Minangkabau

Source: Kartikawening (2002)

Jorong is spatial confinement or section under nagari. It makes nagari a confederation of jorongs. The unit is practically more physically defined. At present, the section has been acknowledged as a formal unit of settlement under modern nagari. It is led by an administrative officer. By scale, jorong is a settlement unit which is more or less parallel with koto. But jorong is a term that is used when discussing settlement unit as a part of a nagari. Koto is term for settlement which explains the state or stage of settlement development with regards to transformation process into the most complete form, nagari. It independently appears as a complete unit of

---

54 Tambo or, Tambo Alam Minangkabau means partially written down chronicles that relate a mythologized history of Minangkabau (Vellingga, 2004).
settlement before it merges with other koto and establishes a confederation of settlement, nagari.

Socially Nagari is congregations of several maternal joint families by blood relation (saparuik). The centre of saparuik is ancestral house, rumah gadang (or literally “big house”). However the flexible trait of suku organization toward bloodline relationship made the notion of maternal joint family compound (kampung) contain level of social classification based on remoteness to the original ancestor, which are saparuik, kaum (people of blood-related member) and warga (adopted member or people of non blood-related member). Matrilineal-descent-rule in Minangkabau has made rumah gadang a female sphere, while the male sphere has been centered in surau (dormitory and common praying place for member of kampung). Another important reference of a kampung is rangkiang or granary. A proper kampung has been prescribed to have three rangkiangs standing on the front yard (alaman) in front of the ancestral house (ruma adat), for daily use, for guest and for ceremony (Kato, 1978). A kampung is also equipped at minimum by common bathing ponds (luhak), common kitchen (dapur) and common granary (rangkiang). Within a kampung there may be several maternal houses or rumahs. Some rumas have distinguished form observable through its buffalo-horn-like roof called ruma gadang (big-house), generally belonging to the most immediate elite-kin family including maternal house of the male-leader. As a whole this cluster is called kampung, and intermarriage is restricted among the member.

Literally in Indonesian language (Bahasa Indonesia), Ruma /rumah means a ‘house’. It conceptually houses the institution of member of maternal-joint family or saparuik. According to Marcel Vellingga (2006) ruma can be more than one house when the house has to accommodate the expanding family. Referring to adat or customary law, there are two kinds of
house namely ruma biasa or ordinary house and ancestral house or ruma adat. Generally ruma adat is where the penghulu or male-leader resides and it became the centre of the kampung. A ruma is lead by house-male-manager (tungganai Rumah), who organize the land-use right on ancestral property (ganggam bantuak) under the supervision of the sub-clan male-leader (penghulu). Navel of the house is a column inside the house around which the functions and rituals are oriented. This column is the first structure erected during construction of the house therefore is called ‘old column’ or tiang tuo. Functions are conducted around this courtyard and column. Proper ancestral house (rumah adat) must have three granaries (rangkiang), for daily use, for guest and for ceremony (Kato, 1978). These granaries are put outside the house.

2.3 COMPARABLE ETHNOGRAPHIC ASPECTS

2.3.1 Legend

Both Kerala and Minangkabau have intersecting history and legend. Both Minangkabau (Tambo Alam Minangkabau) and Kerala (Kerallopatti and Mahatyam) acknowledge the legend overseas migrations, the descending water level that made the original land, and the role of mountain. Both Minangkabau and Keala also acknowledge the legend of Solomon on search for goldmines. Solomon or Sulaiman expedition was conducted around 1000BC by support of Phoenician Sailors, Minangkabau and Kerala/s authors claimed that this legendary Ophir Mountain located both in places.

2.3.2 Historical Concurrence

During the 1st Century AD- 8th Century AD, Minangkabau and Kerala had been once identified as participating in global overseas

---

55 Discussion regarding the legends had been exposed by A.A Navis:, 1988 pp.3 for Minangkabau and S. Menon:2002, pp.16
enterprises. Roman accounts such as Indica, Perryplus by Pliny (1st Century), and Ptolomy (2nd Century) noted contacts with places in Sumatra island and Kerala. The ancient port Barus or Barracea or Barosai and Warusaka was claimed existed in both places according to historical accounts. The place was said to produce materials to embalm Pharaoh of Egypt and this confirms intensive interactions between the two places bound by overseas enterprises.

In 7th Cent. AD - 13th Century both Kerala and Sumatra used to have established polity based on paddy-farming and overseas trades. Therefore a stabile formal settlement and its territory were formulated, in the form of chieftainship and kingdoms and the raise of Brahmanism. These polities were accommodating one another for commercial purpose. The Indian culture which had been Buddhist in nature was assumed to take control before 914AD in both places (Nasroen 1957).

By 11-12th century both places encounter serial invasions by Chola kingdom. By the beginning of the 11th Century Chola resumed their objective of conquest aimed at building up a vast empire which would unify all the polities which were engaged in commercial activities and with this basis they tried to manage establishment of trading ports all along the coast of Bay of Bengal, Malaysia, Indonesia and Indo-China to halt the increasing power of the Arabs (Lamerciner, 1981). These maritime polities significantly changed the power structure in both places. The Kulaeskhara kingdom waned in Kerala and was replaced by the role of swaroopams and feudal characters

56 The discussion regarding Rome in general it had been elaborated in WJ.Meullen (1987) and Paul Munoz (2005); in Kerala has been elaborated by Shreedara Menon (2005,pp.15); and in Minangkabau by A A Navis (1988, pp.4). In general it had been Elaborated in WJ.Meullen (1987) and Paul Munoz (2005)

57 Shreedara Menon (2005, pp.15) identified Baracea is as place in the river mouth of Pampa river South Kerala, while A.A. Navis (1988, pp.4) mentioned the place was in North Sumatra. But researches by French Orientale Studies institute had confirmed its location in North Sumatra

58 The elaborations about reported ports of interactions such as Quilon and Barus were discussed by (OC. Wolter, 1983). The structural changes of people and settlement were elaborated by K.S Singh (2002) for Kerala Nasroen (1957 pp. 31).
brought by Brahmin. In Sumatra on the remain of the kingdom of Melayu or Srivijaya, New Melayu kingdom was founded which established connections to Srilanka and Cambodia\textsuperscript{59}. These events signify a major historical change on the way settlement had been managed. The changes were the increase of autocratic and hierarchical character on the original autochthonous social set up.

During 15th Cent. AD-19\textsuperscript{th} Cent, AD, more elaborated polities appeared which depended mostly on trading web between Mediterranean and China. Indian influence labeled as Aryanization, Sankritization or Indianization had been started since 6\textsuperscript{th} century. In Minangkabau and most generally Southeast Asia this Sanskritization had been more or less limited to the borrowing traditions. However in Kerala major changes took place after 13\textsuperscript{th} Century when local chieftaincy became the ruling power and caste-based system took place. The establishment of polities like Pagaruyung kingdom in Minangkabau, Cochin, Travancore and Samutiri took place during this period. In Minangkabau the formalization of traditional customs had been done by authorizing Tambo Alam Minangkabau as their cultural codex and Marapalam treatise was later upheld as confirmation to incorporate Islam religion as main value for the Tambo.

In 18\textsuperscript{th} -20\textsuperscript{th} century following the full establishment of European Colonial power on both native lands, Minangkabau and Kerala experience changes in practices and perspectives toward traditional customs Historians and anthropologist typically describe this phase as formalization in order to satisfy the Colonial with more controlled mechanism. In this framework such traits like matriliny, cross-cousin marriage, and the role of maternal uncle became a more rigid social construction. Land reform act and abolition of matriliny in Kerala, and subsequent declination of land-holding system

\textsuperscript{59} Elaborated in A.A.Navis, (1988), pp.10
brought down the social-environmental coherence. Monetization of land that followed in 20th century supported by Islam law to reinterpret inheritance and economic system was imposed to penetrate the cultivation policy and disrupted nagari as the unified body social-territorial organization based on rice cultivation (Dobbin, 1997). Dutch colony utilized the penghulu system to enforce their existence. They imposed hierarchical social organization with appointed officer selected by them. Several Nagaris were put under these appointed Colonial versions of penghulus which were called Angku Lareh. As consequence major social operations within nagaris took place, the affinity of ninik-mamak to the younger generations reduced, as well as the bound toward origin land (Mansoer et al 1970).

2.3.3 Social Stratification

The communal autonomy of Minangkabau communities led European writer called them ‘village republics’. Similarly the governor of British Colony in Kerala, William Logan (1901) described tara in Kerala as ‘village republics’. The communal structure of labor division in both regions had been hierarchical but in Kerala it tuned caste-base. The structure of labor division is in both places arranged in the hierarchy of patron-client idiom and sub-caste proliferation. The differences appear that in Kerala taravdi (member of main family) taragas (member of subservient family) and the serf community occupy different cluster distant to one another. In Minangkabau kaum (member of main family) and warga (member of subservient family) could stay in the same maternal joint family compound. In Minangkabau there’s no obvious class-zone difference but the difference is visible by the expression of house, evidenced by the elaborateness of house construction, (Blackwood, 1997).

60 The redefinition process of matriliny in Kerala by Colonial interest had been discussed by Arunima (1996)
61 The identification had been exposed in separated articles, by Dutch Anthropologist Chadwick (1991) for Nagari, and governor of British colony in Kerala, William Logan (1901) for tara.
There had been three major types of social stratas, conceptually: (i) the reference group, (ii) mainstream of the society, and (iii) agricultural laborers and laborers connected to market.\(^\text{62}\). Power such as properties and assets were what made society rise in status. Nagaris in Minangkabau, maintain class system of elite, client, and servant families based on the idiom of kinship bonds of loyalty and community solidarity that help keep agricultural wage labor as a fall-back source of income rather than a dominant relation of production. (Blackwood, 1997). In Kerala, the social stratum was defined by caste, which however had been result from historical transformation from clan structure (Lamerciner, 1981). By the end of of the 13\(^{\text{th}}\) Century the Nambuthiri Brahmin community had become responsible for establishing temple-lands and themselves as proprietors with hereditry right-the jenmis. These were the illam, or the extended Nambuthiri family, as the jenmi and the Nayar taravad as tenant\(^\text{63}\). As result caste proliferations make each community clusters in groups. On the other hand in Minangkabau social hierarchy still follows the depth of original nativity. The descendant of the earliest community would be considered the elite society. Community groups are equally distributed and not necessarily scattered. In Kerala sub-caste proliferation happened starting from the Nayar, where social connections with subordinate caste are built. In Minangkabau social proliferation started from the top society. Slaves are excluded and they are not considered as native.

### 2.3.4 Matrilineal Kinship System

Kinship and social ranking define social network that benefits the corporate function of maternal joint family, with or without blood relation concerns. Among the large matrilineal Nayar population, the practice of

---

\(^{\text{62}}\) The term is borrowed from (in Nampothiri, 2002)  
\(^{\text{63}}\) The transformation was explained at length by Nampoothiri (2002)
hypergamy\textsuperscript{64} along with geographical isolation of the individual taravad increased the opportunity for sub-caste proliferation that triggered formation of new ranked status groups\textsuperscript{65}. In Minangkabau Patron-client ties between landowner and tenant had been vested in the idiom of matrilineal kinship and viewed as beneficial because of the access to land they provided (Blackwood 1997). They can ally themselves with an elite clan through the process of “adoption” and thereafter obtained rights for custody under the authority of elite senior women (bundo kanduang) Polyandry which is non-existent today used to be known in Minangkabau and Kerala.

Matrilineal descent rule underline the role of man and his sister’s son. In this inheritance is through mother’s line and leadership is through sister’s brother line. Gough explains that the Nayars refer to their matrilineal descent system – marumakkattayam- by the word marumakan or 'sister's son' and tayam or ‘inheritance’ (Gough 1962). In Minangkabau matriliny there is no special term for this kinship system but there exist textual prescription in Tambo that describe characters of matrilineal system\textsuperscript{66}, such as inheritance through mother lines, marriage if family members outside mother’s clan; the power if inheritable (communal properties) rested on mother but managed by her brother (mamak) has been all concentrated in the two generation relation of mamak and kemenakan (Kato 1977:57-58; emphasis added in Ng, 2002)\textsuperscript{67}. The trait also suggested that inheritance could not be alienated except for the purpose of comparable significant necessity, such as burial of the relative.

\textsuperscript{64} The explanations has been elaborated by Lemencier,(1981) regarding Sambhandam or free association between a Nambudiri man and a Kshatriya or Nayar woman and thalikattu kalyanam (Lemencier,1981)
\textsuperscript{65} See Mencer, 1966
\textsuperscript{66} This trait is elaborated by Syamsul Asri, “Minangkabau” (1996) pp.45
\textsuperscript{67} The principe of Minangkabau’s matriliny was conceptualized as “Samandai” which has been elaborated by Josselin de Jong: 64; Anwar:78-79 in Kato, 2005, pp. 45, Tsuyoshi (2005), 44-67
member, marriage, Rumah Gadang repairment and currently pilgrimage to Mecca\textsuperscript{68}.

Matrilineal system of inheritance in both place is closer to what is termed as Dravidian Kinship characterized by cross-cousin marriage\textsuperscript{69}. However major difference took place as matrilineal kinship in Kerala is strictly refer to bloodline, while the Minangkabau matrilineal system combine the bloodline relation with adoption trait. The residential pattern after marriage is duolocal. After marriage, a husband moved to or near the house of his wife and spent the night, but continues his affiliation to his mother's house.

2.3.5 Factors that influence Territorial Making

2.3.5.1 River System Settlement

In both Minangkabau and Kerala cultural formation related mostly on the natural, environmental profile particularly the river. Village patterns and culture followed the sustainability of water source like spring water and river. Referring to Nampoothriri (1988) with regards to Nila river and epigraphs related to Cheras of Mahodyapuram reveal there existed Nedunganadu, Valluvanadu, Nedumpurayunadu in the river valley which was called Kuttanadu (western country), which is now part of Palakkad district. Similarly in Minangkbau, river system along the Bengkaweh River well-known 7 nagaris of the ancient polities come together to make inter and intra relationship and direct them into connecting ports in Pariaman and Padang coastal area (Syamsul Asri, 2001).

\textsuperscript{68} The system was thoroughly discussed in Nasroen, M (1957), Dasar Falsafah Adat Minangkabau, Jakarta 33-35.

\textsuperscript{69} The concept of Dravidian Kinship is Elaborated at length by Thurnston (19..)
2.3.5.2 House as element of Settlement

Nagari in Minangkabau and tara in Kerala combined concept of settlement and clan confederations with its elements, matrilineal joint family house compound, which is territorially defined as kampung in Minangkabau which is centered in an ancestral house (rumah gadang) and taravad in Kerala centered in Veedu. An anthropologist Chie Nakane (1969) suggested this kind of organization as household lineage and other than Minangkabau and Nayar, it was practiced by the Khasi, Garo, Zuni, Trukese, and Yao (Nakane, in Hayley, 1969).

The self-sufficient characters of dwelling cultures evolve settlement as congeries of independent dwelling units of matrilineal joint family. The smallest cultural unit is ranging from hut or wide maternal joint family with some agricultural land around it.
2.3.5.3 General Scheme Polity

The concept of polity in both Minangkabau and Kerala were vague. They appear more as a sphere of clans bound by kinship or corporate rather than a sphere of autonomy bowing to single leader. The office of the apex organization was never physically well articulated. In wider communal scale, for instance ruler lie Perumpadappu Swaroopam had many rights over Palghat and Ponanni during medieval period, but his ancestral house is in Ponanni. It is comparable to the sphere of Koto-Piliang and Bodi-Caniago clan over Tanah Datar region where nagaris holding Bodi Caniago affiliates with an ancestral house in Nagari Limo Kaum which is believed as mythical apex of the clan. However the major difference in a way those landowning relations between the important families and the affiliated regions. N.M. Nampoothiri drew a term nakarattar or an authority that operate nakaram or center of Trade Corporation of early period in describing Vaniamkulam. The term coincides with Nagari in Minangkbau. Nakaram is a territorial unit, but its character coincides with nagari in Minangkbau in a way that it is practically trading centers.

2.3.5.4 Hilly area for aborigine and flat table land for the privileged

Remains of aborigine settlement and prehistoric burials are generally seen in hill tracts. Places near river generally are occupied by the privileged family. Ancestor burial of the people are generally in hillier area or mountain. In Minangkabau always stand near major rivers. In Kerala toponym of place close to the river banks revealed Brahmin inhabitations, the ruling families, privileged groups and reference society. This is to suggest that the ruling power that depended on paddy-farming inhabit mostly plain area, while the natives non-paddy-farming cultivator, which has been generally less advanced society inhabited higher planes.
2.3.6 Landholding

Landholding unit in Kerala is called jenmi which means “birth-right”. In Minangkabau the term is not known but they acknowledge harta pusaka which means almost the same, the “inherited land by birth”. They are practically the ancestral landholding units. In Minangkabau there is a difference between landholding units led by the maternal joint family (harta pusaka), and there are personal property of its member (harta Pencarian). This points to the fact that the most important decision makers is ideally or at least his/her representative. In Kerala the Brahmins, temple community and Nayars as main holders of land (jennies) of devaswoms which constitute ancestral land. Apart from the devaswoms they have landownership and lease holderships in the nature of Brahma swom.

2.3.7 Concept of Habitation Organization

In particular, the functional operations of traditional house hold in Kerala\textsuperscript{70} and Minangkabau\textsuperscript{71} are described by anthropologist with an aphorism “Royal Household”, with regards to the land-holding system that maintain social- economic corporate centred toward big an ancestral houses”. The concept is known in most places in South India, Sumatra, ancient Malaysia and mainland Southeast Asia, where ownership of land is under landowner or chieftain, not the sovereign. Household in Kerala is called taravad. A taravad is a group of people who believe themselves descended from common traceable ancestress. The members derive a sense of unity from association with an ancestral house (Gough, 1961, 323). In Minangkabau there is organization called suku. under in suku there are complex of levels in which only in some certain level the notion of traceable ancestor appear, such as the organization of kaum and payung, under suku. This framework often

\textsuperscript{70} Arunima,1996; Lemencier,1981; Nakane,1969;and Gough,1973

\textsuperscript{71} Kathirithamby-Wells 1976; Kroeskamp 1931; Kato, 1979; Dobbin, 1977
puts king merely as chieftain of a maternal joint family or clan with relatively most abundant property and power comparing to chieftain. Therefore, generally formal difference of spatial characters and residence of the powerful chieftain or the so called king from common residence were generally not very obvious, except the size and elaborate ornamentation. Typically the ancestral house belonged to a Joint family kin, owing vast scope land where people supporting the enterprise and maintenance of the property lived within. Definition of house of village is more as clustered settlement of people affiliated to house of origin, the “big-house”. Therefore the building is usually addressed or implied as “Big-House”, like), Maha-Sala, in Pandyan countries of South India (Paranavitana, 1966), Rumah Godang (Mandailing), Rumah Gadang (Minangkabau), Rumah Gorga (Batak), Jambur (Batak Karo), Tongkonan, and Nalukettu (Kerala).