CHAPTER 5

COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS

5.1 GENERAL CHARACTERS OF SETTLEMENT WITH UNILINEAL AND MATRILINEAL JOINT FAMILY

Conclusively the five cases of settlements in Kerala and Minangkabau demonstrate the settlements studied as set of community assemblage based on clan with reference toward one main ancestor, from which the concept of actual clan, kaum or kampung, payung and taravad appear. This clan is blood-related in concept of taravad, and both blood related and non-blood related in the concept of kaum and payung in Minangkabau. Spatially a clan of a traceable ancestress inhabits a house compound. In Kerala taravad clan stays in the taravad. The term therefore contains both social and spatial meaning. In Minangkabau kaum stays in kampung (house compound). Kampung is the spatial term for kaum. Several kampungs could congregate because the kaums belong to common payung.

Marriage tradition determines the establishment of clan assemblage and enhances solidity of families and therefore settlement as a cultural sphere and estate property. Therefore it assured manifestation of solidly defined community and settlement. Both the Nayar and the Minangkabau people tend to conduct marriage with bride and groom from within their own community and class. The ascending generations where the referred generation is mainly born in 1950’s-1930 demonstrated that marriage tradition until their generation tends to happen among member of the settlement units or with
certain families outside the settlement. The role of male-leader is very important to the sanction of marriage, and determining characters of marriage partner for their line of kin.

The partitioning tendency coincides with the fact that marriage is freer, therefore settling a trend of selling property by which members of families started to convert their family assets into other enterprise or investment. It triggered exponential migrations in 1930’s. This kind of trend is more controlled in Minangkabau because the trait of non-saleable inherited ancestral land (harta-pusako) is still adhered to.

The role of wali nagari (Village chieftain) in Minangkabau was recent, and formal like desavazhi in Kerala. The indigenous form of authority is assembly of elders or natukuttam in Kerala and ninik-mamak under the institution of kerapatan adat nagari (KAN) in Minangkabau.

In maternal joint family level, both places acknowledge uncle or sister’s brother (mamak in Minangkabau and maman in Kerala) as male-leader of the family or clan. The deep genealogical depth of clan groups or suku structure in Minangkabau, coincide with the multi-layers of role of male-head or penghulu and its possible inter-territorial authority that is extended in accordance to maternal clan genealogy. In Kerala the function of karanavar is discrete in its own clan or taravad in a Tara. But it has the trait of inter-settlement network which is symbolically maintained by the belief on relations among Bhagavaty of different taras or deshams, articulated by a narrative of divine sisterhood, or travelling goddess. The conceptual network of Bhagavaty idioms in Kerala, and chain of role of penghulu in Minangkabau indicate socially assured cohesiveness of the traditional settlement which could have been dynamically expanded and contracted.
Matrilineal kinship made land propriety never stand under individual ownership, therefore land and property is not identified by boundary but by its status related to ancestor and origin. The property of clan could be scattered in different places and not necessarily integrated in one singular location. In Kerala it had been labeled as jenmi (birth-right ownership) and in Minangkabau as harta pusaka (ancestral property) in Minangkabau. The accounts regarding territorial boundary making which had taken place during the colonial period showed that in Minangkabau properties of a nagari could intersect each other and with the neighboring nagari. In Kerala, some families like Moothedath and Chambath family have ancestral territory beyond tara taken care of by a particular community. Social agreement and consensus has more powerful influence to maintain family enterprise as well as keeping the social integrity of settlement. This is the core of communal life.

5.2 MATRILINEAL KINSHIP AS THEME OF SOCIAL-SPATIAL ORGANIZATION OF SETTLEMENT

Matrilineal descent rule suggests that female member is the owner of property and male member is the caretaker of property. The majority of property ownership in the five cases is indeed held by ladies of the clan. Theoretically property retains its communal characters because matrilineal kinship does not allow any clan member to have absolute power to access property. This scheme still sustains in Minangkabau, but is practically vanishing in Kerala causing partitioning and emergence of new families among traditional families.

Matrilineal kinship does not necessarily associate with female power and accessibility. It is more as positing female members of the matrilineal lineage as the custodian of property. Male leader keeps holding the management. Matrilineal kinship evolves division of male and female space.
Higher importance on the female space relates more to preserving divinity vested on feminine character and purity of descent. The movement and migration of female is in fact more controlled because it would associate with spatial expansion and contraction of house compound and also eventually territory settlement. This case does not happen to male who would freely move without any territorial consequence.

After marriage male retains his place in his own maternal-joint family compound but stay or regularly visit his wife’s family as visiting husband. In Minangkabau this visiting husband tradition is still practiced by majority of husbands of the kaum and diminishing in the cases of taravad in Kerala. Their movement has no impact on formation of settlement and house but enhances the network of settlement authority.

The trait of matrilineal kinship posits them mostly as care taker or manager of the clan, not ruler. Consequently marriage disperses males and thus theoretically prevents these controlling agents to accumulate in a single spot. Male has special domain within house compound. The term pattaypura as grain-store-house which could be distributed within taravad are imbued by male characters, in a way that the male of a clan had duty to take care of the property and therefore they stay there, while the female stays in ancestral house. Ideally pattayapura in Kerala is a single hall house with wooden construction inside to store paddy. It is equipped with attached spaces where the male members of the clan assembled and lived. This conceptual female-male spatial polarization resembles that in Minangkabau, where the male character is attributed to slope area or lurah where surau is situated. The female characters are attributed to kampung where rumah gadang (ancestral house) are situated.

Comparing the role of karanavar in Kerala to the role of penghulu it is seen that the role of penghulu is more sustainable. In Minangkabau
principally the power of penghulu coexists with assembly of ladies of the clan. In Minangkabau they are specifically instituted in bundo kanduung (assembly of married ladies). In Kerala the role of mother has been diminishing. But currently in general currently both appear as more than symbolic concepts and are gradually replaced by father for its nuclear family. Transformation of karanavar to father demonstrate high degree of partialization of property and the growing tendency to concretize individual authority.

A maternal joint family in both places could branch out to different places by extending its lineage (saparuik in Minangkabau and tavazhi in Kerala) in one or some of their inherited properties on which they could build new taravad or kampung. Property outside the clan territory made it necessary to identify other part’s to take care of the estates; therefore they take in to their family sphere the other family. In Kerala some families like Cambath and Kurupath brought professional communities to help them. Patattil brought Pariankath and Chengath taravad along with the serf-community. Similarly all penghulus in Minangkabau have kaum (their own kin- urang asa) and warga (outsider – urang datang). These new comers’ families are inferior to the core family.

The five cases show the relative fluid connectivity among settlements that makes the concept of centre, border, and scale of settlement dynamic and flexible. The tendency of concretization of border, individualizing communal property correlates with the diminishing of matrilineal trait that is seen more in Kerala.

Major difference is that in Minangkabau consanguinility is not the only mode of establishing kinship. The trait of ‘adoption’ of new comer or migrant by a clan group in a nagari enabled maternal joint family compound to comprise blood related kin (kaum) and non-blood related kin (warga).
Blood related kin however constituted the main lineage and descendent of the elite families. This established social hierarchy based on labor within maternal joint family house compound. Descent purity however has been strictly maintained in Kerala and therefore spatial division based on social hierarchy took place in the level of settlement (tara) and confederation of settlement (tattakam or desham).

Degree of modernization indicates that literacy levels are higher in Kerala than in Minangkabau. In Minangkabau agriculture is still practiced with rotation off cultivable land among clan members thereby enabling and sustaining connections within and between settlements. This indicates that while Minangkabau is predominantly rural, Kerala has moved towards urbanization. This may be due to the following reasons:

- Level of development of traditional urbanism which is more progressive and continuous in Kerala than Minangkabau
- The different nature of British colonialism in India and Dutch Colonialism in Indonesia.
- Migration both happened in Minangkabau and Kerala in 1930’s, presumably during Colonialism. The phenomenon of “gulf-boom” in 1970’s in Kerala gave an impetus to massive migrations. It may have been triggered when abolition of landlordship and matrilineal kinship took place in Kerala.

5.2.1 Social-spatial organization based on labor division

As a corporate settlement nagari and tara reflect structure of labor division for agricultural enterprise. In Minangkabau labor division is classified by depth of kinship, while in Kerala by differences in caste. However the notion of caste itself was rooted in the concept of community
clan. In Minangkabau classification and segmentation take place within house compound, while in Kerala it is beyond the level of settlement unit. It can be tabled as follows (refer to Appendix 2).

### Table 5.1 Comparative social hierarchy and labor division

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Notes on Kerala</th>
<th>Keral</th>
<th>Minangkabau</th>
<th>Notes on Mimangkabau</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nambuthiri Brahmins nevertheless exist but it never determined the social livelihood of tara dweller, both Nayar or non-Nayar</td>
<td>Nambuthiris (Kerala Brahmin)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>There is no priesthood family in Minangkabau. And in Kerala, nevertheless exist, they were not part of social life of the tara</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper Nayar family defined by sub-caste category of Nayar</td>
<td>elite family (naluveetil menon, families running temple community)</td>
<td>Penghulu’s family</td>
<td>Core family whose descendants are generally the line of community leader</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle Nayar family defined by sub-caste category of Nayar</td>
<td>midle class Nayar</td>
<td>kaum (blood relative of Penghulu’s family)</td>
<td>family which affiliate with or branch-descendant of Core family</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other category of community which is considered lower, but has practical skill</td>
<td>Non Nayar : Ezhava, Muslim, Viswakamma</td>
<td>warga (member of family)</td>
<td>New comer which has been underwent “mengaku mamak” rituals and therefore authorized to be member of the family. They are bound to service for the family.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Serf community</td>
<td>Harijans</td>
<td>Uran Upahan,</td>
<td>Serf community</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The elite communities such as the Nayar community in Kerala or oldest and original clans in Minangkabau seem to have generally mastered paddy-field agriculture and managed habitation in flat plains of paddy field. In the hinterland there is generally a settlement of the indigenous community, which is not directly related to the mainstream society, like kingdom or urban core. Nagari Rao-Rao and Mathur tara did not belong to the mainstream groups of community and coincidently are situated in more remote areas. There are very few mainstream historical and ethnographic sources
mentioning their name. On the other hand Nagari Sungayang, tara-Nayars in Chittur, Puthiankam and Mathur stood among flatland of paddy-field and on relatively developed place near the highway on elevated flatland. They also belonged to a more referred and advanced society associated with a royal power. The case of nagari Rao-Rao is an example of how a nagari could be advanced into mainstream nagari connected by local kingdom running overseas trade by the advancement of coffee plantation in 18th Century AD. Tara-Nayar in Mathur and nagari Sungayang are prototype of the true practicing agriculturalist community that is still being practiced now. Tara-Nayars in Chittur and Puthiankam are types of settlement that referred to royal power, which now has been shifted into an urban polity.

The spatial concept based on Vastu treatise is used in the layout of the tara and in Minangkabau spatial orientation is based purely on natural characters, like mountain, and river. Metaphor of head-tail and mountain-sea orientation, north facing building, concept of centre (navel) and boundary is taken from these natural orientations, which is mainly attributed to the Merapi mountain.

5.2.2 Character of Social-spatial groupings of Settlement

The concept of tara in tatakam, and suku in nagari confirm that settlement appears as a spatial consequence of orientation toward ancestor and community solidarity with house compounds and venue for assembly is the basic physical configuration of settlement. It could be elaborated in various scales and layers of spatial arrangements. From the final ramification of this social-spatial organization emerges the notion of settlement.

The depth of clan extends from lineage, clan of traceable ancestor, and clan of mythical ancestor, which manifests spatially on the sequential level of habitation, i.e. residential space, neighborhood, settlement,
confederation settlement, and cultural geography. The level and sphere of influence could be tabled as Table 5.2.

**Table 5.2 Type and Term of Social-Spatial Habitation**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reference toward ancestor</th>
<th>Type of Sphere of community</th>
<th>Type of Social-Spatial Sphere</th>
<th>Term of Social-Spatial Organization</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mythical Ancestor</td>
<td>Larger Clan group</td>
<td>Geography of ethnic</td>
<td>Laras (Bodi Caniago, Koto-Piliang) and (extinct)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community group</td>
<td>clan group or habitation Unit</td>
<td>Suku</td>
<td>Tara</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traced Ancestor</td>
<td>Actual Clan</td>
<td>Maternal joint family</td>
<td>Payung, Kaum/ Tara Adav</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lineages</td>
<td>Ancestral house</td>
<td>Saparuik</td>
<td>Tavazhi</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Community organization sharing common mythical ancestor in a locality, like the Nayar, in Kerala is more specific in a tara, yet in limited case it is found that a taravad of one in Mathur also exists in Chittur. On the other hand in Minangkabau clan groupings (suku) and its subsequent order of actual clans (payung and kaum or kampung) is part of social organization with a sphere that covers the whole region of Minangkabau. Although as clan with traceable ancestress, a kampung or a kaum bearing Bodi-Caniago clan group is discrete in each nagari, as member of mythical clan group, a kampung or a kaum would associate with Bodi-Caniago clan groupings found everywhere in Minagkabau. In Kerala, however, trace of possible systematic clan dispersal can be concluded. If kavus keep rudimentary notion of ancestor, the affiliation of several kavus generally addressed under idiom of sisterhood of Bhagavatys, indicate that the taras under these Bhagavatys are related by common mythical or actual ancestor.
Minangkabau ethnic acknowledge many clan groups which are geographically distributed all over Minangkabau land. The most prominent ones are Bodi, Caniago, Koto and Piliang, which are often regrouped as two pair-clans Bodi-Caniago, and Koto- Piliang. Each pair has common core of origin, sphere of distribution and specific cultural traits. In Kerala this kind of grouping appear in Velalla community. They are from Tamil Nadu. In the case of Chittur and Mathur village, the Velalla clans have been typically responsible in establishing the local temples. The member of Nayar of Velalla clans groups are distributed in tara and desham in Palakkad district. Under Nayar there are also other categories such as Kiriathil, Sudra Nayar Velalla that associate with a particular specialized trait of the Nayar in their profession, history and customs. Today society tends to identifies them as Nayar.

In Kerala taravad is specific for each tara and each unit coincides with a maternal-joint family compound unit. It is comparable to saparuiik in a kampung in Minangkabau. But for Minangkabau its supplementary condition where blood relation is not the only determining factor of clan integrity and the higher control has been at the upper level organization, nagari, which made the discreteness of saparuiik as the agent of control less influential, than the collectiveness of kampung as community.

Therefore maternal-joint family compound demonstrates two aspects social and spatial dimensions. In Kerala it is called by the same term taravad and in Minangkabau is called kampung. Kaum is the social term of kampung and kampung is the spatial term of kaum. Figure 5.1 maps spatial and clan hierarchy in Kerala and Minangkabau. It shows that house compound appear as the basic element of settlement organization. Understanding the ancestor in Minangkabau should be seen more as a social reference for its members rather than pure line of descent, because the real
consanguinial relation of the clan is established between the ancestor and the core family or by direct blood related kin of the kampung which is saparuik. This became reference for the non-blood related (warga).

Figure 5.1  Scope Diagram of Spatial Organization and Scope of Clan Organization

5.2.3 Environmental profile as factors of spatial form of Tara and Jorong

The concept of tara and jorong has common meaning as quarter. It is basically configured by the environmental profile which are topography and geometry of paddy-farming plots. It is often metaphorically articulated as ‘island and oceans’. In Minangkabau the function of surau, tapian mandi and fish pond (luhak) of kampungs or house compound are accumulated in the slopes on the fringe of the table land guguak. Absence of rigid boundary or the use of simple marker for boundary, creates notion of barrier but does not practically limit movement of people. Eventually it only evolves spatial schemata for female/male space and private/public sphere and different
kampungs. Unlike Minangkabau in Kerala the residential house compound, male dormitory and bathing ponds are inside taravad and are well protected from the outsider.

![Figure 5.2 Typical Topography Profile of Minangkabau and Kerala](image)

**Figure 5.2 Typical Topography Profile of Minangkabau and Kerala**

Physically, the idea of common single ancestor refers to a landmark of origin whose sphere of influence operates both to bind the clan within territory and clan members outside the territory. Both tara and suku have common traditional landmarks articulated as sitting places under a tree, called Pamedanan in Minangkabau and kavu and Prathistan in Kerala. In Minangkabau this idea of pamedanan has practically vanished and is retained in the collective memory of the clan groups. Its function is transformed into balai adat (assembly hall) which is generally built not far from or on the site of the earlier pamedanan.

The setting of Pamedanan generally appears as huge banyan tree with stone seats underneath arranged in circle. It stands on a higher ground
below which there is river. The setting of Prathistan also appears as banyan
tree with square platform as its base where even now people can sit down and
assemble. The whole setting implies that this is a set up that enables wide
observation over the entire span of paddy field and the settlement.

The spatial distribution of clan group or habitation unit belonging to
a suku and tara-Nayar encountered local confinements which are determined
by topographical setting, geometrical pattern of paddy-field and other
environmental situations that made them spatially grouped into sections. The
term of tara itself is more a spatial terminology than social terminology.
Within tara there could be sub-sectors which are generally named after their
compass position referring to the position of Bhagavaty kavu in the tara, such
as padinjaretara (western quarter), kizhaketara (eastern quarter), nattutara
(middle quarter). Puthiankam tara is the only tara-Nayar in the locality. The
term Puthiankam in is a historical name, is rooted in their history. In
Minangkabau cases topography play major roles in setting the confinement
for settlement. This mode of spatial grouping is called jorong, which would
always contain table land and slopes. Since traits of distant pollution or
limited accessibility are absent, clans could be disperesed across undulating
landscapes. Therefore the horizontal grouping could contain clan members of
different communities or suku. The scheme could be described in the
following Figure 5.4.
Spatially jorong represents stable settlement like tara, but jorong traditionally did not have authority or traditional controlling agent, because it is within the sphere of suku (clan-groups). Currently jorong is controlled territory under kepala jorong. On the contrary, earlier tara has been a controlled territory lead by assembly (nattukutam). Currently the function of nattukutam is replaced by the temple community.

The concept organization of tara is comparable to nagari. Both nagari and tara are controlled territory with boundaries, they have specific homogeneous law, legend and custom, led by a communal assembly, and have spatially religious landmark, like mosque or temple, and by scale and dimension they are comparable. It covers an area of 0.1348 kmsq or 13.5 ha approximately and house compound has an area of 2 acres. Houses are oriented towards common space or rice field. In both regions house also functions as grain storage.
5.2.4  Sequence of Settlement developmental process

There is a common pattern that the elite families, which imply oldest families in Minangkabau and most powerful Nayar families in Kerala, are spatially clustered in places away from the main road. In Kerala they showed remnant of alternative path lines which did not meet path lines from other communities. It implies that the extension of family developed from the interior to the space of current main road. In Minangkabau the oldest families of a suku in a jorong are generally situated far from the present main road, and spatially and visually distinguished by proper geometrical arrangement.

![Figure 5.4 Pattern of formation of Settlement](image)

It may possibly indicate that the elaboration of tara and nagari is a process of filling up the spatial gap, left by earlier settlers, and by the migrants. The major landmarks such as main temple and grand mosque that are always found on the main road or distant from the earliest clusters of compound may indicate that they were constructed after the habitation has been formed. They are not the landmarks which were designed prior to the settlement. It seems that in Kerala this process of filling up the gap has been also occasionally accompanied by occupation of land of the earlier settler, which may be the aborigine. Moreover they also occupied their worshipping
centers and consecrated it as theirs. This process is articulated in the narrative of displacement of Bhagavaty articulated in legends and festivals routes.

All settlements in the five cases were established along major rivers and major route which have been traces of ancient routes. It may indicate that the livelihood of the settlement of nagari and tara had been triggered by the dynamic that developed and passed over the location. The dynamic is urbanization.

5.3 SPATIAL AND FUNCTIONAL CONFIGURATION OF SETTLEMENT

5.3.1 Tree as territorial reference for Centre of Settlement Unit

Religious buildings and communal assembly as the main reference for territorial marker and authority have been conceptually developed from earlier assembly of one community or clan-group which refer to sacred groove and assembly seat or prathistan for tara, and pamedanan for suku. This developed into various level of configuration of foci for different levels of sphere of settlement. The main model is that there are several settlement units with their own referred centre, which are bound by common main centre or landmark. Each settlement unit is assemblage of maternal joint family houses. Practically the model could be developed in there scales as explained in Figure 5.6.

i) Model 1. The sphere is a confederation of several settlements or larger settlement under common spiritual sphere and center. Each settlement confederation refers to one main religious building and consists of several settlement units. In turn each settlement unit comprised of maternal joint family and a community assembly or local religious building. . This
happened in Kattisery-Puthiankam tattakam and Nagari Tanjung-Sungayang.

ii) Model 2. The elementary sphere is settlement units with centre in shrine or temple. Along with other settlement units of simpler communities, they constitute larger settlement that has higher order temple. This happened in Mathur and Chittur. Model two is also practically taking place in modern Nagari in Minangkabau, where each jorong is managed by an administrative chief or kepala jorong resided in jorong office.

iii) Model 3. Happens in traditional nagari Sungayang and nagari Rao-Rao, and modern tara especially in Puthiankam. The cohesive spatial sphere is larger settlement with centre in assembly or religious building. But the larger settlement itself is organized in sectors (JORONG and TARA). Here settlement unit is more a configuration of sectors.
5.3.2 Configuration of House Compound

The notion of dwelling culture which leads to the territorial definition of settlement is determined by the functioning body of its component, where the main elements are house compound. A maternal joint family (taravad and kampung) are more than just a house or elements of ancestral landscape. They are the functional factor that define settlement by which the dynamic of settlement could be sustained and possible evolution of settlement could possibly be retraced. The elementary unit of settlement units could be spatially described in Table 5.3.

**Table 5.3 Elementary unit of settlement**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Minangkabau Spatial Concept</th>
<th>Kerala</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>RUMAH</strong> HOUSE VEEDU</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blik</td>
<td>Ara</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tiang Tuo (central post)</td>
<td>Centre of the house Nadumittam (courtyard)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kapuak</td>
<td>Grain box Pattayam</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tungku</td>
<td>Hearth Aduppu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dapur</td>
<td>Kitchen Adukala</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Labuan</td>
<td>Pathway Taravazham</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>talam</td>
<td>Plate/ platform Talam</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>KAMPUNG</strong> HOUSE COMPOUND TARAVAD</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rumah gadang</td>
<td>Ancestral House Nalukettu,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rumah Bagonjong</td>
<td>structure of single hall house Pattayapura</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tapian Mandi</td>
<td>Bathing places Kolam</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rangkiang</td>
<td>Grain store or grain house Pattayapura</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alaman</td>
<td>Yard Tara</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kandang</td>
<td>Cowshed Tozhuttu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pandam Pakunbunan</td>
<td>Space for the dead Burial or cremation ground</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surau</td>
<td>Education centre Kalari</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mushalla/masjid</td>
<td>Prayer hall or place (Family temple)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Exist</td>
<td>Snake Worship Naga Worship</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Exist</td>
<td>gateway Paddypura</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>JORONG/ NAGARI</strong> SETTLEMENT UNIT TARAVAD</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pamedanan with banyan tree</td>
<td>Assembly council Banyan tree and Prathistan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>NAGARI</strong> LARGER SETTLEMENT DESHAM/ TATTAKAM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Masjid Raya</td>
<td>Main Sanctuary Bhagavaty temple</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Balai Adat</td>
<td>Assembly hall Not Exist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Balai</td>
<td>Market Not Exist</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


The arrangement of house compounds in jorong and tara is basically organic, but there is generalized schematic geometrical order, which provide conceptual and thematic geometry that connect all house compounds. In Kerala the schematic geometry principally connects spots of ancestral reference that connect house compound. The geometry is established connecting taravad entrance or taravad mahcu Bhagavaty room (ancestral chamber) or tulasi tara (sacred basil). The geometrical order is approximately 50 m. In Minangkabau the geometry is established connecting, alaman or back of kampungs with order of 11-15m. Kampung is therefore more dense than taravad. The schematic geometry could be expressed as Figure 5.7.

![Figure 5.6 Schematic grid representation of settlement](image)

Open space is basically a spatio-temporal setting and in between space. They neither are nor particularly designed place. Alaman and tara contained common meanings for elevated land. Both have religious meaning, where alaman is considered as female sphere and tara is always designed with regards to vastushastra. The case of Mathur and velakandam in Puthiankam indicate possibilities that square or settlement public space is basically the most public part of settlement which is created by dried paddy-field after harvesting. And post harvesting time coincides with many festivals. During these festivals the dried paddy field is used as venue for various communal activities. During rainy season this plot is flooded. In
Minangkabau the concept of public square associated with market and assembly activities. In Chittur the set relates more to the proper mainstream temple, with Bhagavaty ponds. This took place in main temple in Puthiankam.

Landmark of community at all levels are developed by and are on the property of main or powerful families, such as temple in Kerala and mosque in Minangkabau. Religious building and space evolved from these powerful families religious space, like Mosque is established from surau, and temple is developed from earlier family shrines.

### 5.3.3 House compound

Structure of house compound in Minangkabau is more fluid and accessible than in Kerala. In Kerala clan is more discrete than in Minangkabau therefore they are more exclusive. Rigid boundary is only known in Kerala, not in Minangkabau. The role of gate and fence is given much importance in Kerala than Minangkabau. In Minangkabau, boundary is marked by back of house, soil leveling, height difference, waterline, stone marking and vegetation marking. In Kerala they are marked by paddypura.

The basic structure of building in both places is rectangular structure with sloping roof. The structure are generally grain-store-house, called rumah bagonjong in Minangkabau and pattayapura in Kerala. They generally have three room and hip-bent roof. Middle room where in Kerala mahcu are situated and kelambu adat is placed is considered sacred. Their plan typology could be explained as Figure 5.8:
Figure 5.7 Basic building plan type

The structure is believed to be ‘home’ for people and paddy, as families practicing agriculture store paddy at home. In Minangkabau granary is conceptually the basic template and is adopted to design balai adat (assembly hall), surau (male-dormitory cum prayer house) Rumah gadang, surau and rumah Ketek. In both places, granary or grain storage take place in:

1. Attic and underneath house,
2. Underneath basement: nilavara and kopuak
3. Granary: rangkiang (granary), nelara (paddy room) and nelpura (paddy house)

From this type other typology has established like the living house (pattayapura in Kerala and rumah ketek in Minangkabau), kitchen house (aduppikala, aduppu in Kerala and rumah dapur in Minangkabau), religious building (temple, and surau in Minangkabau), and new modern houses.

Residential building structure in Kerala is multi-functional and has adjustable capacity. But considering dimension and material, taravad has
greater adaptability to modern functions. The inclination to build rigid structures made rumah gadang less fashionable than modern house. Open space is also comparable. The area of building and common space could be summarized as Table 5.4.

**Table 5.4 Comparative area of building and Space**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dimension</th>
<th>Kerala</th>
<th>Minangkabau</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Width of room (cm)</td>
<td>372.8</td>
<td>187.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area of house (sqm)</td>
<td>12,6x12,7=160</td>
<td>6,8x13=88.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area of ancestral chamber(sqm)</td>
<td>3,12x3 9= 36</td>
<td>5,95x2,52=15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area of middle yard(sqm)</td>
<td>17,5.3x15,1=264.25</td>
<td>13,6x15,5=210.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The concept of navel manifests in central post (tiang tuo) in rumah gadang and courtyard in taravad. The characters of indigenous knowledge especially for construction are practical and metaphoric in Minangkabau and theoretical and abstract in Kerala. Orientation in Minangkabau is metaphoric such as sacred mountain and river, and symbolic in determining order of post construction. In Kerala vastu treatise is utilized but had been termed according to local language and adjusted to local condition by the local carpenters. However both Minangkabau and Kerala have a template which is practical and metaphorical as the geometry of plan as indicated in Table 5.5:

Taravad is spatially more defined than kampung. Several kampung could constitute a higher level of organization. Empty houses are extensively found in Minangkabau, than in Kerala due to circular migration in Minangakabu which is more well rooted. Most Rumah gadang are empty. People prefer to stay in rumah Ketek (small house nearby rumah gadang) or modern house. This is obvious because unlike the case of pattayapura and
nalukettu, the less rigid and more expensive wooden construction of rumah gadjang makes it difficult to adjust with modern functions.

**Table 5.5 Comparative Diagram of Schematic Grid representation of Ancestral House**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Kerala</th>
<th>Minangkabau</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Each space of square (mandala pada) symbolically represents particular gods holding particular offices and role associate with the spatial role. The middle spot or Brahmasstanam is the centre of house where generally courtyard is located and of tulasi in the level of compound are put.</td>
<td>• Each spot where the column are put. Each column symbolically represents structure of leadership or the assembly community. Yet the counsel rest on tiang tuo, which is generally somewhere in the middle of the house, or batu tanam in the level of compound.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• House being nailed to the ground</td>
<td>• House being planted on the ground</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• The diagram is abstract diagram</td>
<td>• The diagram is a practical plot for drawing house plan</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Initiation of house construction is called kutiyadi and Bumipooya in Kerala and Batagak Rumah in Minangkabau and is signified by rituals in preparing ground and erecting the first construction. Kutiyadi appears as setting up the first stone while Batagak Rumah appears as erecting the first column. This corner and column are considered as the auspicious spots, where all rituals of the house would be commenced. It is the first column constructed, and its placement coincided with prayer hall (pooja room), and therefore it was considered sacred.
After these rituals, the subsequent constructions are made. The preparations of materials, like wood, labor and management was professionally maintained in Kerala. The architect is a particular professional-community called Assari belonging to Viswakarma community. In Kerala this labor division places the professional in the lowest level of society. By legend, Bhagavaty could only raise on the availability of this caste, viswakarma. In Minangkabau traditionally building construction is not a professional endeavor as in Kerala. It was ritually maintained by member of family and the village folk together. The architect is the member of family itself, while bundo kanduang (mother of the house) and tungganai (house manager) supervise the work, which was managed by a builder.

In Kerala, construction is a professional work based on treatise and architect. Manusyalayacandrika directly starts with house. It may be caused by the fact that settlement is not the object of design. Setting up a settlement merges with nature at a given time and space. This in Kerala cases and can be traced from any legends of occurrence of the Bhagavaty temple where it that in the event of Bhagavaty willing is placed to reside in a place, an umbrella is placed to depict a spot. In Minangkabau the narrative prescribed at Tambo legend is more about migrating families who finally found places to settle down, developed their habitations, receive another migrants and collectively built settlement and later polity.

5.4 TERRITORIAL INTERPRETATION

5.4.1 Hierarchy of Habitation based on extent of its Territorial Control

The following is the hierarchy of control working at each level of habitation, starting from the smallest sphere to the largest one. It correlates the intensity of power of the controlling agents to other levels of controlling
agents and its effects on the sphere of spatial territory. Figure 5.9 depicts the above analytical scheme for examining hierarchy of the controlled territory.

![Analytical framework of hierarchy of controlled territory]

**Figure 5.8 Analytical framework of hierarchy of controlled territory**

### 5.4.2 Typology of Ancestral House and the Role of Bundo Kanduang, and Amma

Typology of ancestral house is a visual controlling agents of environment embedded in building design. In Kerala the architect (asari) has full control over designs, while in Minangkabau it is a social agreement. By structural typology a taravad could take form of pattayapura, nalukettu; and rumah gadang take form of rumah bagonjong. The typology is expandable by numbers of hall or rooms like rumah gadang tiga ruang (three rooms), lima ruang (five room) or sembilan ruang (nine room).

An ancestral house is managed by male-head (karanavar for taravad and penghulu for kampung) and preserved by the eldest lady (amma) in Kerala and bundo-kanduang (institution of married ladies) and tungganai (care taker) in Minangkabau. It is inhabited by lineages of the clan who are female descendent, or tavazhi in Kerala, and saparuik in Minangkabau.
Traditionally due to communal character, rumah gadang and also rangkiang (granary) in Minangkabau were not only considered as asset of clan but also community. Therefore the council of nagari (kerapatan adat nagari) traditionally had the right to determine and modify the status of rumah gadang. Presently this is not much referred functionally, and the member of clan has every right to modify it and turn it into in individual house.

Ancestral chamber is the axis mundi of clan. It situated in the middle room of ancestral house. It is called bilik tangah in Minangkabau and mahcu ara in Kerala. They are characterized by their specific function to keep symbolic artifacts and relic of ancestor. The importance of ancestral chambers is accompanied by the navel of the house compound which is represented by nattumitam or courtyard for the case of taravad and space in front of mahcu ara for the case of pattayapura in Kerala; and labuan
(passageway) in rumah gadang. Here all ritual activities of the clan are centralized and focused. The significance of ancestral house is male – leader, his mother or sister and their ancestral relic.

In Kerala, in the event of demolition of taravad, mahcu-ara is often kept and reestablished into temple. In Minangkabau the event of demolition of rumah gadang and also rangkiang (granary) are often followed by marking the point of location of central post or tiang-tuo. Eventually this could model the transformation process of habitation into religious building or community landmark.

5.4 3 **House Compound: Karanavar and Penghulu**

Ancestral house is the space of actual clan or clan with traceable ancestor. They are characterized by prohibition of inter-marriage among members. Spatially they manifest in a complex of house compound and residence of the maternal lineage of male-leader called taravad in Kerala and kampung in Minangkabau,

The controlling agent of ancestral house and house compound is a male-head which is generally mother’s brother. They are led by male leader called karanavar in Kerala. In Minangkabau actual clan has more elaborated structure for few cases and includes members that are located beyond their territory. Maternal joint family is spatially called kampung and socially called kaum. They are led by male leader called penghulu in Minangkabau. Some maternal joint families within settlement unit are clustered as they are bound by trait of traceable ancestor and prohibition of inter-marriage called payung. Groups of maternal joint families that include its own within a nagari and those outside nagari is called jurai. Some penghulus hold more than kampung authority but also jurai and payung authority. Earlier male-heads
were major decision makers. Gradually trait of nuclear family and patrilineal has replaced the traditional trait.

In Minangkabau these male-leaders in general gather in surau (male-dormitory cum prayer space) and balai adat (community hall). Surau and balai adat of several kampung and payungs are spatially located and concentrated in slopes near river lines (lurah). In Kerala they would be spread in Pattayapura or grain-house within taravad compound.

5.4.4 Settlement or Community Unit

Several maternal joint families of common communities gather and constitute a social unit under common mythical ancestor. In Minangkabau they are called suku. In Kerala they are a community concentrated in one place, called tara. They are centered towards an assembly of elders called nattukutam with centre in local temple (kavu) for tara and ninik-mamak led by a chieftain called penghulu pucuk in Minangkabau. The assembly of elders traditionally gather in a venue called prathisthan and kavu in Kerala, and pamedanan in Minangkabau. Suku is not spatially concentrated like tara but is dispersed and over-layered. In Minangkabau nagari are divided into sectors (jorong). Maternal joint families of various suku could be dispersed in different sectors.

Another intangible controlling agents of design in the level of settlement and landscape is topography and organic pattern of paddy-farming. It governs the settlement to be arranged in sectors, which in Minangkabau emerges as the spatial groupings without controlling agent, which is jorong.
5.4.5 Confederations of Community and Settlement Unit

Several communities could share common spiritual sphere under main temples which is called tattakam in Kerala. A nagari in Minangkabau is basically a spiritual unit centered in balai Adat (assembly hall) and masjid raya (grand mosque). In Minangkabau the assembly is instituted in kerapatan adat nagari (nagari council), balai adat (community hall), and masjid (grand Mosque). In Kerala they are instituted in Bhagavaty temple, led by a temple Community (oorala) which could be alternatively vellichapad, or non-Brahmin Hindu priest generally the Nayars, or tantric which could be a Pattar or Tamil brahmin, or Nambuthiri brahmin. Typically main temple is established from earlier family temples of the leading communities, like mosque is established from earlier surau of the leading community or suku.

Tattakam is a spiritual jurisdiction around the kavu, under which the inhabitants are traditionally bound to temple activities, and then adimakavu concept could be said as an extension of this jurisdiction. Due to history of migration, some maternal joint families related to the kavu of a tara could be situated outside the tara.

In this way the concept of tattakam could be a sphere that is comparable with the social-spatial organization that bound a settlement with its settlement of origin. It is like in Tamilian terminology for settlement of origin or –ur settlement which bind settlement with their settlement of origin. In Minangkabau it is spatially and functionally acknowledged through the dichotomy of core-origin (darek) and its external hinterland (rantau). It is also comparable with the dichotomy of a nagari and its nagari of origin, like nagari Limo Kaum for nagari Sungayang and nagari Sungai Tarab for rao-Rao, and nagari Pariangan for both nagari Sungayang and nagari Rao-Rao.
5.4.6 Polity

If tattakam is organization of confederations of community centered in religious sphere then deshams is organization of confederations of settlement unit that is administrative. Nagari is organized such that it embraces both characters of spiritual and administrative sphere. Desham was lead by a desavazhi while nagari was under an assembly of elders (ninik-mamak). Both roles managed agricultural corporate and consolidated it with local kingdom. The traditional concept of nagari and desham maintained to become administrative unit. Formally the concept of nagari in Minangkabau is sustained as the village organization. Present roles of desham have vanished and transformed several time by administrative control of amsam and later panchayath, which is totally administrative.

5.4.7 Community group sharing mythical ancestor

Nagari is part of a traditional geographical sphere of origin called, luhak, as prescribed in Tambo Alam Minangkabau. Similarly earlier several desham or amsam stood under a geographical sphere of power called Malanadu as prescribed in Keralolpatti, which has been later segmented to become swaroopam. As a controlled territory and spatial configuration the Minangkabau luhak and nagari are still more cohesive and culture based than swaroopam and deshams in Kerala. Luhak is not a controlled territory like Swaroopam. It is more a schemata of cultural territory of Minangkabau land deep rooted in people of Minangkabau and is instituted in Tambo Alam Minangkabau. In this way the legend appear as controlling agent that assures territorial integrity. But in case of Minangkabau it is more sustainable.
5.4.8 Social-Spatial Organization of Larger Settlement

Nayar families could be named for 4-5 generations approximately while in Minangkabau 8-9 generations, which means that the condition in Minangkabau is more stagnant or stable while in Kerala transformation or transposition of families has taken place which has possibly altered the compositions of clan structure. The longer genealogical depth coincides with elaborated hierarchical groupings and fluid relation of clan structure in Minangkabau within and outside its territory.

Spatially the network of mythical clan organization could extend beyond settlement unit. It brought terminologies rantau (migrant land), laras (large clan groups) in Minangkabau, and adimakavu (slave of the kavu) in Kerala. The concept of laras and suku operated geographically in a way that clan groups are spread in various proportions in nagaris all over Minangkabau. It is justified mainly by the idea of common ancestor according to common written legend, Tambo Alam Minangkabau.

The concept of adimakavu basically reveals the concept clan that directly associates with a kavu to which they regularly pay tribute. The concept kavu is articulation of earlier community to which they refer as acclaimed ancestor. The three cases indicated that the concept of adimakavu bind people within and outside territory of a tara into one association. This concept is more or less comparable to jurai concept in Minangkabau as larger actual clan organization that bound member within nagari (kaum and payung) and those that spread in several different nagaris.

In Minangkabau, the scheme has more structures. One or more payung in a nagari could connect to similar payung from different nagari and establish a community group which is called jurai, like Piliang Tujuh Jurai (seven branch of Piliang), Bodi Caniago Tigo Balai (three House of Bodi
caniago), regional branch clan of Bodi caniago clan, and Kutianyir Tigo Paruik (three wombs of Kutianyir), are jurai that are found in both nagari Sungayang and Tanjung thus makeing both nagari connect as a unit. In Kerala the Chembottil travad are found in Mathur and Palanchatanur, and Moothedath in Chittur and Mathur.

As result Figure 5.10 illustrates the hierarchy of controlled territory to define the integrity of settlement. The thick dotted line indicate intensity of the organizations. The diagram shows that the sense of spatial integrity of the coordinated units happened in correlations of nagari-kampung-rumah gadang bilik and tiang tuo and tara-taravad-nalukettu, mahcu and courtyard. The actual hierarchy as it presently exists could be explained in Figure 5.11.
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**Figure 5.10 Hierarchical structure of traditional settlement**

It is shown that the sphere of confederation of community in Minangkabau is stronger than Kerala. In Kerala the sphere of clan is stronger in holding power. This explains that in Minangkabau nagari is the base of
cohesive habitation, while in Kerala it is in tara. However both indicated that house (taravad and kampung, rumah gadang and nalukettu) is still the basic common territory to be culturally and functionally maintained. It is the most elementary configuration for the establishment of higher layers of spatial organization such as sectors, settlement unit, confederation of settlement, and sacred geography.

The basic common organization lies in the network of houses as shown in relations and clustering’s assembly of configurations of houses (Cd’s) in various spheres and levels of habitations. Immediate spatial organizations are similarly formed by environmental confinement (Cc) which is jorong and tara. Tara is both territorial and spatial. Jorong is spatial. The next organizations are political administrative (Cb), which are nagari and desham and tattakam. Nagari is comparable to tattakam because they are cultural. Nagari is comparable with desham because they are traditional administrative and political. Cultural geography (Ca) exist but is more spatially defined in Minangkabau. Tattakam can be territorial when it coincide with the sphere of territorial organization such as tara or desham.

**Figure 5.11  Diagram of settlement territorial concept from Appendix 3**

The five cases demonstrate that the simplest understanding of settlement is a network of houses. Therefore it is important to define the concept and mechanism of network. The following is the map of segmentation of horizontal structure that constitutes habitation (refer to Appendix 3 and Figure 5.12). It concludes that the elementary social-spatial organization in both cases of settlement is matrilineal joint family compound (taravad, in Kerala, and kampung in Minangkabau). The stabile settlements are spatial confinement in which several matrilineal joint families are clustered together, tara in Kerala and jorong in Minangkabau.
Jorong and tara have larger social spatial organization, nagari in Minagkabau and Desham in Kerala. However in Minangkabau nagari constitute the cohesive cultural unit, bond by common legend of origin and cultural laws, while in Kerala desham constitute administrative political unit. It made culturally the notion of traditional settlement laid in nagari for Minangkabau and tara in Kerala. Cultural integrity of Tara in kerala is defined by caste and common legend, and festival.

The livelihood of settlement is defined by network that interlinked matrilineal joint family houses with other house inside that settlement or outside. The link is governed by kinship both actual and mythical, and depth of generation and, not by authority of the settlement. The link is caused by transformation, migration and expansion of the families. The extent of interlink has no boundary but has distribution pattern which is as wide as current district territory, which is Tanah Datar in Minangkabau and Palakkad in Kerala. These constitute a continuum of cultural geography.

5.4.9 The meaning of Religious Function and annual festivals

Festivals, rituals and cults are meant to bond the territory into a cultural control which in Kerala relates to annual events that articulate the narrative of origin, i.e.: Konganpada in Chittur, Velakooraidal in and koothabishekam in Mathur. Festivals in Kerala such as feast after harvesting, and symbolical reenactment of the emergence of the settlement or village (Vela) are a religious tribute to community or village deity Bhagavaty. In Minangkabau festivals did not exist anymore but social activities are still widely practiced and they preserve social cohesiveness of nagari, as proverbially said as “adat sa nagari” or “customs of a nagari”. Kerala has harvesting and sowing festivals but in Minangkabau it has stopped being a practice since 1960’s through Islam religion. In Kerala they still celebrated vishu, onam, and chaluedal.
The ritual association body has an organizing structure with some or all families performing specific roles for the association body. Temple community and festival committee in Kerala are lead by major Nayar Community in Kerala and kerapatan adat nagari (KAN) are ritual managers in Minangkabau.