

**PARADOX IN SOUTH INDIAN DIVINATION:
A STUDY IN CULTURAL AMBIVALENCE**

Charles W. Nuckolls

Acknowledgments: I am grateful to Professor Omori Motoyoshi for inviting me to participate in the conference.

Recently the Dravidian kinship system of South India has been characterized as an ideal never realized in practice, and therefore fundamentally “incomplete” in its own terms (Trawick 1990). Men give up their mothers and sisters, and women give up their fathers and brothers, but the principle of cross-cousin marriage promises a return of the relinquished, if not directly then through substitution in the next generation. The woman given in marriage in one generation is returned in the next, and the brother and sister divided by their marriages to different spouses are reunited in the marriage of their children. It is a very neatly symmetrical system, at least in theory. But it never can be achieved, and thus the system shapes or gives rise to desires that are never met fully or on time. South Indian kinship is not a static form upheld by shared rules, but a process maintained by unrelieved tensions, “its cyclicity that of a hunter following his own tracks” (Trawick 1990: 152).

What is desire in kinship, such that making it unfillable sustains the dynamic of cross-cousin marriage generation after generation? To pose an answer, we first must dispense with the notion that kinship is a set of prescriptive rules or higher-order structural imperatives. Individuals in South India do not marry their cross-cousin simply because that is the preferred arrangement, or because (at some higher level of generality) cross-cousin marriage sustains long-term alliances between intermarrying clans or lineages (Dumont 1970, 1979). Most people, in fact, are quite clear on

this point: They marry their cross-cousin because they want to. While it might be true that a desire of this kind is the consequence of a relational pattern, the one following the other as motivation follows structure, this explanation is too simple. It assumes that any pattern, if it represents "tradition," naturally and inevitably generates the desire to fulfill it. But desire is more complex than that — and this we know not just from Freud, but from social psychologists whose vocabulary for discussing the complexities of desire is exceedingly large: "ambivalence," "dissonance," "splitting," "rationalization," and "inner conflict," to name just a few (see Festinger 1971 for an excellent review).

It is not coincidental that the vocabulary of desire is rich in terms which assume the importance of emotional conflict. "Ambivalence" and the rest all refer to experiences of opposition, beginning with the one surely most human beings share: the wanting of things which are in conflict with each other. We cannot have both, yet we want them at the same time. Such wanting is most apparent, perhaps, when the desired objects are other human beings, since these desires are not simply one-sided but double, and therefore very complex. The most obvious case in point is the human infant. He or she desires "attachment," as Bowlby (1969) suggests, but must come to terms with the fact that the desired other (beginning with the mother) is not always available. One response is to construct a memory of the desired other, a "selfobject" as Kohut (1970) termed it, which can be called up during the other's periods of absence. Sometimes this is called "introjection." Another is to "split" the desired other into two parts, one representing the beneficent "good half," who is always available, and the other representing the maleficent "bad half," who withdraws affection and leaves. Both strategies, if one may call them that, are complex responses to desire, and reveal that desires are often deeply conflicted. But conflicted desires are also dynamically productive, as Obeyesekere (1981, 1990) has shown, since introjection and splitting can motivate cultural symbols, such as the symbol of the mother goddess in South Asia. The goddess is typically dual, split into

two images, one representing the “good mother” and other the “bad mother” (see also Kakar 1981; Nuckolls 1993; Obeyesekere 1984). This is not to reduce the symbol to the workings of the dynamic unconscious, or to replace culture with psyche, but to call attention to the fact that symbols and meanings necessarily implicate desires, and that many deeply felt desires are also conflicted.

Putting “desire” at the center instead of at the periphery of kinship is anthropologically new, and different from other approaches which, these days, tend to emphasize “power” and define kinship according to the strategies encoded in roles for the acquisition or maintenance of political positions in a field of limited good. Bourdieu, for example, considers marriage rules socially disseminated “lies,” whose purpose is to conceal the symbolic effects of strategies forced on people by economic and political necessities (Bourdieu 1977: 43; see also Kratz 1994; LiPuma 1983). It is not the purpose of this paper to criticize these approaches, but to consider a crucial missing item: *Desire in kinship*.

What will this achieve? For one thing it serves as a much-needed corrective to the tendency to view culture either as a network of finely spun symbolic lineaments (a view sometimes called “Geertzian”) or as an assemblage of discursive strategies which people deploy or resist depending on their positions. Whatever their differences, such views usually end up eliminating or severely restricting the domain of the irrational in everyday life — probably because “the irrational” was claimed by Freud a long time ago, and both the symbol-centric anthropologists of the 1960’s and the power-centric anthropologists of the 1990’s formally eschew psychoanalysis.¹ However, desire is usually irrational, and requires a different kind of conceptual vocabulary.

More than as a corrective, however, a theory of desire in kinship foregrounds the reality of deeply felt needs and wants. One hesitates to argue for the importance of a phenomenon based on the intuition (assumed to be shared) that it actually exists, yet in this case it would seem to be justified. People do feel strongly about the relation-

ships that bind them together or pull them apart, and to regard these feelings as secondary or epiphenomenal is mistaken. In any case, I shall depend on this intuition only in passing, to set the stage for the discussion that follows. If that is asking too much, then one could imagine the task ahead as an experiment in theoretical understanding: If desire in kinship is central, and not epiphenomenal, then what consequences might follow for ethnographic description? Better yet, what does a perspective that puts desire first and foremost tell us about kinship that otherwise we might not know?

As I suggested, the kind of desire I have in mind is of a particular type in which the experience of conflict is foregrounded. In English we have called this experience "ambivalence" ever since Freud coined the term. Of course the experience has been around far longer, and was characterized by Goethe (in the words of Faust) in considerably more poetic language: "You are aware of only one unrest; Oh, never learn to know the other! Two souls, alas, are dwelling in my breast, And one is striving to forsake its brother." Faust struggles between his desires for carnal and spiritual knowledge, and resolves the conflict in favor of the former until he discovers that he has paid too high a price. What appeal would the poem have for us were it not for the ambivalence Faust experiences as he contemplates his choices? If the answer is that it would have less, the reason might be that Faustian choices inspire aesthetic enjoyment. Philosophers at the end of the eighteenth century even had a word for this kind of enjoyment: they called it the "sublime." My purpose is not to argue a point of aesthetic theory, but to suggest that the poetics of kinship, as it were, might depend on a similar mechanism involving conflicted desires.

Specifically, I will argue that Dravidian kinship is motivated by a desire of a certain kind — call it, of the sake of convenience, the desire for "fusion" or "completeness." It is a desire that can never be fulfilled. The reason is in the logic of the kinship system, which promises completeness. Brothers hold fast to their unity as members of the same patrilineal household, but invariably destroy that unity when

they divide, as they must, to form separate sublineages. Brothers and sisters also desire unity, but must separate when they separate — and thereafter their interests regularly diverge, despite their long-term and enduring desire to be united. Men and women want unity, but they also want the things that must obstruct the achievement unity, and the result is more than just “frustration.” It is the very dynamics of the kinship system itself, which I will show cannot be understood independently of the ambivalence it provokes.

THE JALARIS OF SOUTHEASTERN COASTAL INDIA

The Jalaris are a fishing caste people whose greatest concentration is in the Telugu-speaking areas of coastal Andhra Pradesh state. Fishing villages dot the northern coast of Andhra, one of the four southern Indian states where Dravidian languages are spoken. Jalaripet, a large fishing village near the large port city of Visakhapatnam, is on a bay that offers a good harbor and ideal protection from rough seas. Some people say that the bay is called “Lawson’s Bay” after an eighteenth century English pirate, John Lawson, who used it as a shelter between raids. Broad areas of sandy hills divide the habitations into three groups. The largest is Jalaripet itself, inhabited by members of the Jalari caste.

DESIRE IN KINSHIP

Starting from Kakar (1981, 1989, 1995), and others (Erikson 1966; Obeyesekere 1984, 1990; Roland 1988; Samanta 1994; Trawick 1990), I shall claim that the desire for fusion, or coalescence, is the goal toward which kinship structures tend. This goal foregrounds the state of “unity” where otherwise there might be separation, and emphasizes shared dependency over achieved states of independence. Reasons why this is so are a matter of debate, but as Trawick notes, “the manifestations of these feelings in Indian superstructure and behavior are too massive to ignore” (1990: 171). Knowledge systems, like kinship, are built up (Weber would say “rationalized”) with

respect to this goal function to preserve unity where it exists, and to restore it in circumstances where it has been lost, either directly or by displacement to a substitute.

“Fusion” does not imply that Indians never recognize or seek to elaborate purely individual aspects of personality. Some scholars have taken this view, and argued that Indians lack an abstract sense of the individual as in integrated whole (Marriott 1976, 1989). I agree with Mines (1994) that Indians do recognize individuality as an essential feature of ordinary life, and indeed, display a keen awareness of the unique aspects of personality. This awareness, however, is distinct in several respects from Western notions of the individual and of personality.

In the first place, the desire for fusion is not unproblematic, since the means available for its fulfillment are contradictory. Kakar (1981: 34) notes that “the essential psychological theme of Hindu culture is the polarity of fusion and separation . . . a dynamic counterpoint between two opposite needs, to merge into and to be differentiated from the ‘Other,’ where the ‘Other’ is all which is not the self.” But that is only part of the problem, since the means for achieving fusion conflict not only internally, but with each other. In Jalari culture, the problem locates itself in sibling relations, in the choices brothers and sisters are forced to make between different forms of sibling unity and separation. It is in the domain of sibling relations that the work of achieving fusion is supposed to be done, but it cannot be done given the paradoxes embedded in the sibling relationship.

The reason why the goal cannot be reached has to do with the role of sibling relations in South India. According to one set of norms, brothers should remain together as members of the same agnatic group, living in the same house and sharing its resources. But this is impossible. Fraternal interests diverge as brothers establish their own families, and eventually they split up, each to found his own agnatic group. This is the paradox. As brothers fulfill their chief obligation as members of the same patrilineal group, by creating constituent families, they must eventually destroy the

group, once their constituent families become established.

According to the other set of norms, brothers and sisters should cooperate with each other as givers and takers of each other's children in cross-cousin marriage. It is a neatly symmetrical system, at least in theory, but the symmetry is disturbed by the exigencies of each family's circumstances. Either there are not enough marriage partners to go around; or the cross-cousins who should marry don't like each other; or there is competition among brothers and sisters for each other's children. One way or another, something is bound to go wrong, imperiling the ideal of cross-sex sibling harmony. This is the other paradox. Although brothers and sisters want to remain tightly linked, they are prevented from doing so by the very nature of the bond that relates them. The fact that South Indians cannot simultaneously and satisfactorily fulfill all normative obligations in their roles as brothers and sisters is the source of a very deep cultural ambivalences, finding expression in a variety of cultural forms, including kinship roles but also mythology and divination.

For example, divination recognizes that *all* problems have their origin in the paradoxes of the sibling relationship. Divinatory explanation consists of identifying the problem and devising a strategy for setting it right — that is, for restoring the unity of these particular relationships, since “unity” is the paramount directive goal. Jalaris recognize two sources of social dispute as prototypic precipitants of spiritual attack: 1. the agnatic group, composed of male patriline members (prototypically brothers); and 2. the affinal group, composed of married brothers and sisters whose lineages maintain cross-cousin alliance relationships with each other. I use the word “prototypic” to refer to what seem to be core Jalari understandings: While “agnatic” and “affinal” in fact include additional categories, for the Jalaris they tend to focus on siblings. Disputes are outcomes of situations which arise predictably and inevitably within and between relations of these two groups.

In agnatic groups, disputes occur when brothers marry and again, several years later, when their children approach marriageable age. Because each of these two

crisis moments intensifies, in different ways, each brother's desire to create his own, independent patrilineal group, disputes arise at precisely those points when joint actions are essential, e.g., in offering to the household spirits (*ammavallu*) which represent group solidarity. Between affinal groups, united by cross-cousin marriage, similar crises develop when joint responsibilities arise, as in the exchange of money and in the making of cross-cousin marriage alliances.

Patrilineality and alliance are extensions from fraternal and cross-sex sibling relations and constitute the dialectics of South Indian kinship, as well the determining nexus of the social disputes which culminate in divinatory explanation.

Not surprisingly, there are two typical explanatory scenarios which must be evaluated in every divinatory session. Perhaps they could be called "cultural models," in the fashionable jargon of today (see Shore 1996). One is the "agnatic" and the other is the "affinal" scenario. They describe the prototypic ways (fraternal) agnatic and (cross-sibling) affinal relations go awry, leading to attacks by the household goddesses and subsequent distress (usually in the form of illness). There are *only* two scenarios, and a choice must be made between them in divination. Inevitably, one or the other is found to be the cause. The directive goal is to put the relationship back together, to restore sibling relations in fulfillment of the ideal of fusion or unity. Solutions are always temporary, however, because the contradictions informing the process remain unaltered. That is why crises are bound to recur, insuring that the social dialectic they constitute continues as long as the unreachable goal of fusion remains culturally salient.

THE DYNAMICS OF DESIRE IN KINSHIP

What, exactly, *is* the effect of cross-cousin marriage on the relationship between fathers and son, mothers and daughters, brothers and sisters, and husbands and wives that might give to the South a different twist on themes common throughout the subcontinent? The fundamental dynamic of Dravidian kinship is realized in the rela-

tionship between siblings as individuals and as groups whose desires *must* and *do* diverge. The divergence is central to the kinship system, which necessarily opposes the desires of those related agnatically and affinally.

As soon as brothers marry and bring their wives, vast structural changes begin to occur within the patriline they constitute as prototypic members. New wives are notoriously jealous and (in a scenario familiar from throughout South Asia) quarrel among themselves over the distribution of family resources. At the same time that wives come, sisters leave by marrying out. Married sisters are their brothers' primary trading partners, buying their fish and selling it in the market downtown. They expect favorable trading terms which their brothers, either individually or collectively, find difficult to meet or agree on. Both groups, wives and sisters, compete for the brothers' assistance and support, making the effort to balance their competing needs increasingly difficult.

Because of their sudden juxtaposition as competing expectations, I refer to the co-presence of intense affinal obligations at this point as the first "crisis moment." It may take months or years to develop, as all the brothers and sisters marry, and begin their own families. It comes to an end when brothers can no longer agree on the distribution of resources, including money, food, and fishing equipment, to their dependent affines. Factions develop. Several brothers (usually the younger ones) push for greater individual control and other brothers (usually the older ones) advocate continued collectivization and control of resources by an elder. The result is always the same: Dissolution of the patriline as a residential and coparcenary unit.

Following division of the patriline's property, the brothers leave their joint residence and live apart, in physically separate *gadillus* ("room houses.") But the patriline remains "joint" under the authority of the senior male, usually an elder brother, since by this point the father has died. To be sure, that authority no longer means control over or access to collective property or earnings. It pertains to the group's ritual identity — that is, to its members identification with one "big house" (*peddillu*),

where the senior male lives; one “goddess shrine” (*sadaru*), where patriline members worship patriline spirits; and one “goddess money” (*ammavari dabbu*), to which members contribute a portion of their income for the support of rituals. Patriline members remain, both in their own and in the community’s eyes, “birds of a single nest.”

Agnatic solidarity, represented prototypically in the solidarity between brothers, defines the patrilineal ideology that constitutes the ideal of Jalari social life. By “ideology” I refer to what Chasseguet-Smirgel and Grunberger call “the system of thought which claims to be total, [a] historical and political interpretation whose (unconscious) aim is the actualization of an illusion, of illusion *par excellence*, that the ego and its ideal can be reunited by a short-cut, via the pleasure principle” (1986: 25-26). This illusion, with its powerful directive force, is challenged by the fissiparous tendencies of brothers, tendencies which become particularly intense when they marry and start their own families. Eventually it gives way and brothers divide their residences. The paradox is that this not what Jalari men want, or are supposed to want, given the directive goals their culture creates for them. They would prefer to remain united, in multigeneration families, because such families can become powerful in the village both economically and in terms of social prestige. Ironically, the very effort to achieve this ideal results it receding further, until it becomes irretrievably lost.

After the first crisis moment, the deaths of senior males weaken the solidarity of the patriline, leading to changes which now begin primarily on the agnatic axis, in the relationship between brothers. Family problems have shifted from the women who marry into and out of the patriline — the cause of the first crisis moment — to the men whom they marry. The shift reflects a change in structural focus, from concern with the incorporation and exodus of members through marriage to a concern with the continuation of the patriline through the bearing and raising of children. The more serious disputes now begin and end among men, and concern the

allocation of ritual identity, not living expenses.

The reason is that Jalari men become increasingly familocentric as their children grow up, devoting more and more of their resources to their children's' (especially their sons') care and training. Men feel increasingly disinclined to contribute any of their heavily committed funds to the "goddess money," the last collective resource patriline members possess. Serious quarrels between patriline members eventually focus on this money — on how much each member is or is not contributing and on how the collected money should be spent. Since the "goddess money" represents the ritual identity of the patriline, disputes of this kind are really disputes about patrilineal solidarity.

The first crisis moment in Jalari family life is succeeded by another, which develops later and whose consequences finally result in the complete breakdown of the agnatic group. In this case, the fault line does not run fraternally, but between brother and sisters, and centers on the issue that concerns adult brothers and sisters most: The marriages of their children in cross-cousin alliance. How can one satisfy the demands of cross-siblings and agnatic kin at the same time, preserving the unity of both groups? The paradox this creates cannot be resolved, except in the temporary accommodations of myth and divination, which we will consider later.

As pressures mount within the patriline for its dissolution, they necessarily affect relations between the patriline and its affinally linked households, especially the households of married sisters. For one thing, brothers and sisters typically find trading with each other less profitable than trading with others. Then, too, brothers may not respond to their sisters' demands for help or, if they do, may respond in ways their sisters don't like. Finally, either a brother or a sister may abrogate an alliance relationship, deciding to marry their children to other related households or (in an growing trend) to households not related at all. Such problems eventually develop, no matter what.

It is easy to see why. Between brothers and sisters, normal obligations for sup-

port and assistance add considerably to brothers' extra-patrilineal obligations and thus diminish the resources they can devote to the maintenance of the patrilineal group. To support affinal relations to the extent normative obligations require means reducing the amount of support allocable to the patriline. And because obligations to the patriline are most intense at this "moment," when brothers are older, that becomes extremely difficult. The opposite is true also. Fulfilling patrilineal obligations means abrogating some or all of the obligations owed to affines. The patriline is caught in the middle, increasingly unable to hold its own ground against the fishparous pressures exerted by cross-sibling bonds.

Kinship tensions between affinally related patrilines, like tensions within them, cause arguments among patriline members which center on contributions to the "goddess money." Because of competing affinal obligations, brothers stop contributing altogether or demand the return of certain sums to meet personal expenses. Jalaris recognize these acts as symptoms of underlying tension and the result of competing role expectations. They invariably signal members' growing disaffection from the group.

The centrality of the "goddess money" attests to the importance of spirit-human relations as one of the influences co-determining the family's passage through crisis moments in its development. Household spirits require periodic offerings which family members pay for from the "goddess money." When family relations are unsettled, members cannot join together to make offerings. As a result, the spirits become angry and attack, usually by inflicting illness or by causing a sudden drop in the fish catch. Family members then re-examine their sibling relations, to identify and try to address the social problem which caused them to neglect the offering in the first place.

Early in the patriline's development, disaffected members may reunite and resume regular contributions to the "goddess money." But later, when the brothers are older and their contributions to the patriline more difficult to maintain, brothers will

claim that dividing the patriline, rather than keeping it together, is the best way to avoid future attacks. The result is a complete breakdown of the patriline. Brothers enter the "big house" and split off chunks of the goddess shrine (*sadaru*). Each brother takes a chunk to his own house where he consecrates it as a new *sadaru*, thus making his house into a "big house," the symbolic nucleus of a new patriline. The second crisis moment is now over and fission of the old patriline is complete.

The paradox is that although brothers must someday separate, the ideology of fraternal solidarity cuts against this, and makes brothers ambivalent about their role in the group and their efforts to divide it. When brothers say, "we are birds of a single nest," they represent to themselves the intense bonds which constitute the patrilineal ideology and which bind them together as members of the same patriline. Considerable emotive force is bound up in this expression. A Jalari man expresses his love for, and complete dependence on, the patriline by referring to himself as a "bird" and to it, the patriline, as his "nest" or "branch." Most men cannot discuss this subject without being visibly moved. Some are brought to tears.

Sibling images represent two sides of the same paradox. Brothers want to remain together, but cannot, and in fact do everything they can to bring about their dissolution as group. This they then regret. Similarly, brothers and sisters want to remain united, but find this increasingly difficult given their competition among each other and their growing inability to meet each others' needs. Eventually they go their separate ways, signifying their break in a ritual of chicken sacrifice made at the door of one's sibling. But they always regret it and think that somehow the split might have been prevented.

KINSHIP AS PARADOX

This paper has suggested that South Indian kinship is much more than a set of norms and rules. It is a dynamic of unfulfillable desires, and this dynamic is fundamental to the working of the system. In the past, anthropologists have considered

“desire” a derivative of the system, and therefore secondary — something best left to the psychologists. One recalls Leach’s dismissal of Spiro thirty years ago on exactly these grounds (Leach 1969). Unfortunately, the “traditional” view tends to represent the people who actually occupy kinship roles as unthinking and unfeeling automatons, blindly implementing cultural programs. Clearly this is inadequate, but critique does not justify abandonment of the idea of “systems” or worse, the idea that power and position explain everything. The desires people have are essential to their participation in the system, and when those desires conflict — as they must — then a very different analytic language is called for, one that comprehends the dynamic power of conflict, contradiction, and frustration.

This is not the first time, that the importance of dynamic conflict has been noticed. In the 1960’s, Francis Hsu introduced the concept of dominant kinship relationships, to explain how such relationships could have an effect on kin and non-kin behavior (see Hsu 1965). Hsu’s theory is long overdue for reconsideration. According to Hsu’s hypothesis, the comparatively few attributes of such relationships provide the frameworks within which a variety of cultural aspects could be understood. It was only a step from this to the view that dominant relationships conflict, and thus generate ambivalence which the kinship system both represents and tries to resolve. The anthropologist who first proposed making ambivalence central to the study of kinship was van der Veen (1971). “Of essential importance for every human relationship,” he stated, “is the way in which the inherent ambivalence of the relationship is solved” (1971: 379). But van der Veen was concerned mostly with universal conflicts, such as he believed existed between the desire for independence and the need to conform to social norms. One could see cross-cousin marriage in similar terms, perhaps: The patrilineal desire to be independent against the continuing need to affiliate via the inclusion of affines. Van der Veen may be right, but I prefer to adopt a more particularistic frame of reference, limiting my description of the conflict to the dynamics of South Indian kinship.

CONCLUSION

Gregory Bateson pointed out that there are problems that cannot be solved, such as alcoholism and the political opposition between Palestinians and Israelis (Bateson 1972). What is the nature of these problems? Far from being merely secondary or derivative, such problems might be fundamental to what we call "culture." Where each generation transmits to the next its unresolved problems, there exists a continuity between generations that goes by the name *culture*. That is because they are not problems, but *solutions* to problems which are covert and intractable. Such problems are paradoxes, like those I have described as emergent in South Indian kinship. To follow Bateson's insight, what we need is a theory of paradox in culture. It has been the purpose of this paper to suggest a strategy for formulating this kind of theory.

REFERENCES

- Bateson, G. 1958 *Naven*. 2nd edition. Stanford: Stanford University Press.
- Bourdieu, P. 1977 *Outline of a Theory of Practice*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Bowlby, J. 1969 *Attachment and Separation*. London: Hogarth Press.
- Chasseguet-Smirgel, J. and Grunberger, B. 1986 *Freud or Reich? Psychoanalysis and Illusion*. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Chodorow, N. 1978 *The Reproduction of Mothering: Psychoanalysis and the Sociology of Gender*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Erikson, E. 1969 *Gandhi's Truth: On the Origins of Militant Nonviolence*. New York: Norton.
- Dunn, J. 1988 *The Beginnings of Social Understanding*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Hsu, F. 1965 "The effect of dominant kinship relationships on kin and non-kin behavior: a hypothesis," *American Anthropologist* 67: 638-61.
- 1971 ed. *Kinship and Culture*. Chicago: Aldine.
- Kakar, S. 1981 *The Inner World: Childhood and Society in India*. Delhi: Oxford University Press.
- 1989 "The maternal-feminine in Indian psychoanalysis." *International Review of Psychoanalysis* 19: 355-362.
- 1990 "Stories from Indian psychoanalysis: Context and Text," In *Cultural Psychology: Essays on Human Development*. eds. J. Stigler, R. Shweder, and G. Herdt. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Kolenda, P. 1993 "Sibling Relations and Marriage Practices: A Comparison of North, Central, and South India." In *Siblings in South Asia: Brothers and Sisters in Cultural Context*. ed. C. Nuckolls. New York: Guilford Press.
- Kurtz, S. 1992 *All the Mothers are One*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Leach, E. 1969 *Genesis as Myth and Other Essays*. London: Jonathan Cape.
- LiPuma, E. 1983 "On the preference for marriage rules: A Melanesian example," *Man* 18: 766-785.
- Marriott, M. 1976 "Hindu Transactions: Diversity Without Dualism," In *Transaction and Meaning: Direction in the Anthropology of exchange and Symbolic Behavior*. Ed. B. Kapferer. Philadelphia: ISHI.
- 1989 "Constructing an Indian Ethnopsychology," *Contributions to Indian Sociology* 23: 1-39.
- Merton, R. 1976 *Sociological Ambivalence*. New York: Free Press.
- Mines, M. 1994 *Public Faces, Private Voices: Community and Individuality in South India*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Minturn, L. 1993 *Sita's Daughters: Coming Out of Purdah*. New York: Oxford University Press.

- Nuckolls, C. 1991a "Becoming a Possession-Mediumship in South India: A Psychocultural Account," *Medical Anthropology Quarterly* 5: 63-77.
- 1991b "Deciding How To Decide: Possession-Mediumship in South India," In M. Nichter (ed.) special edition, *Recent Trends in Ethnomedicine, Medical Anthropology* 13: 57-82.
- 1991c "Culture and Causal Thinking: Prediction and Diagnosis in a South Indian Fishing Village," *Ethos* 17:1: 3-51.
- _____. ed. 1993 *Siblings in South Asia: Brothers and Sisters in Cultural Context*. New York: Guilford Publications.
- Obeyesekere, G. 1981 *Medusa's Hair*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- 1984 *Cult of the Goddess Pattini*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- 1990 *The Work of Culture*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Rank, O. 1992 [1912] *The Incest Theme in Literature and Legend*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Roland, A. 1988 *In Search of the Self in India and Japan*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Samanta, S. 1994 "The Self-Animal and Divine Digestion: Goat Sacrifice to the Goddess Kali in Bengal," *Journal of Asian Studies* 53: 779-803.
- Trawick, M. 1990 *Notes on Love in a Tamil Family*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- van der Veen, K. 1971 "Ambivalence, Social Structure, and Dominant Kinship Relationships: A Hypothesis," In F. Hsu ed. *Kinship and Culture*. Chicago: Aldine.
- Zukow, P. ed. 1989 *Sibling Interaction across Cultures: Theoretical and Methodological Issues*. New York: Springer-Verlag.

南インドの託占とアメリカの精神療法術におけるパラドックス

〈要 旨〉

チャールズ ナクルス

南インドのドラヴィダ型親族体系は、もはや現実化されない理念で、従ってそれ自体は基本的に「不完全」なものと特色づけられる(Trawick 1990)。男性は母親や姉妹を、女性は父親や兄弟を送り出す。しかし交差いとこ婚の原理が、たとえ直接でないとしても次の世代で代替えとして、送り出された人たちを連れ戻すと保証するのだ。ある世代で婚出した女性は次の世代で戻される。婚姻により離された兄弟は、かれらの子供たちの結婚によりふたたび結合される。ドラヴィダ型親族体系は少なくとも理論上は均衡を保たせる体系なのだ。しかし、この理論どうりには実際には行われない。それゆえ、この体系に託された願いも完全には、また時機にかなって、具体化し、実現したりはしない。南インドの親族体系は分与された複数の役割に支えられた静的な形ではなく、「自分の足跡を追う獵師のような循環」(同書, 152)のような、解消されない緊張に保持された一つのプロセスにほかならない。

親族体系に込められた欲求を満たさないままに、何世代間も交差いとこ婚を躍動するのは何なのか？ この間に答える前に、私たちに必要なのは、親族体系が幾つもの規則を押し付けたり、より高い次元の、構造を規定するものの組合わさりと考えるのを止めるべきだ。南インドの人々が交差いとこ同士で結婚する場合には、望ましい形の結婚という理由だけでなく、(より一般化して言うなら)交差いとこ婚が氏族やリニッジ間の通婚が長期にわたる縁組みを支えるからでもない(Dumont 1970,1979)。多くの人たちの意見はこの点できわめて明確だ。人々はそうしたいから交差いとこ結婚する。人々がそう望むのは、関係構築パターン(構造によって動

機づけられ、人々は他の人々に倣う)の結果だと考えてもよいかも知れない。だが、このような説明は単純すぎる。どんなパターンも、それが「伝統」を表象するのなら、自然に、また必然的に伝統を実現したいとの欲求を創りだすと考えられる。しかし欲求はもっと複雑なものだ。私たちはこの事実をフロイトからだけでなく、社会心理学者たちから学んだ。欲求の複雑性を議論するための語彙は、社会心理学の方がはるかに豊富で、ほんの二、三を挙げても「両面価値」、*dossonance*、[分割]、[合理化]、[内面葛藤]、などがある (Festinger 1971のすぐれたレビューを見よ)。

「欲求」を親族組織の周縁にではなく中心に据えるのは、人類学では新しく、他のアプローチとは異なる。他のアプローチとは、限られた財を支配できる政治的な地位の獲得や保持に必要なさまざまな役割のなかに込められた諸方策に応じて親族関係を規定するとか、「権力」を強調する傾向がある。Bourdieuは、一例として婚姻規則は社会的に広められた「賤」で、その目的は経済上、政治上の必要から人々に強いられる諸方策のシンボリックな様々な効果を秘密にしておくためだと考える (Bourdieu 1977: 43, Kartz 1994, LiPuma 1983も見よ)。

本稿では社会的パラドックス (逆説)、抑圧された欲求、そこから生成される両面価値、これらのダイナミックスを記述する。つぎに社会的パラドックスが占いのシステムに及ぼした結果を跡づける。占いのシステムの中で人々は乱された近親関係に不幸をもたらす原因を探るのだ。最後にアメリカの心理療術と比較するが、これは南インドの占いと同じくパラドックスで深く引き裂かれたシステムで、かつジェンダーの観念と強く関わりあっている。