Richard Feinberg, *Anuta: Social Structure of a Polynesian Island* with a foreword by Sir Raymond Firth. Laie, Hawaii and Copenhagen: Institute for Polynesian Studies and The Danish National Museum, 1981. $16.95.

Anuta is a valuable and precise ethnography that advances our knowledge of the Western Pacific; it also puts forward a hypothesis on Oceanic kinship that is worth discussing. Accordingly, after a few remarks on the ethnographic presentation, I will concentrate my comments on the theoretical part of the study.

Feinberg presents Anutan society in terms of integrative levels, successively discussing three main units of increasing size: the *patongia* (extended family); the *kainanga* (a "descent group" with some qualifications); and the *kanopenua* (which includes the entire population of the island). This method of presentation reflects a functionalist bias that presumes that a lower-level unit can be defined independently from higher-level units, since the latter are viewed essentially as aggregates of the former. The approach is in sharp contrast with a structural one, for which the determination of the parts presupposes that of the whole, so that the system cannot be viewed as the integration of preexisting components.

Without entering into the philosophical debate over the respective virtues of Functionalism and Structuralism, it seems to me that the superiority of a presentation based on structuralist premises is dramatized by the difficulties the reader encounters in following Feinberg's exposition: when treating lower-level units he must constantly refer the reader to the subsequent discussion of higher-level units. This gives the impression that

the book should be read backwards. It would have been more helpful to begin with a brief global presentation of the system and its basic principles which--as Feinberg recognizes (pp. 3, 146)--are found at all levels of Anutan society.

Generally speaking, the book is more ethnographic than interpretive; for instance, one looks in vain for an analysis of the interesting *rites de passage* and their symbolism (p. 109-22). Only their functional import is considered by Feinberg.

The ethnographic nature of the study is further emphasized by the fact that almost half of it consists of appendixes, Especially valuable are the complete genealogical record of the population, the appendix that lists the use of kin terms by fourteen Anutans, and the extremely detailed record of personal data of all the inhabitants of the island. One would have liked, however, to see more of these data incorporated into the discussion of the principles of Anutan society, especially as statistics.

Most disappointingly, Feinberg has not used the genealogical and personal data to give more substance to his very sketchy account of marriage. He presents the "Anutan system" as one in which restricted exchange is practiced by each generation with a different group, and the original alliance is repeated after five generations (p. 125). No empirical evidence is given to support this model and to show how it relates to the concrete patterns of intermarriage.

Feinberg's description of Anuta is based on the principle that the ethnographer must scrupulously adhere to the "native view" (p, 4). He suggests that "a division of the sociocultural universe in terms of integrative levels more nearly approaches universality than one which breaks phenomena down into politics, economics, kinship, religion, and the other categories according to which Western social thought has been accustomed to proceed" (p. 4). But in practice Feinberg contradicts this programmatic statement by liberally using Western categories to define Anutan institutions. For example, he claims that "the *patongia* is conceptualized fundamentally in economic terms" (p. 99, cf. p. 73) because it is "the group which shares a common basket when food is distributed among the island's population . . ." (p. 98). This reductive characterization of food sharing as a purely economic phenomenon goes against all we know about food as: a symbol of identity in Oceanic societies and especially the association established in Anuta between food and *aropa,* "love" as an index of kinship (cf. p. 69).

On the theoretical plane, Feinberg's most interesting contribution is his rather Schneiderian characterization of Anutan (and Oceanic) kinship

as based on two principles: genealogy (i.e. belief about biological relations, cf. p. 2) and "code for conduct," which involves "the giving and sharing of labor, goods, and particularly food" (p. 2). The "behavioral component" of kinship is summarized in Anutan culture by a single concept: *aropa* "love."

Although at one point Feinberg concurs with Goodenough in declaring that "in order to be 'kinship,' a domain must be defined at least in part by genealogy" (p. 42, n.4), the central thesis of the book is that the 'behavioral component" of kinship can be separate from the genealogical and take its place entirely. In other words, acting like a kinsman would suffice to make one a kinsman in the full sense of the term, without any need of genealogical connection (pp. 71, 146, 197).

The problem with this view is that it does not recognize the true basis of the principle that acting like a kinsman makes one a kinsman. This basis can only be, in my opinion, the axiomatic connection established between a certain genealogical relationship and a certain pattern of behavior. Since a genealogical kinsman is supposed to act in a certain way, acting in this way may be (considered the index of the corresponding kinship relationship, and because it evokes it, because it makes it present in the mind, it makes it exist in a certain sense.

To put it another way, the rule "if behavior x, then relation y" is true only because it is the reciprocal of another rule that it presupposes: "if relation y, then behavior x." Accordingly, "kinship by conduct" is not an autonomous principle but presupposes "kinship by genealogy." Moreover, it is evident that to the extent that the relationship between behavior and genealogy is really considered axiomatic, it should imply that behavior establishes not simply a vague "kinship" that it would be possible to define without reference to genealogy, but genealogical kinship itself.

The ethnographic data given by Feinberg seem to establish that the axiomatic connection between kinship and behavior is not valid in all contexts, because there are cases in which behavior does not seem to really establish kinship or does not override a previous genealogical relationship that is in contrast with it. When the axiom is considered valid, however, one notices a tendency--at the very least--to postulate a genealogical connection.

Anutan adoption exemplifies the class of cases in which a given behavior is not axiomatically translated into a given kinship relationship. In an adoptive relationship, the adopter behaves like a father and the adoptee like a son. Nevertheless at the moment of marriage the adoptee is considered "a member solely of his natal *patongia*" (p. 95). Obviously, then, the

ideology of descent is so strong that it is not overridden by behavior. Behaving like a father does not make one a full father. The point is further emphasized by a case cited by Feinberg (p. 94) in which the adoptive father is still considered by his adoptee as the mother's brother that he is genealogically.

This case contrasts with those in which behaving like a kinsman makes one fully a kinsman by bringing about a genealogical incorporation. Thus Pu Raropita, an immigrant, having begun as a bond friend *(toa)* of the last descendant of the founder of a *kainanga,* ended up being a perfectly valid genealogical link between his own descendants and the founder of the *kainanga* in which he was incorporated. Thus the relationship between the descendants of Pu Raropita and the founder of the *kainanga* is one of descent (pp. 131, 167).

In the end, the paradigmatic connection of kinship and genealogy is recognized--rather contradictorily--by Feinberg himself at the end of the hook where he writes: "When an immigrant is incorporated into the Anutan kinship system on the basis of his conduct, the genealogical element is supplied terminologically, and he is called not just *taina maori* ["true sibling of the same sex"] by members of his sex and generation in his *patongia,* but *taina maori, nga maatua e tai* ["true siblings of the same sex with the same parents"] as if they actually believed him to be the offspring of the same couple as themselves" (p. 197).

This confirms that genealogy is the true ideological principle of kinship in Anuta (cf. p. 56) and that, insofar as behaving in a certain way axiomatically implies kinship, it involves the fictitious establishment of a genealogical connection or the use of kin terms that imply that connection. I infer from all this that by making behavior an autonomous and "distinct" (p. 197) element of the Anutan ideology of kinship, its true relationship with genealogy is misunderstood.

This criticism notwithstanding, I find *Anuta* valuable both as an ethnographic record and as a stimulating and challenging revindication of the "behavioral" aspect of kinship in Oceanic societies.

Valerio Valeri
University of Chicago