

**Property, Inheritance and Authority:
A Case Study of Land Resource Management in Sangalla', Tana Toraja**

Nurul Ilmi IDRUS*

Abstract

Tongkonan is an honour and a source of property for Torajanese. Property itself consists of private property—composing of achieved property (*éananna*), inherited property (*mana'*), and gifts (*tékkén*)—and communal property (*mana' tongkonan*) which refers to property owned by members of *tongkonan* from one *pa'rapuang*—ramage traced back to the first ancestor who founded a Tongkonan House. Therefore, this latter type of property can only be maintained, managed, enjoyed, and benefitted from among members of *tongkonan*, though in practice this can also be benefitted by non-family members.

However, since *tongkonan* is a source of property, this may also become a source of conflict among members of *tongkonan*, especially for prosperous *tongkonan* and in terms of who is eligible to manage *tongkonan* property (*toma'kampai tongkonan*). In theory, pawning or selling such property is prohibited since it is believed this may cause a disaster and is similar to pawn and sell their ancestor (*mbalu' néné'na*). In practice, this has become an evident among Torajanese.

A Torajanese may become a member of more than one *tongkonan* because of bilateral kinship system. But, since contribution towards *tongkonan* (maintenance and rituals) is costly and time-consuming, the multiplicity of membership is politicised as to whether one becomes a “core” or “common” member in certain *tongkonan*. Despite the fact that the philosophy of inheritance sharing is *mabbagé rata*, various grounds may be taken into account which makes a difference between siblings in a nuclear family and between members *tongkonan*. I argue in this article that the sharing system and the right to benefit *tongkonan* property are closely interconnected to one's contribution to rituals.

Key words: *Tongkonan*, property, inheritance, authority, membership, and gender.

I. Introduction

Numbers of study about Toraja have been conducted by both local scholars,¹ and scholars from abroad.² Most of these studies are on the subject of Toraja rituals and

* Department of Anthropology, Faculty of Social and Political Science, Hasanuddin University (Fisip-Unhas), Makassar.

¹ For instance, Sandarupa (2004), Said (2004), Duli and Hasanuddin (2003), Tangdilintin (1974).

belief, architectures and tourism, as Toraja is known as a unique ethnic group among other ethnic groups in South Sulawesi, not just in terms of religious rituals (Rambu Solo and Rambu Tuka'), but also in regard to its traditional architecture which attract domestic and overseas tourists. Hollan and Wellenkamp (1996) explores Toraja reflections on the life cycle by examining the cycle of life from birth, infancy and early childhood; later childhood and adolescence; marriage and parenting; to adulthood, aging and death. Kis-Jovak et.al. (1988) deal with the changing patterns in architecture and symbolism among the Toraja. Adam (1988, 2003) has written about the use of house in relation to tourism, ethnic and international markers. George (1996) deals with the language and cultural politics of ritual violence in a minority religious, emphasising on the song, speeches, and liturgies of the headhunt and show how this ritual is neither a relic form of primitive violence nor an obsolete discourse on the social horizons of a remote community. Closely related to George's study, Sandarupa (2004)—a Torajanese scholar for example—examines the use of certain poetics genres that particularly display power relations and the structure of hierarchical organisation and of identities. Said (2004) studies traditional Toraja house (*tongkonan*) by examining symbolic elements of its structures. Among others, little if any, study on Toraja related to property and inheritance sharing. This sharing is unique because of its relationship with rituals and one's contribution to rituals. This study fills this gap.

The research is aimed to explore how property (*éanan*) and inheritance (*mana'*)—land resources in particular—are managed and/or shared, who authorise what, how property is associated with status (*tana'*), gender and age, and *tongkonan* membership and contribution to rituals, and how *tongkonan* property is socially functioned towards its members.

The article starts with a discussion about *tongkonan* as an honour and a source of property as well as a source of conflict. Subsequently, it examines how inheritance is divided based on gender and age. This is followed a discussion on the authority and management of *tongkonan* property and the variety of inheritance sharing system. Then, the article explores multiple *tongkonan* membership and the political aspect of ritual contribution. Finally, it discusses how property is socially functioned by examining two cases of exodus from Ambon and Papua, as well as how non-family members may benefit from *tongkonan* property.

II. Research Method

This study was conducted back and forth between January 2005 and February 2006 in Sangngalla'.³ The empirical data derives from, but not limited to Tongkonan Tampang Allo. This name—which consists of Tampang (T. protecting) and Allo (T. sun)—carries the sense of protecting from sun. Papa' Laso'—the present dweller of this *tongkonan*—clarified that the name of Tampang Allo was given to this *tongkonan* was because the first older House used huge wood to protect the House from the sun.

² For example, Adam (2003, 1988), Donzelli (2003), Waterson (1993), Volkman (1985), Nooy-Palm (1979).

This *tongkonan* is not just one of the biggest and most important *tongkonan* in Sangngalla'³, but it is also regarded as a sacred (*makarama'*) *tongkonan*. Story about the *tongkonan* was recounted by those who live around the *tongkonan*. For example, lightening in the *tongkonan*, snake suddenly appeared around the *tongkonan* etc. More than that, members of this *tongkonan* vary according to religion (Alu' Todolo, Christian, Islam), and there are three graves of their ancestor (*néné'*) under the older *tongkonan* Tampang Allo.

This case study was constructed using in-depth interviews with community leaders (e.g. *to minaa*, *to parénggé'*, head of *lémbang* and *dusun*, senior of *tongkonan*), members of *tongkonan* and other members of the surrounding community in Sangngalla' who happened to talk to me during my fieldwork. Small survey—with twenty-five (25) respondents—was employed as an additional data collection. Triangulation is aimed for data cross-checking collected from different methods concerning different kinds of property, inheritance sharing, *tongkonan* multiple membership, and social function of *tongkonan* property.

III. Results and Discussion

1. *Tongkonan*: an Honour, a Source of Property and Conflict

Tongkonan can be a traditional house (*banua*) and a rice barn (*alang* or *korang*).⁴ Both are usually in pair and are located in opposition to each other. This indicates the great importance of rice to the community, not just because it is considered as the symbol of life, but is also viewed as 'the golden plant' of the upper world. So, the prosperousness of rice harvest is not just associated with the adequate amount of rice to eat—a source of life—but it is also connected with the ability to arrange a major ritual. Ritual related to rice is mostly conducted in and around rice field and *tongkonan*, reflecting the significance of land to this community.⁵

Tongkonan is not just about a physical manifestation for Torajanese, but it also indicates a group of people. This is reflected in the term itself which comes from the word *tongkon* (sitting). Thus, *tongkonan* means the center for people to sit. In other words, it is society's major type of grouping (Said 2004:52; Sandarupa 2004:360), especially for conducting rituals. The implied idea of *tongkonan* is an establishment of a united community, though conflict among them—even among members of *tongkonan*—is not absent, especially conflict related to land resources. The unity of Torajanese is reflected in any *adat* rituals both death ritual (Rambu Solo) and life ritual (Rambu Tuka')⁶ where *tongkonan* becomes the center of such rituals. The implementation of such rituals is usually controlled, though is not possessed, by the one who is in charge for the management of *tongkonan* (*to ma'kampai tongkonan*), and is commonly the one who pays for land tax (I. Pajak Bumi dan Bangunan, PBB).

³ The Three Vessels (Tallu Lémbangna)—Makalé, Sangngalla', and Méngkéndék—is believed to have sibling relations among them. Makalé is the agreed elder sibling (*bassé kakanna*), Sanggalla is the agreed middle sibling (*bassé tanggana*), and Méngkéndék (*bassé adinna*) (Interview with Papa' Robert). Among these three, Lémbang Kaéro (in Sangngalla') is the center of Tallu Lémbangna, and the most developed area (See also Sandarupa 2004:43)

⁴ There are two types of rice barn: one is predominantly of bamboo with devoid of carving, the other one is made of wood, with carved decoration (Kis-Jovak et. al. 1988:74).

⁵ See, for example, Kis-Joval et.el. (1988) who discuss the importance of rice for Torajanese.

⁶ For details, see for example, Said (2004:32-41), Waterson (1993).

But, who is eligible to be *to ma'kampai tongkonan*? *To mina'a* Tato' Dé'na explained that *to ma'kampai tongkonan* has to be a member of the family, can be a man or woman, is able to manage the family, rituals, and to maintain *tongkonan* and its property. However, as long as there is still an elder (*to dipatomatua*) of *tongkonan*, the authority of *tongkonan* is still in his/her hand, as in the case of Tongkonan Tampang Allo (for details, see the case of Papa' Laso' below).

According to Tato' Dé'na, it is difficult to be *to ma'kampai tongkonan* today, especially if *tongkonan* lacks of property since the maintenance of *tongkonan* is relatively expensive. In theory, the maintenance of *tongkonan* is funded by members of *tongkonan*. In practice, this seems to work out for prosperous *tongkonan*. However, this is difficult to be applied to those neglected *tongkonan* (*tongkonan disa'biangan*) given that lacking property of a *tongkonan* makes contribution is also lacking, reflecting that the contribution towards *tongkonan* is also related to whether or not members of *tongkonan* benefit from it. As if the wealthier the *tongkonan*, the more interested the members in contributing to it. Thus, it is not a surprise if we found a *tongkonan* unoccupied or neglected (*disa'biangan*) somewhere in Sangngalla' or in any other places (see Multiple Tongkonan Membership and the Politics of Ritual Contribution later in another section). Conversely, to be a *to ma'kampai tongkonan* is also a source of conflict, especially for prosperous *tongkonan* in view of the fact that any member of *tongkonan* may claim him/herself as *to ma'kampai tongkonan*.⁷

When people are talking about property, it includes property achieved individually (T. *éananna*) and communal property, known as *tongkonan* property (I. *mana' tongkonan*). *Tongkonan* property refers to property own by members of *tongkonan* from one *pa'rapuang*—ramage traced a first ancestor who founded a Tongkonan House—which comes from the word *rapu* (sub-ramage).⁸

In addition, private property comprises achieved property (*éananna*), inherited property (*mana'*), and gifts (*tékkén*). Achieved property is property owned by an individual from of his/her own effort (individual achievement). Private property can also be inherited by parents to his/her child/ren. Inherited property can be wet land (*uma*), dry land (*padang*), house (*banua*), buffalo (*tédong*), or sometimes pig (*bai*), but mostly land, so does *tékkén*, which literally means cane. An individual who is given a land can border his/her land, and a bordered land of an individual is called *tékkén-nya* (one's own land), indicating that the land is under one's property right. *Tékkén* is given by parents to their children when their parents still alive, particularly mentioned in a special occasion, such as when the first birthday or first tooth growths (*ma'kai*), when children getting married (*méndapo'*), or any time whenever parents feel happy (*parru'mo pénanna*) to give *tékkén* to their children. *Tékkén*, however, can only be

⁷ During the period of my fieldwork (25 December 2005), there was a case of killing because of such conflict, resulted in the death of Andarias, his wife (Martina) and his child (Israil). The killer—Markus—claimed that he had the right to live around the *tongkonan* than Andarias and his nuclear family (*siana'*) who lived and cared for the *tongkonan* (*tiro-tiro tongkonan*).

⁸ Sandarupa discusses *tongkonan* by examining the use of *tongkonan* domestically. A cognatic descent group (*ma'rapuan*) or ramage traced a first ancestor who founded a Tongkonan House. As the of growth, the family-group branched out and created a new group called *rapu* (sub-ramage) and this process of segmentation marked the establishment of a new *tongkonan*. In this view, cognatic descent and its segmentation are coterminous with mother *tongkonan* and child *tongkonan* (Sandarupa 2004:444).

controlled when parents (the giver) already died, unless child/ren (the taker/s) are already able to work the land. *Tékkén* is given by parents on account of feeling affection for the children. But, *tékkén* can also be given to someone who has rendered a service to someone else—whether or not he/she is a member of a family—as a recompense for his/her service (*pa'kamasé-kamasé*), as well as to strengthen relationship between the giver (*to ma'tammui*) and the taker (*pangngala*), especially between those who are not related by blood (*to sénga'*), but the person is already regarded as part of the family. Hence, someone who is not related by blood may be regarded as sibling or family because of his/her service. *Tékkén* is given after engaging in deliberation (*ma'rampung*) among members of the family. The following case can best illustrate this.

One morning when I visited Dusun Pasang, Lembang Turunan (Sangngalla') at the end of December 2005, I met Bokkosakké—a retired teacher—who was standing in front of his house facing wet lands. He told me a case which can best illustrate *tékkén* given to someone who is not related by blood. That is between Pak Sumule (the *to ma'tammui*) and Pak Palayukan (the *pangngala*). Pak Sumule—who was the head of Tax Office in Jakarta—was accompanied by Pak Palayukan and his wife—who because of their meritorious service—were already considered as part of his family. When Pak Sumule's wife died, he thought that they deserved *tékkén* from him. We were facing the given *tékkén*—a piece of land (3686 meter squares) which was just harvested—when the interview was conducted.

The case of Pak Palayukan not just demonstrates a sense of appreciation for someone's merit, but also reveals that one who is not related by blood (*to sénga'*) can also be regarded as a family member (*rapu*). This implies, to some extent, the broader meaning of family for Torajanese. However, *tékkén* can be taken over from *to sénga'* because of his/her disloyalty.

Tongkonan property or hereditary property itself consists of wet land (*uma*), dry land (*padang réngko*, comprising bamboo tree, cendana tree etc.), ancestry instruments, such as decorated flag (*sarita*), heirloom kris (*gayong*), ornaments of beadwork (*kandauré*), magical objects (*balo' tédong*), and stone grave (*liang batu*) etc. Any *tongkonan* property can be benefitted from or used by (*pendului*) any member of *tongkonan*, but it cannot be possessed, except wet land which is inherited from one generation to another. In this sense, such an inheritance sharing system makes *tongkonan* running out of land property.

As a symbol and an honour (*siri'*) of family, *Tongkonan House* cannot be certificated for private ownership, since it is communally owned. It can only be maintained, managed, while other kinds of *tongkonan* property can be benefitted from among members of *tongkonan* with a number of restriction. For example, cendana tree can only be cut in certain days according to elders (*to dipatomatua*), one cannot urinate (*katténé*) under cendana tree not just because this tree is sanctified, but it is also believed to cause illness to individual as most of ritual is conducted around cendana trees. In addition, cendana is especially planted at the time of ritual.

Pawning or selling *tongkonan* property, particularly *tongkonan* house, is believed to cause disasters. I have heard such an expression a number of time. For example, one morning, I was sitting in the coffee room of a small hotel in the middle of Makalé, while enjoyed my breakfast. The owner of the hotel—a woman in her middle age—greeted me and we talked about a number of different things. I, then, asked her about the

importance of *tongkonan* for Torajanese and the possibility to pawn or to sell it. She directly responded to my question enthusiastically by saying:

No, no, no, that's taboo for us. *Tongkonan* is our family symbol and honour (*siri'*). If *tongkonan* is pawned, not to mention is sold, this is similar to pawn or to sell our family honour and our ancestor, and it causes shame to the whole members of *tongkonan*. *Tongkonan* property can be added up, but it cannot be lessened, so that it can provide sustenance for the future generation of a *tongkonan* (Ibu Dina, 61 years).

The above statement indicates the sacred and the importance of *tongkonan* towards its members. Despite the fact that in many chat with members of community in general or members of *tongkonan* in particular, I heard an almost similar expression as mentioned above, people neglected either pawning or selling *tongkonan*. This is also the case when they were talking about land resources of *tongkonan*, wet land in particular, which is based on the principle that *éanan tongkonan* cannot be lessened, but the reverse. In practice, however, wet land is inherited to descent of *tongkonan* (*ana' tongkonan*), from one generation to another (see Social Function of Tongkonan Property below), but *tongkonan* house is not.

In spite of the fact that Tato' Déna also neglected pawning *tongkonan* (*pa'péntoéyan*), he inadvertently mentioned that such forbidden phenomenon is evident, usually without consent of other members of *tongkonan* and considers such a person as traitor (*maki-maki*) or a pawnor or seller of ancestor (*mbaluk nene'na*). There is a saying related to pawning or selling *tongkonan*: "It is better to cut our head than to pawn or sell our *tongkonan*." This overtly indicates respectedness of individuals towards *tongkonan*.

For example, Tato' Déna told me that there was a case which was finally known by other members of a *tongkonan* when the pawnor was asked to pay back the money he got from pawning the *tongkonan*. In such a case, if there is a member of the *tongkonan* is willing to redeem the *tongkonan* (*la'bak*), he/she has the right to get the head of buffalo in a ritual—in addition to his/her own share based on his/her status—similar to the share given to high ranking noble (*tana' bulaan*). On the one side, this implies the respectedness of family towards individual who has redeemed *tongkonan*. On the other side, it also shows the concern of the family towards the survival of *tongkonan*, as this is akin to getting back their ancestor (*pa'gang*).

Another classic case is conflict related to the border of land of *tongkonan*. This is because the land, where *tongkonan* is built, is not certificated. Claiming the border of a land solely on the basis of hereditary recognition, literally stated, or making a literally bequest. This confirms the susceptibility of conflict related to land border since no single document can be used as a proof of ownership. There is yet no agreement between folk law and civil law concerning certification of land where *tongkonan* is built.

Another instance is conflict between family members who claim a certain property (usually land) as his/her own, obtained either from inheritance (*mana'*) or from *tongkonan* property (*éanan tongkonan*). Some case has been brought to court, but this is also caused another problem given that the court deals with such case based on civil law, while the family requires folk law. This makes the cases are more complicated.

Such conflict was also stressed by the head of the Pengadilan Tinggi Tana Toraja—when I visited this office one day in January 2005—who stated that not only

the matter of the quantity of the cases (mostly land) which concerned him, but also the complicatedness of handling cases associated with land in Tana Toraja. Although many cases are still handled through family discussion (*kasiturusang ada'*), not few cases are brought to the court.

In the case of pawning a wet land authorised from *tongkonan* property or inherited from parents for ritual contribution (*tumpuan*), Nene' Nita (male)—the head of village Turunan of Lembang Turunan (Sangngalla')⁹—told me that such case is usually between two people who are not related by blood. This is particularly because if they are related by blood and ask for pawning, there is a possibility that the land may not be redeemed (*la'bak*) since it comes from *tongkonan* where both are members. It may be considered that the pawner and the one who pawns has the right to the same land.

However, cases of pawning and repawning is common in Toraja. Take, for example, a case experienced by Bokkosakké. He explained that someone (A) pawned a land to someone else (B). After a number of years B assumed that A may not pay him back to get the land. B repawned the land to another person (Bokkosakké). The reason Bokkosakké accepted such repawed land was because A was his daughter's father-in-law. Given that A is already considered as part of Bokkosakké's family as a result of the marriage, retaking the responsibility towards the payment of land to B is a moral responsibility of Bokkosakké to safe family face from or to maintain family *siri'*. By doing this, Bokkosakké had shown to B that the family is still able to pay the debt. Even though, it is handed over by Bokkosakké, these families (Bokkosakké and A's family) are two-in-one who share one *siri'*.

Fascinatingly, when I was talking to a *to paréngngé'*—Lebang—(76 years) regarding different kinds of property, he referred all property mentioned above into three, based on the philosophy of *tallu lolona* (three fetuses), consisting of *lolo tau* (human beings), *lolo tananan* (lands), and *lolo patuan* (animals). This three-in-one fetuses symbolises interconnection between one *lolo* (fetus) to another in the life of Torajanese in which *lolo tau* as the life manager, *lolo tananan* as the source of life (golden plant), and *lolo patuan*—especially buffalo—as an important object in Torajanese rituals.

It is interesting to note, however, that any valued property is estimated according to the value of buffalo. This insinuates the significance of such animal to the life of Torajanese as buffalo is regarded as the most sacred animal to be sacrificed by close family members (*tangkéang suru'*) as the protection of the dead person from bad things on the way to the land of spirit (*puya*), as ritual is identified with animal sacrificing.¹⁰ But, when people are talking about ritual contribution, I found it quite ambivalent. On the one side, such ritual contribution has become a burden for them. On the other side, it is the pride of Torajanese and is believed it may not cause poverty, it even preserves one's livelihood.

⁹ Sangngalla subdistrict comprises 15 villages (T. *lémbang*), spreading out from 6 *lémbang*, one of which is Lembang Turunan. Lembang Turunan itself consists of three *dusun*: Dusun Turunan, Pasang, and Kalémbang.

¹⁰ *Tangkéang suru'* carries the sense of holding something in hands for giving protection to the spirit and sacrificed animal is seen as the vehicle of the human corpse from this world (*lino*) to the next (*puya*). As long as a human corpse (*to maté*) is not being festified, he/she is still considered as a "sick person" (*to makula*) ora "sleeping person" (*to mamma'*), entailing the consequence of death ritual for *to maté*.

2. *Mabbagé Rata*: Inheritance, Gender, and Age

Unlike other three ethnic groups in South Sulawesi—Bugis, Makassar and Mandar—which divide inheritance based on Islamic law in the comparison of two and one for men and women respectively;¹¹ inheritance system among Torajanese is based on the philosophy of *mabbagé rata* which comes from two words, *bagé* (sharing) and *rata* (flat, but carry the sense of equal). The equality of sharing is not just related to sex—male and female—but also age—older and younger siblings—indicating egalitarian inheritance system among Torajanese.

There is a saying related to the former (egalitarian between the sexes): *dipappada bang bainé tu moané*, meaning that men and women are treated the same in association with inheritance. This is also reflected in the complementarity division of labour in the household between *to ma'nasu* for the wife (*bainé*) and *to mékayu* for the husband (*muané*). They are addressed by the term *bainéku* and *muanéku*, manifesting mutual belongingness between husband and wife. *To ma'nasu*—which comes from the words *to* (person) and *ma'nasu* (cooking)—refers to person who cook (for the family). In practice, however, the term has a broader meaning since it also includes other related household activities, such as washing, cleaning, taking care of children etc (*indo' ma'jama lallu banua*). *To mékayu*—which comes from the words *to* (person) and *mékayu* (looking for firewood)—means the person who is looking for cooking firewood (*rampanan kapak*). This is in line with the term *méndapo'*—the Toraja term for marriage—which is literally meant “to form a hearth or kitchen” or “to create a kitchen.”¹² Since either the term for wife or husband is associated with kitchen, it implies the relationship between married life and the production and consumption of food.¹³

Another related saying states: *dénnattuana bainé dadi moané*, which signifies that sometimes a woman can be a man, and vice versa. This is not to say that a woman has to be a man in order to have an equal sharing. In order to understand this, we should examine the contribution of individuals in customary rituals, particularly in the deceased ritual, called Rambu Solo. Since the husband is considered as the breadwinner (*péndaka' kandé*) and the wife as income spender (*to mangringki'*),¹⁴ the former is expected to contribute more than that of the latter to any ritual. But, this is not always the case, I was told that the phenomenon of the reverse is occurred in many cases.

In relation to this, a poetry was conveyed by Tato' Dé'na , as follows:

<i>Tang mutiro rékatau</i>	Can't you see, hi human beings?
<i>Tang ta'paraka matammu</i>	Can't you view through your eyes
<i>Unda diang pira landong</i>	Bearing numbers of cocks
<i>Kumémbong pira bainé</i>	Creating numbers of hens

¹¹ See, for example, Idrus (2003:266) who discusses inheritance sharing system of the Bugis.

¹² See, for example, Holland and Wellenkamp (1996:104-105) and Sandarupa (2004: 445).

¹³ Sandarupa (2004:445-446) further analyses the relationship between marriage alliance and the system of exchange between Houses.

¹⁴ Like other ethnic group in South Sulawesi, the wife is usually money manager of a household. Terms related to a husband who manages household income is *to daru'* for Torajanese, *kampidokang* for Makassarese, and to

<i>Nabainé dadi landong</i>	A woman becomes a cock
<i>Namuané dadi birang</i>	A man becomes a hen
<i>Susi mua' ganna' lino</i>	Such the creation of the world
<i>Paséruanna daénan</i>	The manifestation of land
<i>Timai sanda kasallé</i>	All growing vast

This poetry contains teasing allusion, usually uttered in the moment of *ma'réttang* (ritual singing) during *mabbadong* (dancing in Rambu Solo ritual). It is conveyed to tease men in relation to his/her contribution to any ritual. A man—because of his lack of contribution to a ritual—is considered as a hen (*birang*), while a woman—who can contribute to a ritual considered as a cock (*landong*). Thus, it is implied in these cross-sex terms that a man can be a woman and vice versa in relation to his/her contribution to any ritual. When a man becomes a “hen” it reflects a negative connotation, though it is not associated with his sexual orientation, it is rather a teasing allusion (*passimba*) related to his contribution to rituals. This negative connotation lowers his social prestige, which in many cases is usually because he is lazy and gambling.¹⁵ But, when a woman becomes a “cock” it indicates a positive implication as it makes her social prestige higher because she has the ability to manage members of *tongkonan*, to control renovation or rebuilding *tongkonan*, and/or to handle rituals.

From this point of view, inheritance sharing is not based on gender, but it is based on the capability of individual in handling rituals and managing *tongkonan* and its property. This is in contradiction with the constructed ideal about how a man and a woman should be. For example, Bokkosékké'—a seventy-five year old I met one morning in Lembang Turunan (Sangngalla')—reveals a phrase that *bainé ma'dodo'*, *muané masséppa'* which means women wearing sarong, men wearing pants. In that sense, while males can climb (*méntéka'*), females cannot, implying the flexibility of males' movement in the everyday life.

In terms of inheritance sharing between ages, Tato Dé'na told me that older and younger brother are treated the same, as he stated: “*sama bangsia kaka to adik ké yo.*” Thus, dissimilar sharing between older and younger sibling is irrelevant. But, in many cases, the eldest and the youngest siblings may be differentiated according to gift (*tékkén*) given by their parents in the present of members of the family, which is rather a non-inheritance sharing.

3. Authority towards *Tongkonan* Property, and Inheritance System

When talking about this point, a big question I have in mind: what is the local norm concerning the authority towards *tongkonan* property and the variety of sharing? On this point, a number of aspects came into account, such as family policy (*kasiturusanna rapu*), one's contribution to customary rituals (*tumpuan*), one's dedication to his/her parents (*undaranai to matuanta*), one's role to maintaining and managing *tongkonan* property (*ungkorok éanan tongkonan*, including *tongkonan* house). All of which is decided based on family discussion (*ma'rampung*).

In terms of family policy, it was said that ‘the capable’ helps “the needy.” This implies that ‘the capable’ is morally responsible to help “the needy,” including when the latter is in need to contribute to a customary ritual, particularly Rambu Solo. In theory,

¹⁵ According to Kis-Jovak et. al. (1988:16), in former times a man who gambles excessively could lose his position in society.

this has to be redeemed (*dila'bak*) whenever he/she is capable. Otherwise, it becomes a sustainable debt. The basic philosophy of such debt is that if one is not able to contribute to a ritual until the end of his life, his/her children or grandchildren will pay the delayed ritual contribution (*tumpuan*) in the future, indicating the inherited debt of previous generation (*indang disiasso'i*).

In practice, however, it is more complicated. For example, an informant told me:

If I contribute something (e.g. a buffalo) for the sake of another member of the *tongkonan* (e.g. my brother/sister) because he/she at the time of the rituals is not capable to play a part. This means that a buffalo of mine is in his/her land .

This implies that debt is not reckoned in terms of money (e.g. the price of the buffalo at the time ritual), but in terms animal contributed to the ritual, especially in the case of long term debt. This is especially because the price of the buffalo increases over time. Someone's debt in such a case is associated with his/her land. Thus, the one who makes use of another person's contribution for the ritual has his/her own part in the person-in-debt's land. This is expressed as *misak tédongku lan umanna* (a buffalo of mine is in his/her rice field). Such substituted contribution also shows the connection among three aspects included in the the philosophy of *tallu lolona* (three fetuses): human being (*lolo tau*), land (*lolo tananan*), and animal (*lolo patuan*).

In addition, one who is capable to contribute to the ritual, but his/her contribution is considered less than what he/she suppose to contribute, he/she will be the subject of gossip by other members of *tongkonan*, or even the surrounding community, though such gossip is also usually neglected. Fascinatingly, however, as I was told by Puang Karurukang—the elder (*to dipatomatua*) of Tongkonan Kaéro—that such a person is viewed as *noka nola kasiturusang sangrapunna* (unwilling to contribute to the family), not as a stingy person (*to makassa'*). This implies that lack of contribution to rituals is not about stinginess, it is rather about lack of sense of togetherness (*kasiturusang*).

Continuity of the contribution to customary rituals is another aspect to consider inheritance sharing. If one's contribution is discontinued (*taé'na turu'*), one's right to *tongkonan* property is terminated. Thus, living away from Toraja does not make the contribution is irrelevant, and does not extract one's membership to *tongkonan*.

Still another consideration is dedication to parents (*undaranai to matua*). The one who takes care of his/her parents (*to tanai to matua*) in their olden age will get more inheritance (*mandarana*) than that of other children. It is usually the parents' house is given to son/daughter—mostly daughter—in return. This is not to say that instant care to parents is accomodated for children who solely intend to get more inheritance given that the process of caring is an important consideration for this extra inheritance sharing. Conflict between siblings sometimes occurs in terms of who see themselves having the right for such extra inheritance. Despite the fact that gift (*tékken*) and inheritance (*mana'*) are two different kinds of property, when people talk about extra sharing, ambiguity between extra *mana'* and *tékken* is taken place.

Finally, for one who is considered able to maintain, manage *tongkonan* property and/or live around *tongkonan* (*to ma'kampai tongkonan*) because of his/her merit, he/she may authorise a special portion of *tongkonan* property. In many cases, however,

such authority is usually and already viewed as a “special portion” given that not every body may become *to ma’kampai tongkonan*.

In spite of the fact that the norm towards inheritance sharing is based on the philosophy of *mabbagé rata*, the considerations mentioned above indicates some variation and to some extent explains that inheritance sharing, contribution to *tongkonan* and the right to *tongkonan* property cannot be rigidly separated to each other. It demonstrates that the right to benefit *tongkonan* property and the share of inheritance depends on one’s contribution to customary rituals (*tumpuan*), especially in the ritual of Rambu Solo, which is ordinarily estimated according to how many buffalo contributed to such ritual. Such contribution is evidently related to one’s social status.

Kis-Jovak et.al.(1988:16) indicates the importance of property for Torajenese in determining status and stating that:

Someone’s place in society is partly determined by his or her accumulation of worldly goods. A person from a high class may rise still further in status if he becomes rich. These riches should be spent afterwards by giving feasts, for one could thus gain prestige, and the right to be buried according to a superior funeral rite.

When asking questions pertaining to the difference of inheritance system among different parts of Toraja (e.g. the South, the North, and the West of Toraja), many times I heard from people in the South, particularly from Tallu Lémbanna, who differentiates the sharing system of the people from the North of Toraja and theirs. Reflecting back to the history of Tallu Lémbanna (Three Vessels), it implies that when they compared the system of inheritance in relation to the death rituals, it is not just about differential inheritance system, but it is also about the awareness of their nobility (noblecentrism). On this point, people from the South see themselves as more hierarchical and having better inheritance sharing system than those from the North.

Of the former, this is because Tallu Lémbanna used to be and is still considered as the district of nobility (*kadatuan/kapuangan*). Of the latter, Néné’na Nita, for instance, explained to me that people in the South gives precedence to the deceased before sharing inheritance (I. *Urus orang mati dulu, baru urus warisan*), given that inheritance sharing is prohibited ahead of deceased ritual, and inheritance is shared on the basis of equality (*mabbagé rata*) between siblings. While people in the North is on the other way around (I. *Urus warisan dulu baru urus orang mati*). Thus, children of the death should discuss their contribution for the ritual as the basis for their inheritance sharing (*disumpa’ kadénni*), known as *patta’lang*. For outsiders, this sounds ironical “as if” inheritance sharing is more important than carrying out the deceased ritual. But, this is not the real picture since family discussion (*ma’rampung*) precedes the ritual—to decide, for example, what, how many buffalo is sacrificed—and members of the family avoids eating rice as the symbol of grieving. What is interesting to me is that I always found people in the South and the North have never compared themselves with those from the West part of Toraja. This may be because the latter is more egalitarian than that of the former.

4. Multiple *Tongkonan* Membership and the Politics of Ritual Contribution

Bilateral kinship system makes it possible for Torajanese to have multiple *tongkonan* membership. Membership in a *tongkonan* is reckoned in terms of biological descent (consanguineal relatives) and marriage ties (affinity). Membership is not solely related to one's consanguineal relatives (*pa'rapuan*) and affinity (*tété rampéan*), but it is also about one's involvement (*kasiturusang*) in each of ritual activities of *tongkonan* where one becomes its member which is not his/her ancestry *tongkonan*. As Waterson states:

The *pa'rapuan* cannot ... be called a descent group for it is not corporated in any real sense, nor it its membership exclusive. It is possible to belong to a number of *tongkonan* because the activities with which each is concerned are only occasional. These are chiefly rituals ... and the rebuilding or reroofing of the *tongkonan* (Waterson 1981:34-35).

An individual, because of bilateral kinship system, at least has a four-*tongkonan* membership which is two from his/her mother's parents (mother's mother and mother's father) and another two from his/her father's parents (father's mother and father's father). In addition, marriage link also makes it possible for one to have more than four *tongkonan* memberships. In a marriage between those who are related by blood (*sullé langan banua*)—meaning “returning to the house”¹⁶—both husband and wife are automatically become members of his/her spouse's *tongkonan*, and their children become the members of their parents's *tongkonan* (*rara buku*). In an exogamous marriage (*rampé salianan*), however, such an automatic membership is lacking for husband's spouse and vice versa given that the spouse who is not related by blood (*to sénga'*) is considered as “the other” (*to rampé*). But a husband is responsible to contribute to his *tongkonan* for any kind of ritual conducted by his relatives and may contribute to his wife's family *tongkonan*, and vice versa. Children become members of their parents' *tongkonan*, and the membership of their mother to their father's *tongkonan* and vice versa is reckoned via their children (*nula' ana'*). This indicates that the dichotomy between *rapu'* and *to sénga'* in terms of *tongkonan* membership which explains to some extent the importance and the preference towards endogamous marriage among Torajanese.

Kis-Jovic et.al., however, argue that further status can be gained when an individual becomes a member of a number of important *tongkonan* (Kis-Jovic 1988:16). This entails that the membership in *tongkonan* is not just about the number of membership, but it is also about whether or not an individual becomes a member of many superior *tongkonan*, not just an inferior one. Correspondingly, “quantity” of *tongkonan* membership is as important as its “quality.” For instance, Mama' Laso'—who is the *to ma'kampai tongkonan* of Tongkonan Tampang Allo—is a member of a number of superior *tongkonan*, such as Tongkonan Tampang Allo, Tongkonan Kaéro, and Tongkonan Buntu Kalando.

¹⁶ Holland and Wellenkamp (1996:98) call such marriage as “close marriage” and explore that this kind of marriage is preferred and strongly recommended among all social classes for various reasons, namely: close resources circulation, logistical reason for fulfilling ritual obligations, and emotional as well as psychological reasons.

A question arises: is an individual contributes to any of *tongkonan* where he/she becomes the member? Kis-Jovik et.al. argue that since one's connection to so many *tongkonan*—in which a genealogical specialist is needed to trace one's affiliations—is expensive and time-consuming, one should made his/her choice (ibid). An individual may choose which *tongkonan* he/she becomes a “core” or a “common” member. In theory, each individual has the right towards certain *tongkonan*, depending on his/her contribution towards *tongkonan* which gives him/her the right to *tongkonan* property and to give his/her say.

From this point of view, it is obvious that one's membership to *tongkonan* is not just the matter of affiliation to *tongkonan* as well as the cost—money and time—one should actively express one's connection, but it is also about political significance towards *tongkonan*. An individual may become a “core” member in one (or many *tongkonan*) and a “common” member in another (or others), depending on what benefit an individual can gain from each. But, one's contribution to “core *tongkonan*” is as far as one can tell not as much as to that of her “common *tongkonan*.” But, one's contribution to rituals not just reflects his/her social status, but also indicates that one is “the core” or “the common” member of certain *tongkonan*.

Therefore, politics considerably play a part in such ritual significance, not just locally, but also as Sandarupa (2004:4) argues that local rituals in Toraja affect national and international politics. Accordingly, as I mentioned earlier, it is not a shocking phenomenon to observe an underprivileged *tongkonan* is neglected.

It is interesting to note, however, that a number of time I heard an expression from individuals of lower class (*to kalala*) that he/she does not belong to any *tongkonan*. When I confirm such an expression to *to minaa* Tato' Dé'na, he said that everybody must have his/her own *tongkonan* (as explained above), an individual who considers himself/herself not belong to any *tongkonan* is as a consequence of taking apart from his/her *pa'rapuan*, lacking contribution in any ritual conducted by his/her *tongkonan*, either from his/her consanguineal relatives or affinity, or both.

But, how does a *to kalala* contributes to ritual while he/she is poor? By opening two palms of his hands and showing them to me, Tato' Dé'na explained that ritual contribution (*tumpuan*) does not have to be a buffalo, a pig, or any significant animal, it can also be by a ten-finger (*rangka' sampulota'*). This kind of contribution, however, is not just to his/her family (*ditunduan rapunta'*), but also to those of the same village (*sia sang tondokta*) whenever a ritual is conducted or a help is needed. According to him, ritual contribution (*tumpuan*) with a ten-finger (*pasuru' bangki limanta'*) is more valuable as long as one does it wholeheartedly (*masorok pénanna*) than contributing significant animal halfheartedly (*tangponnok pénanna*) just for showing up (*morai disanga*) to others, or even imposing himself/herself though he/she is not capable to contribute at the time of ritual. This is because rituals are also a moment for status performance.

There is a saying related to deceased ritual: *to maté kaburu' to tuo* (the deceased buries the living), which carries the sense that all property is sold for the sake of deceased ritual. Conversely, another saying states that *to tuo kaburu' to maté* (the living buries the deceased), this carries the connotation that one's contribution depends on his/her capability. From this point of view, it can be said that one's contribution in a ritual should depend on one's willingness (*masoro'*). But, when we are talking about this subject, people usually ends the discussion with an expression that lack of

contribution in a ritual will be recompense by one's offspring in the future, though contribution with a ten-finger (*rangka' sampulota'*) has already existed. This indicates that as long as animal is not contributed, it is considered "as if" something is lacking, implying highly value of animal contribution to a ritual since animal—especially buffalo—is considered as sacred creature of a ritual. Buffalo in Toraja is especially for ritual contribution. Furthermore, Bokkosakké' confirms that in the past animal slaughtering in rituals was based on the local belief, Alu' Todolo'. These days, such slaughtering is conducted simply to meet a demand of one's social status. Such customary rituals are still performed today more as a part of a "custom" (*pangngalukan ada'*)—an ancestral exemplary model that has handed down from one generation to another as the basis of society (*sangka'*)—rather than as part of a "belief" in Alu' Todolo' (*pangngalukan néné'*) given that they are now mostly Christian. This justifies how Alu' Todolo' has significantly changed in practice.

The ability to contribute to a ritual may vary according to one's social status and determined by *to paréngngé'*. Hence, there is a difference between *to sugi'*, *to kalala*, and the one who is not capable to contribute at the time of a ritual, but not necessarily *to kalala*. While *to sugi'* may be expected to show his/her wealth, *to kalala* may contribute by open his/her two palm hands (*pasuru' bangki limanta'*), as mentioned above. Those who is not capable at the time of a ritual may pay his/her contribution later in another ritual.

Members of the same *tongkonan* can possibly not recognise each other since the numbers of one *tongkonan* is countless, but they can meet and possibly introduce to each other when they attend a ritual. Each member of *tongkonan* is responsible to contribute to any ritual conducted by his/her *tongkonan*. Incontinuous contribution to rituals does not make the membership of an individual is terminated, but one will get social sanction from the family or surrounding community as a result of his/her lack of contribution, especially for ascending ritual of one's parents.

I was told a number of times that if one does not contribute to a deceased ritual of his/her parents, he/she is viewed as one who is in vain to be born (*to taé gai'na didadian*). As she states: "*Kataébangmo berkorban lako tomatoa ba'tu tongkonan*," meaning that it is useless to bear an individual who has not or never sacrificed or offered for his/her parents and *tongkonan*. This is because parents cannot get benefit to their children's income as a result of lack of contribution (*taé' naturu'*) to the deceased ritual of his/her parents. Such attitude is negatively responded by family (*taé tomporari pa'rapuan*) and is considered as the one who is not aware of good deed (*to tangnga dianna sangka'*) towards his/her parents.

5. Tongkonan Property and Social Function

Tongkonan can also be a return or transit place for those who are away for years and return to his/her village. *Tongkonan* property, land in particular, can be used for those who are in need. Two cases of exodus, one from Ambon (Papa' Steven's family) and another from Papua (Papa' Laso's family), illustrate the significant of *tongkonan* property towards the livelihood of its members.

Papa' Steven and his family: a case of exodus from Ambon

Papa Steven and his family are exodus from Ambon who were there until 2001 (Papa' Steven was there since 1968, and Mama' Steven since 1971, they got married in 1972 in Ambon). They came back to Toraja without any property left to survive because of the

conflict and chaos in Ambon. Despite the fact that this family lived in Ambon for over thirty years, Papa' Steven and his wife continuously contributed to rituals back in their village. Consequently, when they returned homelessly in 2001, they were allowed to stay for a while in the *tongkonan* house—as a transit place—of Mama' Steven's family which is resided by his elder brother who is responsible to maintain *tongkonan* house and its property.

At the time of their return, there was a local government program for Ambon exodus by building up a wooden house in their own land. Papa' Steven and his family registered themselves in the Social Department in Makalé. Then, a wooden house was built in a land of Mama' Steven's inheritance, where various vegetables planted around the house for their subsistence. This land was previously authorised by her uncle (since her parents already passed away). In addition, she was given the right to occupy a part of *tongkonan* property—a wet land (*uma*)—for their staple food (rice). The right to occupy this land as a part of *tongkonan* property—by *to ma'kampai tongkonan* who is her elder brother—is due to her continuous contribution during her absent in the village.

Since the *uma* is part of *tongkonan* property, according to *tongkonan* property management (*ungkorok éanan tongkonan*), the crop must be shared. The sharing is half-by-half (*mabbagé dua*). In this case, Mama' Steven occupies a half of the land (*uma paré*) and another half is benefitted from by other members of the *tongkonan*.

When talking about cases of exodus and their relation to government program, Tato Dé'na responded by saying that exodus was asked by the office of Central Bureau of Statistics (BPS) about their membership to *tongkonan*. The significant of such question is that because individuals usually come back landlessly, and in that case *tongkonan* plays an important role to help exodus. For example, by giving the authority to use a land where the government can build a wooden house for the exodus, as mentioned in the case of Papa' Steven above. If the exodus does not know his/her family because, for example, the relationship was terminated during his/her wandering, or he/she does not know his/her ancestor, he/she is considered as “confusing person” (*to pusa*) or as he/she is seen as a “lost descent.” Tato' Dé'na expressed such a person in a phrase: *pusa mo sulé tama tondokna* (lost in his/her own village), indicating one's relationship to his/her village (or more specifically to *tongkonan*) discontinues, so does the right to *tongkonan* property.

Papa' Laso' and his family: a case of exodus from Papua

Papa' Laso', accompanied with his wife and two children, lived in Nabire (West Papua) since 2000 when he was accepted as a civil servant in the Department of Mining. After five years, however, he, his wife (Mama' Laso') and children finally decided to return to their village because of the earthquake in Nabire without any property left, like in the case of Papa' Steven and his family above.

When they returned home, *tongkonan* Tampang Allo where they become the members was under the authority of a forty-year old elder cousin of her—Batara Londong Allo, known as Papa' Renza. He was given the right to be *to ma'kampai tongkonan* because he is a close family member and lives not far from *tongkonan*. Regardless of the fact that he is the *to ma'kampai tongkonan* of *Tongkonan Tampang Allo*, he does not live around the *tongkonan*, but gives the right to his inferior (*kaunan*) to take care of the *tongkonan* (T. *tiro-tiro tongkonan*). This is because Papa' Renza himself runs his own business in a shop close to his house in Suaya which is located not far from the

tongkonan. The top decision regarding *tongkonan* and its property, however, should be still under Puang Londong Allo—the eldest brother of Mama' Laso's mother (Puang Ramba')—who is still alive and is considered as the elder (*to dipatomatua*) of the family of Tongkonan Tampang Allo.

In the beginning of their return, Papa' Laso's family stayed in his parents's house in Rantétayo (in the North of Toraja) while waiting for family decision for their living arrangement which has to be through family discussion (*ma'rampung*) with members of Mama' Laso's extended family (*sangrapu*). Four months since they returned from Nabire, the family finally decided that Mama' Laso' was given the right to occupy a piece of land of Tongkonan Tampang Allo's property. This land is already under Mama' Laso's mother's (Puang Ramba') authority and is located around Tongkonan Tampang Allo. When people were talking about dwelling *tongkonan*, what I had in mind was to dwell in *tongkonan* house. In fact, Papa' Laso and his family dwell in the wooden house built next to Tongkonan Tampang Allo. This is also the case when I visit other *tongkonan* in Sangngalla', including Tongkonan Kaéro and Tongkonan Buntu Kalando. This confirms that *tongkonan* is not a house for living, it is rather a family symbol, but human corpse is commonly housed in *tongkonan* before being festified.

Other people (*to sénga'*) can only watch *tongkonan* (*tiro-tiro tongkonan*) when the descent of *tongkonan* (*ana' tongkonan*) does not live around *tongkonan*, like in the case of Tongkonan Tampang Allo before Papa' Laso' and his family return from Nabire. But, it was not taken care properly by the *to sénga'*, so it was like a neglected *tongkonan* (*tongkonan disa'biangan*), probably because he did not stay around the *tongkonan*. This is an important point why Mama' Laso' (and her family) is given the right stay around Tongkonan Tampang Allo and to be the *to ma'kampai tongkonan*, substituting Papa' Renza.

This authorisation became the reason why Papa' Laso' did not apply for government program for exodus upon his return from Nabire, as in the case of Papa' Steven above. According to Mama' Laso', as long as resources are still available, outside resources (e.g. from government) are as much as neglected. However, this is not just about the availability of resources and the ability to built a wooden house, but it is also about their prestige as noble descent.

When Mama' Laso' and her nuclear family (*siana'*) was still in Nabire, this land used to be pawned to someone else. When the pawn is ended, it was redeemed (*dila'bak*) by Mama' Laso'. Two questions arise: Did she continuously contribute to any ritual in her village when she was in Nabire? Does the harvest was shared with other members of the *tongkonan* as in the case of Papa' Steven above? Mama' Laso' explained that despite the fact she did not send any contribution from Nabire for any rituals back in the village, her mother did for her. On this point, Mama' Laso' is still considered loyal to her *tongkonan* through her mother (Puang Ramba'). Therefore, she has the right to occupy part of her *tongkonan* property. All the crop from this land is controlled by Mama' Laso', half of it is saved for any ritual conducted by the *tongkonan*, so there is always something to contribute whenever a ritual is conducted. In the period of this interview, Papa' Laso' is still waiting for his decree (I. *Surat Keputusan*, SK), transferring his work from Nabire to Makalé.

The two cases illustrated above evidently confirms the great importance of *tongkonan* property. It is interesting to note, however, that in each case land resources come from the wife's side, not in the reverse, implying the significant role of women in

terms of *tongkonan* property right. But when I confirmed such phenomenon, but this is not to say that land resources from women's side are more important than those of men, or that women have more significant role than that of men, but it is rather the matter of availability of resources and the decision from family discussion.

In addition, the sharing of the crop of occupied land by members of *tongkonan* like in the case of Papa' Laso' and Papa' Steven show similar, but different method (*sama bangsia taéna susi*). In both cases, the sharing is similar which is "half-by-half." The uniqueness of each case lies on the target of another half of the sharing. In Papa' Steven's case, another half of the land crop goes to other members of *tongkonan*, while in Papa' Laso's case, it is kept by Mama' Laso' for the sake of ritual contribution (*tumpuan*). This indicates that whatever the method of sharing is, the basic principle is that the share is benefitted from other members of *tongkonan*, reflecting the sense of commonality of the family pertaining to *tongkonan* property.

Besides wet land, any materials from dry land (*padang réngko'*) of *tongkonan* property can be utilised by members of *tongkonan* as long as his/her contribution to any ritual conducted by *tongkonan* continues. For example, bamboo tree is used for making raised platform for ritual (*lantang*), stalk of cendana tree can be used for house building.

Ancestry instruments (as mentioned above) and the crop of dry land, however, are not inherited. While the former is kept and maintained by someone in the family—usually by *to ma'kampai tongkonan*—and can be used for rituals as needed, the latter is socially functioned by members of *tongkonan* (including their inferior, *kaunan*) under the consent of *to ma'kampai tongkonan*.

When I visited Tongkonan Kaéro—one of the Tongkonan Layu' in Sangngalla'—I also found that *kaunan* of the descent of Tongkonan Kaéro (*ana' tongkonan*) who live around this *tongkonan*. Mama' Darwani—the *to ma'kampai tongkonan*—explained that even though these *kaunan* have paid the tax of the land and have stayed for countless years, these lands cannot be possessed. But, paying the tax of the land seems to be a "powerful ticket" for these *kaunan* "as if" they have full right to the land given that none of member of this *tongkonan*, including Mama Darwani, ever asks them to leave. This illustrates that *tongkonan* property may be helpful not just for members of *tongkonan* (from one *pa'rapuan*), but also for others (*to sénga'*) because of their service as the sense of appreciation, especially if they are already considered as part of the family (*rapu'*), and therefore blurred the difference between the two.

IV. Concluding Remark

As a house of society, *tongkonan* can be a "source of property," as members of *tongkonan* can benefit from its property. But *tongkonan* can also be a "source of conflict" given that any member of *tongkonan* has the right to be *to ma'kampai tongkonan* even if not everyone is eligible to be the one.

Regardless of the fact that property varies on the basis of personal ownership (achieved property) and communal ownership (hereditary property) which may consist of land, animals, and other valued objects, these are all included in the philosophy of three fetuses (*tallu lolona*) which consists of human beings (*lolo tau*), plants (*lolo tananan*), and animals (*lolo patuan*). This is not just about simplification of various property, but it is also about interconnection between these three, as a triangle attaching to each other in the life of Torajanese.

Albeit inheritance sharing is based on the philosophy of *mabbagé rata* (equality between males-females as well as between elder-younger siblings), Hence, a male may have less/more sharing than females or vice versa. This is also the case between elder and younger siblings. However, inheritance sharing may vary in terms of family policy, contribution to rituals and *tongkonan* maintenance, or dedication to parents.

Children are automatically become members of their parents' *tongkonan* because of bilateral kinship system. Accordingly, multiple *tongkonan* membership is customary. But, since contribution is costly and time consuming, one usually becomes "core member" of certain *tongkonan* and "common member" of other *tongkonan*.

Inheritance sharing, contribution to *tongkonan* and right to benefit *tongkonan* property are seen as three-in-one, they are closely related to each other. Lack of *tongkonan* property makes contribution to *tongkonan* is politically connected to how members of such *tongkonan* can benefit from its property. Therefore, the wealthier the *tongkonan* the more members contribute to it. Thus, underprivilege *tongkonan* is more often than not neglected (*disa'biangan*). In theory contribution with a wholehearted ten-finger (*rangka' sampulota'*) for lower class people is accepted for rituals, but as long as animal contribution is lacking, this has become a generated debt (*indang nisiassoi*) which should be paid in the future.

Even though the norm to benefit *tongkonan* property has to be members of *tongkonan* (*ana' tongkonan*), in practice, others (*to sénga*) may also gain from it, especially for those who are in need. This implies that *tongkonan* is socially functioned and indicates that the dichotomy between members of family (*rapu*) and others (*to sénga*) becomes ambiguous in this context.

The difference between inheritance sharing in the South and the North has lead to a further study to understand why different parts of Toraja has different sharing system, and how different their sharing system from one to another part of Toraja.

Reference

- Adam, K. 1988. *Carving a New Identity: Ethnic and Artistic Change in Tana Toraja, Indonesia*, Washington: The University of Washington.
- Adam, K. 2003. The Politics of Heritage in Tana Toraja, Indonesia: Interplaying the Local and the Global,' *Indonesia and Malay World*, Vol. 31, No. 89, pp. 91-107.
- Donzelli, A. 2003. 'Diversity in Unity: Multiple Strategies of a Unifying Rhetoric, the Case of Resemanticisation of Toraja Rituals: From "Wasteful Pagan Feasts" into "Modern Auctions",' *Jurnal Antropologi Indonesia*, No. 72, September-December, pp.38-57.
- Duli, A. and Hasanuddin (eds.) (2003) *Toraja: Dulu dan Kini*, Makassar: Pustaka Refleksi.
- George, K. M. 1996. *Showing Signs of Violence: The Cultural Politics of Twentieth-Century Headhunting Ritual*, Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Hollan, D.W. and J.C. Wellenkamp. 1996. *The Thread of Life: Toraja Reflections on the Life Cycle*, Honolulu, University of Hawai'i Press.
- Idrus, N. I. 2003. "To Take Each Other:" *Bugis Practices of Gender, Sexuality and Marriage*, Ph.D Thesis, Canberra: the Australian National University.
- Kis-Joval, J.I.; H. Nooy-Palm, R., and U. Schulz-Dornburg (1988) *Banua Toraja: Changing Patters in Architecture and Symbolism among the Sa'dan Toraja Sulawesi Indonesia*, the Netherlands: Royal Tropical Institute.
- Nooy-Palm, H. (1979) *The Sa'dan Toraja: A Study of their Social Life and Religion, Organisations, Symbols and Beliefs*, the Hague: Martinus Nijhoff.
- Pelras, C. 1996. *The Bugis*, Blackwell Publishers, Cambridge.

- Said, A. A. 2004. *Toraja: Simbolisme Unsur Visual Rumah Tradisiona*, Ombak, Yogyakarta.
- Sandarupa, S. 2004. *The Exemplary Center: Poetics and Politics of the Kingly Death Ritual in Toraja South Sulawesi Indonesia*, PhD Disertation, Illinois: the University of Chicago.
- Tangdilintin, L.T. 1974. *Toraja dan Kebudayaanannya*, Ujung Pandang: Lembaga Sejarah dan Antropologi.
- Tang, M. 1997. *Aneka Ragam Pengaturan Sekuritas Sosial di Bekas Kerajaan Berru, Sulawesi Selatan, Indonesia*, the Netherlands: University of Wageningen.
- Volkman, T.A. 1985. *Feast of Honour: Rituals and Change in the Toraja Highlands*. Urbana: University of Illinois Press.
- Waterson, R. 1993. "Taking the Place of Sorrow: the Dynamic of Mortuary Rituals among the Sa'dan Toraja," *Southeast Asian Journal of Social Science*, No. 21, pp. 73-97.
- Waterson, R. 1981. *The Economic and Social Position of Women in Tana Toraja*, PhD Dissertation, Cambridge: Cambridge University.