(116)

their belongings, perhaps, because no guarding was necessary and each of them respected the others rights. None would think of taking away the others belongings in his own group. Thus right of ownership of the collected property seems to be well-established. This is perhaps limited to the individual or the family and with reference to movable articles of immediate use. In the same way the tribe as a whole may have a strong feeling of ownership of the land or the forest as a whole and that may be the reason why they are hostile towards any intervention from outsiders. If it was not so, i.e, if they had the system of finders are keepers then when a stronger force came and occupied their area they would have meekly accepted it ~~inst~~ (as it has happened with many other groups in history) instead of resisting and continuously fighting back. This aspect of the Jarawa social behaviour should be always kept in our mind in our future dealings with the Jarawas.

Are the Jarawas patriarchal?

Another important point to be noted with reference to the family ~~in the naming system~~ appears to be the naming system. The husband and wife would acquire the same ^name, perhaps, after the marriage as for instance TAACHYE TAAHADI YAAMA and TAACHYE-TAAHADI VAAYA, the husband being indicated by the ending -AAMA and the wife by -AAYA. This husband/wife relationship seems to continue even after the death of the husband (and may be perhaps wife as well) as can be seen in the case of the two women ANUVAAYA* and ~~EA~~ TEELAANGUVAAYA* continue to be referred to as wives of ANUVAAMA and TEELANGUVAAMA who died some years back.

I also understand from Dr Rajasingh who is working on the naming system that the first child in a family ~~(or may be)~~ bears the first part of the father's name,

(*. Both Anuvaaya and Teelaanguvaaya have one more name each (perhaps maiden names as Yaanpalaayiye and Meeyaay, which are also in use)