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The Allocation of Power and Responsibility in Bulu Society:
A test of the usefulness of a methodology developed by Marion Levy Jr. in “The Structure of Society”

INTRODUCTION

Power and responsibility (hereafter written P/R) in traditional (pre-white) Bulu society was allocated to such concrete structures as the patrilineage (ayôñ) or to such concrete substructures as the village council of household heads, to various male and female associational units and to other actors of this society. Taken on a most general level, Bulu society will be considered as a concrete structure in operation, while its political aspects, that is, the allocation of P/R, will be considered as an analytic structure, although, “it is a patterned aspect of action which is not even theoretically capable of concrete separation from other patterned aspects of action.” “There are no concrete acts or systems that are totally devoid of either economic or political aspects.” (Levy, The Structure of Society, 1952, p. 89.)

PROCEDURE

Our procedure will begin with an analysis of P/R in a predominantly economically oriented concrete structure, Bulu society. This will be assumed without going through all of the steps suggested by Levy to establish it; since this is to test the usefulness of this model in studying the political aspects of this social structure, rather than to try to

1. A Bantu tribe of the Southern part of the Federal Republic of Cameroon.
establish, if, in fact the society is a society. The remaining steps will be to investigate the allocation of P/R in certain concrete substructures and, finally, the allocation of P/R among the members of Bulu society according to role assignment and role differentiation.

In the test of usefulness of this model we will find it advantageous to treat these Bulu concrete structures and substructures as relationship structures with our orientation toward the allocation of P/R to each structure and substructure according to sex, age and role.

This will also serve as an introduction to a general discussion and use of Levy’s analytical aspects of relationship structures (Levy, Ibid., pp. 238-298), especially of his “polar terms for relationship aspects” (Levy, Ibid., Table 4, p. 281), which will give a framework to discover and compare the political implications of relationships of these concrete structures and substructures.

According to Levy, “A relationship structure is defined as any social structure (or set of structures) that defines the actions, ideally and/or actually that interrelate two or more individual actors.” (Levy, Ibid., p. 238). This definition also “conforms to the definition used here of concrete structure” (Levy, Ibid., p. 81), a definition which we will also follow.

In a comparative analysis of relationship structures there are at least six relationship aspects with twelve polar terms as reproduced from Levy in the chart below. These aspects and polar terms are useful as “. . . Tools for the comparative analysis of social structures.” (Levy, Ibid., p. 279.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>POLAR TERMS FOR RELATIONSHIP ASPECTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Cognitive aspect</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 2. Membership criteria aspect             | x  
| 3. Substantive definition aspect          | rational  
| 4. Affective aspect                       | universalistic  
| 5. Goal orientation aspect                | functionally specific  
| 6. Stratification aspect                  | avoidant  
|                                         | individualistic  
|                                         | hierarchical 
|                                         | y  
|                                         | non-rational  
|                                         | particularistic  
|                                         | functionally diffuse  
|                                         | intimate  
|                                         | responsible  
|                                         | non-hierarchical 

(Levy, Ibid., p. 281)

I will not take time here to discuss either the relationship aspects or the accompanying polar terms. These are sufficiently explained in The Structure of Society (pp. 238-298) where he gives a complete discussion as to use, meaning, etc. From time to time, throughout this study, I will discuss the aspect and polar terms relative to the
particular relationship at hand, or problem stemming from their use. We can now proceed to an analysis of the concrete structures and substructures of Bulu society.

I

A.—A Concrete Structure: the Patrilineage

The Bulu, with distantly related groups, live in the equatorial tropical rainforests of what is now south-central and south-western Republic of Cameroon. They migrated into this area about one hundred years ago in two distinct migrations, both of which originated in present-day Central African Republic. Although white man's trade goods had entered the area, the Bulu did not see their first white man until 1894 when an American missionary, A. Good, first entered the area. The Bulu people had lived here from thirty-five to forty years before this first white contact was made.

The patrilineage is the largest political unit in Bulu society, consisting of over fifty politically independent units. Each lineage is composed of male and female members each of whom are blood related: each recognizing the same male ancestor as progenitor of the lineage.

Although all who called themselves Bulu were members of Bulu society, without lineage distinctions, the Bulu had neither unified the lineages, nor those who called themselves Bulu, into a political unit such as "tribe". Nor did the Bulu have either a word or concept which would suggest the possibility of such "tribal" unity. In fact, each of the patrilineages were so politically independent of each other that raiding, disputes over territorial boundaries, etc. was more a common pattern of interlineage behavior than the exception. The concepts of patrilineage, village and blood related family are translated by one Bulu word, ayôñi. It was the patrilineage and not "Bulu society" which was the largest recognized political structure among the Bulu with the range of political action coming first from itself, then descending to its substructures and smaller units of its own lineage membership until finally to the actors themselves. In size, the patrilineage might have consisted of only one village with a membership of from 100-500, or a composite of a number of physically non-connected villages.

When the lineage consisted of one village, P/R was controlled by the male household heads who, and at the same time, would be the council of village elders, benyâ bòtô. That is, the concrete structure, the patrilineage and the concrete substructure, the council of village
elders would be the same unit with allocation of P/R only to the males.

When the lineage consisted of a number of villages, each local village was a semi-autonomous unit, with the allocation of P/R to each council of village male elders, each a concrete substructure. At least once a year, or more, should the occasion have demanded it, all of the local councils of village elders would meet as a *body politic*. The patrilineage functioned, either as one village or a combination of villages, until it became too large to continue as a single body at which time individual families would leave it and begin patrilineages of their own.

The difference between the lineage as a concrete structure, and the village council of elders as a concrete substructure was one of only degree based upon the numerical size of the village(s) concerned. This effected the allocation of P/R in degree also. Although each local village council was an autonomous group, each, when lineage decisions were to be made, each made these decisions in conjunction with other village council heads of the same lineage usually at their annual assembly.

The allocation of P/R on either the patrilineage concrete structure level or the village council of household heads, the concrete substructure level, diminished by degrees from the role of the judge, who was the final authority, to all male members of the patrilineage or the village council, all who had the same degree of P/R within the council.

The application of P/R on the patrilineage level was effective in controlling territorial boundaries, armed conflicts with other lineages and/or tribes and in other means of an effectual social control through trade and joking relationship alliances with other lineages or tribes in the area. This was also the responsibility of the concrete substructure, the village council of household heads, when the lineage consisted of more than one village, with the local village council seeking political balance, through marriage and trade alliances with other villages in their own area, leaving the lineage the larger responsibilities.

For the sake of clarity, we will first consider the patrilineage concrete structure and village council of elders concrete substructure, as one and the same (not forgetting that although a woman was a member of a patrilineage, she could never be a member of the village council composed of male household heads) and analyse the application of P/R by various analytical units.

The patrilineage village council of elders allocated P/R in the following instances:

1. Lineage borders.
2. Trade alliances (individual alliances with village implications).
3. Interlineage and/or intertribal alliances (*avusõ*), “joking relationships”.
4. Allocation of P/R to family heads.
5. Allocation of P/R to each elementary family.
6. Control over the following concrete substructures:
   a. The men's age-grade brotherhood.
   b. The men's secret society, the leopard.
   c. The women's secret society.

i. The Bulu migrated into an area which was already occupied by such groups as the Ngumba and the Pygmies. As the Bulu forced these local societies further west, toward the Ocean, or settled among them, it was of the utmost political importance to establish patrilineage and village territorial boundaries and to be prepared to defend or extend these boundaries. Larger boundaries were established by the patrilineage and would be recognized as a strip of uncleared forest, a swamp, an unpassable river or a mountain ridge. Village boundaries were established by the local village council using similar natural barriers as boundary lines. That such boundaries might over-extract those of another lineage or another tribe concerned the lineage only in the degree that they were prepared to defend these boundaries through the responsibility allocated to the youth and men of the warrior age.

There was no individual ownership of land among the Bulu. The village council controlled all of the land and the use thereof. To each village family, the council allocated enough land, each according to the size of the family, for a kitchen garden, the upkeep of which was the women's and girls' responsibility. These boundaries were recognized by an uncleared strip, a row of plantains or a rude fence made of sticks and brush. Should the family not farm their garden the village allocated it to another family, the decision resting upon the merits of each case.

Ordinarily, there was little or no theft in a village. Most people owned only the barest material essentials of life: a man, a spear or two, goats, sheep, chickens, a machete, amulets and charms; a woman, a pot or two, a few chickens and magical objects. Goats or sheep eating from the garden of another village member would be interpreted as stealing and considered as a case worthy the deliberation of the village council.

Adultery was also a "theft" of property belonging to another man and, if discovered, would involve litigation between the offended, the offenders and all families involved. For the most part the nuclear families of the individuals concerned would settle each case, according to the degree of seriousness of relationship, which, in turn, would be based upon the type of marriage contract agreed upon. Serious cases were judged by the village council, or, if too difficult for them, the judge heard the case and settled it with a final decision.
Unlike western systems of marriage, Bulu marriage was considered as a contract between two lineages, rather than between two individuals, and arranged by the families concerned.

Prestations were set by family of the girl and a special goat or sheep was ceremonially eaten by members of the two families of the villages concerned. This contract or alliance had political implications in that it supposedly secured trade and peace relationships between the two contracting lineage-families.

Divorce, before white contact, was more the privilege of a Bulu husband than that of his wife (ves). Only to tell the village council that a wife would not cook for him, committed adultery or tried to poison him was sufficient grounds for separation and divorce. The return of the contract and security symbols of the union by the husband to his wife's family would also involve members of both villages and sometimes the village councils. In some instances the parents of the divorced wife would replace her with another girl, a sister, rather than to return the prestations. A woman could not be allowed to sue for divorce but would either run away or poison her husband. In either case no prestations would be returned either to her or to her family.

2-3. The range and action covered by P/R of the patrilineage council of household heads also included alliances made with other lineages and/or tribes. For the most part these alliances were both economically and politically oriented: trade and peace and were considered as "eternally" binding by all parties concerned. The pact became binding after the village elders of both groups ate the meat of the quasi-sacred red antelope (sō). Socially, both groups used intimate kinship terms with each other and behaved in a "joking", or better, "mocking" relationship toward each other, indulging in such behavioral actions which might otherwise be considered as "insulting": stealing, lying, making practical jokes upon others and sometimes indulging in intimate sex behavior. Politically both groups were not only sworn to eternal peace but also to encourage inter-lineage marriages, gifts, dances and feasts.

4. The lineage/village council of household heads delegated P/R to each male household head (each of whom and at the same time, in another role, were members of the lineage/village council who allocated the P/R), complete control over his household. As a household head, a man could make a trade alliance with another man in another lineage or village as well as enter into marriage alliances with those of other lineages or villages.

5. The lineage/village council allocated to each nuclear family
certain rights and privileges which were no more than given to any other nuclear family. Each nuclear family received garden plots which each could use as well as the family prerogative of making marriage alliances with lineages other than their own.

Unless, in any given situation, the acts of the nuclear family upset the village balance of social control, the council left the nuclear family strictly alone.

6. Control over the various concrete substructures by the lineage/village council was more ideal than actual, depending, of course, on the unit.

a. All of the male members of Bulu society were members of either the antelope (sô) society or the gorilla (nguì) society.

The antelope society was a concrete substructure, the one which we shall use for example in this study, and was found along all Bulu lineages as well as in the lineages of the kindred groups; the Êwôndô, Fang, Ntum, etc. It was politically important because it crosscut lineage social boundaries. In case, for example, of an impending raid, the members of the secret society of the lineage or villages involved, would often warn their blood friends of the raid and not take part in it.

b. The men’s secret society (ze), or leopard, consisted of members whose names were secret, in comparison to the antelope society whose members were known not only to each other but to everyone in the village. The leopard, and other secret societies were often in conflict with the council of village elders despite the fact that inevitably some of its members belonged to the secret society. The society had a great deal of power which enforced social control through the simple technique of murder of any “undesirable” village member, by a member, dressed in a leopard skin, murdering the victim during a night. Expected group behavior was thus achieved through such power.

c. Each village ordinarily had at least one women’s secret society which exercised covert control over all of the women and girls in the village. It may have also been a “mutual aid” society, offering protection to the women from their husbands and fathers. It met with the knowledge, if not the agreement, of the male village council.

Relationship Aspects of the Concrete Structure: the Patrilineage

One should keep in mind that Levy’s methodology is oriented toward a comparison of industrial and non-industrial societies rather than an analysis of “primitive” societies. Also the relationship aspects, listed below, are based upon “social relationships” either between structures or between actors. Ideally, one should have
constructed a series of polar terms for political aspects rather than to follow Levy’s relationship aspects. However, one implies the other and some P/R can be understood and abstracted from these relationship aspects.

The Relationship Aspects of the Patrilineage: A Concrete Structure

1. Cognitive aspect — non-rational
2. Membership criteria aspect — particularistic
3. Substantive definition aspect — functionally diffuse
4. Affective aspect — intimate
5. Goal orientation aspect — responsible
6. Stratification aspect — non-hierarchical

Or, the same written symbolically: 1y, 2y, 3y, 4y, 5y, 6y.

The first three relationships always tend to cluster (Levy, Ibid., pp. 296-297) toward one or the other polar extreme. Should the clustering lean toward the x pole then the relationship aspect would be called “universalistic”; should the aspects cluster toward the y pole then the relationship aspect would be called “particularistic” or traditional.

The aspects which tend to cluster are: no. 1, the cognitive; no. 2, the membership criteria aspect and no. 3, the substantive definition aspect. No. 4, the affective aspect ordinarily tends to join the above three, but there were many exceptions when this was not the case; hence it was not included with those which, in the majority of cases, tend to cluster.

At a general level, the relationship aspects of the patrilineage were oriented to the y side, the “particularistic” or traditional pole. The cognitive aspect (no. 1), was non-rational in that the relationship the concrete structure seeks to achieve by the means it has chosen, was not identical with end qualified scientific observer knows its actors would achieve (after Levy, Ibid., p. 242). That the relationships were non-rational means that they were not empirically set-up. The opposite relationship—rational—of the cognitive aspect, would be a relationship where definite ends and means are known in advance. An example of this would be found in the businessman—businessman relationship in the United States. It is a rational relationship in that its means and ends are logically constructed and recognized. Others, those who are not businessmen, are effectively barred from the relationship. Further, the relationship aspect is functionally specific, to get business.

The institutionalized relationships of the Bulu patrilineage are non-rational in the cognitive aspect; inclusive in the membership criteria
aspect and functionally diffuse in the substantive definition aspect, that is, the relationships were not "precisely defined or precisely delimited" (Levy, *Ibid.*, p. 256).

B. — THE VILLAGE COUNCIL OF ELDERS: A CONCRETE SUBSTRUCTURE

Inasmuch as the similarities and differences of the village council as a concrete substructure were discussed under the patrilineage, no further discussion will be required at this point. We shall continue with the relationship aspects of this concrete substructure at which level similarities and differences between it and the patrilineage will be noted.

*Relationship Aspects of the Concrete Substructure: the Village Council*

The relationship aspects of the council of village elders are as follows:

1. Cognitive aspect — non-rational
2. Membership criteria aspect — particularistic
3. Substantive definition aspect — functionally diffuse
4. Affective aspect — intimate
5. Goal orientation aspect — responsible
6. Stratification aspect — hierarchical

Or, the same written symbolically: 1y, 2y, 3y, 4y, 5y, 6x.

We have been considering the concrete substructure, the village council of male elders as a part of the patrilineage for reasons given above. Considering it as a substructure—apart from the patrilineage—it is noted that the same relationship aspects are true for both with a single exception. The stratification aspect is hierarchical—x for the village council rather than y as in the patrilineage.

This stratified aspect is based upon sex with the males assuming the higher status and with it P/R. This hierarchical aspect permits control of the members of the village by the council and safeguards the identity of both the lineage and local village by not permitting political membership to women who come to the village as wives of the local men.

C. — A CONCRETE SUBSTRUCTURE: THE MEN'S ANTILOPE GROUP

The allocation of P/R to the antilope brotherhood group was based upon sex and age. It was a male society which controlled
most if not all of men and boys in a village or lineage in which this society was found.

In a social sense a boy could not be a "true man" (nya môle) until he became a member of the brotherhood and carried, in the form of three scar scratches on his neck, the symbol of manhood and membership. (A boy was ordinarily circumcised round 6-7 years of age. It carried no religious implications.)

Membership had also political implications in that, after marriage, the boy, now a man, had automatic membership in the village council and patrilineage with full P/R which accompanied his new role as a man.

The concrete substructure was found in other kindred groups such as the Fang, the Ewôndó (Yaounde) and the Beti as well as the various interlineage units of each group. When, for example, the Beti and the Fang, in a ceremonial feast (avusô), ate meat from the same quasi-sacred red antelope (sô) together, the alliance transcended any other loyalty by making all of the men involved "brothers". These brothers would call each other "brother" (mojañ) and enter into a "joking" relationship with the others. They would also agree to warn each other of impending danger, such as a coming raid between their lineages; protect other members of the avusô as they would their own brothers; establish a joking relationship with all concerned and encourage intergroup marriages thereby forming a web of friendship, which, as it spread throughout the area, aided the peaceful control of the area, action contrariwise to the behavior exhibited by these groups when they first settled the territory.

The Bulu also, in each lineage established the avusô relationships as, for example, between the Yemfek & Esafak; Esakoe & Yemfek; and Eve & Esakoe. One can see that in each lineage and as members of the avusô alliance, there would be a network of duties and obligations to all who were members of this group in protection, asylum, shelter, feeding, marriage rights, etc., exercising power and responsibility through the establishing of these security links.

**Relationship Aspects of the Concrete Substructure: the Men’s Antelope Group**

The relationship aspects of the concrete substructure the men’s antelope group are as follows:

1. Cognitive aspect — non-rational
2. Membership criteria aspect — particularistic
3. Substantive definition — functionally diffuse
4. Affective aspect — intimate
5. Goal orientation aspect — responsible
6. Stratification aspect — hierarchical
Or written symbolically: \(1y, 2y, 3y, 4y, 5y, 6x\).

The relationship aspects of this concrete substructure follows, on a general level those of the two preceding structures.

On this general level, the relationships would be as written above. However, differences on a second level, the degrees between poles \(x\) and \(y\) illustrate finer differences and therefore, more accurate ones.

In other words, these relationship aspects are not entirely polar, either \(x\) or \(y\)—black or white—they more often merge into graying degrees containing elements of boths \(x\) and \(y\), depending on their relative position between either pole. (Levy, *Ibid.*, p. 296, lists four systematic approaches to sources of differences. In this test, I have used only 1 and 2 and only in this one section. These might have been more profitably utilized throughout this study, but time pressure prevented their full exploitation.)

These degrees of differences are noted in relationship aspects nos. 3, 5 and 6. For the sake of clarity, I have plotted them in this fashion (the dot . indicates position):

Aspect no. 3:

| Pole X | 1. | Pole Y |

Aspect no. 5:

| Pole X | 1. | Pole Y |

Aspect no. 6:

| Pole X | 1. | Pole Y |

Aspect no. 3: The substantive definition aspect which relates to the rights and obligations of the relationship under consideration, the concrete substructure, are functionally diffuse \((y)\) but carry elements of specificity related to age and time of year. The rights and obligations are certainly both known and specific to the boys who are undergoing their one year of initiation into the antilope society, as well as to the men who are in charge of them. Except for this one period of time, the relationship aspect is diffuse following a standard of behavior which is loosely constructed, following tradition and custom.

Aspect no. 5: Goal orientation aspect should be seen as it is defined by and in relation to the antilope concrete substructure. In that sense it is individualistic. If seen from the patrilineage as a whole, it carries a degree of “responsibility” since “for the good of the society” is also one of its functional requisites. This latter orientation is less than 50% of a possible 100% and although the latter is recognized, the former \(x\) relationship aspect carries the weight of action.
Aspect no. 6: This is another aspect which is difficult to plot with a real degree of accuracy since variable factors influence its precise location. Considering the antelope associational group without reference to any other Bulu social structure, it is non-hierarchical or egalitarian. In relation to all the Bulu male and female, the stratification aspect becomes hierarchical. However, somewhere between the two, but on the y side of the center, this social unit is probably best described, for within the institutionally defined unit, it is non-hierarchical; all men, after initiation, are "brothers".

D.—A Concrete Substructure: the Men’s Leopard Secret Society

Social control of a covert type was exercised through both the men’s leopard society and the women’s secret society. In both instances the societies enforced rules which affected the behavior of the individuals involved. The men’s society, in addition, controlled the behavior of all women as well while the women’s society was limited to girls and women.

Membership was secret in the leopard society and the members sometimes had to kill a mother, wife or child to gain entrance. Behavioral goals were enforced by murdering the villager who did not follow institutionalized behavior patterns or if someone in the village was considered more valuable dead than alive.

Relationship Aspects of the Concrete Substructure: the Leopard Society

The relationship aspects of the leopard society are as follows:

1. Cognitive aspect — non-rational
2. Membership criteria aspect — particularistic
3. Substantive definition aspect — functionally diffuse
4. Affective aspect — intimate
5. Goal orientation aspect — individualistic
6. Stratification aspect — hierarchical

Or the same written symbolically: 1y, 2y, 3y, 4y, 5x, 6x.

One of the strong functional prerequisites of this secret society, as well as its most affective aspect, was the intimacy of those who claimed membership in the unit. Often this intimacy was manifest in the use of a secret language, the use of secret signs and symbols and the political control the group had over a village through covert methods. The goal orientations were for the good of the secret society rather than the lineage or village as a whole. The society is hierarchical accord-
ing to age rather than sex and role. Otherwise relationships follow the "traditional" or $y$ pattern as other concrete structures and substructures.

E.—A CONCRETE SUBSTRUCTURE: THE WOMEN'S SECRET SOCIETY

Very little is actually known of the women's secret societies. The last of them stopped about thirty years ago. The missionary author, Nassau (Fetishism in West Africa, pp. 249-250), speaks of the "impossibility of learning the society's rites", but suggests their goals as: "to pretend to detect thieves, to find out the secrets of their enemies, direct women in pregnancy" and "to protect the females from harsh treatment on the part of their husbands." However, he was writing about the Mpongwe tribe of Gabon and not of the Bulu. Certain similarities could probably have been observed among the Bulu and the goals and general political orientation as a control, covert to be sure, was just as true there as in the Gabon, both emphasizing making all girls and young women join the group.

The Relationship Aspects of the Women's Secret Society

The relationship aspects of the women's secret society are as follows:

1. Cognitive aspect — non-rational
2. Membership criteria aspect — particularistic
3. Substantive definition aspect — functionally diffuse
4. Affective aspect — intimate
5. Goal orientation aspect — responsible
6. Stratification aspect — hierarchical

Or written symbolically as follows: $1y, 2y, 3y, 4y, 5y, 6x$.

The women's secret society followed a relationship pattern similar to the men's secret society and a more general level pattern of relationship aspects of a "traditional" or particularistic social unit. There is little more to add at this point concerning this group, except that it is hierarchical within the substructure itself.

***

It might be valuable to make a comparative relationship chart showing differences and similarities. Certain theories might be posited as a result of this comparison.
A comparison of the relationship aspects of selected concrete structures and substructures in Bulu traditional society.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>The Lineage</th>
<th>The Village Elders</th>
<th>Antelope Society</th>
<th>Men's Secret Leopard Society</th>
<th>Women's Secret Society</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

On a most general level of comparison we note that the Bulu concrete structures and substructures were traditionally oriented with the y element in common within all of the structures and substructures. It is not until we arrive at some of the lower levels of comparison do we note, within the structures themselves, polar differences, that is in the goal orientation and stratification aspects of the secret societies substructures. Differences in degree have been noted in another section, and we will not take time to restate them here. A more thorough analysis, according to degree, on lower levels of analysis, would give this area better detail.

Since this study is oriented to old Bulu society no comparison is possible until the modern social structure is analysed and compared with the above. At that time real changes should be plotted, theories can be formulated as to reason and direction of change.

All that I have been able to do here, relative to concrete structures and substructures is to show their general level of universality that the similarities suggest that we are dealing with a traditional society, the allocation of P/R as it descended from the patrilineage concrete structure to the remaining structures was based upon male dominance in a political role.

The remaining part of this study is to use role analysis according to selected roles and the interrelationship aspects of these roles according to the allocation of P/R in this same pre-white Bulu society.
Power and responsibility was allocated, in diminishing degrees of intensity, and according to age, role and sex, to all adult members of this society. (This does not imply that children had no “roles”. Their roles will not be a subject for investigation in this study. On the whole their roles subordinated those of the adults.)

In general, P/R was primarily allocated and equally distributed to each adult Bulu male who had achieved the societal goal of a “true man” (njō mot). This title and accompanying role, gave each male social equality with every other male of the same absolute age (Levy, Ibid., p. 308), not only with those of the same village, but also with all other male members of the same patrilineage or concrete structure: that is, each male of the same lineage would call every male of the same absolute age, the same familiar classificatory term, “brother” (moneyaï).

In this male dominated society a woman had a minor role. In the village of her birth, she was constantly under the authority of her father, mother and eldest brother up to the time of marriage. Taking up residence in the village of her husband, she was considered, from a political orientation, as a “foreigner” because her political allegiance remained in her home village. In her husband’s patrilineage village she enjoyed recognized, though restricted, social rights and privileges as his wife, as well as some P/R within the precincts of her own household, if she was a senior or older wife and vis-à-vis her own children.

A wife played an important political role in Bulu society, for example, in time of war between her husband’s and her father’s villages. She would have had the role of an intermediary (monekal) to whom and through whom the councils of both villages might speak when mediating for a peaceful settlement of the hostilities. With the aid of her eldest brother, a woman would represent her father’s and family’s interests concerning the future of her children. At the time of her children’s marriages, for example, her eldest brother or a representative from her family, would sit in and take part in marriage negotiations.

As will be pointed out later, a woman had to be obedient to her husband, his family as well as her own, enacting a role containing the least degree of P/R of any, except children, in Bulu society. (The social-political roles of both the “stranger” and the “slave” were probably “lower” than that of a woman. However, they, differing from a woman, could never be considered as “true” members of Bulu society, lacking, according to their roles, social prerogatives and more
important, often coming as war prisoners, from other kindred groups and even tribes. From the Bulu point of view, the slave and stranger were not true Bulu, a position which I am following here. As a member of the Bulu concrete structure, the woman enacted a role which carried little P/R.

While the woman occupied one polar extreme, according to the allocation of P/R, it was the man in the role of the judge (kaso), who occupied the opposite pole, and to whom was allocated the most P/R in Bulu society. All other roles fell between these polar extremes. These roles are listed below in an order of their intensity of P/R. The first named had the greatest amount of P/R, the others diminishing in intensity in the order named:

1. Judge (kaso).
2. Richman (nkukum).
3. Fetisher (nkungu, sing., bekungu, pl.).
4. Oldest living male (ntole mot).
5. Village Household head and village elder (njö mot).
6. Warrior (nwoódsan).
7. Sorcerer (nëa’a or nbanba’a).
8. Friend:
   a. Trade (nùu’aa).
   b. Blood (either secret society or alliance) (nyia mooé wam).
9. Woman (minga).
10. Stranger (njin also enemy).
11. Slave (díí).

I. Judge (kaso) (See infra for symbolized descriptions of relationship aspects).

There was only one judge in each Bulu patrilineage. To him was assigned sufficient P/R to “judge” cases which could not be disposed of by the concrete structure, the patrilineage or the concrete substructure, the council of village household heads. A judge’s decision was final, there being no higher “court” of appeal. He ordinarily judged cases as adultery, stealing and interlineage disputes which the assembly could not handle.

The institutionalized relationships, on a most general level, of the members of Bulu society toward the judge were particularistic or traditional. That is, no. 1, the cognitive aspect, was non-rational; no. 2, the membership criteria aspect, was particularistic; and no. 3, the substantive definition aspect was functionally diffuse. There were exceptions such as is found in no. 4, the affective aspect, where certain role relationships were more affective as avoidant; no. 5, the goal orientation aspect which was sometimes individualistic and no. 6, the stratification aspect where the relationship was often hierarchical.

Action between two actors, according to relationship aspects may
have fruitful results in a comparative study. Social interaction differs according to the roles and the relationship these roles play to other roles in a society. Roles delimit the action the relationship takes.

The most effective relationship between the judge and the sorcerer was avoidance while the opposite end of effective relationship was between the judge and his blood friend which was intimate. Other effective relationships, those of the richman, fetisher, oldest living male and village household head—in the order given—were less intense occupying a middle position in comparison to the two extremes mentioned above. The rich man and the oldest living male, after the blood friend, were on a more intimate relationship with the judge and with about the same degree of intensity, than were either the village household head or the fetisher. The sorcerer, as mentioned above, had the most avoidant effective relationship, probably having to physically avoid the judge, while the stranger, warrior and the judge's slave(s) had to probably avoid him on a hierarchical rather than physical basis. The role of the warrior to the judge in this effective relationship would have probably been midway between the polar extreme of avoidancy and intimacy.

A relationship which is considered as responsible carries with the implication of "for the good of the group" in its goal orientation. In a political framework, this kind of a relationship is observed in the behavior of the richman, fetisher, village household head (in the role of a village elder), the oldest living male and, should an occasion arise, a judge from another lineage to the local judge. In each example the institutionally defined roles relate to the responsibilities each actor has to the total social unit as opposed to individually directed ends. When a man was called to a village in the role of the judge, he was called by those who were his social equals, who allocated to him political authority and to whom they had a respect for office, realizing that his decision in a case would be for the good of the village. The only roles which might carry individualistic orientations were those of the sorcerer and stranger. In either case, it is doubtful if there would have been interrelations according to the institutionally defined goals.

There is a possibility, rare as it might have been, for two judges, each representing his own lineage, to meet on lineage "business". Such as relationship would have probably been similar to the businessman—businessman type of relationship as found in the United States. The relationship, even if only theoretically possible, would have been, in its cognitive aspect rational in that definite ends and means would have been known to both actors; the membership criteria aspect was particularistic in that there was social barring; the rights and obligations of each judge were specific with the limits known to each of them; the affective aspect was avoidance in their role of judges; the
goal orientations were related to responsibility to their own lineages, while on the stratification aspect, they considered each other as equals. This kind of relationship in Bulu society is exceptional and rare and to be found in only a few instances, this one and in the “trade-friend” relationship which is most nearly identical in role relationships to the businessman—businessman example of the United States.

2. Richman (nkukum).

In each patrilineage village there is one rich man. His position came from his success in trading, inheritance or/and marriages. By the former, he acquired both wealth, which gave him the highest social role in his village, and trade-friends (nbwa) which insured peaceful relationships with otherwise warring neighboring villages during the time of trade. A very successful nkukum would soon leave his father’s village and establish one of his own. This he “owned”. It would consist mainly of his large house and individual houses for each wife, their children and animals. Many successful marriages would enlarge the web of peaceful relationships with neighboring villages since marriage was primarily considered as an alliance (for peace) between two lineages (ayoŋ, s.) permitting trade for achieving wealth and prestige goals. Although the nkukum lacked specific political power—he could never be a political chief or “king”—his role gave him a great deal of political responsibility in maintaining peaceful relations in his area in a social framework.

It should be mentioned at this point that to be a nkukum was not only a life goal but an after-life-goal among the Bulu. At death a man, believed the Bulu, would enjoy the same social prestige and role in the underground villages of the deceased ancestors as he did upon earth. This led, as a dysfunction, to competition and conflict among male members of each village who were motivated by their social goals to become richmen.

As in the case of the judge, and as in all of the relationships according to role differentiation in old Bulu society, the roles of other individuals toward the richman were traditionally oriented. The relationship had not clearly defined means and ends, rather, it was loosely constructed within the bounds of expected social behavior with recognized social barring. The relationships, in general, were extensive rather than complicated, lacking the specificity of roles such as found in the officer-enlisted man relationships in American military society.

The primary exception in this role differentiation, a similar exception found throughout Bulu social structure, was the richman-trade-friend relationship. And as in the case of the judge, the trade-friend
relationship was highly empirical with known means and ends, no social barring and functionally specific.

This “business type” relationship aspect has important political implications in that whenever a trade relationship was founded, a political alliance was also founded.

3. Fetisher (*nkungu, s., bekungu, pl.*).

This man was highly respected because of his recognized reputed magical power. He was the human medium through which anyone might have contact with lineage ancestors. The newly married would come to him asking him to guide the ancestors in sending them a healthy child. If famine or disease struck a village, the fetisher would call the ancestors to remove the curse (for a price). When the adolescent boys would go through their initiation ceremonies, it would be the fetisher who was in charge of them. It was he who would decide what magical actions might be required for any particular occasion, the decision resting upon his assumed attitude and relationship toward the ancestors in a given situation.

There were degrees of avoidancy between the fetisher and the judge, richman, warrior, stranger, slave and perhaps a fetisher from another village. There were degrees of intimacy with the following: the village elder, household head and the oldest living male. The fetisher and his blood friend enjoyed in intimate relationship with no avoidant elements.

The fetisher’s right to “curse” a village or the “tie” it with a taboo, would admit certain measures of political significance as a latent function.

4. The Oldest Living Male (*ntole mot*).

In so far as I know, the Bulu do not have a word meaning “to obey”, there was, however, “obedience” with action stemming from customary usage according to the sex, age and role of the actors involved.

Thus if a child was asked to cut sugar-cane by his father or from a member of his father’s age-grade, the child would say, “I understand”, and, in fact, “obey”. So would any woman if asked by any man, although no man would “obey” any woman. The “judge” would be obeyed because of obligation coming from tradition, the allocation of R/P granted him by each patrilineage.

In much the same way, the word “respect” carries elements of “obedience”. The oldest living male commands more “respect” and “obedience” than any other Bulu. One reason for this seems to be that, barring accidents, he would theoretically be next to enter the
underground villages of the ancestors. His house was a “depository” for dance masks and the skull of the first ancestor. As the oldest living male, he was supposedly “absorbing” some of the power held by the ancestors.

The effective aspect of the village members to him was one of intimacy with the exception of the slave, the stranger and a trade-friend. These latter roles leaned toward the avoidance pole. As in all other cases his relation to his blood-friend would be most intimate.

5. **Village Elder as Household Head (njô môt).**

The married male, in the role of a household head and/or village elder, enjoys social and political equality with all other male household heads except the judge (*kaso*) whose political role is higher. This equality probably comes from the fact that each of the men have the same ancestor in common which makes each either blood or classificatory brothers carrying the right to use familiar relationship terms with each other. P/R is equally diffused among each male as a council member when the council is meeting.

There are two roles represented here for the village male. One is that of a village elder who, with other men, forms a concrete substructure controlling all village affairs, which has already been presented in part I of this study, and secondly, his role as a household head.

In his own household, the father was supreme head with full authority and responsibility over each member of his family. For example, he would have life and/or death power over each member, and, at the same time, would be held responsible for the acts of each member of the family.

The son, especially the eldest, had a somewhat favored position since he would have had his father’s name and inherit whatever wealth his father had at the time of his parent’s death. The eldest son was also responsible for his eldest sister’s welfare, and, at the time of marriage, he would join the father in transacting the marriage contract and the obligations which it implied.

The father enjoyed intimate relationships with all those of his sex and age class—those whom he called brothers and who were, at the same time, members of the same village council. This intimate relationship was not extended to the stranger, sorcerer or trade-friend. As in all other cases in this group, one’s most intimate relationship was with one’s blood friend, for, with a blood friend, “a man would share even his wife.” In an otherwise “unstratified” society, elements of stratification were present in such relationships as: vis-à-vis the sorcerer, stranger, slave and to some extent, but less in intensity, the warrior.
6. Warrior (*nwôwôsan*).

After a boy had undergone initiation ceremonies at puberty he would automatically become a warrior. He was responsible only to the village elders and would follow them in the raiding patterns or revenge patterns or "war" patterns of the Bulu. After marriage his participation in raids gradually subsided with the parallel increase in his responsibility as the head of his own household.

Both unmarried and recently married young men composed the warrior class. In this role, they were obedient to the general wishes of the village council to which younger married warriors also belonged. Thus, if a raid was announced, the council would call the warriors and off they would go. There was never a "blind" obedience, but obedience which was fluid, loosely constructed. Even in "battle", there was no war leader to give orders or one to follow. It was like an army of generals, each following his own leading.

The most effective goal orientation for this group was "responsibility", since the united actions of each warrior was for the "good of the group" rather than self-motivations. For the most part, the stratificational aspect was hierarchical with the warrior playing a lesser role except where the relationship involved the stranger and the slave. Here, the warrior was superior. The warrior enjoyed equal hierarchical status with other warriors and his blood friend.

7. The Sorcerer (*nba'â*).

Most all of the social relationships with the sorcerer would be secretive and asocial. In some cases the sorcerer was not known but covertly and any relationships are held in secrecy. He manipulates the forces of "evil", bringing about death to anyone's enemies if properly paid for it. Presumably, he knew the location of stolen objects, the prospects of a journey one was to take or the trade relation one was to enter.

"One who jumps around on four legs" suggests some of his behavioral characteristics. He is also assumed to be able to change himself, at will, to a gorilla, owl or a hawk, and change other people also. He was a man who was feared and one to be avoided. This was the expected behavior pattern for the members of Bulu society toward him.

On a most general level, it was patterned similarly to the professional man—patient role of our society. Although the cognitive aspect had perhaps more non-rational elements than those of the professional man in the U.S., other relationship aspects were professionally-wise similar. For example, there would have been no social barring in the membership criteria aspect; rights and obligations would have been functionally specific and the affective aspect would
have been avoidant. Perhaps the only “traditional” relationship was one the sorcerer had with his blood friend or neophytes in his school. P/R of a covert type was allocated to him, with control as a latent function through witchcraft.

8. Friend

   a. Trade (ǹọwa’a) (high tone).
   b. Blood (nyia mvôé wam).

There were two principal types of “friendship” recognized by the Bulu: the trade-friend and the blood friend, or literally, the “friend of the middle tying”. Both had about the same degree of potential P/R.

In this pre-white contact period of our study, the Bulu had not yet settled completely in the area which they occupy today. A few years would have been spent in one area then the patrilineage would migrate to another location farther west, toward the sea. Because they would settle on lands belonging to other lineages and other tribes, there evolved a pattern of almost daily raiding, internecine and intertribal warfare. There was little peaceful communication or alliance between the various groups. Raids and deaths resulting from these raids led to a pattern of revenge and counter-revenge from a sense of obligation thought due to the family of the deceased. With such a background, it is not difficult to understand why having a “friend”, either trade or blood, had real positive political significance.

   a. Trade-friend. Any man could establish a trade-friend relationship with any other man in any other lineage or tribe. (This was on a “lower level” of relationships than the “joking-relationship” (avusò) alliances made between either lineages or tribes discussed above). During the time of the relationship between two men, the villages represented would form a peaceful alliance and during the time of the trade, would cease to fight. This relationship would continue until one man had not only exhausted the wealth of his trade-friend, but usually that of the other male members of the village as well. The relationship would cease after one man became impoverished. Often, during this relationship, other alliances such as marriage would also be made so that at the end of the trade relationship alliance, the peace alliance would be continued and enforced by other contracts.

   When a large number of men became engaged in this kind of relationship, there arose, throughout the lower present-day Cameroonian area, a web of alliances, linking large and small villages, families, patrilineages and tribes; alliances which reduced the threat and reality of the raiding patterns which these groups had formerly found necessary. As Gluckman suggests: “it gave (these alliances) a man friends among his enemies”. (M. Gluckman, in the Symposium, The
Blood friendship (nyia mvôé wam). This was a different kind of a relationship, but with about the same political end as a trade friendship. It, too, gave a man a close friend among potential enemies. We have treated it above in the section of the concrete substructure, the antilope (sô) society. The links resulting in this relationship would cut through patrilineage and often tribal boundaries.

Both of the above alliances, with others such as marriage and the avusô, had a strong manifest function toward peaceful relationships, which, in turn, allowed economic and social relationships to grow. It is possible that the role of the judge, with his final authority, emerged in a more responsible role as arbitrator just before the coming of white man than any other time in Bulu history. The importance of these institutionalized friendships cannot be overemphasized as a functional reality and as an integral part of the allocation of P/R among the Bulu.

9. **Woman (minga).**

As was previously pointed out, the woman had the least political status and role in old Bulu society. Coming to her husband's village as a foreigner, with her continued loyalty to her father's village, she was a potential "fifth columnist" in her new village home. And she was treated as such. Never could she join her husband in the men's club-house; always she would have to taste the food she prepared for her husband before his eyes to insure him that it did not contain poison; always the "guilty" party in times of death or murder and for which a woman would have to die or in time of calamity when she would have to undergo a purifying treatment as a scape-goat.

However, with the aid of her older brother, she preserved her family's interest in the children, including their future marriage arrangements. Through her older brother, her children could always seek audience with their own father should they have, in any way, insulted him. Or, in time of conflict, the woman represented her father's village in "peace" talks as the intermediary (monékal).

In her own home, a woman had more authority but only over the children, though, at her husband's death, authority would pass to the oldest son. At death, in order to continue the contract made between the two villages, the woman, if living, would become the wife of one of her husband's brothers or even one of his sons, though not her own.

Although she would not arrange a marriage between her children, she would be expected to pass judgment upon the girl her son(s) would want to marry, or upon the man her daughter(s) would want to marry.

In the case of a polygynous household, a man's first wife, or
sometimes his favorite wife, would exert a great deal of influence over her husband as well as having full authority over the other wives, who, depending upon their age, would be treated by her either as an equal or as a servant.

To be obedient would perhaps characterize a woman's role in the allocation of political power and responsibility of the society. This, and other relational aspects are traditionally oriented marked with avoidant behavior in all relationships vis-à-vis the village men excepting her husband and his brothers. An elder brother might have, on certain occasions, sexual relationship with a wife of a younger brother (whom he calls minga wom—my woman—) though not with a wife of an older brother since this older woman is taboo (nōi) to him. In other aspects, sexual favors could ordinarily be given by arrangement with her husband, particularly if he had many wives. Children born in such arrangements would probably take the name of the husband of the woman, not the name of the man who fathered the child.

10. Stranger (njin).

A stranger, one not born in a village, enjoyed only a precarious position as a member of a village. His status would be a little higher than a slave and, like the slave, he would enjoy no political rights, but unlike the slave, would some day have political rights and might be an accepted member of a village. Men or women living as strangers in a village are in constant fear for their lives because they might be blamed for any unexpected calamity or ill fortune, which might come either to the village or to any important members of the village.

Having few rights, these strangers would often be bullied and were often afraid to live in a foreign village. However, once accepted, they enjoyed equal social and political rights as any other adult.

11. Slave (ōlō).

A slave had no political rights of any kind. He was the property of the man who had either bought him, captured him in war, or to whom he gave himself in payment of a trade debt. When his master died, a slave might be buried with him to serve him in the next life. Should a slave run away and be recaptured, his master often severe his finger or an ear, and sometimes put one or both eyes out. Although deprived of all political rights a slave often had social rights. He could join a substructure associational group which had other slaves as members. A free woman might marry him although the children would bear her name rather than his, and a slave could mingle freely with little or no avoidant regulations effecting his behavior.

His affective behavior would probably avoid either extreme of
“social barring” or “germaneness” depending upon the role the person facing him would enjoy. The greater weight of his goal orientation aspect would be probably individualistic, since his primary concern would be to please the individuals composing the group. Hierarchical levels would certainly be implied, although not with the intensity of a master-slave relationship played in this country during the pre-civil war days as ideal roles. Actual roles in Bulu society would have probably permitted less stratification and more germaneness with a greater diffusion of rights and obligations than one might ordinarily expect. Slavery might be expressed more as deprivation of political rights rather than an absence of social rights of those concerned.

**

The next tables represent the analytical aspects of relationship structures written in a simplified form for easy comparison. Action moves from the second to the first actor named. Thus in No. 1, the action goes from the Richman toward the Judge in an institutionalized form, etc.

**

Table I

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Relationship</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Judge – Richman</td>
<td>1y – 2y – 3y – 4y – 5y – 6y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Judge – Fetisher</td>
<td>1y – 2y – 3y – 4y – 5y – 6y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Judge – Sorcerer (Avoidance so predominant, probably no interaction at all)</td>
<td>1y – 2y – 3y – 4y – 5x – 6x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Judge – Warrior</td>
<td>1y – 2y – 3y – 4y – 5y – 6x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Judge – Village Elder</td>
<td>1y – 2y – 3y – 4y – 5y – 6y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Judge – Oldest Living Male</td>
<td>1y – 2y – 3y – 4y – 5y – 6y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Judge – Stranger</td>
<td>1y – 2y – 3y – 4x – 5y – 6x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>Judge – Slave (his)</td>
<td>1y – 2y – 3y – 4x – 5y – 6x</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
   b. Blood = 1y – 2y – 3y – 4y – 5y – 6y |
| 10. | Judge – Judge (only one in patrilineage. Others unlikely to meet), probably 1x – 2x – 3x – 4x – 5y – 6y unless they happened to be “blood”. |
Table II

Richman (nkukum).

1. Richman - Judge
   1y - 2y - 3y - 4x - 5y - 6x
2. Richman - Fetisher
   1y - 2y - 3y - 4x - 5y - 6x
3. Richman - Sorcerer
   1y - 2y - 3y - 4x - 5x - 6x
4. Richman - Warrior
   1y - 2y - 3y - 4x - 5y - 6x
5. Richman - Village Elder
   1y - 2y - 3y - 4y - 5y - 6y
6. Richman - Oldest Living Male
   1y - 2y - 3y - 4y - 5y - 6x
7. Richman - Stranger
   1y - 2y - 3y - 4x - 5x - 6x
8. Richman - Slave (his)
   1y - 2y - 3y - 4x - 5x - 6x
9. Richman - Friend
   a. Trade - 1x - 2x - 3x - 4x - 5x - 6y
   b. Blood - 1y - 2y - 3y - 4y - 5y - 6y
10. Richman - Richman
    Would only meet as "friend" in a. or b. above.

Table III

Fetisher (nkungu)

1. Fetisher - Richman
   1y - 2y - 3y - 4x - 5x - 6y
2. Fetisher - Kaso
   1y - 2y - 3y - 4x - 5x - 6y
3. Fetisher - Sorcerer (Would probably have no occasion to interact in these roles)
4. Fetisher - Warrior
   1y - 2y - 3y - 4x - 5x - 6x
5. Fetisher - Village Elder
   1y - 2y - 3y - 4y - 5y - 6y
6. Fetisher - Oldest Living Male
   1y - 2y - 3y - 4y - 5y - 6y
7. Fetisher - Stranger
   1y - 2y - 3y - 4x - 5x - 6x
8. Fetisher - Slave (his)
   1y - 2y - 3y - 4x - 5x - 6x
9. Fetisher - Friends
   a. Trade (probably none)
   b. Blood - 1y - 2y - 3y - 4y - 5y - 6y
10. Fetisher - Fetisher (Usually only one fetisher in each local village except for neophytes. Such a relationship may be particularistic).
    1x - 2x - 3x - 4x - 5x - 6y
### Table IV

**Oldest Living Male (*ntole mot*).**

1. Oldest Living Male - Richman  
   \[1y - 2y - 3y - 4y - 5y - 6y\]
2. Oldest Male - Judge  
   \[1y - 2y - 3y - 4y - 5y - 6y\]
3. Oldest Male - Fetisher  
   \[1y - 2y - 3y - 4y - 5x - 6y\]
4. Oldest Male - Sorcerer  
   \[1y - 2y - 3y - 4x - 5x - 6x\]
5. Oldest Male - Village Elder  
   \[1y - 2y - 3y - 4y - 5y - 6y\]
6. Oldest Male - Warrior  
   \[1y - 2y - 3y - 4x - 5x - 6x\]
7. Oldest Male - Stranger  
   \[1y - 2y - 3y - 4x - 5x - 6x\]
8. Oldest Male - Friend  
   Trade (If living) - \[1x - 2x - 3x - 4x - 5x - 6x\]  
   Blood - \[1y - 2y - 3y - 4y - 5y - 6y\]
9. Oldest Male - Slave (his)  
   \[1y - 2y - 3y - 4x - 5x - 6x\]

### Table V

**Village Elder (*njō mot*) (Or Household Head).**

1. Village Elder - Richman  
   \[1y - 2y - 3y - 4y - 5y - 6y\]
2. Village Elder - Judge  
   \[1y - 2y - 3y - 4y - 5y - 6y\]
3. Village Elder - Fetisher  
   \[1y - 2y - 3y - 4y - 5y - 6y\]
4. Village Elder - Sorcerer  
   \[1y - 2y - 3y - 4x - 5x - 6x\]
5. Village Elder - Warrior  
   \[1x - 2x - 3x - 4y - 5y - 6x\]
6. Village Elder - Oldest Living Male  
   \[1y - 2y - 3y - 4y - 5y - 6y\]
7. Village Elder - Stranger  
   \[1y - 2y - 3y - 4x - 5x - 6x\]
8. Village Elder - Friend  
   a. Trade - \[1x - 2x - 3x - 4x - 5x - 6y\]  
   b. Blood - \[1y - 2y - 3y - 4y - 5y - 6y\]
9. Village Elder - Slave (his)  
   \[1y - 2y - 3y - 4x - 5y - 6x\]
10. Village Elder - Village Elder  
    \[1y - 2y - 3y - 4y - 5y - 6y\]
### Table VI

**Warrior (nwêwôsan)**

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1. | Warrior – Richman  
   | $1x - 2x - 3y - 4x - 5y - 6x$ |
| 2. | Warrior – Judge  
   | $1y - 2y - 3y - 4y - 5y - 6x$ |
| 3. | Warrior – Fetisher  
   | $1y - 2y - 3y - 4y - 5y - 6x$ |
| 4. | Warrior – Sorcerer  
   | $1y - 2y - 3y - 4x - 5x - 6x$ |
| 5. | Warrior – Village Elder  
   | $ix - 2x - 3x - 4y - 5y - 6x$ |
| 6. | Warrior – Oldest Living Male  
   | $1y - 2y - 3y - 4y - 5y - 6y$ |
| 7. | Warrior – Stranger  
   | $1y - 2y - 3y - 4x - 5x - 6x$ |
| 8. | Warrior – Friend  
   | $ix - 2y - 3x - 4y - 5y - 6y$ |
| 9. | Warrior – Slave (his)  
   | $ix - 2y - 3y - 4x - 5x - 6x$ |
| 10. | Warrior – Warrior  
    | $ix - 2x - 3x - 4y - 5y - 6y$ |

### Table VII

**Sorcerer (ǹwêwa’a or ngwenbwa’a or ngengan)**

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1. | Sorcerer – Richman  
   | $ix - 2x - 3y - 4x - 5x - 6x$ |
| 2. | Sorcerer – Judge  
   | $ix - 2x - 3x - 4x - 5x - 6x$ |
| 3. | Sorcerer – Village Elder  
   | $ix - 2x - 3x - 4x - 5x - 6x$ |
| 4. | Sorcerer – Warrior  
   | $ix - 2x - 3y - 4x - 5x - 6x$ |
| 5. | Sorcerer – Oldest Living Male  
   | $ix - 2x - 3y - 4x - 5x - 6x$ |
| 6. | Sorcerer – Stranger  
   | $ix - 2x - 3x - 4x - 5x - 6x$ |
| 7. | Sorcerer – Friend  
   | a. Trade – Probably would not have one.  
   | b. Blood – $1y - 2y - 3y - 4y - 5y - 6y$ |
| 8. | Sorcerer – Slave  
   | $1y - 2y - 3y - 4x - 5x - 6x$ |
Table VIII

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1. Trade Friend – Trade Friend</th>
<th>$1x - 2x - 3x - 4x - 5x - 6x$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2. Blood Friend – Blood Friend</td>
<td>$1y - 2y - 3y - 4y - 5y - 6y$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Two or more men of same age group belonging to same or other villages but who belong to same brotherhood—So, ngui, etc.).

Table IX

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Woman (minga)</th>
<th>(One who becomes a resident in husband’s village).</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Woman – Richman</td>
<td>$1y - 2y - 3y - 4x - 5y - 6x$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Woman – Judge</td>
<td>$1y - 2y - 3y - 4x - 5x - 6x$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Woman – Petisher</td>
<td>$1y - 2y - 3y - 4x - 5x - 6x$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Woman Sorcerer</td>
<td>$1y - 2y - 3y - 4y - 5x - 6x$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Woman – Village Elder (not her husband or his blood brother)</td>
<td>$1y - 2y - 3y - 4x - 5x - 6x$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Woman – Warrior</td>
<td>$1y - 2y - 3y - 4x - 5x - 6x$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Woman – Oldest Living Male</td>
<td>$1y - 2y - 3y - 4x - 5x - 6x$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Woman – Stranger (male)</td>
<td>$1y - 2y - 3y - 4x - 5x - 6x$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Woman – Woman (Another woman of husband’s village but not from her home village).</td>
<td>$1y - 2y - 3y - 4x - 5y - 6y$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Woman – Woman (One in husband’s village from her village. A “sister”).</td>
<td>$1y - 2y - 3y - 4y - 5y - 6y$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Woman – Slave (hers – male)</td>
<td>$1y - 2y - 3y - 4x - 5x - 6x$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Woman – Village child (not her own)</td>
<td>$1y - 2y - 3y - 4y - 5y - 6x$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Except for Woman-husband relationship, symbol 4y indicates deviant behavior. An older brother might, in some cases, have intimate relations with his younger brother’s wife. This would not be deviant.)

(An unmarried woman might marry a slave. The children would be born free and carry the family name of the mother).
**Table X**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Relationship</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Stranger - Richman</td>
<td>( 1y - 2y - 3y - 4x - 5x - 6x )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stranger - Judge (Predom. avoidance)</td>
<td>( 1y - 2y - 3y - 4x - 5x - 6x )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stranger - Fetish</td>
<td>( 1y - 2y - 3y - 4x - 5x - 6x )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stranger - Sorcerer</td>
<td>( 1y - 2y - 3y - 4x - 5x - 6x )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stranger - Village Elder</td>
<td>( 1y - 2y - 3y - 4x - 5x - 6x )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stranger - Warrior</td>
<td>( 1y - 2y - 3y - 4x - 5x - 6x )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stranger - Oldest Living Male</td>
<td>( 1y - 2y - 3y - 4x - 5x - 6x )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stranger - Friend</td>
<td>( 1y - 2y - 3y - 4x - 5x - 6x )</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the majority of cases, a stranger—someone who is not kin related—would be permitted to live in a “foreign” village with the status of a slave or pawn. He would be in constant fear of the men of the village trying to either bully him or, through witchcraft, kill him. Although not a slave, such a man would have few social or political rights.
Table XI

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Slave (änder)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Slave - Judge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1y - 2y - 3y - 4y - 5y - 6y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Slave - Richman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1y - 2y - 3y - 4y - 5y - 6x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Slave - Fetisher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1y - 2y - 3y - 4y - 5y - 6x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Slave - Oldest Living Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1y - 2y - 3y - 4y - 5y - 6x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Slave - Household Head</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1y - 2y - 3y - 4y - 5y - 6y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Slave - Warrior</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1y - 2y - 3y - 4y - 5y - 6x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Slave - Sorcerer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1x - 2x - 3x - 4x - 5x - 6x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Slave - Friend</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Trade - none</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Blood - 1y - 2y - 3y - 4y - 5y - 6y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Slave - Woman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1y - 2y - 3y - 4y - 5y - 6x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Slave - Stranger</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1y - 2y - 3y - 4y - 5y - 6y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Slave - Slave</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1y - 2y - 3y - 4y - 5y - 6y</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Conclusions

1. The pre-white society of the Bulu was “particularistic” or “traditional”.

2. Power and responsibility was allocated in equal degree to all male household heads who, in turn, composed the council of elders.

3. When in session, the council of elders had sufficient P/R, based upon tradition and custom, to control the patrilineage or village to which it belonged.

4. Should the council not reach a majority decision, there emerged in the Bulu political system the judge (kaso) to whom was allocated maximum P/R, also based upon tradition and custom, with full authority to judge a case and whose decision of it would be accepted as final.

5. A woman’s political allegiance, even after marriage and moving
to her husband's village, remained on the lineage of her father.

6. Alliances of the various types described above, emerge as having singular political importance in maintaining political equity between villages, lineages and sometimes tribes which would otherwise be hostile.

**Discussion**

1. Structural-functional analysis is a method which selects from a large number of variables, social phenomena which are relevant to a particular study.

These phenomena are grouped in a series of levels, beginning with the most general, and descending to lower levels of generalization.

At these various levels certain theories may be formulated about the universality of the phenomena, thereby "creating a conceptual scheme for the comparative analysis of societies and a theoretical system of general relevance to the structure and formation of societies" (Levy, *Ibid.*, p. 1).

2. The structure of a model implies the setting up of certain categories, such as the "analytic aspects of relationship structures" into which pertinent social phenomena are grouped for analysis and comparison with other systems. It was here where I had the most difficult task of fitting the Bulu into predefined and predetermined "molds". This point, I will now illustrate.

Among the analytical aspects of relationship structures are the "cognitive" and the "substantive definition" aspects. Polar terms for the cognitive are "rational" and "non-rational" and the polar terms for the substantive definition aspect are "functionally specific" and "functionally diffuse". All relationships in Bulu society, whether on the concrete structure, concrete substructure or lower, on the actor-actor levels, must either be one aspect of the polar terms or expressed in degrees between the various polar terms.

On the most general level the Bulu was a "particularistic" or "traditional" society because, in part, the cognitive aspect was "non-rational" and the substantive definition aspect was "functionally diffuse", both characteristics of non-industrial societies.

This "pigeon-holing" is confusing, for, in fact, the Bulu were "rational" concerning their cognitive aspects of their relationships as well as being "specific" in terms of the substantive definition aspect of the relationships. For example: All Bulu social relationships were based upon well-known and well-recognized obligations according to age, sex and role. The behavior of a man to his wife was clearly understood, defined and delimited according to role expectation which, in turn, was based upon customary law and tradition.
A man would be faced with serious disapproval by his wife's parents if he:

a. Eloped with their daughter;
b. had not given them all the dowry they had demanded;
c. made their daughter the drudge (nlulup), the "last one", if he had more than one wife;
d. lied to his in-laws;
e. had been disrespectful to them;
f. prohibited his wife to visit her home village;
g. or his family made trouble for the girl.

Likewise a wife would face serious disapproval by her husband's family if she:

a. Continued to have lovers in her home village;
b. stayed too long on a visit to her home village;
c. or returned to her husband just "hands and feet", without presents for his family implying that her people regarded her husband lightly.

These and similar illustrations point out that the cognitive aspects of relationships are "rational" rather than "non-rational" and that the social bounds are "specific", in the sense that they are "precisely defined and delimited." Levy writes: "A functionally specific relationship is one in which the activities or considerations or rights and obligations or performances are precisely defined and precisely delimited." "A functionally diffuse relationship is one in which the substantive definition of the relationship is more or less vaguely defined and delimited." (Levy, *Ibid.*, pp. 256-258.)

The social relationships of the Bulu, according to the above definitions, fit more nearly into a "specific" category rather than a "diffuse" one. Political and social obligations are known and specifically set by tradition and custom according to age, sex and role. There are few other social phenomena which are more "precisely defined and delimited" than those based upon "obligations" in non-industrial societies. Extra- and intra-familial relationships may again be used as a case point. These relationships are based upon institutionalized behavior stemming from custom and tradition, which, in a functional setting, prevent social dysfunction. Should they be any less "specific" social anomie might easily result, and has resulted in societies where change seems to be a pattern, where "diffuseness" is prevalent.

If this is an example of exceptions, or lack of a clear understanding of such concepts in relationships and other aspects, this may seriously handicap this model as a useful tool in comparative analysis, for these neutralize the real differences between "traditional" and "universalistic" societies on every level.

3. One of the larger problems concerning structural-analysis, no
matter whose system is used as a model, is the need to learn and to use a “special language”. Let me first point out, for discussion’s sake, what to me seems to be some disadvantages, then consider some of its advantages.

a) Only those who know the special language, who are initiates, can use it. To others, it remains foreign and unintelligible.

b) It takes a great deal of time just to learn the language of a system before one is able to begin to use it, or to understand others who use it. Within this problem comes the complimentary one of having to learn the languages and systems of other theoreticians who have constructed their own models and languages. A great deal of time must be given to understanding other theoreticians at the expense of research.

c) The final disadvantage is bound up in the almost metaphysical problem of universals:

The idea of a “model”, as I understand it, comes from the natural sciences, probably physics, and, to a lesser extent, biology. To a physicist the “atom” as found in Europe is exactly the same as the one found in the United States, China, etc. The atom can be placed and understood as a part of a system. The atom is universally the same in space and time in so far as we now know it.

A social scientist’s use of a model implies that certain social phenomena, “on a most general level”, are similar (not the same) throughout the world. This implies that certain social phenomena have at least one characteristic common with the physicist’s atom, their spatial similarity and distribution. This point is debatable. “The family” is often used to illustrate a social phenomena with a world-wide distribution. Even taken on a most general (universal) level, the family is not only not the same, it is not even similar on a world-wide distribution (this does not imply that certain characteristics are not found world-wide), despite the fact that among all of the social units (atoms?), the idea of family merits a universality. Even as a minimum definition, there is no social unit which approximates the atom in a universal sense.

A model, with its established categories, concepts (always open to question) and definitions involves almost a scholastic schema: the social world and all of its variables must fit into predetermined categories. Thus in category “FAMILY” all of the world’s familial systems must be included. It would seem to me that knowledge of the diversities as well as similarities of “family” systems is more nearly a goal of a social scientist, rather than the “atomization” of a social system on a universal level.

4. There are certain advantages, however, in the structural-analysis technique. I will point out four of them:
a) There are certain areas of this comparative technique, if properly worked out, where this would be very helpful. In general, role analysis and the idea of aspects in relationship structures were most helpful in abstracting information which I might have otherwise missed.

b) Although I feel that the conclusions *per se* about the Bulu were not changed or even helped using structural-analysis, it was theoretically possible to gain a certain depth which would not have been possible to attain otherwise.

c) Through the use of a similar model, upon different societies, comparative analysis becomes easier, since all societies are related to the same model in the same way.

d) Once one learns the language, there is real value in the use of structural-analysis, other factors being equal, in its use in interdisciplinary communication. Once all traditional definitions of various social sciences are swept away, there are advantages to all concerned in using a common tongue. But which one?