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I

The Gogo are a Bantu-speaking people who inhabit part of what is now the central region of Tanzania¹. They numbered some 300,000 in the 1957 census. Their country, known as Ugogo through Swahili usage, lies primarily in the thorn-scrub plain formed by the eastern arm of the Rift Valley where it becomes rather indistinct. It lies between 2,900 and 3,900 feet above sea level.

The crucial factor in the ecology of Gogo society is rainfall. The single rainy season of about five months a year is extremely erratic, and actual rainfall varies a great deal, both from year to year and from place to place in Ugogo. Over most of the area it averages just over 20 inches a year, but owing to periodic failure, frequent drought occurs, resulting in famine. No rivers run throughout the protracted dry season in Ugogo.

The Gogo subsist basically upon the hoe-cultivation of sorghum and bulrush millet crops, but also rely upon their herds of cattle, sheep, and goats, to a great extent during famine and drought and to a lesser extent all the time. Most Gogo own, or have rights in, some livestock, and many have very large herds. The predominant values of Gogo society, in economic exchange, ritual, and symbolic contexts, are expressed in terms of cattle.

These economic and ecological factors influence Gogo society in

* The data upon which this paper is based were collected during a period of fieldwork in Ugogo from September 1961 to August 1963. The first three months were financed by the then Colonial Social Science Research Council; I completed the rest as a Fellow of the East African Institute of Social Research.

two ways: (a) they affect the density and the residential stability of the population, and (b) they affect the type of goods which constitute the major heritable property.

II

The economic correlates of segmentary lineage systems with corporate unilineal descent groups have frequently been indicated as basic factors in the type of kinship structures characteristic of these societies (Fortes 1953:24; Forde 1947; Worsley 1956). The absence of such conditions has also been cited to explain the absence of corporate unilineal descent groups (Richards 1950:251; Fortes 1953:35).

However, I would suggest that it is not simply the incidence of rights in heritable (durable) property which is the fundamental point in the correlation between types of kinship structures and economic systems, but rather the economic conditions which allow a certain degree of “stability and density of population” (Forde 1947:218-219, 221). Thus the type of property in which the rights are vested is also a factor. It would appear that corporate unilineal descent groups are often (but not always) associated with subsistence economies centred upon heritable land rights, which stabilize groups of kin in fixed localities (Worsley 1956:69).

This does not mean, of course, that all societies with lineage systems have this type of economic system: for example, the transhumant Bedouin and the Nuer are cases in point (Peters 1960; Evans-Pritchard 1940), as is that of the nomadic Somali (Lewis 1961). In this type of society, rights in property are primarily in livestock, but they have developed segmentary lineage system. It would appear that in the case of more nomadic or semi-nomadic groups with livestock, in an environment with extremely scarce resources of grazing and water, the political functions of lineage organizations (which, after all, are their primary functions) assume an importance in demarcating areas within which only members of particular agnatic groups may have rights: for example, in grazing and water (but cf. the important differences among such societies as pointed out by Lewis 1965). It will be seen that among the residentially mobile Gogo, rights in grazing and water are free everywhere, although relatively scarce. This is also the case among the Jie and Turkana, who do not have segmentary lineage systems (Gulliver 1955:34-35, 255-256).

Where rights in a fixed land unit are heritable, in the context of a subsistence economy, the localization of those with interests in that land is inevitable (Worsley 1956; Fortes 1945:180). When land is not heritable property, rights tied to local areas are irrelevant in the
formation of kin groups. If cattle or other livestock constitute the primary form of property, the dispersal of kin in each generation is not only a possibility but often a necessity. The Gogo provide a case where livestock form the most important heritable property, and dispersal of agnatic kin in each generation is the usual pattern. Although agriculture is the basis of subsistence, usufructuary rights in land are not inherited, and thus the localization of descent groups does not occur on the basis of such rights.

The problem arises: if the domestic group is the point of articulation between the sphere of cognatic, interpersonal kinship relations on the one hand and the external politico-jural domain on the other (Fortes 1958), and the structure of the latter is not based upon corporate unilineal descent groups (as is the case in Ugogo), what kind of articulation is there between the structure of the domestic domain and the structures which exist in the politico-jural domain?

It will be seen that the external domain in Gogo society is composed of two aspects: (i) an ideology of kinship based upon clans, sub-clan names, and patrilineal descent, and (ii) the system of clearly bounded ritual areas and vaguely defined, fluid local communities (neighbourhoods). We are thus led to an examination of the pattern of residence, the network of kinship, and co-operation in local communities, and of the influence upon this pattern of a patrilineal descent system which produces dispersed, broad descent groups, ‘corporate’ only in the sense of being “exclusive name-owning groups” (Fortes 1959:208).

It is not my intention here explicitly to pursue the significance of the present analysis either for ‘types’ of general kinship theory, or for ‘types’ of kinship system (Schneider 1965). But the material presented here bears directly upon these problems. The emphasis in my analysis of the Gogo kinship system lies upon the operation of ‘kinship network’ in terms of locality and residential mobility. The reason for the relative weight I assign to cognatic and affinal ties in the context of locality and co-operation, over those of descent embodied in clan, sub-clan, and patrilineal group affiliation, will, I hope, appear. An analysis of this type necessarily involves a considerable (but not entire) reliance upon numerical data: the ‘statistical facts’ of social action rather than normative statements about it (Fortes 1949b:56-59; Leach 1961:8, 9, 300). Such data cannot be presented in any detail within the limits of a single paper. But naturally, both kinds of data are essential for structural analysis, although one must beware of assuming a necessary convergence (or divergence) between them (Beattie 1959:46-47; Nadel 1951:107-114).

1. I present a fuller analysis in a forthcoming monograph on Gogo kinship.
III

In the following description of Gogo clans, sub-clans, avoidances, and so on, I want to emphasize that I am putting forward formal concepts of descent and kinship in terms of Gogo conceptual categories themselves. I am not talking about 'groups' such as 'major lineages', 'minor lineages', and so on, defined in functional terms. This latter procedure may be applicable to the description and analysis of segmentary lineage structures; it is not so in the case of a society like that of the Gogo. I am describing the broad categories into which Gogo themselves conceive of their society as being divided. As these categories are based upon the general application of a concept of patrilineal descent, I am describing what may be called an 'ideology' of patrilineal descent. It will be seen that these categories are not always clear or unambiguously defined. This is because Gogo themselves frequently have rather fluid ideas about the functions of these broader categories of kin, and there are local differences as to what the terms really mean. We may say that the principle of affiliation upon which these categories are based is, in theory, rigid and unambiguous; but what the categories actually mean for Gogo society and kinship structure may vary somewhat from place to place, time to time, and even opinion to opinion.

All Gogo are divided into over eighty-five named patrilineal clans; or, at least, I have used the term 'patrilineal clan' as a 'translation label' (Conklin 1962, 1964:29) for the Gogo concept mbeyu. The word mbeyu also means 'seed', 'kind', or 'type'. One belongs to the mbeyu of one's social father or pater. The term denotes a classification of all persons into the most fundamental possible categories. Everyone must belong to some mbeyu, and each can only belong to one mbeyu. This applies equally to all non-Gogo who, of course, are thought of as belonging to non-Gogo clans. The fundamental and exhaustive nature of this classification is true of all clanship systems, which constitute what may be called 'kinship (or relationship) by assimilation'. Many Gogo clans share their names with clans amongst neighbouring peoples, including the matrilineal Kaguru and the patrilineal Hehe, Kimbu, and others. In fact, all Gogo clans have histories of migrations and founders who traced their descent to one of the great number of surrounding peoples (Rigby 1964). These histories are remembered, retold, and handed down by the elders on all occasions when clanship becomes important, such as at weddings, funerals, inheritance ceremonies, and so on.

1. In Eastern Ugogo the term mbeyu is not used for this social category. Instead the word mulongo, which I have called 'sub-clan name', is used (cf. infra).
Gogo clans are, however, non-exogamous, except in the ideal case. They are not localised, save that the members of some clans are statistically preponderant in the ritual areas in which they have ritual control. Each clan is linked to one more ‘ritual areas’ (yisi, see below; also Rigby 1966a, 1966b, 1967a) by the possession of rainstones used in rain-making ceremonies, the stool upon which they are kept, and other insignia of ritual office. The possession of these ritual objects and their relation to a particular area are justified in the clan history.

All the members of one clan have the same ‘clan oath’ (cilahiolo). Clan oaths are commonly uttered when one stubs a toe, sneezes, or suffers some minor mishap. It is designed, Gogo say, to remind one in such situations of one’s origins and ancestors, and serves to ward off any supernatural dangers which may occur.

Gogo ritual areas have definite physical boundaries, but they are usually small. In 1961-1963, the average population of a ritual area was about 3,000 persons. Adjacent ritual areas commonly share boundaries, but in the past it is probable that there were areas of ‘no-man’s land’ between some of them. This, however, is of limited significance. Although these boundaries have meaning for the location of fields (because the efficacy of rain and fertility medicines obtained and distributed by the ritual leader is lost outside them), they do not limit changes of residence, or grazing and other rights.

Ritual leadership (wutemi) in terms of these areas is restricted to the office of mutemi, which I have translated as ‘ritual leader’. A ritual leader cannot himself carry out most of his functions without the assistance and support of a diviner (muganga). Succession to the office of ritual leader is ideally by patrilineal primogeniture. But this influences only the residence of the small-depth agnatic group, the ‘sons of one man’, who are directly responsible and concerned with the transmission of, and succession to, ritual leadership. The other members of any clan are dispersed residentially over their own and other ritual areas in Ugogo. Hence each ritual area is occupied by the members of a great many clans. These people do not necessarily have any contact with their fellow clansmen in other, distant, ritual areas, unless they transfer their residence to those areas.

The members of one clan are never gathered together in the ritual area associated with them at any time, for political, ritual, or other purposes. But the members of the same clan residing in one area and in constant contact consider each other ‘kin’ (ndugu). They call each other by the terms of address used between paternal parallel cousins (alaba). However, they would not normally be referred to as ‘being parallel cousins’ (wali cana cawasewo), but rather as ‘being
relatives' (*wali ndugu*). *Ndugu* is a category which includes all cognatic kin as well as affines.

Members of certain clans living as neighbours in the same area consider each other joking partners (*watani*) if there is a joking relationship between their clans (Rigby 1967c). Similarly, clans are linked with each other in special 'perpetual kinship' relationships, usually based on the kin categories 'MB/ZN'. Each clan is linked to several others by both these and joking partnership ties. The grounds for each are embodied in the clan histories; or the relationships are thought of as growing out of affinal links between members of each clan in the distant past, and hence cross-cousinship, which is a joking relationship (Rigby 1967c). But I emphasize again that these inter-clan relationships arise out of the Gogo ideology of relationships between clan categories, and not because clans or other unilineal descent groups were 'corporate' in relation to marriage in the past.

Gogo are divided into a further set of broad descent categories. Most Gogo clans are subdivided into what I have called 'sub-clans': those categories of persons which the Gogo call *milongo* (plural of *mulongo*). *Milongo* are also named units, and each is associated with an avoidance (*muzilo*). Some *milongo* names are very common and occur in several clans. Thus in some senses, *mulongo* affiliation may be said to cut across clan affiliation, as is the case with the associated avoidances. But this would not be the Gogo view. Even though the same *mulongo* in different clans may be associated with the same avoidance, and some sort of relationship would be thought to exist between persons with the same *mulongo* but different clan origins, they would not be considered 'kin' (*ndugu*), at least in Central Ugogo (I have pointed out the distinction between Central Ugogo and the East). If, however, they belonged to the same clan as well, they would be 'close kin'.

Some *mulongo* or sub-clan names are based on the avoidances themselves, and they are generally thought of as being closely associated with the avoidances. The concept of *mulongo* and the concept of avoidance (*muzilo*) are inextricably linked. *Mulongo* names in some parts of Ugogo may be used as honorific terms of address.

1. I use with reservations the term 'perpetual kinship' for these inter-clan links. But they are permanent in the sense that they are enshrined in the history of each clan, and provide a basis for relationships between individual members of each clan who are not related in any other way. But in Gogo these links do not depend upon 'positional succession' to political roles (such as lineage heads) as in the case of some Central and East African peoples (Richards 1950; Gray 1953; Cuniniso 1956). There are no such lineage leadership roles in the Gogo political system. However, Gogo inter-clan kinship links do persist beyond those of the type explicitly excluded from the category 'perpetual kinship' by Cuninison (1956:30). (Cf. Rigby 1964:84 ff.)
Some clans and sub-clans are further subdivided into what, for want of a better term, I have called ‘maximal lineages’ (milango, sing. mulango: lit. ‘doorway’). Despite the fact that these are not segmentary structures, and milango are not further subdivided into smaller segments (except what could be called ‘minimal lineages’ of three generations, which I discuss later), the translation label ‘maximal lineage’ appears to be appropriate enough for mulango, because it is a genealogically ‘fixed’ category in relation to a ‘founder’. A mulango cannot proliferate any more, at least in theory; and genealogical ‘telescoping’ takes place ‘beneath’ its founder.

Milango or maximal lineages are thought of as significant primarily when one clan is associated with ritual leadership in more than one area. The ‘grandsons’ (wezukulu) of the clan founder (which denotes any persons in the second descending generation and beyond) are postulated as the founders of each mulango in each ritual area. The genealogical depth of milango reckoned from present elders is seldom more than three generations. But again, the maximal lineage is neither localised nor corporate. Even marriage can take place within it, if a special ceremony for ‘killing the kinship’ (kuwulaga ndugu) is performed beforehand, although such marriages are frowned upon. The burden of ritual leadership within a ritual area still falls upon the small-depth agnatic group concerned with the inheritance of the rainstones. The lack of corporate significance in agnatic descent groups wider than the ‘sons of one man’ is indicated genealogically by the absence of horizontal proliferation of agnatic descent lines.

But some clans are not divided into sub-clans, and yet others are divided into sub-clans but not maximal lineages. The variations in the operation of these categories can be seen from the following figure, which compares the subdivisions of two clans, the Pulu and the Nyagatwa, in relation to the ritual areas in which they have control:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Clan (mbeyu)</th>
<th>Founder</th>
<th>Sub-clan name (mulongo)</th>
<th>Avoidance (muzilo)</th>
<th>‘Maximal lineage’ (mulango)</th>
<th>Ritual area (yisi)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PULU ....</td>
<td>Maguhe</td>
<td>Munyambwa</td>
<td>Ndunghu</td>
<td>Wanyamadako</td>
<td>Nhyemianga, Makutupola, Igoji, Ikogolo, Citelela, Ciale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Wanyigoji</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Wanyikogolo</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Wanyakitelela</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Wanyaciale</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NYAGATWA</td>
<td>Macinyinha</td>
<td>Sembuce Munyambwa</td>
<td>Mbofu</td>
<td>(Wanyacikombo) (Wanyibwijili)</td>
<td>Cikombo Ibwijili</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


What emerges from this rather complex set of affiliations and their local variations is that, although a person's clan (mbeyu) places him in the most general and fundamental category of descent recognized by Gogo, his proper place vis-à-vis his ancestors, their activities, and the areas with which they are associated, can only be established when his clan, sub-clan name, avoidance, clan oath, and place of residence are taken together. Each person acquires his set of sometimes cross-cutting affiliations normally through patrilineal descent. These place him in particular relationships with the members of other clans linked to his in various ways and scattered in family groups through large areas of Ugogo.

Hence clan affiliation is based upon a conjunction of several of these factors taken together, although membership of the clan itself is thought of as the most fundamental.

So much for the Gogo concepts of the broader categories of kinship, based upon the ideology of patrilineal descent. The general pattern may be said to be one of widely dispersed clanship ties, spread at each generation over a network of tiny ritual areas. This broad ideology of descent, at times vague but in some respects concerned with precise, unambiguous principles of affiliation, is one or the factors which 'inform', as it were, the operation of kinship and affinal ties as they are actually worked out in Gogo local communities. Each individual Ego classifies his kin and affines with whom he actually comes into contact, co-operates with in all spheres of social action, and depends upon through his life cycle, into various categories. The most important of these categories I describe below. Into these categories are grouped the 'actually existing' interpersonal kinship and affinal ties Ego is involved in. The limits pertaining to the operation of these Ego-oriented networks of relationship are 'historical' and 'spatial' ones. But owing to the high residential mobility of homestead groups, the potentiality of these relationships are 'spread' over the whole of Ugogo, in terms of the ideology of descent and the resulting categories I have just described.

Hence each person has a different set of interpersonal relationships, which constitute a series of Ego-oriented networks; only full-siblings, the children of one mother and father, have very similar sets of operating kinship ties. It is to the operation of these relationships within the context of the local community, and the categories into which they are divided, that I now turn.

IV

Each ritual area with its definite geographical boundaries contains several neighbourhoods (matumbi), although if a ritual area is very
small it may be composed of only one neighbourhood. These neighbour-
hoods are not identifiable as discrete geographical units, either
with regard to the positioning of homesteads within them, the fields
cultivated by their residents, or the areas in which their livestock
graze. Neighbourhoods are characterized by the clustering of home-
steads, whose members are related by various kin and affinal links,
about certain points—usually around topographical features—while
the boundaries between them are indistinct.

There is no single principle which characterizes the organization
of Gogo neighbourhoods. Owing to the relatively high mobility of
population in residential terms, the population of neighbourhoods
tends to display a cyclical or developmental pattern. Neighbourhoods
are founded by a homestead-head taking his dependents and cattle to
a new area, clearing the bush, and building a new homestead. If he
is rich (and no other person would attempt the founding of a neigh-
bourhood on his own) and successful, others will follow him. Some
of them may attach themselves to his homestead, or build nearby.

The founder of a neighbourhood need not belong to the clan with
ritual precedence in the area in which it lies. He need not seek per-
mission from the ritual leader, but must be known as a person who
would abide by the ritual direction of the mutemi. Rights to usufruct
of land and water are based on the principles that herding and water
are common (except for certain wells), a building can be constructed
anywhere as long as no one else is using the land for another purpose,
and fields can be begun anywhere on the same basis. Rights in fallow
fields last only for two years, although permission should be sought
if the previous cultivator is still in the neighbourhood.

At any particular time, most Gogo neighbourhoods are occupied
by homestead-heads and their dependents who may be classified into
three basic categories: a) those who are the ‘earliest’ residents and
are related to the founders, b) more recent residents who have remained
long enough to be linked by ties of descent and kinship of various
kinds, and have closely-knit obligations over livestock and other
goods and services with those of the first category and amongst them-
selves, and c) the real ‘newcomers’, linked by a few ties of kinship to
previous residents but whose main obligations centre around newly
created affinal links with their neighbours. Common to all these
categories is a complex network of cattle transactions, which now
link them in a further network of common rights and obligations
in all further transactions, some of which will be exercised and ful-
filled and others not (Rigby 1964:Ch. iv).

Population thus builds up in a neighbourhood, until most of the
‘bush’ (mbago) has been cleared. The population will then start
decreasing and building up elsewhere, for reasons which will become
apparent. This process of accretion and decline may take up to fifty, sixty, or more years. Although scarcity of cultivable and grazing land within easy reach is cited by Gogo as one of the reasons for population movements out of a neighbourhood, the specific reasons given for residential movements by particular homestead-heads are usually drought, famine, the scarcity of good grazing, or witchcraft and sorcery accusation. When homesteads move from one neighbourhood to another they move independently, and the members go to live near kin or affines in other areas. I describe later what categories of kin and affines these are, both in terms of Gogo values about them and in terms of their statistical frequency in the clusters of homesteads which make up Gogo neighbourhoods.

It is immediately apparent that, because land is not inherited, the localization of agnatic descent groups broader than full-siblings and paternal half-siblings does not occur in Gogo society. In fact, the emphasis lies the other way: to create cattle-owning homestead groups which are independently mobile and can therefore adjust to the vagaries of a marginal economic environment and difficult ecological conditions.

After the death of a homestead-head and father, the domestic group of which he was head soon dissolves. Fission takes place primarily along the lines of differentiation between sets of full-siblings linked to each other as paternal half-siblings or parallel cousins. The matricentral unit of one woman and her children (a ‘house’, nyumba) forms the basis of the new, and independent, residential and domestic unit. The fission of these units from the original domestic units may precede the death of the homestead-head and father, and frequently does; although this is normally reprehensible. Hence agnatic ties do not form the basis of local groups like neighbourhoods, except insofar as groups of full-brothers may live in the same homestead or different homesteads of the same cluster. These groups of full-brothers may remain, at least for a time, near their paternal half-siblings (though hardly ever in one homestead), due to the necessity of contacting the spirits of the dead through rituals at their father’s gravestone (citenjelo). In these rituals, the eldest son of the senior house has precedence, although this too may be challenged by his younger siblings as their own homestead groups mature.

These sets of full-siblings living in neighbourhood clusters within the neighbourhoods, marry the sisters of their close neighbours, who in turn marry the sisters of other like groups. I do not mean that there is ‘wife exchange’; there is not. But Gogo live near their close affines, and admit that they have to, although their attitudes about this are ambiguous.

So it may seem that ties of patrilineal descent through patri-filiation and clanship cut across neighbourhoods and the boundaries
of ritual areas. They have territorial significance only in respect of the stool-holding segments of the ritually dominant clans. But as far as the operation of kinship and affinal relationships are concerned, as opposed to the operation of descent groups, it remains valid to isolate the neighbourhood as a unit for analysis.

The heads of 45 homesteads in one neighbourhood recognized 126 significant kin and affinal links amongst them at one time. By ‘significant’ I mean that some homestead-heads are related in other ways, but these links are not considered operative; although they could possibly be invoked in specific circumstances. They are overlaid by the ‘significant’ ties. The total population was 413 adults and children. Of these 126 links between homestead-heads, only 17 (or 13.4%) were based upon patrilineal descent. Seven of these (5.6% of the total) were between full and half-siblings.

Links between homestead-heads in the ‘MB/ZS’ category were as frequent as ‘F/S’ links, and accounted for 9 (7.2%) of the total. Ten (or 7.9% of the total) of all the links were between cross-cousins. But 89 (or 70.7%) relationships between these homestead-heads placed them in affinal categories of one sort or another vis-à-vis each other. Links between ‘brothers-in-law’ (walamu) made up the largest single category and numbered 43 (34.1%) of the total number of links. The ties between cross-cousins already mentioned would also be dependent upon this pattern of the close residence of affines. For naturally, the near residence of persons in the category ‘cross-cousin’ stems from the close residence of affines in previous generations.

The homesteads of this neighbourhood were further grouped into three ‘clusters’ (vitumbi, lit. ‘small neighbourhoods’). That these clusters were based upon a network of cognatic and affinal ties is confirmed by the fact that 94 (or 75%) of the total number of links were intra-cluster links, and only one quarter (25%) were between homestead-heads living in different clusters. Although members of all homesteads in the neighbourhood, and even from nearby neighbourhoods, co-operate in such activities as communal agricultural work-and-beer parties, tighter groups like herding associations (kuhanza ndima) are usually based upon the homestead cluster within each neighbourhood.

It must be kept in mind that these figures refer to homestead-heads who stand in these relationship categories with one another, and that they think them significant. They do not necessarily refer to actual genealogical links of ‘own wife’s brother’, and so on; although in many cases they do. The significance of these categories will appear later. But first we must examine in a little more detail the developmental cycle of the domestic group.
The headship of a homestead, whose core is the domestic group, is the only role which entails full political and jural authority in Gogo society. Other roles and offices such as ritual leader (mutemi) and diviner (muganga) entail further ritual authority in the public sphere. Being the head of a homestead (munyakaya) means acquiring the only status in Gogo society which confers full jural and political stature upon a man in the external domain. He automatically becomes an ‘elder’ in relation to the ad hoc local courts of elders which are the main judicial bodies of Gogo society; although there is an incipient age-set organization, and real seniority in age is necessary for full acceptance as an authority in the elders’ courts.

The status of homestead-head is also the only one through which a man can gain full control over the deployment, use, and ritual welfare of the most important property in Gogo society: livestock. For the homestead group is the basic ‘stock owning’ unit in Gogo society. Yet within it, the homestead herd (itéwa) is divided up and allocated to the various matricentral units of married women and their children. And the full-brothers in one ‘house’ will inherit only those livestock allocated to their own house (nyumba). This allocation is carried out during the lifetime of the husband/father, although he retains final control over the herd in his byre. Gogo homesteads are built around the cattle byre, and it is the livestock herd which symbolizes the unity of the patricentral domestic group, the core of the homestead (Rigby 1966a, 1967a).

But it is over livestock, its deployment and use, that the major conflicts occur which lead to fission in Gogo domestic groups. Polygyny is highly valued, although only 30%-35% of married men have more than one wife with them at one time (Dorjahn 1959:98-105). Bridewealth is comparatively large. Thus Gogo recognize that conflict between father and adult sons over the deployment and use of livestock is inevitable although, of course, it is highly condemned. Witchcraft and sorcery accusations between father and son are frequent and expected (Rigby 1964:290-307 and Appendix E).

One solution to this problem is that adult sons, together with their mother (if she is beyond childbearing), their wives and children may move away and set up their own homestead; although this action is strongly condemned in moral terms. The son thus establishes his own cattle byre and thence has at least partial control over his own herd. Sets of full-brothers are kept together because they cannot divide up the herd they have obtained from their father, even after his death, until their mother dies.
Hence fission in agnatic groups occurs at a very 'low level' and in each generation, as regards both corporate rights in property as well as common residence. The house-property system facilitates this process. And the general result of small, relatively independent stock-owning units, free to move their residence, interlocks with the general economic processes and ecological conditions evident in Ugogo.

Gogo homesteads, however, do not move haphazardly, as we have seen; they cohere in clusters on the basis of close cognatic and affinal ties. The development of neighbourhoods and relationships within them are closely interwoven with the developmental patterns of domestic groups: they are two aspects of the same process. In this process lies the point of articulation between the domestic and politico-jural domains of Gogo society. Gogo themselves represent the choices involved as being between residing with or near agnatic kin on the one hand, or near matrilateral or affinal kin on the other. As it is desirable (and statistically frequent) for close affines to live near each other, the move represented by the break-away of a 'house' to go and live near matrilateral or affinal kin may not be spatially very great, although on occasion it can be. The important element is not distance, but the establishing of a new homestead with an independent byre, and all that this means in Gogo society.

VI

Gogo have neither a preferential marriage system nor, as I have indicated, unambiguously defined exogamous groups. Of a sample of 203 marriages, past and present, only 45 (22.2%) were between kin of any category. Of these, 11 (24.3% of kin marriages) were between classificatory cross-cousins. Another 13 were between persons already 'affines' in one way or another.

Nevertheless, as in all marriage systems where no prescriptive rules or effective preferences exist, locality is an important factor in the selection of spouses (Fortes 1962:6-7). This is particularly so in Gogo society, due to both the normative preference for residence adjacent to close affines, and its high statistical frequency. In the sample of marriages already mentioned, over 50% took place between persons whose homesteads were less than five miles apart at the time of their

1. When asked out of context, Gogo say that it is bad to live near close affines, on the argument that if one quarrels with one’s wife, she will run home straight away to enlist the support of her kin, mainly her brothers (Rigby 1964, 1967c). But when faced with the facts of the frequent close residence of affines around them, they immediately find good reasons for it: the necessity for co-operation between affines, and the linked role pairs of kin discussed below.
marriage. 88.5% of the marriages took place within a radius of twenty miles. Marital residence is both normatively and statistically patri-virilocal in its early stages.

I conclude, safely I think, that the incidence of kin marriages is a function of this highly restricted spatial range. Gogo theorize that it is desirable to marry classificatory matrilateral cross-cousins, but no marriages are arranged on the basis of the prior existence of this relationship. Such a marriage is logically compatible with the Gogo theory of patrilineal descent; but in fact the existence of a cross-cousin relationship is only invoked when the marriage is already arranged, as an argument for suggesting that it will be a good one. I came across one marriage with ‘actual’ MBD, but this is strongly condemned as it confuses the bridewealth contributions on which the conjugal tie is based. Let me explain why this is so.

Bridewealth (cigumo) for a young girl should ideally be over 20 head of cattle and 16 to 20 small stock; it can be as much as 30 head of cattle. Actual transactions average 15 head of cattle and 11 small stock. For the first marriage of a youth, his father and other agnates should contribute two-thirds to three-quarters of the cattle, and most of the small stock. His matrilateral kin, particularly those who stand in the category ‘mother’s brother’ to him, should contribute one quarter or one third of the cattle and some small stock, including a special goat (itambi) essential for ritual purposes (Rigby 1966a:13). This duty usually falls upon mother’s full brothers who have been in contact and co-operation with their sister and her children throughout their upbringing. But theoretically it may lie with any person in the category ‘mother’s brother’. The bridewealth is distributed in the same manner amongst the girl’s agnatic and matrilateral kin (Rigby 1964:Ch. vi).

The point to be emphasized is that the matrilateral kin, the ‘mother’s brothers’ who take part in bridewealth transactions, should have been in constant contact and co-operation with their sister and her children. Particularly at the initiation and other life-crisis rituals concerning his sister’s children (both boys and girls), a ‘mother’s brother’ should provide certain animals used in medicinal preparations and ritual, which ensure the recovery and health of his sister’s children. In turn, when a man dies, one of his ‘sister’s sons’ (usually the one closest to him) must provide a sheep for the ritual ‘cleansing’ of the inheritance symbol, the bow (uwupinde), before his own son can inherit it (Rigby 1966a, 1967c).

For this continued close economic co-operation and ritual interdependence with matrilateral kin to be possible, close residence is (in the long run) essential. This implies the desirability of the close residence and co-operation of affines: for Ego’s ‘mother’s brothers’ are,
of course, his 'father's wife's brothers'. In fact, close co-operation in all spheres of activity is stressed normatively for brothers-in-law. A man knows that his own sons cannot properly contract their own marriages without the co-operation, in the economic and ritual aspects of the marital contract, of his own wife's brothers.

This co-operation and interdependence with affinal/matrilateral kin further distinguishes sets of full-siblings from their paternal half-siblings. Each 'house' or set of full-siblings has its own matrilateral connexions, different from those of their paternal half-siblings. Sororal polygyny occurs only in exceptional circumstances and its frequency is insignificant. Note that this differentiation of paternal half-siblings occurs on both the levels of property and economic transactions, as well as in ritual interdependence (Rigby 1966a), although the 'house' unit only has meaning and status in terms of its membership of the patricentral domestic group under the authority of the husband/father, from whom it obtains both property and kinship status.

We may see now why the Gogo 'model' of the really important choices about the relationship categories which a person must appreciate and manipulate during the course of his lifetime lie between close agnates, matrilateral kin, and affines. There is no basis, either in terms of residence or property relations, for a person to be dependent upon, or form a corporate group with agnates or patrilineal kin beyond his paternal half-brothers; and even these relationships lapse as a person matures in his status of homestead-head. This is consistent with the lack of important functions attributed to unilineal descent groups in the politico-jural domain, as I have indicated.

Ego is dependent, however, upon the relationships he can 'play off' between his own siblings, and the kin who are related to him in the categories 'mother's brothers', 'cross-cousins', and 'brothers-in-law'. As affinal relationships are essential to the interdependence of roles which fall within this complex of categories, and as affinal relationships of this kind are set up (or at least have to be renewed) in each generation, there must be some stability in them. The stability of the conjugal bonds upon which affinal relationships are ideally based is confirmed by the very low divorce and separation rate in Ugogo. The divorce rate, in terms of Barnes' Divorce Ratio C (Barnes 1949:44), is 9.6%. This is very low. And divorce, when it does occur, is usually brought about before the marriage is properly matured: marriages ending in divorce had lasted an average of only 3.3 years (Rigby 1964:274-277).
A consideration of the terminology which designates these kinship categories is really necessary for a fuller understanding of them. A detailed exposition is not possible in this paper (Rigby 1964:Ch. VII and Appendix D), but the main terms and their connotations may be summarized as follows:

**Table of Basic Kin-Category Terms**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WB/ZH</th>
<th>Reference: reciprocal term <em>mulamu</em>; might be derived from 'those with whom we visit'.</th>
<th>address: <em>mbuyane</em>; implies great familiarity but attendant strains. Joking.</th>
<th>address: <em>latalai</em>; derived from Baraguyu (Masai) terms <em>elatia</em>, 'neighbours'.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MB/ZS</td>
<td>Reference: <em>kuku/mawihwa</em>; <em>kuku</em> = 'grandfather', both paternal and maternal, but this does not indicate 'extended Omaha' type terminology (Radcliffe-Brown 1950:34-35).</td>
<td>address: reciprocal <em>bulayi</em>, from Baraguyu <em>olapu</em> (genitive <em>apulai</em>, 'my MB/ZS'). Implies close, intimate relationship with additional element of obligations over livestock exchange.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FZS/MBS</td>
<td>Reference: reciprocal <em>muhizi</em>; might be derived from <em>kuhiza</em>, 'to steal', <em>i.e.</em> 'thief-kin' (Rigby 1967c). Joking relationship. (Derivation explicit but not universally accepted.)</td>
<td>address: reciprocal <em>baguma</em>; might refer to cattle exchange and obligations (cf. <em>kwiguma</em>, 'to give bridewealth').</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B/Z</td>
<td>Reference: reciprocal <em>ilumbu</em> (<em>iyangu</em>, 'mine').</td>
<td>address: personal name; very close relationship, expected to endure through life. Ritual interdependence.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H/W</td>
<td>Reference: <em>mulume/mucukulu</em> (<em>mugolece</em>); second term for wife, more formal and honorific.</td>
<td>address: personal name, bestowed by husband on marriage; usually 'mother of so-and-so', even if child of that name not yet born in family. Wife uses husband's personal name. This is generally a formal slightly distant relationship, though Gogo recognize possible passionate involvement (<em>mbwiga</em>); but this is condemned. Emotional attachments should be formed (normatively) outside marriage, in a highly institutionalized 'lover' or concubinage relationship (<em>mbuya</em>). The formality of the H/W relationship is not thought to affect adversely the ideal closeness and familiarity of WB/ZH, but in fact to help the continuation of the latter by causing no disruptive incidents.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The high incidence of Baraguyu (Masai) terms in the system of address usually reflects the presence of 'exchange of livestock' relationships. Thus 'daughter's husband' refers to his 'father-in-law' as *mukwe wangu*, and the latter refers to him as *mukwe-mulima wangu*: literally 'the in-law who cultivates'. This defines their structural asymmetry in formal terms. But in address they call each other by the reciprocal term *wandawo*, which implies reciprocal respect, is derived from Masai *entawuo*, 'heifer', and indicates 'those who have been involved in the exchange of livestock' (for further aspects of this relationship, cf. Rigby 1967c).

A closer examination of these central relationship categories further indicates their critical interdependence, in this case on the level of a set of 'ideal categories' and conventional attitudes espoused by Gogo. We can profitably look at the structural relationships between these categories in the Gogo kinship system in terms of the heuristically useful concept of 'elementary structures' postulated by Lévi-Strauss (e.g. 1949; 1958:50-55 (trans. 42-46); 1965, *passim*). The predictive value of the relation MB/ZS:B/Z::F/S:H/W has been illustrated by many examples (Lévi-Strauss 1949, 1958, 1965; Needham 1962:33-35, 1963:146-148; etc.).

Denoting intimate, free, and equal relations by the sign +, and unequal, formal, and reserved or antagonistic ones by sign —, Gogo 'conventional attitudes' would appear as shown on the diagram.

However undesirable it is to reduce to a set of two symbols relationships which are complexes of attitudes, rights, and duties as we have seen briefly in this paper (and Lévi-Strauss states this difficulty himself), the relational structure postulated for these pairs of categories by Lévi-Strauss is clearly upheld. In the Gogo case, the MB/ZS relationship is further illuminated in its functional interrelationship with WB/ZH and FZS/MBS as a sub-system. The former is contained within the central structural complex; the latter arises directly out of it.
VIII

It could be said that the Gogo kinship system cannot be understood without isolating the various processes which occur within it, both in the domestic domain and the politico-jural domain. This has direct relevance for the problem of combining into a coherent analytical tool the two aspects of 'social structure' and 'social process' (Vogt 1960). Or put another way round, we are concerned with the introduction of the 'time (and, I may add, space) factor' into the concept of social structure.

In the field of kinship studies, one of the most fruitful advances has been the introduction and application of the developmental cycle concept in domestic groups (Fortes 1949b; Goody, ed., 1958; Gulliver 1955; Gray and Gulliver, eds., 1964; etc.). This freed the study of 'family' organization, or the domestic domain of kinship relationships, from the limitations of typology making, and established the idea of 'process', albeit cyclical.

Most of the studies which have resulted from this have assumed that the 'unit of social reproduction' is articulated with a broader social structure which could still essentially be described in formalized terms: usually a set of 'perpetual' kinship groupings (corporate lineages) which, even if segmentary, retained over considerable periods their corporate identity. Thus the 'external domain' could be described in formal structural terms of, for example, the relation between corporate groups, property (land), and the political relations which then arise among them.

I have attempted to show in outline that the Gogo kinship system, in the politico-jural domain, cannot be described formally as a set of patrilineal descent groups which provide the basis for corporate political action and local organization. For Gogo society, local organization in the neighbourhood must also be analysed in developmental terms, because no formal rules exist to relate descent groups to local units. And the pattern of residence in turn cannot be seen outside of a consideration of the cycle of development in the domestic group, the property relations which provide its mainspring, the early fission of agnatic groups, and the role of affinal relationships. The setting of these processes in the general ecological context in which they occur, and the economic system which influences them, is consistent with the structure of kinship relations I have outlined.

I have stressed the structural importance of affinal relationships in the Gogo kinship system, as against those of descent. One of the

1. An analysis with the same theoretical implications has been made of a Bemba village (Harries-Jones and Chiwale 1963).
central factors promoting the economic and ritual co-operation of persons involved in a fluctuating set of cognatic and affinal relationships is spatial propinquity, while spatial separation tends to reduce the maintenance of effective agnatic descent links. This occurs within the general pattern of an overall residential mobility of domestic groups, over fairly lengthy periods. The factor of descent does not produce co-operating (or corporate) groups beyond the ‘sons of one man’. But the affinal, and resulting cognatic, relationships set up in each generation and between proximate generations do provide strong localized bonds upon which co-operation in all spheres, including the economic and the ritual, is based. The network of kin relationships involved in such co-operation is in each case an Ego-oriented one. It does not provide the basis for groups with corporate rights in property. But the individual persons involved have mutual rights and obligations in each other’s property which must be fulfilled, as a condition of the proper functioning of the relationships. Conventional attitudes and affective ties indicate the actor’s conscious, ‘home-made’ model of the relevant kin categories (Lévi-Strauss 1958:309 [trans. 282]; Ward 1965, 1966).

Although patrilineal descent is a basic element in Gogo kinship theory and structure, the emphasis in the Gogo system lies more upon relationships which derive from successive steps of filiation (which is always ‘bilateral’), and affinity. We may give, then, the factors of filiation and affinity important and equal emphasis in the operation of Gogo kin relationships. Descent, on the other hand, is operationally important only at the ‘shallow’ level commensurate with the other two. I have attempted in this analysis, therefore, to put into perspective in an operational context what could in other ways be viewed as a considerably elaborate ideology of patrilineal descent.
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