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Résumé
A. Barnard — Système de terminologie de parenté chez les Bushmen Nharo.
Pour les Nharo, la parenté consiste en un réseau de liens de consanguinité, d'affinité et d'hononymie déterminant les relations de chacun avec tous. Deux catégories majeures — parenté à plaisanterie et parenté à évitement —, divisées chacune en trois catégories inférieures qui peuvent elles-mêmes contenir quelques termes plus spécifiques. Le mariage est permis entre membres de la catégorie tsxo, qui sont parents-à-plaisanterie. La parenté est recoupée par un système de quasi-parenté où la relation principale est basée sur l'échange de cadeaux, qui renforce les réseaux interpersonnels.
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The Nharo are a Khoi-speaking (or Hottentot-speaking) people of the Ghanzi district of western Botswana. They are also known as //Aikwe¹ or Naron. They number some 5,000 and live in small settlements or ‘bands’ of some eight to forty people each. Although traditionally hunter-gatherers, many Nharo today keep goats or work as seasonal labourers for the Tswana, Kgalagari, Herero, Afrikaans and English subsistence herders and ranchers who have settled in Ghanzi district.

Among their closest linguistic relatives are the G/wikhwe (or G/wi) and G//anakhwe (or G///ana) of Botswana’s Central Kalahari Game Reserve, and other members of the ‘Tshu-Khwe’ language group of the Khoi language family. The Nharo are more distantly related, linguistically, to theNama and Kora Khoikhoi (Hottentots), both herding peoples of Namibia and South Africa respectively.² The structure of the Nharo kin terminology system in many ways resembles those of these other Khoi-speaking peoples (Barnard 1976: 102-132). It is also similar to the system of the well-known !Kung Bushmen, an adjacent but non-Khoi-

---

¹ This article is based on my Ph. D. thesis (Barnard 1976: 34-84, 99-100, 192-193, 248). I would like to thank Adam Kuper and Isaac Schapera for their many valuable comments on the original draft. However, I alone am responsible for any errors in data or analysis. My fieldwork among the Nharo (May 1974 to September 1975) was sponsored by the Swan Fund (Pitt Rivers Museum) and authorized by the Office of the President of Botswana. I am grateful to both for their support.

² Traditional Nharo social organization has been documented by Passarge (1907) and Bleek (1928), and present conditions on the Ghanzi ranches by Guenther (1974; 1975a; 1975b; 1976) and me (Barnard 1975a; 1975b; 1976: 23-31, 88-98, 231-237; 1978a passim). The G/wikhwe and G//anakhwe have been described by Silberbauer (1961; 1963; 1965; 1972; 1973) and Tanaka (1969; 1971; 1976). For a description of Khoikhoi kinship and social organization, see, e.g., Hoernlé (1925), Vedder (1928; 1938: 51-60), Schapera (1930: 221-395), Engelbrecht (1936) and Barnard (1975c).
speaking people, in that it is characterized by a small set of reciprocal categories which are extended universally throughout society by consanguineal, affinal and namesake-equivalence ties.

It is my view that traditional methods in the study of ‘kin terminology’, in which each point on the genealogical grid is designated by a ‘kin term’, cannot adequately represent such a system. Such methods fail to take into account the overlapping sets of categories (whose labels depend on the linguistic context) and the intricate rules of kin category extension (which depend on marriage and on the personal naming system). Thus earlier writers on Nharo kinship (Bleek 1924: 68-69; Guenther 1974: 78-79) have misrepresented the system. Bleek and Guenther give conventional lists of egocentric ‘kin terms’, most of which are in reality mutually non-exclusive kin term stems. For example, Guenther (1974: 78) records mama as ‘grandfather’ (FF, MF) and tsxo (tsxô) as ‘grandson’ (SS, DS), when in fact both these terms can refer to either grandfathers or grandsons as well as many other relatives.

This paper is intended both as a contribution to the study of universal systems of kin categorization, those in which all members of society are classified as ‘kin’ (Barnard 1978b), and as an outline of the previously poorly-recorded workings of this very interesting kinship system. I shall examine first the kin categories themselves and the method of categorization, then the effects of the naming system, the linguistic and behavioural contexts of the categories, and finally the system of para-kin relationships which cross-cuts the kinship domain.

1. The System of Categories

There are two levels of categories (Table I): the level of the higher categories g//ai and !au, and the level of the lower categories tsxo (the marriageable category), ki and !kwi, khwe, g//o, and /\w/.

Ego classifies every fellow Nharo he meets as member of one of the higher categories and as a member of one or more of the lower categories. On the higher level, g//ai and !au are mutually exclusive. On the lower level, the category designated ki and !kwi is exclusive of other lower level categories (except in the special cases, to be taken up later, of FFB [m.s.], MFB [m.s.], FMZ [w.s.], and MMZ [w.s.] and their reciprocals, and of spouse’s same-sex sibling’s spouse, who are all both tsxo, and ki or !kwi). Khwe (spouse), only when it applies to real spouse, is mutually exclusive of tsxo, the category into which the spouse-to-be was born (one may marry only a tsxo, after which he or she becomes a khwe). Other lower level categories are mutually exclusive only when their non-exclusiveness would disrupt the necessary dichotomy on the higher level. Note that spouse’s categories are transformed into categories of one’s own. Upon marriage, all one’s spouse’s g//ai become one’s own tsxo and all one’s spouses !au become one’s own /\w/.
Table I. — Nharo Kin Categories*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>g//ai</td>
<td>joking partner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(a) tso: namesake; grandparent; grandchild; cross-uncle or aunt; cross-cousin; cross-nephew or niece; spouse's g//ai</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(b) ki, ikwi: same-sex sibling or parallel cousin (ki, literally ‘old’, is older than Ego; ikwi is younger)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(c) khwe: spouse, spouse's same-sex sibling (who is also tso)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>lau</td>
<td>avoidance partner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(a) g/o: parent, parent's same-sex sibling, child, same-sex sibling's child, spouse's g/o (who is also /wi)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(b) ki, ikwi: opposite-sex sibling or parallel cousin (ki, literally ‘old’, is older than Ego; ikwi is younger)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(c) /wi: spouse’s lau</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* For simplicity, not all specific relationships within the categories are included. Note that ki, ikwi does not include spouse’s ki, ikwi. Spouse’s ki, ikwi are tso (and khwe) if same sex as spouse, or /wi if opposite sex as spouse (same sex as Ego). This follows from the fact that same-sex ki, ikwi is g//ai (1b) and opposite-sex ki, ikwi is lau (2b), and from the fact that spouse’s g//ai is tso (1a) and spouse’s lau is /wi (2c).

I include ki and ikwi in the same category because they are structurally the same; the two terms distinguish, within the category, the real relative age of two people in the ki, ikwi relationship (expressed reciprocally in Nharo as ikwi-ku). The ki (literally, ‘old’) is the elder sibling (real or classificatory) and the ikwi is the younger. But, whereas relative age is not of structural significance, relative sex is, both in defining their joking/avoidance relationship to each other and in defining the relationship of those whose genealogies are traced through the siblings. For this reason it is sometimes necessary to isolate same-sex ki and ikwi (g//ai) from opposite-sex ki and ikwi (lau) as sub-categories.

The category khwe also contains two non-reciprocating terms, but these distinguish only real sex. Since Ego is always of opposite sex to his or her khwe, the distinction of relative sex cannot occur; and only relative, and not real, sex is of structural significance in the Nharo kin terminology. The terms are k’au (literally, ‘male’) and g//ais (‘female’). Khwe means ‘persons’ and can be said to have the primary meaning ‘spouse’, when used as a kin term.

In Table I, note that both reciprocals of the pairs of consanguines are shown. Affines are shown only through Ego’s spouse, but since terms are self-reciprocal, the reciprocals are the same. For example, Ego’s g//o’s spouse is the same as Ego’s spouse’s g//o, i.e. lau, g//o and /wi. For simplicity, name relatives (except ‘namesake’, a primary kinsman) are not shown in this table.

In the consanguineal domain, the Nharo can trace up to 222 sex-
specific relationships for Ego of given sex (222 triangles and circles in a standard kinship diagram). These are grouped into three lower level categories: tsxō; ki, !kwî; and g///o. Figures 1, 2, and 3 illustrate consanguineal categorization. In theory, according to the structure of the system which can be abstracted from the relationships explained to me by the Nharo (those shown), boxes could be added indefinitely in Figure 1.

![Kinship Diagram](image)

**Fig. 1. Nharo Consanguines**

- **T** = tsxō
- **G** = g///o.
- **K+** = ki, !kwî, same sex (g//ai)
- **K−** = ki, !kwî, opposite sex (lau)

The child of K+ is G. The child of K− is T. Second cousins and their ascendants are shown in detail in Figures 2 and 3.

But in reality, the Nharo never even use all the relationships shown, since affinal and name ties will surely intervene before the more distant relationships are reached. If the system were extended, tsxō boxes would be added to the left of Ego's same-sex sibling in Ego's own generation and ki, !kwî boxes to the right, each higher generation alternating, to the left and to the right, same-sex and opposite-sex sibling links. The tsxō versus ki, !kwî distinction in Ego's generation is of great importance, since only tsxō are marriageable. Within the limits of the diagram as shown (Fig. 1) are 104 tsxō relationships (including four which are also same-sex ki or !kwî), thirty-one same-sex ki or !kwî (including the four which are also tsxō), twenty-seven opposite-sex ki or !kwî, and sixty-four g///o.

Figures 2 and 3, showing second cousins and their ascendants for a male Ego and a female Ego respectively, make the categorization of some of the distant relationships a bit clearer. And incidently, they reflect more clearly the way in which the Nharo themselves discuss kinship, genealogy usually being traced downwards from a sibling group and not
in the first instance outwards from Ego. Genealogical points labelled 'TK' are both tsxô, and ki or !kwî; either designation may be used. Note that g|j|o and ki, !kwî alternate generationally. The category 'parents/children' does not occur in Ego's own generation or in those of his grand-kin; these are the generations of 'siblings'. A grandkinsman is one's tsxô; he is a namesake or like a namesake, and his siblings are 'one's own'. Note too that only second parallel and not second cross-cousins are tsxô. The reason that the Nharo give is as follows: since 'tsxô' (first cross-cousins) are marriageable, their children cannot be; their children are ki and !kwî. However, the argument fails if the tsxô one speaks of is one generation removed.

Fig. 2. Nharo Second Cousins and their Ascendants (Male Ego)
In the affinal domain all relatives are either tsx̩ or /wi. One’s affinal tsx̩ are one’s affinal g||ai’s g||ai, one’s g||ai’s affinal g||ai, one’s affinal lau’s lau, and one’s lau’s affinal lau. One’s /wi are one’s affinal g||ai’s lau, one’s g||ai’s affinal lau, one’s affinal lau’s g||ai, and one’s lau’s affinal g||ai. Here, ‘one’s g||ai’ or ‘one’s lau’ is not necessarily a consanguine, but may be an affine (implying more than one affinal link) or a name relative.

![Diagram of Nharo Second Cousins and their Ascendants (Female Ego)](image-url)

Some affinal tsx̩ are also khwe. These include spouse’s same-sex sibling and same-sex sibling’s spouse. One affinal tsx̩ relationship, spouse’s same-sex sibling’s spouse, is also ki or !kwì. This relationship,
which merits a special term in some Khoi languages (but not in Nharo),
can be very important behaviourally and will be discussed later. The
categories /wi and g//o also overlap. Both are applied to spouse’s parent
and to the reciprocal, child’s spouse (and by extension, to child’s spouse’s
same-sex sibling).

For the Nharo, the actor’s view of ‘genealogical’ proximity includes
not only the conventional genealogical notions of consanguinity and
affinity but also the notion of name relationship. To the primary
genealogical relationships, father, mother, brother, sister, son, daughter,
husband and wife, we must add namesake (abbreviated ‘N’). All names-
sakes are tsxo and a relative’s namesake is in the category of the relative.
Where close kin are also namesakes, consanguineal and affinal catego-
ration may be disrupted (see infra, pp. 616–617).

Table II shows the rules of Nharo kin categorization. These rules are
easy to apply and account for all traced relationships, and Table II
reflects the method which the Nharo actually use to classify kinsfolk, not
merely the structure of the system which results. Categories are expres-
sed for both egocentric positions of each relationship. Given that all
categories are reciprocal, fourteen of the thirty-three consanguineal and
affinal sex-aspecific relationships shown are redundant. These,
distinguished in Table II by stars (*), are included only for clarity. The
name relationship rules could also be stated in Lounsbury’s symbols
(e.g. Lounsbury 1964; Scheffler and Lounsbury 1971) as a single rule:

\[
( \footnotesize{\text{N}} \ldots \rightsquigarrow \footnotesize{\text{N}} \ldots )
\]

i.e., let anyone’s namesake as a link in a ‘genealogical’ chain be regarded
as structurally equivalent to that person himself or herself. But for
clarity, I prefer the more specific rules. The converse of this Lounsburian
rule, incidently, is altercentric and therefore makes no sense in terms of
the method of categorization. Its omission above, like the omission of
starred name relationship rules in Table II, reflects the fact that each
individual normally classifies according to his own genealogy (not some-
one else’s) and the possibility of conflicting categorization.

The rules for consanguineal relationships in Table II determine which
of the lower level basic categories the nineteen sex-aspecific consanguineal
relationships will occupy, according to the relative sex of individuals
through whom descent is traced. The rules for affinal relationships
build on those of the consanguineal relationships, and each other, in
generating from categories as well as from a primary genealogical point
of reference (spouse). This is for simplicity. The same is true of the
rules for name relationships.

The principles of lower level categorization presented earlier are also
visible. Note, for example, that among consanguineal /au categories,
g//o and ki, lkwil do not occur in the same generation. And they do not
occur within the same number of degrees of relationship, except in the
first degree. In some generations and degrees of relationship, the g//ai
Table II. — The Rules of Kin Categorization

**Consanguineal Relationships**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>a</th>
<th>b</th>
<th>c</th>
<th>d</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Pa</td>
<td>G</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sb</td>
<td>K</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ch*</td>
<td>G</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>PaPa</td>
<td>T</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PaSb</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>PaSb op sx Pa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>G</td>
<td>PaSb sm sx Pa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SbCh*</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>Sb op sx Ego</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>G</td>
<td>Sb sm sx Ego</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ChCh*</td>
<td>T</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>PaPaPa</td>
<td>G</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PaPaSb</td>
<td>TK</td>
<td>PaPaSb sm sx PaPa and PaPa sm sx Ego</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>T</td>
<td>elsewhere</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PaSbCh</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>PaSb sm sx Pa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>K</td>
<td>PaSb op sx Pa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SbChCh*</td>
<td>TK</td>
<td>SbChCh sm sx Sb and Sb sm sx Ego</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>T</td>
<td>elsewhere</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ChChCh*</td>
<td>G</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>PaPaPaSb</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>PaPaPaSb op sx PaPaPa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>G</td>
<td>PaPaPaSb sm sx PaPaPa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PaPaSbCh</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>PaPaSbCh op sx Pa and PaPaSb sm sx PaPa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>G</td>
<td>elsewhere</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PaSbChCh*</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>PaSbCh op sx Ego and PaSb sm sx Pa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>G</td>
<td>elsewhere</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SbChChCh*</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>Sb op sx Ego</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>G</td>
<td>Sb sm sx Ego</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>PaPaPaSbCh</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>PaPaPaSb op sx PaPaPa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>K</td>
<td>PaPaPaSb sm sx PaPaPa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PaPaSbChCh</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>PaPaSb sm sx PaPa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>K</td>
<td>PaPaSb op sx PaPa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PaSbChChCh*</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>PaSb op sx Pa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>K</td>
<td>PaSb sm sx Pa</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Affinal Relationships**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>b</th>
<th>c</th>
<th>d</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sp</td>
<td>S</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sp T</td>
<td>T</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sp TK</td>
<td>T</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sp K</td>
<td>TS</td>
<td>Sp K sm sx Sp</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>W</td>
<td>Sp K op sx Sp</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* indicates redundant rule if given that categories reciprocate themselves.
Sp G  G  Sp G is SpCh (spouse’s real child)
WG  elsewhere
Sp S  TK  (spouse’s same-sex sibling’s spouse)
Sp W  W
T Sp*  T
TK Sp*  T
K Sp*  TS  K Sp sm sx K
W  K Sp op sx K
G Sp*  G  G is Ego’s (real) parent
WG  elsewhere
S Sp*  TK  (spouse’s same-sex sibling’s spouse)
W Sp*  W

The premarital categorization of ChSpPa is retained if of three degrees of relationship or fewer. Elsewhere, ChSpPa is ‘T’. (After divorce, ‘S’ reverts to ‘T’, but relationships traced through the ‘S’ remain.)

Name Relationships

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>a</th>
<th>b</th>
<th>c</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>T’s namesake</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>G’s namesake</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TK’s namesake</td>
<td>TK</td>
<td>S’s namesake</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TS’s namesake</td>
<td>TS</td>
<td>W’s namesake</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K’s namesake</td>
<td>K</td>
<td>WG’s namesake</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The reciprocals of the name relationship rules (namesake’s ‘T’ is ‘T’, namesake’s ‘TK’ is ‘TK’, etc.) are used only when Ego reckons through Alter’s genealogy (e.g. if Alter is much older than Ego or if Alter’s genealogy yields a much closer means of reckoning than Ego’s). Ego’s namesake is always ‘T’.

General Rules of Categorization (to determine the order of precedence in which to apply the rules above):

1. The least number of degrees of relationship shall be used.
2. When more than one means of reckoning yield the least number of degrees of relationship, the order of precedence among the degrees will be: (a) affinal degrees, (b) consanguineal degrees, (c) name degrees. And a given number of consanguineal degrees shall take precedence over the same number of affinal and name degrees in equal proportion.

Key:

a = degree of relationship (consanguineal relationships)
b = genealogical point of reference (sex-aspecific)
c = kin category
d = environment (‘where . . .’)

Read:

‘Relationship b is of category c where d’, or in linguistic symbols (as used in phonological analysis):

\[
\text{Pa} = \text{parent} \quad \text{Sb} = \text{sibling} \quad \text{Ch} = \text{child} \quad \text{Sp} = \text{spouse}
\]

(Sp refers to either a present spouse or a previous one; and half and full sibling links are both referred to as Sb.)
category \( tsxō \) is contraposed to the \( !au \) category \( g//o \); in others, it is in opposition to the \( !au \) category \( ki, !kwī \). Intergenerationally, \( g//o \) and \( ki, !kwī \) are contraposed to each other as representatives of the higher category \( !au \).

The rules also suggest the pattern of opposition between \( g///ai \) and \( !au \) in general, but this pattern is implicit. The pattern of opposition may itself be expressed as a general rule: same-sex sibling, spouse and namesake links retain higher level category, and parent, child and opposite-sex sibling links change higher level category. If for example, a genealogical point of reference is \( !au \), this \( !au \)'s spouse is also \( !au \), but his parent is \( g///ai \). By extension of this principle, Ego's \( g///ai \)'s \( g///ai \) and Ego's \( !au \)'s \( !au \) are Ego's \( g///ai \); and Ego's \( g///ai \)'s \( !au \) and Ego's \( !au \)'s \( g///ai \) are Ego's \( !au \). However, there are three special rules which take precedence over this general one. The first is that cross-uncles and aunts and cross-great-great-uncles and aunts (and cross-great-great-great-uncles and aunts, etc., if the underlying principle of this special rule, that lineal ascendant \( g//o \)'s opposite-sex sibling and lineal ascendant \( g//o \)'s opposite-sex sibling's child are both \( tsxō \), were allowed to generate consanguineal categorization indefinitely) have children of the same category. Both they and their children are \( g///ai \) and \( tsxō \) (see again Fig. 1). Without this rule, no consanguineally traced relative of Ego's own generation except a second parallel cousin (and a fourth parallel cousin, a sixth parallel cousin, etc.) would be marriageable. In short, it allows cross-cousin marriage. The second special rule (which is an exception to the rule that Ego's \( !au \)'s \( !au \) is \( g///ai \)) is that first ascending generation \( g//o \)'s children are \( !au \) (\( ki, !kwī \)) if opposite sex as Ego. The third special rule is that grandparents' opposite-sex siblings, like grandparents' same-sex siblings, are \( g///ai \) and \( tsxō \). Since categorization is reciprocal, this means that opposite-sex siblings' children's children are also \( g///ai \) and \( tsxō \).

2. Naming and Categorization

The Nharo extend kin categories universally throughout their society by means of like-name relationships similar to those of the Kung Bushmen, who live to the immediate north of the Nharo (Marshall 1957: 7-19, 22-24; 1976: 223-242). A major difference, however, is that among the
Nharo no particular significance is given to the name-giver/name-receiver relationship or to the ‘old name/young name’ relationship (Lee 1972: 357). All Nharo namesakes are in precisely the same relationship to each other. Yet the essential effects of the naming system are the same for the Nharo as for the !Kung—relationships traced through a namesake may alter the categorization that would exist if consanguineal or affinal ties alone were used, and through the naming system even those not traceably related through consanguineal or affinal ties may and must be classified as members of some kin category.

Among the !Kung, fathers name their children. Ideally, the first-born male child is named after his FF and the first-born female after her FM, regardless of the order of birth. The next son and daughter are named, respectively, for their MF and MM. After this, children are named after their parents’ siblings or parents’ siblings’ spouses. Names are sex-specific (Marshall 1957: 7; 1976: 224-225).

Among the Nharo, when the first child is born to a couple, the child’s grandparents come to see it, and the first pair of grandparents to arrive will name the child. If both pairs of grandparents are present at the birth an argument may ensue, but once the child is named, the name remains for life. The Nharo method of naming might best be illustrated by an example. Grandfather /Kise and grandmother N/isa arrive to see their new grandchild. The child’s other grandparents are nowhere in sight. N/isa looks and sees it is boy. Since names are sex-specific, she asks /Kise to name the child. He says simply ‘/Kise mi’i’ (‘He [the child] is /Kise’), and thus the child is named. Baby /Kise is then kissed and greeted by name by all the people present.

The second-born child must be named by the opposite pair of grandparents, or, if the real grandparent who is expected to name the child is no longer living, by someone in the ‘grandparent’ (tsxo) category, including affines, on the proper side of the family. Naming alternates between baby’s maternal grandparents and baby’s paternal grandparents. The name-giver always gives his own name.

Nicknames normally Nharo words for animal species may be given later by anyone and are used to distinguish from each other different individuals bearing the same real name. Real Nharo names are said to be ‘God-given’ and nicknames ‘man-given’. Non-Nharo people are often given nicknames, for reference purposes, and are occasionally honoured by the gift of a real name, in order to fit them into the kinship system. Domestic animals, i.e. dogs, donkeys and horses (but never livestock), are named too, but never with human names.

In addition to real names and nicknames, kin terms may be used in reference or address. Two additional ways to distinguish between namesakes are (r) to designate place of residence, as in ‘N//wa//xe di-Tshebe’ (Tshebe of N//wa//xe), or (2) to add age-indicator infixes. The age-indicator infixes are //oa (deceased), ki (old), g///o (sexually potent) and /kwa (small, i.e. young). These are used in the form: name, plus age-
indicator, plus masculine singular or feminine singular gender-indicator. For example, one may speak of Tshebe-ki-sa (Tshebe, a female name; ki, old; sa, feminine singular) in order to distinguish her from a younger Tshebe. A number-gender suffix is required only if an age-indicator is used.

Namesakes are always of kin category tsxo to each other, the same relationship as that between grandparent and grandchild. Category tsxo, of course, refers not only to namesakes, grandparents and grandchildren, but to many other consanguines and affines as well. Yet the relationship between namesakes (/kwi-ku) is a special one. A Nharo may develop an extraordinary attachment to his baby namesake, whether the two are name-giver and name-receiver or not.

Kin categorization seeks the shortest means of reckoning. If consanguineal ties are closest, they are used. If affinal, they are used. And if name, name ties are used. Beyond namesakes, each individual uses his consanguineal or affinal genealogy to categorize another. Alter is placed in the category of a namesake who appears as a close relative in Ego’s genealogy. This means that Ego classifies Alter in the same way as Alter’s namesake; the process is the reverse of Scheffler and Lounsbury’s (1971: 58-59) ‘extension via Alter-Ego’. The process Scheffler and Lounsbury discuss, Ego placing himself according to his namesake’s place in Alter’s genealogy, is not possible in any system unless Ego already knows Alter’s genealogy.

Proximity is defined by the number of degrees of relationship needed to name a point on the genealogical grid. Parent, child, sibling, spouse and namesake (primary kin) are one degree from Ego. If two of these terms are required to name the nearest point on the grid, the relationship is of two degrees; if three, of three degrees, etc. For example, MB is two degrees and MBN is three. Within one degree of relationship, categorization is obviously simple. Beyond that, when one means of reckoning yields a genealogical point closer than any other (requiring fewer primary terms to define it), categorization is equally simple. But when Ego is of the same degree of relationship by more than one means of reckoning and the means yield different categories, further rules of precedence are necessary. According to the general rule of categorization given in Table II, affinal ties (husband, wife) take first precedence, consanguineal ties (father, mother, brother, sister, son, daughter) take second precedence, and name ties (namesake) take third precedence. Since there are few names, thirty-five male and twenty-seven female by my count (some more common than others), one rarely needs to trace through more than three or four degrees of relationship.

Two examples may help to illustrate these rules. If the same individual is both Ego’s MB (two degrees, both consanguineal) and Ego’s WF (two degrees, one affinal and one consanguineal), the latter means of reckoning takes precedence and the individual is categorized accordingly (category /wi). By Ego’s marriage, the categorization of
the MB/WF was changed from *tsxō* (MB) to */wi* (WF). A link by marriage takes precedence over a link by blood, and one cannot belong to both these categories at the same time.

The second example, illustrated in Figure 4, is more complicated.

**Fig. 4. G/wâ’n//ae’s Genealogy**

G/wa’n//ae’s (a female name) MF was named Dabe (we shall call him Dabe I). Her MZS was named after him (Dabe II). Enters Dabe III, G/wa’n//ae’s suitor. Is he a classificatory ‘grandfather’ (the only marriageable category, *tsxō*), or is he a classificatory ‘brother’ (parallel cousins are classed as siblings)? MFN being closer than MZSN, Dabe III is *tsxō* and the two marry. Had Dabe II been G/wa’n//ae’s real and not her classificatory ‘brother’, her marriage to Dabe III could not take place. Dabe III would be G/wa’n//ae’s BN (hence her ‘brother’), a closer relationship than MFN (*tsxō*).

A further, although rarely necessary, rule exists. The rule (given in Table II) is that three degrees of relationship, all consanguineal, take precedence over three degrees of relationship, one affinal, one consanguineal and one name. One could not find conflicting categorization between two people related by two degrees of relationship, both consanguineal, and also two degrees of relationship, one affinal and one name. Either both these means of reckoning would yield the same category (e.g., FZ and WN are both *tsxō*) or the marriage implied would have been to non-*tsxō* and therefore could not have taken place. For example, MZ and WN are in different categories (*g//o* and *tsxō* respectively). Ego’s prospective wife would have been his MZN and thus in the non-marriageable category of the MZ (*g//o*).

The rules do not exhaust all possibilities, but they are all that can be extracted from Nharo explanations and practices of categorization, and they do solve the overwhelming majority of real and hypothetical problems of categorization. Where conflict arises, it is not generally conflict amongst or beyond the rules, but conflict between the method’s different results in the hands of two individuals, each categorizing the
other by his own genealogy. For example, if Sobe is $g//ai$ to $\neq Ka\neq Ke$, $\neq Ka\neq Ke$ should be $g//ai$ to Sobe. If each person (following the rules above) places the other in the same category, no conflict occurs and the categorizations may be said to be reciprocal. If one of the two men regards the other as his $g//ai$ and the other regards the former as his $lau$, the relationship between the egocentric categorizations is conflicting, or non-reciprocal. The non-reciprocal situation never arises when the reckoning is through consanguineal and affinal links alone; it arises when each of two people uses his own consanguineal or affinal genealogy to place the other by the other's name, applying the kin category of the other's namesake within his own genealogy. This conflict of category could probably never occur among the !Kung, for there only the elder, according to his own genealogy, classifies the younger. The younger person accepts the elder's usage and reciprocates appropriately (Marshall 1957: 14; 1976: 227-228). Among the Nharo the conflict is resolved either (1) by one of the two (usually the younger or the one whose genealogy yields a more distant namesake) giving up the categorization of his own genealogy and reciprocating the other's, as among the !Kung; (2) by each person simply refraining from using a kin term and behaviour obviously appropriate to only one of the two categories; or (3) by the people avoiding each other, so that categorization is not necessary. All three have their difficulties: the first may confound other categorizations, the second is unlikely to work where the two parties are of opposite sex, and the third is hardly possible in such a small scale society as that of the Nharo. The solution must depend on the particular circumstances.

3. The Linguistic Context

The system of kin terms operates in two grammatical forms, egocentric nominal and reciprocal copulative. Each expresses the same categories. The former expresses categories by identifying their members as possessed objects. The possessive morpheme in Khoi languages is syntactically bound to its object. For example, $ti-g//ai$ is one word and means 'my $g//ai$' (referential or vocative); $tsa-g//ai$, 'your [masculine singular] $g//ai$'; $xa-m\ di-g//ai$, 'his $g//ai$'; etc. To the Nharo, $g//ai$ and other kin categories of its type (both higher and lower level categories) have no meaning except in their linguistic context. When expressed as nominal kin terms, they must take possessive prefixes, and in reference, but never in address, usually take number-gender suffixes.

In anthropological writings we usually express kin terms as true nouns, but in the Nharo language the concept of kin category may also be expressed copulatively with the verbal suffix of reciprocity, $ku$; for example: '$G//ai-ku'u$' or '$G//ai-ku (xa-) d$z\tilde{\imath}$i''$, both meaning 'They are
g///ai to each other. In the reciprocal copulative, kin terms do not take prefixes. The Nharo copulative is formed not only with words which normally function as nouns and adjectives, but also with ‘verbs’, suffixing ku. The kin terms I have described as categories may not normally function as verbs but share with some morphemes which do, this particular construction. Not unexpectedly, these same ‘verbs’ may function as nouns, but only with possessive prefixes. Nharo kin terms are not verbs, but the ‘verbs’ with which they share this construction may very well be considered para-kin terms. Their usage will be discussed later, but one verb which is a true kin term should be mentioned here: se, ‘to take’ (marry), replaces khwe in reciprocal usage. The ki, !kwî (sibling) relationship is expressed with !kwî-ku, as mentioned earlier.

I have implied by usage that kin terms are those which one uses in the linguistic context and that kin categories are those which one can abstract for analytical purposes. But there exist kinship concepts in Nharo which, by virtue of their morphemic isolation, may be treated as ‘kin terms’ in the more conventional sense. Au-ba means ‘my father’, real or classificatory (senior g//o); ai-sa means ‘my mother’ in the same sense. The vocative forms are, respectively, au-e and ai-e; number-gender suffixes ba and sa are dropped and the vocative indicator e is added.3 Only one other kin term stem may be used as an alienable noun, with only a number-gender suffix. This is sau, meaning ‘[someone else’s] parent’. Except in the (non-reciprocal) copulative, where number-gender indicators are incorporated, sau must take a number-gender suffix, but unlike the terms for one’s own parents, it may take a possessive prefix. When used without a prefix, it means ‘your parent’. Also within the g//o category is /kwa, ‘child’ (literally, ‘small’). This morpheme is often used in its literal sense in combination with a kin term; e.g., ti-tsxô-/kwa-ba means ‘my little tsxô’ (masculine singular). But as a kin term stem it is used in the same manner as its category name, g//o (the pattern illustrated above with category g///ai), except that it may not take ku; nor may the ‘parent’ terms.

As mentioned earlier, tsxô is semantically, but not syntactically, synonymous with another term, mama. In a sense, the opposite of mama is papa, which most Nharo apply to all lau but some apply only to g//o. G///ai who are not tsxô (i.e., same-sex siblings, and spouses) are not subsumed under either mama or papa. Kin terms mama and papa never take possessive prefixes and are most often used in address. For example, one may address one’s tsxô, Mama-e. ‘He is my tsxô’ may be translated Ti-tsxô mi’i or Mama-mi’i. Tsxô-ku and mama-ku are equally acceptable. Papa is used in the same way, in place of kin terms with the stems /au or g//o. There is also a kin-aspecific form of address, ma-e

3. Possibly the e originated as a contraction of kin terms and tse (‘you’, vocative, masculine singular) or se (‘you’, vocative, feminine singular). (See Beach 1938: 110-111.)
(really mae, since this ma- is used only in the vocative). It implies friendship and like mama and papa, it is often used at the end of a sentence in any of the three formalized greeting dialogues.

Finally, there is the category //we. //Wē as a verb means ‘to divorce’. Grammatically, it follows the same pattern as g//ai. As a kin term, it means ‘divorcé’ or ‘divorcée’ and is a subcategory of tsxō. And, if it is a kin category, do, which also follows the pattern of g//ai, means ‘kin’ or (as a verb) ‘to kin categorize’. All Nharo are do-ku. Table III illustrates the relationship between Nharo egocentric kin terms and their respective kin categories.

**Table III. — Nharo Egocentric Kin Terms and Kin Categories**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Higher level categories</th>
<th>Higher level kin terms</th>
<th>Mama and papa</th>
<th>Lower level kin terms</th>
<th>Lower level categories</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>g//ai (joking)</td>
<td>ti-g#/ai-</td>
<td>mama-</td>
<td>ti-tsxō-</td>
<td>tsxō (T)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ti-#/we-</td>
<td></td>
<td>ti-#/we- (divorcé/e)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ti-ki-</td>
<td></td>
<td>ti-ki- (elder)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ti-kiw-</td>
<td></td>
<td>ti-kiw- (younger)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ti-khwe-</td>
<td>ti-k'au-</td>
<td>ti-k'au- (m)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ti-g#/ai(s)-</td>
<td>ti-g#/ai(s)-</td>
<td>ti-g#/ai(s)- (f)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hau (avoidance)</td>
<td>ti-hau-</td>
<td>papa-</td>
<td>ti-g#/o-</td>
<td>g#/o (G)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ti-g#/o-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ti-g#/o- (elder)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ti-g#/o- (younger)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ti-g#/o-</td>
<td>g#/o (G)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ti-ki-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ti-ki- (elder)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ti-kiw-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ti-kiw- (younger)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ti-#/wi-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ti-#/wi-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Mama is applied to individuals of category ‘T’. Papa may be used in a general sense for ‘avoidance’ (hau), or in a more specific sense for category ‘G’ alone. Sau (category g#/o, elder is omitted because it is altercentric. Its egocentric equivalents are au- (m) and ai- (f).}

4. Category, Genealogy and Behaviour

Kin categories are never the sole determinants of behaviour. In Nharo society, as in other societies, relative age and sex and (for close kin) precise genealogical relationship are often as important as kin category. In the realm of category, only the joking/avoidance dichotomy is of overwhelming behavioural significance. Other kin categories and genealogical points of reference within the higher level kin categories determine the intensity of the relationship and more specific kinship roles.

Radcliffe-Brown defined a ‘joking relationship’ as ‘a relation between two persons in which one is by custom permitted, and in some societies required, to tease or make fun of the other, who in turn is required to take no offence’ (1949: 195; 1952: 90). The Nharo equivalent is
Since each classifies the other as a member of the same egocentric kin category, the relationship is, however, always symmetrical; that is, if A ‘jokes’ with B, then B ‘jokes’ with A. G//ai may caricature each other’s speech and actions, sleep side-by-side or sit together with legs entangled, engage in farcical ‘fights’ and generally abuse each other in word and deed. But, to a limited degree, same-sex, same-generation /au may do the same; and g//ai are not required to behave in this way. The ultimate g//ai relationship is with opposite-sex g//ai, that is with tsxō, the marriageable category. The word ti-g//ai may sometimes even be used to mean, specifically, ‘my spouse’. Between young, unmarried, opposite-sex g//ai, sexual intercourse is allowed. After marriage, although it is not proper to ‘take’ another’s spouse, a woman may still tease any of her male g//ai, for example by flapping her skirt and then running away, hoping at least to be chased, if not captured. This is also the way many young women behave towards their husbands. Even an old Nharo may in public jestingly claim his or her handsome young g//ai as ‘spouse’, much to the youngster’s embarrassment. But with age, the sexual nature of the relationship is diminished and its intensity is transformed into affection.

Intensity of relationship varies in direct proportion to the degree of relationship. For behaviour, the order of precedence is certainly not as absolute as it is for category, but consanguineal ties normally take precedence in defining the intensity of relationship within the categories. Spouses and consanguineal g//ai maintain a closer personal relationship than affinal or name (other than namesake) g//ai. Grandkinsmen and namesakes are particularly close. When a Nharo says he is going to visit his tsxō (or mama), it is assumed that he will be visiting his grandparent or his namesake, not his cross-cousin or some more distant tsxō. The grandparent/grandchild and namesake bonds are strong and grandparents and namesakes take a special interest in teaching and amusing their young tsxō. Children often live with their grandparents or other close g//ai (MB, FZ or adult same-sex sibling). And grandparents, especially maternal grandparents and especially grandmothers, are said to ‘own’ (kau) their grandchildren. This ‘ownership’, though, implies only the same bond as exists between namesakes, except that the ‘owners’ of a female are entitled to receive token gifts on the birth of her first child.

In adulthood, the strongest bond is often that between same-sex siblings, who from childhood play and work together. The ‘same-sex sibling’ group may include not only real siblings but also parallel cousins and same-age, same-sex tsxō, and their spouses. When tsxō are included, they are sometimes designated as (classificatory) ki and !kwēi, emphasizing their membership in a ‘sibling’ group. This change in category is not really significant (nor is the difference between ki and !kwēi) because, as the Nharo explain, the crucial factor in a relationship is its place in the g//ai /!au dichotomy. All other categorical distinctions are, by
comparison, insignificant. Band-exogamous marriage (bands are agamous, but most marriages are to individuals outside the band) might threaten the bond were it not for the fact that residence is so fluid. There is no reason not to marry into another band and bring the entire classificatory same-sex sibling group along, or to leave the sibling group upon marriage and return later with one's spouse. One might expect a group of brothers to marry a group of sisters, but this rarely happens. Nharo couples are usually content to keep just one same-sex sibling group intact. The Nama and Kora, the herding peoples who are linguistically related to the Nharo, have special terms to use in this situation. The stem g/am (Nama) or j'am (Kora) describes the relationship between the husbands of two sisters or the wives of two brothers (Hoernlé 1925: 21; Engelbrecht 1936: 153). The Nharo designate the spouse's same-sex sibling's spouse simply as tsxô, and ki or kwî.

!Au means literally 'to fear'. Unlike g//ai it can be used as a verbal kin term, 'to avoid' (in the technical sense of 'to be in an avoidance relationship'). In some Khoi languages, the term g//ai does not occur and is replaced by !au-tama, the negative of !au. !Au-tama can also be used in Nharo for 'to joke' (again, in the technical sense), or with appropriate prefix and suffix as a synonym for -g//ai-, the nominal kin term.

The most extreme !au relationship is that between /wi, particularly between opposite-sex parent-in-law and child-in-law. !Au are not usually addressed by name, and parents-in-law are certainly not. They are addressed by kin term. A Nharo respects his !au and does not argue with him. All !au are treated cordially; arguments are reserved for joking partners.

Friendliness between !au is protected by the necessity of maintaining physical and social distance, but social distance does not necessarily mean emotional detachment. This is particularly true of the parent/child relationship. When one's /kwa (little child) reaches puberty, he becomes truly g//jo and !au—but he is always one's /kwea. The affection of a parent towards his child (or a child towards his parent) remains, but it can no longer be expressed by touching or embracing. Instead, it is manifest in an intense concern for each other's well-being. Much the same can be said of the opposite-sex sibling relationship. What Heinz (1966: 181) has written about the !Ko might apply equally well for the Nharo: 'Avoidance between siblings, far from expressing estrangement, is perhaps a precaution against intimacy that might be promoted by deep affection.'

Behaviour, however, is not always determined by the 'rules'. Sexual intercourse between !au is never permitted, but if the ethos of g//ai behaviour is prevalent, even (same-age, opposite-sex) !au may transcend

4. G/am or j'am means 'two' or 'next' (of kin?).
5. To my knowledge, g//ai has no meaning in any Khoi language except in its kinship context. Possibly it is derived from Khoi Bushman (Tshu-Khwe) g//ai-s(a) ('female', 'wife').
their category and behave as if $g//ai$. If by the evening fire young men are grabbing hold of young women and the nearest girl is one's !au, her category makes little difference! Of course she protests, but she would do that anyway. Both parties take care not to address each other by kin terms, because their behaviour is contrary to their mutually recognised kin category. Significantly though, the young woman does not run away, for to do so would be inviting behaviour even more inappropriate to their relationship.

5. Para-Kin Relationships

Nharo 'kinship' is the system of relations by blood, marriage and name. It is a 'universal system' in that all members of society are related in some particular way to all others. The para-kin relationships, however, are not universal. They are associated with no particular kin relationships and they are voluntary. Except for the /kara (friend) relationship, their labels are derived from verbs and the relationships they express are relationships of action and transaction.

These para-kin terms are the verbs mentioned earlier. *Se* (to marry) is not among them because it is a true kin term—its reciprocal form expresses the kin category *khwe*. The para-kin terms share syntactic position with kin terms following the pattern of category $g//ai$. Since they follow this pattern exactly, the para-kin terms are used in the positions of both *khwe* and *se* when these morphemes express kin category *khwe*. The archaic Nama and Kora category *xai* (from the verb 'to engage in sexual intercourse'), unlike *se*, followed the pattern of $g//ai$ in Nharo and it is reasonable to imagine its use as a para-kin relationship category as well as the Khoikhoi equivalent of *khwe*. But by the rules of incest prohibition, it could have existed only within the /n//uri kin category, roughly the Khoikhoi equivalent of *tsxô*.

Apart from the friendship category, /kara, the categories in common use among the modern Nharo are /koba (which expresses a relationship of borrowing of material possessions), //ama (which expresses a trading or buying/selling relationship), and //ai (the gift-giving relationship). All three are essentially identical in meaning to their respective verbs, and none is restricted to a kin category. The first two are self-explanatory and not of much significance in the understanding of kinship behaviour; the third is by far the most important (compare Marshall 1961: 241-245; 1976: 303-311; Wiessner 1977).

Two people in the //ai relationship give gifts to each other, one at a time, at irregular intervals. Anyone may initiate a //ai relationship by asking anyone else, of any kin category, of either sex, in the same or a different band, for some specific gift. It can be a piece of jewelry, a pipe, a digging stick, or any other piece of non-consumable movable property. For example, ≠Ka≠Ke, who is visiting his friend Tete, points
to Tete’s pipe and asks: !Ko-sa//aï-te (‘Pipe, give me’). Tete either refuses or gives ≠Ka≠Ke the pipe. If he gives it, the two enter the gift-giving relationship. A day, a month, or a year later Tete will request (or demand) a reciprocal gift in the same manner. Gifts are made only upon request and unreasonable requests may be refused. Still, the Nharo continually make demands on each other for gifts (even if they do not need them), and exchange is one of the most common topics of conversation.

The cost of maintaining the relationship varies according to the value of the gifts and the frequency of the transaction. To some degree the //aï relationship redistributes wealth; it is not polite to own more than one’s neighbour and not give things away when asked for them. In this sense it has the same economic function as obligatory distribution of meat. (As among other Bushman peoples, meat is distributed according to participation in the hunt, ownership of the hunting dogs and killing arrows, and kin relationship to the participants; it is shared by several people.) But the //aï relationship has an additional social function, to extend the network of friendship and kinship beyond the band.

For the Nharo, ‘kinship’ consists of a system of consanguineal, affinal and name links which determines the relationship of every individual to every other. There are only two major categories: joking and avoidance. These higher categories, in turn, are each divided into three lower level categories; and within each category several more specific kin terms may be represented. To some degree, kin category determines behaviour, particularly in the case of the two higher level categories. G//aï (joking partners) are treated casually; /au (avoidance partners) are generally treated with more reserve.

G//aï include tsxô (namesakes, grandparent, MB, FZ, cross-cousin, etc.), ki or !kwê (the same-sex elder sibling/younger sibling relationship) and khwe (spouse). !Au include g//jo (parent, child, FB, MZ, etc.), ki or !kwê (the opposite-sex elder sibling/younger sibling relationship), and /æi (avoidance-in-law). All these categories are extended through namesake-equality rules. This sometimes results in conflicting categorization, two individuals each classifying the other differently. Like other Khoi-speaking peoples (but unlike the !Kung), the

6. //Aï means specifically ‘to give in gift-giving relationship’. Ma is ‘to give’ in most senses, and /au is the polite vocative ‘please give’. In the example above, the optional imperative indicator -ô is omitted; it is not usually used after //aï-te. Nor is it grammatically necessary to indicate the purpose of the thing requested, as it is in asking for water (Tsa ma te ra k’a, ‘Give me water so that I may drink’), for example.
Nharo permit marriage to members of only one kin category—\( t\)sx\( \ddot{o} \). Any opposite-sex tsx\( \ddot{o} \) of approximately the same age as Ego is a potential spouse. The Nharo also recognize other reciprocal relationships, here termed para-kin relationships, which cross-cut the kin categories. Of these, the \( \text{/ai} \) (gift-giving) relationship is the most important. It serves to maintain networks of personal contact, thereby renewing and intensifying relationships of kinship not only within, but also beyond the band.

*London, April 1978.*
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