



Retrieved from: <http://www.cifas.us/smith/chapters.html>

---

Title: "Differentiation and the segmentary principle in two societies."

Author(s): M.G. Smith

Source: In *Man in Africa*. M. Douglas and Phyllis Kaberry, eds. London: Tavistock Publications. p. 151-173.

---

*M. G. Smith*

## Differentiation and the Segmentary Principle in Two Societies

This essay illustrates a neglected feature of Professor Daryll Forde's work which seems fundamental for the comparative analysis of segmentary relations and processes in acephalous societies based on unilineal descent groups. In such societies segmentary principles of organization are manifest in the situationally variable alignments of collateral descent groups to form contraposed blocks of elastic scale and roughly equivalent strength, span, and genealogical status. The structural relativity of these social units and their relations presupposes the primacy of genealogical and local principles of collective differentiation. Yet in his accounts of Yakö society Forde has repeatedly shown how these preconditions of segmentary lineage systems may be qualified or obstructed by other principles of structural differentiation and collective alignment, such as age-grouping, corporate associations, or double unilineal descent (1938, 1939, 1961, 1963).

Further, in considering the factors which determine the extent to which lineage organization is elaborated into larger groups of varying span and genealogical depth, Forde contrasted his field observations among the Yakö and Hopi with data from such societies as the Nuer, Tallensi, and Ibo in which relativity of lineage structure prevailed. For the Hopi, he observed that 'fission with continued inter-segmentary relationship is possible within clan and lineage inside the pueblo. But the continuance of wider group solidarity between segments, separated by migration to other pueblos, is inhibited because it conflicts with the economic, ritual, and political autonomy of the village unit' (1947: 221). Implicit in this discussion and in his analysis of Yakö society is the thesis that collective differentiations on non-

genealogical grounds may restrict or exclude segmentary relations, even in acephalous societies based on unilineal groupings. To develop this thesis, it is merely necessary to show how identical conditions of social differentiation exercise identical effects on the lineage organizations of two or more distinct societies, while differing modes of social differentiation promote divergent effects. The following brief comparison of Kadara and Kagoro societies seeks to illustrate this.

#### CONTEXTS AND HISTORY

The Kadara and Kagoro are two tribes settled about one hundred miles apart, south-east of Kaduna in Northern Nigeria (Smith 1951a, 1951b; Gunn 1956). In 1950, when first visited, the Northern Kadara of Kajuru District in Zaria Emirate numbered about 9,000.<sup>1</sup> Another 8,000 Kadara in Kacia District due south-west were also ruled by the Fulani Emir of Zaria. At that date the independent Kagoro District in the extreme south-east of Zaria Province contained 13,000 inhabitants, of whom 10,500 were Kagoro tribesmen, another 2,300 Kagoro being settled in the Fulani Emirate of Jema'a, due south-west. Kagoro and Kadara speak languages, provisionally classified as Nigerian Semi-Bantu (Thomas 1925: 137). However, the two peoples are historically unrelated and moved to their present sites from opposite directions over 200 years ago. On reaching Kagoro, the original migrants or Ankwei occupied a massif which later provided excellent refuge from Muslim attacks. Farther north the Kadara, pressed by Muslim from Zaria and from the Habe vassal-state of Kajuru nearby, remained independent of Kajuru but rendered tribute to Zaria, which raided when it was due. In 1894-5 the Emir Yero attacked Ma'aveli, the leading settlement of Northern Kadara. The tribesmen dispersed in flight, some to nearby Kadara communities, the majority to found new villages at Kufana, Dan Bagudu, Kiamara, Dutsen Gaya, and Rafin Kunu. In 1950, while internally autonomous, these new settlements were all attached to Kufana, whose chief (*agwom*) supervised their administration.

Thanks to their rocky refuge, the Ankwei maintained their independence until the British came (Tremearne 1912). However, during the last century, Ankwei received refugees from

## *Differentiation and the Segmentary Principle*

Katab, Kagoma, Kaninkwom, and nearby tribes of similar speech and culture, who fled from Fulani pressure. After an interval these immigrants were assimilated into Kagoro society as a moiety called Kpashan (Smith 1960: 139-40), subject to certain regulations. In return for land, they furnished token tributes of grain annually. They were excluded from active roles in the calendrical rites (*ci*) that sacralized land and people. They were forbidden to marry one another or to abduct the wives of Ankwei, being thus obliged to marry the latter's daughters. However, unless otherwise prevented by relations of kinship or community, Kpashan were free to abduct one another's wives, who were Ankwei by birth. Ankwei, the original occupants, continued to marry among themselves and to abduct one another's wives as before, while intermarrying with Kpashan. In their beleaguered state, both moieties participated equally in their common defence and in the tribal head-hunter's cult.

Kagoro and Kadara are hoe-farmers who supplement their staple grains with root crops. Possessing rudimentary technologies, both people lacked cattle, markets, and currency, and depended on hunting for meat. For defence, both tribes had nucleated settlements, thus demarcating communities sharply; and in 1950, the period to which these data refer, both retained this pattern. At that date Kufana and Fadan Kagoro, the communities I studied most fully, contained 1,800 and 2,000 persons respectively, Kagoro have since experienced notable changes, Kadara rather less so.

On pacification, the British placed Kagoro under a 'tribal chief' whom they supervised from Kafanchan, Jema'a. Not until 1930-3 did Ankwei ritual leaders protest against this secular administration; but by 1950 a *modus vivendi* obtained (Smith 1960). Christian missions, active at Kagoro since 1926, had by then converted about one-third of the adults and nearly one-half of the children; the old Ankwei ritual order was passing, and Kpashan were already the larger moiety. Among the Kadara, despite parallel mission efforts, Christian influence was negligible, and in 1950 traditional Kadara rites were unimpaired.

### MARRIAGE REGULATIONS

Both Kagoro and Kadara have agnatic descent, prohibit marriage between agnates, proscribe cross-cousin marriage, esteem

polygyny, and prescribe virilocal residence. Both practise early betrothals for first marriage and observe similar modes of widow-inheritance. Lacking durable objects of value, bride-wealth in either tribe involved a long series of prescribed transfers. In Kagoro, standard payments of hoes and goats, known as *drangwan*, were required from men to ratify their paternal rights in each child at its weaning. Among Kadara, following infant betrothal, the groom's father and agnatic kinsmen perform farm service for the bride's kin at annually increasing rates. There also, husbands maintain their marriages and ratify paternity claims by set gifts to their affines. However, while Kagoro abhor premarital unchastity, Kadara welcome pregnant brides as demonstrably fertile. Both tribes observe similar institutions of secondary marriage (Smith 1953). All secondary marriages begin with wife-abduction. Normally the abductor has made the betrothal payments in advance to the woman's guardian (father, father's brother, or, rarely, mother's brother). In both tribes men are entitled to arrange successive marriages for their daughters or female wards without consulting the women's husbands, but without thereby terminating their marriages. Thus women can participate in several marriages simultaneously, though they may cohabit with only one spouse at any moment. In either tribe, only with her guardian's approval should a woman desert her current husband for some other. Then, to obviate paternity disputes, she should demonstrate non-pregnancy to some senior kinswoman at her next three menstrual periods. However, since the woman remains married to her former husband despite her removal, she is obliged to return to his lineage to undergo widow-inheritance on his death. Women could also rejoin their former husbands at any time without further payments, with or without the knowledge and formal consent of their current partner. On such occasions the woman reassumes all her wifely duties. Neither Kadara nor Kagoro recognize divorce or annulment; and in both societies widow-inheritance indicates the corporate character of marriages and lineage interests in them.

Secondary marriage is distinguished from primary marriage and widow-inheritance, and is regulated by identical rules in both tribes. Since these unions presuppose prior marriages, unwed girls cannot be taken as secondary wives. Secondary

## Differentiation and the Segmentary Principle

marriage is also forbidden between agnates anywhere, and within each local community. Thus wife-abduction is explicitly an inter-community as well as an inter-lineage affair. Men can neither marry the daughters of those whose wives they may abduct, nor inherit the widows of those whose daughters they may wed. Once abduction has occurred, antecedent relations of betrothal and intermarriage between the lineages concerned automatically change into collective relations of wife-abduction. Thus abductions are restricted to lineages that do not marry one another's daughters. Most betrothal-marriages are thus arranged within local communities; and most men live among their kin and affines, away from their rivals.

Among Kadara, real or potential affines address and describe one another reciprocally as *azaimi*. Men whose lineages practise mutual wife-abduction describe each other collectively and individually as *aformi*. *Azaimi* represents affinal alliance, *aformi* is the opposition of rival affines. *Azaimi*, *aformi*, and exogamy are symmetrical and mutually exclusive relations between corporate groups, each of which has its own unique distribution of these relations, widow-inheritance being normally restricted to the local exogamous lineage group. However, while *aformi* institutionalizes antagonism between particular lineages settled in different communities, *azaimi* entails insecurity for husbands within each community, since lineage norms authorize men to disrupt their daughters' unions. Lineages linked by *aformi* relations must have certain *azaimi* relations in common with particular descent groups; they compete as *aformi* for the daughters of their common *azaimi*.

The Kagoro equivalent of Kadara *azaimi* (affinity) is known as *niendi*; the Kagoro equivalent of *aformi* (affinal opposition) is known as *nendwang*. However, Kagoro exhibit two levels of exogamy. That which bans wife-abduction as well as intermarriage is called *bin* and characterizes agnatic kinship. Kpashan moiety exogamy differs from *bin* in allowing mutual wife-abduction between Kpashan of different communities. Like Kadara, Kagoro reserve widow-inheritance for local exogamous groups, and here also a single incident of wife-abduction immediately converts *niendi* relations into *nendwang* between the lineages concerned. Here also, men can only abduct women eligible to them as *niendi*. Thus in Kagoro, rival lineages compete

for their common affines. Under the moiety arrangements, some Ankwei are rivals, others are affines, and others are *bin*. With the sole exception mentioned below, all Ankwei and Kpashan are reciprocally *niendi*; and, beyond community boundaries, all Kpashan not linked by agnation are formally *nendwang* (rivals).

Secondary marriage presumes that agnatic groups reserve continuing rights over their kinswomen, and provisionally over the latter's issue. While these lineage reservations exclude annulment and divorce, they limit men's rights in their wives reciprocally. In either tribe relations of exogamy, marriage, and wife-abduction (*nendwang*, *aformi*) hold between corporate local descent groups as determinate collectivities.

#### LINEAGE ORGANIZATION

Among Kadara and Kagoro, lineage divisions are explicit and formalized. Special terms denote successive levels of patrilineal grouping. In Kagoro, *kwai*, and in Kadara, *ute*, refer equally to the dispersed patriclan and to its largest local divisions. Major segments within these largest localized lineages are described by Kagoro as *tusa* or *uli*, by Kadara as *anepa* or *erute*. These segments are further subdivided into minor segments called *ufam* at Kagoro and *aban* among the Kadara. Kadara *aban* are multi-family compounds containing households called *engau*, corresponding to the Kagoro *kyambwak*. Even these small units also contain named divisions. Such terminologies suggest such fixity in the identities and relations of these segments as to exclude their structural relativity. However, despite these parallels, the two lineage systems differ in certain ways.

While Kadara genealogies rarely extend two generations beyond the senior living males, among Kagoro even the Kpashan cite five or six deceased ancestors, and the Ankwei normally eight. This Kagoro stress on lineage genealogies contrasts sharply with Kadara indifference to them. The difference cannot be explained simply by Kadara dispersal from Ma'aveli, since at Kagoro immigrant Kpashan all assert elaborate genealogies. Evidently this divergence indicates that, while genealogy is critical to Kagoro conceptions of lineage, Kadara rely on other criteria.

In both tribes the mother's brother and his lineage are identified by a single term. The sister's son has a privileged relation

## *Differentiation and the Segmentary Principle*

with his mother's lineage and may settle permanently among them, or he may be claimed in infancy for non-payment of prestations required to ratify paternity rights. However, while Kagoro lineages are almost all eponymous, most Kadara lineages bear place-names or other descriptive terms such as Anigum or Anaregum, that is, the lineage of the *agwom* (chief). Further, Kadara compounds that house minor lineages generally bear the names of their current heads, not those of their founders.

Given their indifference to genealogy, Kadara make little use of lineage fictions. Kagoro, conceiving lineages in strictly genealogical terms, deny publicly that any agnatic group contains unrelated descent groups or segments attached by uterine ties. Despite the differential exogamy that generally distinguishes such assimilated segments, given their lineage axioms, Kagoro cannot avoid such public denials. Kadara encounter no such problems. Among them, lineages are validated by external identifications and by ritual connexions. An immigrant male, a sister's son, or wife's son born elsewhere, may be assimilated into a lineage by ritual and jural identification through continued co-residence. The lineal issue of such assimilated men maintain differential exogamy relations but, as Kadara exogamy excludes both marriage and wife-abduction, this restriction entails no positive deviation from the specific complex of affinal alliances and oppositions of the host lineage. Given their identical marriage regulations, these conditions affect lineage organization equally in both tribes.

In each tribe, irrespective of their genealogical or ritual status, autonomous patrilineal groups are distinguished by their individually specific combinations of positive relations of marriage and wife-abduction with one another. Though agnates neither intermarry nor abduct one another's wives, since each autonomous localized group maintains a distinctive set of relations of intermarriage and wife-abduction with specific lineages, it is distinguished by them as a discrete collectivity having common exclusive external and internal affairs.

### LINEAGE STRUCTURE IN KAGORO

In Kagoro the marriage system has direct implications for lineage groupings, although these are formally defined by agnatic

genealogies that segment serially to segregate units of decreasing level and span. I shall illustrate the implications of these marriage rules for Kagoro lineages by six concrete cases.

Of the three original Ankwei clans, Mingio are probably the largest. All Mingio at Fadan Kagoro can trace common agnatic descent except the minor segment of Biniat, which descends from a Kumat man of that name and a woman of the Kabiom major segment of Mingio at Fada. Biniat are thus immediate 'sisters' sons' of Kabiom, and indirectly of other Fada Mingio. Being assimilated to Kabiom, Biniat observe all Mingio marriage regulations, including exogamy with Mingio living elsewhere. However, being of Kumat descent, Biniat also observe exogamy with the Kumat nearby. With this exception, Biniat practise the same affinal alliances and oppositions as other Mingio of Fada. Though no other Mingio at Fada observe exogamy with Kumat, Mingio assert publicly that Biniat are their agnates. Privately, the Mingio lineage head (*tienwhop*), who was also the community priest, explained the reasons for this anomaly and for these public statements.

The position of Kumat, another Ankwei clan, is also of interest. In 1929 Kumat formed a distinct patriline, coordinate with their agnates, the Mungwop, also settled at Fada (Meek 1931, vol. II: 92). As agnates, Kumat and Mungwop observe common exogamy, though inheriting widows separately. In 1950 both Kumat and Mungwop asserted their unity, citing their common exogamy and descent. If publicly accepted, such reunion would reduce each unit to the status of a major segment and each of their major divisions to minor segments. However, Mungwop and Kumat maintain distinctive sets of marriage relations involving other descent groups. Kumat maintained affinity with the Ankwei lineages of Zafan and Ti at Kadarko, while practising wife-abduction with Kikwot there. Mungwop's relations with these Kadarko lineages were exactly the opposite. In consequence, despite their efforts to assert common identity within Fadan Kagoro, given their differential sets of inter-lineage relations, Kumat and Mungwop remained distinct clans to other lineages. These external differentiae also affected relations between Kumat and Mungwop. The two groups remained residentially separate, each with its own head. Each is a distinct unit of collective responsibility and holds exclusive corporate rights

## *Differentiation and the Segmentary Principle*

in its land, members, ritual, and widows. Thus whereas negative differences between Biniat and other Mingio did not obstruct their fusion, the positive differentiation of Kumat and Mungwop by their affinal alliances and oppositions blocks their asserted reunion.

In Kagoro, different levels of lineage grouping differ in their properties and structural significance. As the largest localized agnatic group the *kwai* is identified by exogamy, by its uniform and unique set of affinal alliances and oppositions with other units, by residential concentrations, by its common head, eponymous ancestor, genealogy, and totems. At various seasons each *kwai* annually carries out collective action to harvest and thresh certain cereals. Each clan also maintains its shrines (*shwo*) for war and hunting rituals, including the purification of killers. Each has exclusive corporate rights in named hunting areas, and Ankwei clans have similar rights in ritual performances of the calendrical cult. Further, each *kwai* initiates its boys separately in its own *obwai* cult, and has its own *obwai* shrine, priest, and ritual paraphernalia. To conclude each hunting season, each clan conducts its purification rites (*akanyam*) separately; and, formerly, in distress, each held its own *nainda* rites and ordeals to identify the sources of mystical misfortune (*nendyung*). The clan is also the widest unit of collective responsibility in kinship affairs and holds exclusive residual rights in the farm plots, house sites, and widows of its members, and in its daughters' offspring until filiation dues are paid. All lineage segments are bound by these conditions.

The major segments of a local lineage are segregated residentially, genealogically, by distinct headships, and, symbolically, by shrines at which small game are shared. Men of the same major segment normally farm contiguous plots and should assist one another in disputes with members of coordinate segments. Each segment normally seeks to preserve its members' widows for internal inheritance, and each performs certain funeral rites for its members separately. However, though most localized lineages contain two major segments, many have three and some have four. A dichotomous organization of paired segments in balanced opposition is neither essential nor characteristic in this lineage structure. For serialized contrapositions to operate effectively, units should not be organized with such hierarchic rigour.

Each major segment contains two or more minor segments distinguished genealogically by their closer co-residence and by their first claims to the farms, compounds, house sites, widows, and personal possessions of their members. Members of minor segments share all newly made beer and meat of hunting with one another. Structurally, major and minor segments are distinguished by their positions *vis-à-vis* one another and their coordinates in the lineage hierarchy, despite similarities of functional capacity and organization. They differ in scale, complexity, and structural potential. By contrast, differences between autonomous local lineages and major segments are very marked. In declaring their unity, Mungwop and Kumat exhibit structural inconsistency since, although each should then revert from clan to segment status, thus redefining their constituent major segments as minor ones, each retains the structural status and properties characteristic of *kwai*. Such attempts by autonomous collectivities to change their status arouse wide public interest because of their implications for the structure of inter-lineage relations of marriage and wife-abduction, with which societal integration and boundaries are identified. They are accordingly obstructed wherever inconsistent with the necessary conditions of the social system. In effect, the relativity of structural units and relations is inconsistent with those differentiations on which the identities and articulation of these corporate lineages are based. Such differentiations obstruct those situational realignments of genealogically coordinate units that express their segmentary organization. Even though Kumat and Mungwop share public rituals at Fadan Kagoro, each unit retains its distinctive ritual role; their separateness is enhanced by their attempts at reunion.

Among the Kpashan of Kpak, the Nientswot, numbering 256 in 1950, and the Kabiyip, then 92 strong, observed common exogamy as agnates. Though both units shared purification rites and widow-inheritance, they were distinguished as patrilans by all others, following a single divergence in their external relations. Kabiyip intermarried with the anomalous Sukurak of Kukum, with whom Nientswot practised abduction. Marriage relations maintained by these Sukurak, a Kpashan clan, probably antedate the present moiety regulations.

At Kpak also, Micen numbering 222 souls were agnates of

## *Differentiation and the Segmentary Principle*

Kanwai, the smallest Kagoro *kwai*, which contained 9 persons in 1950. Though Kanwai and Micen conducted all their clan activities together, like other Kagoro, they recognized their separateness, which followed on a single difference in marriage relations. Formerly a minor branch of Micen, Kanwai abducted a wife from the Kpaguwak of Kukum, an Ankwei group, thus breaching the historic ban on inter-moiety wife-abductions and initiating a struggle that publicized the event. When Micen dissociated itself from Kanwai's action, the latter was publicly distinguished as a separate unit of collective responsibility in inter-lineage relations, and so became a *kwai*.

At Fadan Kagoro the Kalahu, a Kpashan clan which holds the tribal chiefship, consists of three genealogically unrelated and ritually distinct major segments, Kamang, Bafwei, and Tukum, that inherit their widows separately. Originating among the Kutrok of Kpak, Bafwei and Kutrok maintain exogamy and joint rights of widow-inheritance, though I know of no such cases. However, as Kpashan within the same community, Bafwei, Tukum, and Kamang can neither intermarry nor abduct one another's wives. Further, neither Tukum nor Kamang, among whom the Bafwei settled on moving from Kpak to Fada, had abducted any wives from the Kutrok of Kpak. Given their residential contiguity, the three lineages were therefore assimilated into a single clan, Kalahu, by other lineage groups with whom they shared common marriage relations. This assimilation developed despite differences of descent among the units concerned. Tukum and Kamang have thus adopted Bafwei exogamy with Kutrok, to share uniform marriage relations.

These cases show that *uniformities* of marriage relations identify groups Kagoro regard as clans, while *differences* of marriage relations distinguish such units, irrespective of genealogical linkages, numbers, and levels of internal segmentation. Since marriage alternatives are mutually exclusive, symmetrical, and bind autonomous lineages, all are directly concerned with the boundaries and identities of each, to maintain the system of collective relations on which the societal order rests. In consequence, Kagoro lineages are defined by these external differentiae; they cannot alter their public status, alignments, or identities independently, as segmentary principles require. The structural relativity of lineage units is overridden by the system

of differential marriage relations that determines their identities; and perhaps this is why their internal organization presents an ideal hierarchy.

The Mingio at Kpak illustrate the force of these extrinsic conditions. These Mingio, locally known as Ankpen, observe exogamy with Mingio elsewhere. In 1950, during the tribal census of lineage groups, segments, relations, and personnel on which this summary is based, Ankpen asserted their division into two independent groups, the Kusak of 89 souls and the Kasa'a of 90. While together they still constituted an exogamous unit, each group conducted its own rites of purification, initiation, and expiation separately and had a separate shrine for hunting and war. Each had its own head and inherited its widows exclusively. No lineages at Kpak challenged the claim of Kusak and Kasa'a to rank as separate clans, since this entailed no change in the community system of marriage relations. However, these claims to separate independent status were unanimously rejected by the tribal assembly, precisely because Kusak and Kasa'a observed identical relations of affinity and wife-abduction with all other clans throughout Kagoro. For this reason, Mingio and other lineages outside Kpak categorically identified the two units as coordinate major segments within the Ankpen. In short, lineages can neither alter their public status merely by processes of internal segmentation, nor can they avoid such differentiation, once they are distinguished by external relations of abduction and marriage. Marriage regulations differentiate or identify lineages as collective units, irrespective of their numbers, genealogical character, and internal alignments. Such differentiations are of direct significance to all other *kwai* engaged in this marriage system; in consequence, all lineages are concerned with one another's boundaries, identities, and external relations. Though these lineages are ideally based on agnatic descent and co-residence, Kagoro mis-state and misunderstand their nature in stressing their genealogical basis to the exclusion of marriage.

At Kagoro, community obligations override lineage and moiety loyalties, wherever both are engaged. All Kagoro communities are multilinear and most contain Kpashan and Ankwei in approximately equal numbers. For defence against foreign foes such as Kaje, Ganawuri, or Fulani, and for rituals in such

### *Differentiation and the Segmentary Principle*

emergencies as famine or epidemic, the small tribal territory was divided into three unequal areas called *bin*, each under the ritual jurisdiction of its senior Ankwei priest, the *tiebin* (pl. *niebin*). In the sporadic struggles over alleged theft or wife-abduction, each community fought as a unit once its war-horn was blown, until the community priests (*nienci*, sing. *tienci*) intervened to halt the fray. Such fighting recurrently demarcated community boundaries and reinforced their several solidarities. In these encounters, members of opposite moiety avoided one another, and agnates on opposing sides directed their blows elsewhere. Thus in the disputes generated by wife-abduction, clans and moieties were neither isolated nor contraposed. Moreover, within each community, disputes only engaged the agnates of their principals up to the relevant level of lineage grouping. As elsewhere, conventions regulated the weapons appropriate for disputes of differing social range; these and other rules were jointly enforced by the village priest and local lineage heads with fines and other punishments. Thus in the political and legal spheres, lineage autonomies and oppositions alike were restricted by conditions of community structure. Affinally opposed lineages had thus no chance to feud in isolation or with their affinal and agnatic associates; communities furnished the principal units of social solidarity and contraposition. Inter-lineage strife was immediately converted into inter-community fights until stopped by the village priests. The political preconditions of segmentary lineage alignments were excluded by the overriding obligations of communal unity, these communities being the largest local groups within which abductions were proscribed.

#### KADARA LINEAGE ORGANIZATION

Kadara share the marital arrangements found in Kagoro, and their lineages are similarly affected. In either society some agnatic groups are widely dispersed, and all localized descent groups are internally segmented. In addition, Kadara lineages have to meet important ritual requirements. Though they lack the moiety divisions and two modes of exogamy found in Kagoro, Kadara communities divide into two halves known as *abanizum*, one of which contains the lineage of the village priest, the other that of the chief. Though such groupings are only

effective in certain ritual and age-set activities, they express Kadara distinctions between ritual and secular action and leadership. These *abanizum* have no exogamous or moiety connotations.

Unlike the Kagoro *ci*, Kadara ritual centres on ancestors, two of whom are recalled annually in each community, one by each division, for the final funeral rites held between *eguro* in February-March and *otron* in August. Normally, in each village one recalled ancestor is female (*akra*), the other male (*atururu*). Known as *ahwasasen*, these returned ancestors are elaborately masked representations whose secret nature is stringently taboo to women, strangers, and the uninitiated. In the daily dances held at this season, each leads those sections of the community age-sets (*ufro*) that belong to its division.

Every eighth year Kadara initiate a new age-set (*awolegum*, *ufro*), segregating the novices for eight to ten weeks in nearby bush under the local lineage (*ute*) that has ritual jurisdiction over forest and waste. All males should undergo initiation before puberty. For defence, large-scale hunts, road clearance, and wall-building, Kadara relied on their age-sets, the senior directing the junior. In Kajuru District, Kadara communities were also grouped in two divisions that pursued their annual ritual cycles and initiated their age-sets in fixed orders. None the less the local communities, in which bloodshed and secondary marriage were both prohibited, formed the widest effective units of their social system. Each community initiated its age-sets separately; and, although equivalent, sets from different communities seem never to have combined. Thus, despite their weak village chiefships, Kadara were even more fragmented than Kagoro, whose three senior Ankwei priests (*niebin*) sometimes acted together in tribal emergencies, such as smallpox or famine.

In Kadara communities, patrilineages are grouped in ritual associations known as *ategburu* which also serve as village wards. The lineage composition of these ritual groups at Kufana in 1950 is given opposite, each being named after its ritual leaders.

At Kufana the ritual groups headed by Anigum and Anegepon form one community division, while those headed by Anigile, Anaberetan, and Anekyum form the other. The village chief is from Anigum, the village priest from Anigile. In 1950 the 17 Kufana patrilineages averaged 54 males each; the five ritual

*Differentiation and the Segmentary Principle*

| ATEGBURU     | PATRILINEAGES | COMPOUNDS   | HOUSEHOLDS   |
|--------------|---------------|-------------|--------------|
| Anigum       | Anigum        | 5           | 12           |
|              | Anaboahwhah   | 6           | 25           |
|              | Anafishie     | 3           | 15           |
|              | Anekekow      | 1           | 3            |
| (total)      | 4             | 15          | 55           |
| Anegepon     | Anegepon      | 3           | 10           |
|              | Anakyum       | 1           | 3            |
|              | Anukwasali    | 3           | 8            |
|              | Anadai        | 2           | 4            |
| (total)      | 4             | 9           | 25           |
| Anigile      | Anigile       | 4           | 11           |
|              | Anumabe       | 3           | 16           |
|              | Adaru         | 2           | 7            |
|              | Anoahwhanum   | 3           | 7            |
|              | Anugima       | ?           | ?            |
| (total)      | 5             | 12 +        | 41 +         |
| Anaberetan   | Anaberetan    | 2           | 13           |
|              | Anehurola     | 3           | 14           |
| (total)      | 2             | 5           | 27           |
| Anekyum      | Anekyum       | 1           | 3            |
|              | Anilup        | 3           | 15           |
| (total)      | 2             | 4           | 18           |
| <b>TOTAL</b> | <b>17</b>     | <b>45 +</b> | <b>166 +</b> |

groups 183; on average each compound contained about 3.5 households. Given Kadara indifference to genealogy, the compound represents the normal limits of demonstrable agnatic kinship.

*Ategburu* are agnatically heterogeneous associations of locally contiguous lineages for ritual and social purposes. As primary subdivisions within the community, they provide its administrative wards, each component lineage having its own sub-warden. In community age-sets, boys are organized in separate sections, first by ritual groups and then by lineage.

Though Kadara often describe these ritual groups as clans, the two types of group differ profoundly. Of the five Kufana ritual groups listed above, only that led by Anaberetan was exclusively agnatic. In the Anigum group, Anekekow are unrelated to all others; so are Anoahwhanum and Anugima in that led by Anigile. In the Anegepon group only Anakyum and Anegepon are kin, Anadai and Anukwasali being unrelated. Anekyum and Anilup are also not kin. Anafishie and Anaboahwhah are junior collaterals of Anigum, which leads their group. In relation to Anigile, so are Adaru and Anumabe. Anakyum is likewise a junior collateral of Anegepon. Thus *ategburu* may include unrelated lineages or others linked as senior and junior collaterals, yet all have equivalent status as coordinate units. Occasionally segments of a single patrilineage are attached to different ritual groups. Thus in Kufana one compound of Anoahwhanum participates in the Anegepon group, the remainder in that led by Anigile.

Marriage prohibitions attach to agnatic kinship, not to membership in ritual groups. For most purposes Anaberetan and Anehurola form a distinct ritual group, while joining the Anigile group for others. Anaberetan and Anehurola are linked to Anigile, Adaru, and Anumabe as agnatic collaterals. In this case, segmentation closely approaches fission. Anaberetan and Anehurola, while observing common exogamy, intermarry with all the Anigile group despite agnatic ties. Anoahwhanum and Anugima, being unrelated to Anigile, Adaru, Anumabe, Anaberetan, or to one another, intermarry as freely within their ritual groups as beyond them. Likewise, Anekekow intermarry with the exogamous agnatic group of Anigum, Anaboahwhah, and Anafishie. Anekyum and Anilup also intermarry. Within the *ategburu* led by Anegepon, Anadai and Anukwasali could marry one another or Anakyum and Anegepon, an exogamous agnatic pair. Segments of Anoahwhanum attached to the groups led by Anigile and Anegepon maintain mutual exogamy, as also do certain agnatic groups that claim common maternal origin. Thus despite Kadara attempts to identify them, their ritual and descent groups differ profoundly.

Each autonomous agnatic group maintains exogamy, exclusive widow-inheritance, and a unique combination of affinal alliances and oppositions with similar units. Collateral lineages

## *Differentiation and the Segmentary Principle*

such as Anafishie, Anaboahwhah, and Anigum, although observing common exogamy, are distinguished by their differential sets of affinal alliances and oppositions. Within each ritual group, lineages preserve their separate identities and interests. Each lineage is a distinct unit for certain ancestral rites, residence, widow-inheritance, headship, and distribution of the 'meat of hunting'. While maintaining agnatic links or ritual alliances, these lineages are clearly segregated as coordinate units. However, despite differentiation in ancestral worship, other ritual considerations prescribe their collaboration.

Though the ritual leaders in each group enjoy precedence, the associated lineages are all substantively equal. Such equivalence is unaffected by differences in their numbers or genealogical relation. Anekekow and Anakyum remain distinct, though each occupies only one compound. Given their distinct descent and marriage relations, even these small groups represent separate units of collective responsibility, formally identical with those that lead the ritual groups to which they belong. Moreover, although, at Kufana, Anekyum lead the ritual group in which Anilup are the majority, at Dan Bagudu where these two lineages are also linked, their relations are reversed. There, although a minority, Anilup lead the group in which Anekyum predominate numerically. In all cases, the ritually senior lineage of an *ategburu* is that which possesses the essential means for recalling ancestral and age-set spirits for certain calendrical public rites. Thus, besides their differentiation through marriage relations, Kadara lineages are simultaneously differentiated by their varying ritual endowments and aligned by their particular ritual needs. The affiliations of Anekekow, Anadai, Anoaahwhanum, Anugima, Anilup, and Anukwasali in ritual groups at Kufana all reflect these ritual imperatives. To conduct recurrent rites they regard as indispensable, lineages that lack the necessary ritual instruments must associate in exclusive continuing relations with those that have them.

Normally, this ritual association presumes contiguous residence of the linked units. In such conditions, lineages distinguished by their specific marriage relations, their internal autonomy and ancestral spirits, preserve ritual ties with senior collaterals who retain the ritual heirlooms of their clan. Thus despite intermarriage, Anabetan retain their ritual links with

Anigile. Ritual links accordingly restrict lineage segmentation and regulate alignments by enjoining stable associations for critical recurrent rites. Moreover, as the major community units, these ritual groups furnish the essential framework for the communal initiations and age-set organization, for hunting, defence, and village administration. Only those lineages such as Anoa-whanum, which lack both the necessary ritual objects and agnatic ties to others that have them, are free to subdivide and realign among differing ritual groups in response to purely internal pressures. Even then, Anoa-whanum remain a single entity in inter-lineage marriage relations, though they no longer unite for internal affairs. In effect, lineage location, segmentation, and ritual affiliations are subject to two sets of structural differentiae: those ritual conditions that govern community organization, and those marriage alternatives that simultaneously segregate and align communities and agnatic units.

Within a ritual group, each lineage has its own ritual and secular leaders. The latter is normally an active man of middle age, chosen by the lineage head and elders. The lineage head (*anekute* or *anekwun*) is normally its oldest living male. His activities and authority are ritual and advisory, while his junior colleague, the secular head, acts as the group's executive, directing its age-set and administrative affairs. This division between ritual and secular leadership of lineages parallels that between the village chief and priest, around which the two community divisions are grouped. Within the ritual groups, ritual and secular leadership rests formally with that lineage which holds the essential instruments of collective ritual; but, in either sphere, the group's affairs are administered through councils of lineage representatives. Thus lineage autonomy is restricted by ritual ties to such spheres as marriage relations, widow-inheritance, reallocations of lineage land and house sites, burials, and internal age-set or administrative arrangements. Each descent group conducts separate ancestral and hunting rites, undertakes such periodic tasks as farm clearing or cultivation, and builds its compounds alone. Since lineage compounds are usually adjacent, intra-lineage disputes are routinely settled by the senior men. Disputes between members of differing lineages within the same ritual group are conducted through their representatives in the unit's secular or ritual councils. Thus lineage disputes within

## *Differentiation and the Segmentary Principle*

ritual groups tend to mobilize neutral members who normally impose an acceptable compromise. Similarly, disputes between lineages attached to different ritual groups stimulate their neutral members to seek some acceptable solution, since, given their mixed composition, diverse functions, and equivalent positions in the age-organization and village administration, ritual groups cannot unite in mutual opposition. In serious disputes between ritual groups, the Anigile village priest might intervene with the support of neutral groups and the village chief. In intra-community disputes, metal weapons were forbidden, but I learnt of few such fights, and no ensuing deaths, perhaps because the ritual groups and age-organization enabled men of senior generation to enforce traditional norms on their juniors by appropriate ritual and secular means. The age-organization further limited occasions for intra-village dispute by prescribing fraternity among age-mates and deference to seniors, irrespective of lineage membership. The community organization also subordinated lineage loyalties and autonomies to the needs of ritual groups, which furnished the framework for age-sets and provided the essential intermediate organization between lineage and community.

Between communities, hostilities were canalized in inter-lineage relations of wife-abduction with their contingent paternity disputes. Here, as at Kagoro, lineages engaged in mutual wife-abduction were prevented from feuding in isolation or with lineage allies; once violence occurred, retaliation was obligatory for the local lineage and for the age-set of the injured party, while all other lineages in his ritual group remained neutral, as required by their individually specific relations of exogamy, marriage, and abduction. In asserting collective responsibilities for their members on such occasions, age-sets tended to equalize the relative strengths of the contraposed lineages and to extend their dispute to community levels without, however, engaging the communities concerned as total units. Thus lineages were neither isolated nor united by opposition within or beyond community limits. Other corporate groupings interposed to forestall this, thereby restricting lineage autonomies and excluding segmentary alignments.

Kadara rituals integrate ancestral worship with communal rites that sacralize and initiate age-sets. The ancestor cult pre-

supposes certain sacred objects for its calendrical rites, when many people should participate to ensure their success. Since essential features of this cult are hidden from the uninitiated, Kadara lineages depend on one another to preserve the mysteries essential for their common welfare. These ritual secrets centre on spirit representations (*ohuma*) and on certain instruments inherited from ancestors and ultimately attributed to God (*Onum*, the sun). While junior lineage segments may never have possessed these instruments, other lineages probably lost their direct possession during the flight from Ma'veli. For example, those Anilup who fled to Dan Bagudu took the Anilup ritual objects with them, and other Anilup who came to Kufana consequently lack them. Such impoverished units cannot make good their ritual deficiencies by manufacture or purchase: Kadara say that newly-made substitutes can have no ritual validity, since they lack sacralizing ancestral use and divine origin. This belief effectively discourages the ritual segregation of lineages which could threaten or destroy the ritual units on which these communities and their age-organization depend for cohesion. If Kadara lineages were all ritually independent, the community age-organization, which presupposes their stable groupings for ritual action, could scarcely obtain in its current form. It is more likely that in such conditions Kadara lineages would initiate their youth separately, as Kagoro do in their *obwai* cults, thereby frustrating the preconditions of this communal age-organization.

Of these ritual necessities the bullroarers, trumpets, *iholi* flutes, *ahupe* pods employed in mortuary rites, and the *ibini* drums of clanship are apparently crucial. Without them, neither the age-set nor the ancestral spirits can be recalled, since the bullroarers, *iholi* flutes, and *ahupe* pods represent their voices and movements, while *ibini* and the trumpets are required to summon them. Thus, without these five musical instruments, neither the final funeral rites nor the annual visits of age-set spirits (*ibeigbum*) in September-October can occur.

While each distinct lineage has its own ancestral shrine (*esan*), *kutu* drum, tomb, and burial-flutes (*ahusha*), and all but two have ritual huts, in Kufana only those that led the five ritual groups had their own bullroarers, trumpets, and *ahupe* pods; and of these leading lineages, only four held ancestral drums of

## *Differentiation and the Segmentary Principle*

clanship, Anaberetan borrowing the Anigile drum as necessary. Further, only Anigile and Anaberetan at Kufana possessed *iholi* flutes, and only four local lineages could recall the age-set spirits. Of fifteen ritual instruments, two lineages that led ritual groups held thirteen each, two fourteen, and only the Anigile retained all. By contrast, of ritually dependent lineages, five each had only four objects, two possessed five, and two had six. Given Kadara ritual and belief, such parallel distributions of essential instruments and ritual capacities simultaneously differentiate lineages and enjoin their continuing cooperation in ritual groups for cult and age-set activities. Thus the conditions that differentiate lineages in ritual capacity restrict their autonomies and prescribe their association to meet common needs; and, although these ritual differentiations and combinations proceed independently of secular differentiations in the marriage system, both sets of conditions identify lineages by exclusive and specific external relations that deny the structural relativity prerequisite for their situationally variable segmentary alignments.

### CONCLUSION

These synopses show that in Kagoro and Kadara societies the segmentary capacities of localized patrilineal groupings were deflected and suppressed by other principles of structural differentiation. Despite the differences between Kagoro and Kadara conceptions of lineage, in both societies identical structural conditions exercised identical effects on these two lineage systems. Both societies practised identical patterns of marriage; in both, lineages engaged as collective units in identical sets of mutually exclusive marriage relations – exogamy, affinity, and wife-abduction. In each society, local patrilineages are accordingly distinguished by their unique sets of marriage relations, irrespective of strictly genealogical criteria; and, in either case, these external differentiae preclude the situational realignments of descent groups in segmentary contrapositions by individuating their collective identities, boundaries, and relationships. In both societies, lineage oppositions within communities were restrained and overruled by communal norms; in both, violence and wife-abduction were prohibited within communities. Moreover, lineages settled in different communities could not pursue hos-

tilities in isolation or in segmentary alliances. At Kagoro such inter-lineage violence opposed communities as units; among Kadara, such disputes mobilized the age-sets as well as the lineages of their principals, thus generalizing the conflict to other groups interested in its resolution, without disturbing the intricate network of inter-lineage marriage alignments.

Despite their similar multilineal community bases, both societies also exhibited significant structural differences. Lacking age-organization, Kagoro rely for tribal cohesion on their moiety and territorial divisions (*bin*), calendrical rites (*ci*), dispersed patrilineages, and alternative marriage relations, and identify lineages by genealogy and residence. Among Kadara, as Anoa-whanum illustrate, lineages retain external unity despite divided residence, ancestral worship, and genealogy, so long as their members observe uniform marriage relations. Lacking tribal unity, Kadara rely for community cohesion on their ritual groups and age-set system. In both tribes, wife-abduction and violence characterize inter-community relations; within Kadara villages, lineage autonomies and alignments were governed by necessities of ritual and age-organization on which communal boundaries and integration depended. Segmentary relations between lineages were accordingly inhibited. In Kagoro, moiety regulations excluded wife-abduction and contra-position between Ankwei and Kpashan lineages, while communal norms subordinated lineage autonomies and regulated their alignments. It seems, then, that similar conditions of structural differentiation exercise similar restraints on the segmentary capacities of patrilineal groupings in these two acephalous societies, while differing conditions of structural differentiation have differing effects. In either case, non-genealogical principles of structural differentiation effectively obstruct segmentary processes of alignment among the lineages on which these societies are based.

#### NOTE

1. I first visited Kadara and Kagoro in 1950 on a studentship from the Colonial Social Science Research Council, and again in 1959 while attached to the Nigerian Institute of Social and Economic Research. My thanks are due to both these bodies.

## *Differentiation and the Segmentary Principle*

In 1950 Kagoro was administered as an independent District of Zaria Province. In 1954 the District was transferred to Plateau Province, and since then, with Jema'a, Jaba, and Moroa, has formed the Jema'a Federation of Native Administrations. By comparison, Kadara administration developed little between 1950 and my third visit in 1964. The present account refers to the situations observed in 1950, when some changes had already occurred under the British administration. Hence, in this paper, 1950 is the ethnographic present.

For summary ethnographies of these tribes, see Gunn 1956: 88-103 (Kagoro) and 122-37 (Kadara).

© M. G. Smith, 1969.

### REFERENCES

- FORDE, C. D. 1938. Fission and Accretion in the Patrilineal Clans of a Semi-Bantu Community in Southern Nigeria. *Journal of the Royal Anthropological Institute*, 68: 311-88.
- 1939. Government in Umor. *Africa*, 12 (2): 126-62.
- 1947. The Anthropological Approach in Social Science. *The Advancement of Science*, 4 (15): 213-24.
- 1961. The Governmental Roles of Associations among the Yakö (Munro Lecture). *Africa*, 31 (4): 309-23.
- 1962. Death and Succession: An Analysis of Yakö Mortuary Ritual. In Max Gluckman (ed.), *Essays on the Ritual of Social Relations*. Manchester: The University Press, pp. 89-123.
- GUNN, H. D. 1956. *Pagan Peoples of the Central Area of Northern Nigeria: Ethnographic Survey of Africa, Western Africa, Part XII*. London: International African Institute.
- MEEK, C. K. 1931. *Tribal Studies in Northern Nigeria*, Vol. 2. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.
- SMITH, M. G. 1951a. Social Structure of the Northern Kadara. Unpublished MS.
- 1951b. The Social Organization and Economy of Kagoro. Unpublished MS.
- 1953. *Secondary Marriage in Northern Nigeria*. *Africa*, 23 (4): 298-323.
- 1960. Kagoro Political Development. *Human Organization*, 19 (3): 137-49.
- THOMAS, N. W. 1925. The Languages. In C. K. Meek, *The Northern Tribes of Nigeria: An Ethnographical Account of the Northern Provinces of Nigeria together with a report on the 1921 Decennial Census*. London: Oxford University Press, Vol. II, pp. 132-47.
- TREMEARNE, A. J. N. 1912. Notes on Some Nigerian Headhunters. *Journal of the Royal Anthropological Institute*, 42: 136-200.