ANTHROPOS

108.2013: 117–135

Contrapuntal Lineage, Clan, and Village

A Regional Perspective

Thomas R. Barker

Abstract. – Tait's recognition and re-ordination of contiguous and non-contiguous regions (and their sub-regions), founded on the proposed ordered ontologies was, for instance, commensurability as governance or polity. Its commensurability was as governance for instance when, subsequently, the jural-political domain was uniform throughout the region and sub-regions considered, or when the jural-political domain was extended. Its commensurability can be as government when, subsequently, the jural-political domain can be reduplicated and extended or projected, in a much reduced form, as the domain of ethnicity, which may also be, simultaneously, a system of sub-regions, regions, and supra-regions from central, identifiable frames of reference. Historically and ethnographically West African social systems exhibited a de facto totalization and pre-totalization necessary to the reproduction of the constituent elements and systems as structures, and their transformation in a macro-structural environment. In this conception bounded groups of "scale" remained which were subject to circumstances, conditions, affairs, and expansive strategies of control. They were progressively reproduced asymmetrically but with numerous revisions, reversions, and reflexivity in the assumed sequences. *[Ghana, Konkomba, Dogon, contrapuntality, lineage, region]*

T. R. Barker, PhD, has taught anthropology at the University of Toronto and the University of Western Ontario, Departments of Anthropology. – He has done anthropological research in the Northern Region of Burkina Faso, Northern Region of Ghana, Oro, and the East New Britain Provinces of Papua New Guinea. He has worked on development projects in Burkina-Faso, Northern Region of Ghana, Southern Africa, East New Britain Island, and the high montane zone of the Oro Province. His continuing interests are the Northern Region of Ghana, the Ateker of Uganda-Kenya-Sudan-Ethiopia, and the ancient Papuan systems of the old "Northern District." – For publications, see Ref. Cited.

"La tortue dit que si elle a une flèche au corps,
ce ne peut être qu'un parent qui l'a tiré"
(Dogon)

Introduction

This essay[1] constitutes an attempt to circumscribe Tait's notion of the contrapuntal lineage and clan and to place them in consistent theoretical, analytical, empirical, and local perspective. It is suggested that the various contrapuntal forms examined emanated from a West African ontology and that this trans-local ontology (and gnoseology) was mirrored in a second ordered local ontology, which was simultaneously structural (a "structural term," Tait 1955b) and sociological perhaps somewhat in the style of Giddens (1984; and Cohen 1987). The primary ethnography used in this connection is the Konkomba of the Northern Region of Ghana (or Northern Ghana as some might have it), and in a limited manner the Dogon of Sanga, the latter largely remaining within Tait's anticipatory analysis. The congruence with Michel Izard's essays as collected in "L'Odyssée du pouvoir" is noted, particularly where African political thought is fused with the phenomenology of space (1992: 35). There is a balance between diachrony and synchrony in the status

1 Barring the addition of an exergue, the modifications that I have made to this manuscript since 1994 are minimal. The modifications are qualificative or they are changed to a past tense where the "ethnographic present" (1930–1950 or somewhat earlier) originally predominated.

Notes on the Orthography: The sometimes awkward appearance of the orthography owes to the fact that, as nearly as possible, I have attempted to maintain the form of the original sources even where that form was a modified phonetic transcription.

https://doi.org/10.5771/0257-9774-2013-1-117
Generiert durch IP '3.21.93.38', am 30.07.2024, 01:47:51.
Das Erstellen und Weitergeben von Kopien dieses PDFs ist nicht zulässig.

of the person (1992: 36). They are reflexive in the "lived-in" duration and the "extension." Together they are existentially co-valent. In his essay Izard (1992: 42–44) provides a statal perspective:

> En quelque sorte, les sociétés non étatiques ménagent les places du pouvoir et du sacré disjoints, même si elles pensent le pouvoir et le sacré dans la dualité conjointe. Tout se passe comme si l'État existait en creux dans le pré-étatique, sans qu'on puisse parler d'une intentionnalité pro-étatique, mais sans qu'on puisse a fortiori envisager la visée fantasmatique inverse, porteuse d'une dénégation première d'un exorcisme de l'État. A l'histoire de jouer, qui produira de l'étatique ou n'en produira pas, mais ne se heurtera jamais à la "nature" de la société s'il agit finalement d'en produire (Izard 1992: 43).

Part I: Social Organisation of the Konkomba

The Konkomba, who, in 1966 numbered perhaps 110,000, in 2003 were estimated at about 500,000. They originally lived alongside the Oti River, "on a grassland plain that lies between the low hills of Eastern Dagomba and the Kotokoli hills" (Tait 1953: 213). There is a dialect of Bekwam or Northern Gushiego[2] in Dagomba and it was, supposedly according to Tait, not intelligible to those of the Oti plain. Not going into detail, and farther afield, there are the surrounding Basare or Bedzelib, the Gurma or Bùgruu, and the Kabire. The matter can be put into relief by considering the late 19th-century "Gurunsi" towns and settlements as given by Binger (1892) and Stanford (1897).

In spare form, the Konkomba are Bekpokpam, *be-* being the prefix for people, a mass noun prefix. The Dagbane form is Kpakpambe and we may imagine that the term Konkomba originated with the latter. The land inhabited by Konkomba is *kékpokpam* or "Konkombaland."[3] The language is Lekpêkpam.

A clan less clearly, but a maximal/major lineage is *onibaa*, "one man," the corporation.[4] The clan is defined by its scarification and totem.[5] Analytically Tait states that "The territorial groupings are also kin groupings and each local group is either a clan or a segment of a clan" (1958: 200).

Tait divides former Konkombaland into numerous clan "districts," and for purposes of his initial area of study, perhaps five of the fourteen or so reported "tribes" (principally Betshabob, Nakpantib, Bemokpem, Begben, Kpaltib). It should be noted from the outset that the terms "territory" and "district" are used indiscriminately by Tait without presentation of either bounded tracts of land as tribal "territories" or district sometimes as anything more than an indeterminate area centred on an earth shrine or *nteŋbe*. There is no word in Konkomba for "district" (Tait 1958: 168). However, even though there is no word for district, if one, for example, refers to *bêmwatiak* (people), the change to a *ke-*, *ke-* or *ku-* prefix denotes the "land" of those people, e.g., Kumwtiak (Tait 1955b). Later, in consideration of the Sanga Dogon it should be reported that Tait (1955a: 208) refers to the "district" of the *hogon*. Tait (1952: 109) says that the district is a "natural unit" since "subdivisions of the clan carry out separate rites."

The elder[6] of a district or sub-district and the kin group which occupies it is the *onekpel*. The elder at all levels of segmentation is *n'te*, my father. Diagrammatically, by generation, the following emerges.

2 In the area of Gushiego in the 1950s were Dagomba, Konkomba, and Komba. Without emphasising Tait's proposed mechanism for the incorporation of Konkomba into state apparatus, "Here the Komba and Konkomba hold 26 out of 34 Kambuonsi sub-titles and the Guɪi Kambuong Nakpema is a Konkomba" (Tait 1955a: 206).

3 *Kékpokpam* is subject to many glosses. From the outset, although not emphasised by Tait, it should be given that he did refer to it as the largest arbitrary political and ritual unit. The similarity between the term and *kékpo*, the "hunter," is noted.

4 Tait (1952: 54) sees, for example, the "contrapuntal" District of Kitiak (Ngkwodo), and its "offshoots" identified as Barangaman. They may refer to themselves as Onibaa. That is, the term is "extended" and Tait glosses it as "fellow members of a District."

5 Totem as standard anthropological classification is notably limited in Tait's writings. There is no term of reference which includes it as identity and nothing at that level or as practice which would allow the presentation of animal and other organic totems in relation to *onibaa* as the clan or lineage, or the presentation of minor personal totems attached to lesser segments. Except in myth, and that seven clans observe totemic prohibitions (*kwo*) as the crocodile (*buakwintib* and *kpaltib*), leopard (*genangman*), cobra (*sobibtib*), and wolf (*bekjumbwam*). Tait (1958: 178) does note that totemism is more usually "linked with those who 'hold spirits' and with those 'sent by' a shrine" ("spirit owners," *kébwabég/mbwabém*), and that totemism does not appear at the tribal level.

6 Oddly, in another study centred on Wapuli and Yankasia (Steele and Weed 1966), there was a term for "elders" in the plural, which is *binìngkpîb*. The difference between *komba* and our subject is well demonstrated in the "line" which Tait (1952: 10 f.) drew to demarcate the Tshereponi as being Kworli, Demon, Sunson, and Tsheriponi (Tsheriponi Feme and Malba attached to the Dagomba and not to the Mamprusi). Wapuli itself was a [sic.] Bênafiab market attended by Kabire and Tschakosi. This brings into question the coordination of Sansanne Mangou, Nalori Anufo, Komba, Konkomba and Dagomba, Mamprusi, and Nanumba (E. Goody 1973; Kirby 1983, 1985, 1993). In the opposite direction, Toma is to have been subdued in the 14th century, while Naya (Yendi) remain separated and dispersed as from the 17th century. Konkomba within Dagbon chieftancies were absorbed through the *tendana* line and military organisation, but not to be confused with a reported Dagban usage of *tengbiisi*.

https://doi.org/10.5771/0257-9774-2013-1-117
Generiert durch IP '3.21.93.38', am 30.07.2024, 01:47:51.
Das Erstellen und Weitergeben von Kopien dieses PDFs ist nicht zulässig.

1 *onibaa*/elder for maximal lineage

2 *otindaa – onekpel*/elder for major lineage

[3 *benatshom*/elder for his segment][7]

4 supra-ordinate minor lineage/elder

5 minimal lineage/*otʃendaa – ledetʃar* for the compound

Fig. 1: Lineage representation through 4 generations

The *otindaa* is ritually senior to *onekpel*. He is the landowner and master of the earth – perhaps having been "sent by the earth." But he may "hold the people," and "hold the land as well," that is *u dzo benib* and *u dzo kekeng* ("land") *mu*. This is or can be paralleled with *onekpelanib*, the "elder's people" or men of his segment, while *otindanib* are the "owner's people," the earliest settlers of the district, or, again, he or she "who was sent by the land" (earth as *ntõ*).[8] The latter may partially approximate "those who rise from the earth."

The clan district is as *bije bibaba*, "they are of the same clan." It is more correctly that "they are by themselves" in the sense of autonomy as a lineage, as opposed to those who are *onibaa*, or of the same minimal, minor, major, or maximal lineage, clan or tribe. Tait gives [sic.] *bibaba* as "different" or "another" clan. Clan mates are *dejaa*. For example, a husband's clansmen are *tʃatijoo* (pl. *tʃatijaa*), a woman's clansmen are *nindzatib* (sing. *nindza*).

At the working level of the major lineage in the elder's compound is found the *dzambuna* which is given as an object of rainmaking and "the present symbol of the living kin group." It is not a shrine or *luwaa* – the matter is ambiguous. What Tait may have been thinking of was a division between "living" and "dead" at a high level of inclusion or ritual categories. There are five basic shrine types, the *nteŋbe* or earth shrine, the *kpambwer* or fertility shrine, the *njitshuror* water shrine, *tshan* or ancestor shrine (of the compound), and *kewabo* which is given as a shrine "without special attachment" (Tait 1952: 229), and a market shrine. A Konkomba market was named after its shrine, usually found as a *baobab*. In the matter of *dzambuna*, although, again, it is specifically denied that it is a shrine, Tait reported, *"Dzambuna a waa lena"* (*dzambuna* is a shrine). Also, if it is not stretching the concept of shrine, *igi* might be considered a medicine shrine. Tait did comment regularly upon the convergence of *dzambuna* and *igi* at various levels and under various conditions. However, if the village is contraposed, an adjacent major lineage is given as "those who helped him," that is those who assisted the founder. Hamlets and villages are often named for the apical ancestor of the occupying segment.

Minor lineages, for purposes here, may be given as "he who came here first." The minor lineage, likely as not, contained the *igi*, a focus for prophylaxis in homicide and a shrine.[9] Should the minor lineage be of the supra-ordinate variety, it will include nuclear segments as localized descent groups. It follows that what can be one, two, three, or four such nuclear segments in a supra-ordinate minor lineage are short lived. Below this level are the households and, in particular, the extended household or *do*. Membership, to phrase it as Tait might have, is "counted through both males and females". It is the site of the *njog* or medicine shrine. I would assume that most of the "villages" with markets (where the "Elder of the Market"[10] or *onjandaa* is from the lineage opposed to the "owners people") are contraposed. Formerly, a variant of this theme was found in control of the product of the tri-annual hunt, redistributed to households by the elder of the maximal lineage, probably formerly associated with second burials.

In gross terms, the land shrine or *nteŋbe*, for Tait, is definitive of the clan territory as a district and one assumes one maximal lineage. In this way one relation of clanship is the congregation, or the "Council of Elders," and their real or imagined authority, and traditionally the interrelation of varied ritual. Council in its temporal and policy-creating sense was apparently suppressed by Tait even though the contributions to the local government are noted. The term for "meeting" is *kukumtab* (no plural form is given in Tait 1954a). New maize rites and yam rights are exercised in the compounds of minor or major lineages. The "unity" of the minor lineage is found in the medicine shrines and those who "hold spirits," an expansive category. Tait emphasised that the unity of the contraposed lineage was found in subscription to the earth shrine (1953: 213). In the terminol-

7 *Benatshom* is congruent with Konkomba age-sets or *onatshipwatotib*. Tait allows that *benatshom* is a term "used by an elder when speaking of men of his segment and can be used by the Elder of a minor lineage, major lineage or a clan" (1958: 196).

8 That is, the *otindaa* may also be first, or elder, not of a lineage, but of the category of "spirit holders" who were "sent by the land" within the major lineage (Tait 1952: 143).

9 It should be noted that a relatively large number of shrines were available to Konkomba, but these were not nearly consistently hierarchically associated with levels of lineage segmentation as among the Dogon. At least, Tait did not present them in such an ordered fashion.

10 From the north of the Konkombaland again "market" is given as *kiñeng*, while it is *kénja* in the south.

https://doi.org/10.5771/0257-9774-2013-1-117
Generiert durch IP '3.21.93.38', am 30.07.2024, 01:47:51.
Das Erstellen und Weitergeben von Kopien dieses PDFs ist nicht zulässig.

ogy associated with the very active lower elements, houses – the term here is used in its commonplace English language sense – or an area of houses, is *ngetembu*, "the houses."[11] The *do* is a house and family.[12] *Letʃeni* is the compound proper and the site of several houses. The generic master shrine is at the doorway (*ibisamwab*) to a compound, the door, *dzaleŋ dzale*. This is where sacrifices are made to a remote ancestor or a father. It is the entrance to the compound. The patrimony of the father is "stuck into the thatch above the door of the room that gives access to the compound" (Tait 1952: 200). It is as the painted cross and hoe blade forming a lintel. This may be Tait's *tshan* or ancestor shrine.

The compound proper, again, is *letsheni* (Tait 1952: 160). The area of the compound is *lenampar* (pl. *ngenampar*), or "house" (Tait 1952: 165). The head of the household is *ledetʃar*, the "senior male." Interestingly, Tait also gives the compound as *ledetshar* with the plural form *ngedeʃar*, and later the "householder" becomes *otʃendaa*, a formal title.[13] The compound is divided as children of one room (*kedig*) (Tait 1952: 169), itself a "descent line" and *naabim*, one father, and one house, and the compound as *taabim*. The *letʃendaa* refers to those in the compound as *ma nib*, "my people" (Tait 1954b: 138). All levels of household, minor and major lineage (or tribe?) may be characterised as *ti je mfum mba*, "we are one."

11 For the purposes of the thesis here it is important to note that in again referring to the area closer to 9° north latitude that probably the houses as a hamlet were referred to as *ngetembu* as opposed to the "bush" or *timwoni*. Nearer Wapuli though and unnoted by Tait, a "town" was given as *kïting* and plural form */tìm*. The second term for "town" might well historically be found to refer to a "village" and market. In addition, Tait saw the market as a matter of "inter-clan, inter-tribal and inter-national relations" (1958: 183) while the view taken in this article is that markets are fundamental to the district-region and contraposed clan village.

12 Tait (1952: 166) at one point characterised the *do* as a "… group descended from a common grandfather counting through both males and females, a group often spoken of under the term 'kindred'." He relied on the notion of the "extended house" which functioned "exclusively" in the marriage system, that is, "[t]he prohibitions on marriage relate to individuals not only as members of a category of kin but also as members of extended houses" (Tait 1952: 167).

13 It strikes me as difficult to understand given the terminology of *letʃeni*, *lenampar* and *ledetʃar*, and the title *otʃendaa* why Tait failed to exploit them in a definitive and detailed sociological manner in the style of Fortes, in particular the *le-* prefix as in *letengbale*.

Part II: Contrapuntality

Often avoiding the term "territory," Tait offers essentially intra-district segmentation and extra-district fission as mechanisms or strategies for regulating the horticultural carrying capacity of land. The former may or may not result in contrapuntally organised clans while the latter invariably does. That is his emphasis is virtually exclusively placed on contrapuntal lineages in the fact of extra-district fission. In the matter of segmentation it is taken, as with Fortes, that the mechanical structure of segmentation is as complementary filiation: That is "matri-central" lines (Fortes 1953: 33), as the complementary line of filiation which juncture becomes the focus for segmentation. In one of his articles, Tait (1958: 179) chooses an expansive portrayal of "fusion":

> … to show that this autonomy is a fusion of parts. It is this fusion of lineage segments into a clan by means of territorial, ritual, legal and agnatic ties which creates the political system of the Konkomba.

What is suggested here is that the residentially and "territorially" compact lineages or clans as villages represent a "region." The remainder of this exposition of Tait explores the statement.

Initially the proposition is made in this fashion for the same reason that Tait (1950b) reinforced the use of Griaule's term "region" for Upper and Lower Sanga,

(1) a Konkomba district is not a tribal unit, and
(2) nor is it a singular ritual unit, and
(3) the authority of the *otindaa* may be extended in the filial relationship engendered by clan segmentation, and
(3a) in the contrapuntally organised village the authority of the *onekpel* as "the owner of the people" is not stated as extending to the whole "District." It may do so as a "Council of Elders" who sacrifice to, and consult the earth shrine (among other shrines)
(3b) if "gemelléité" is a predisposition of Dogon, why should it not also be a predisposition of Konkomba? And, in advance of the discussion, are the *manto/mantotib*-kith expressions of clanship and agnatic kinship, among other things, not founded on pairing?

First an ethno-linguistic detail must be repeated. Each time that Tait formulated his statement of clan types, and emphasising contrapuntal lineages, he was fond – not to put it any more strongly – of using the terms "propinquity" and "contiguity" in

https://doi.org/10.5771/0257-9774-2013-1-117
Generiert durch IP '3.21.93.38', am 30.07.2024, 01:47:51.
Das Erstellen und Weitergeben von Kopien dieses PDFs ist nicht zulässig.

reference to the arrangement of houses and compounds. Tait's near exclusive use of the word "hamlet" should be born in mind. In more detail, one of Tait's schemas, a typology and formative processual analysis follows. First, it is necessary to state that Tait comes very close to invocation of Malinowskian needs, masquerading as ecology, as will be understood in the insufficiency of arable land as the limit of agnation, but it is given here that such needs as security or as apparent desirability or necessity do not supersede the requirement of order and order as classification (Lévi-Strauss and Jack Goody). A combinative reconstruction of Tait's proposed formative processes follows:

(1) a nuclear lineage (see Tait 1956) or minor lineage settles in a new district (e.g., Banjuni and Kulpene Valley). They state a common ancestor
(2) No. (1) becomes a major lineage with one *ntengbe* and is exogamous.[14] It is virtually always segmented into two minor lineages, and "invariably" so when it is constituted by a single "hamlet"
(3a) No. (2) develops and segments to form two major lineages with contraposition of *onekpelanib* and *otindanib*, which are exogamous if contiguous (e.g., Benangmam, Bwakwintib),
(3b) if not contiguous, they do not go into contraposition (e.g., Kpeotib, Bemwatiak)
(4a) No. (3a) lineages are named independently, remain contraposed and intermarry (e.g., Benasom, and Bekumbwam and the major lineages of Nakpando-proper)[15]
(4b) they form intermarrying segments which are not contraposed (e.g., Sobib, Tshegbam, Gbenza, Nalog)
(5a) one or the other lineages of (4a) segments (e.g., Saboba, Kukwen, Kedzabo)
(5b) No. (4a) major lineages, one or both, segment (e.g., Sangul, Kukwen).

As much as this processual typology is inclusive for Tait's purposes of description of the forms of unitary, compound, and contraposed lineages and clans encountered, it de facto ignores intra-systemic change. To explain, it ignores intra-systemic change except as the exogenous variable of ecology which is weighted toward inter-systemic behaviour. That is, it specifies interpenetration and domination of a generally diminutive variety as fission, fusion, and awkwardly as segmentation, but principally fission and concomitant elision (Tait 1952: 200, see also Goody 1958). Everything proceeds, seemingly, in known "ecological and structural conditions" (Tait 1952: 262). Tait (1952: 191) suggests that once a major lineage has more than 250 people, it "segments" to form two major lineages. Fortes (1953: 32) observed:

> Just what the optimum spread of lineage segmentation in a particular society tends to be depends presumably on extra-lineage factors of political and economic organization of the kind referred to by Forde (1947).

An Elder, to underscore the historical reality of degradation of the ecology and colonisation, expressed it as,

> The Konkomba too came and get here stay. They generally get up and go across the river [Oti River] to stay. They divide thus to stay by themselves because there is no land to hoe (grow) food and eat. They divide and stay by themselves, stay alone, they too stay by themselves.

The original of the text is not offered but I believe it is reasonable to accept that "they too stay by themselves" is as [sic.] *bibaba*, separate and autonomous. This is likely to be the net result of extra-clan fission: A separate existence as dramatic action. In a more than somewhat variant bent and direction, it is suggested that Tait's schemata (points 1 through 5b) demonstrates intra-systemic transformation. His schemata's changes are internal to,

(1) a social system, society or "tribe,"
(2) a clan formation or creation,
(3) a district or part thereof, and
(4) as Tait had almost done, the "changes" may be phrased entirely within the form and meaning of the lineage system and its political structure.

It is possible now to look at the other historical statements of the problematic. The more public and accessible statements by Middleton and Tait are instructive. Here for example (1958: 18):

> Symbiotic union of a rather different kind occurs in West Africa, where there may be a distinction between "chiefs" and earth priests, each representing groups which claim

14 Elsewhere (Tait 1958: 178) Tait summarises that he had one Konkomba example of segments of different tribes going into contraposition. And as concerns exogamy, or more specifically those examples of two units of the same district which are not exogamous, it is attributed to, "… the breakdown of exogamy between Owner of the Land's People and Elder's People … due, in part, to a wide dispersal of their segments in unusually large districts."

15 This even though "… marriage between two inhabitants of the same village is never permitted" (Tait 1952: 193).

https://doi.org/10.5771/0257-9774-2013-1-117
Generiert durch IP '3.21.93.38', am 30.07.2024, 01:47:51.
Das Erstellen und Weitergeben von Kopien dieses PDFs ist nicht zulässig.

originally different ethnic origin and which are symbiotically related to one another so as to link all units into a single social system. Linkage of this sort is similar in many respects to that we have referred to as "aggregational" when discussing societies of Group III. This process of differentiation provides a means of absorbing aliens into the society. Whole groups may be absorbed, the original settlers perhaps becoming specially associated with the earth cult while invaders became associated more with a purely political chiefship.

Chiefs and earth priests[16] in Tait's category III-"societies" of un-centralised political authority and/or the segmentary lineage system, enter into a neutral "symbiotic union." However, this symbiosis occurs as either,

(1) between those "groups" originally of different "ethnic origin" (inter-systemically, e.g., Dagomba-Konkomba); or,
(2) between stranger or "alien" and host groups as intrusion and domination.

Neither point one nor point two strictly apply to the Konkomba in Tait's ethnographic present in terms of the acknowledged problematic. His presentation of the Konkomba was as those between various chieftaincies. But the use of "ethnicity" in such a context would be worthy of investigation.

Continuing, the regulatory nature of earth cults is emphasised as clanship to contrast with the lineage system proper:

In societies of this group there are often earth cults and similar institutions that inhibit the exercise of violence within a territorial unit. Earth cults reaffirm ties based on territorial propinquity rather than upon descent and so are closely connected with the political importance of overlapping ties of clanship (as it is found in these particular societies) as against those based on lineage (Middleton and Tait 1958: 21).

The question of relations of clanship will be taken up shortly. However, if one examines the invocations at the, minimally, five basic shrine types, those invocations will be seen as being principally directed to the ancestors (see fn. 18). Finally, the "Earth Cult" is emphasised as a principle of "locality or community." Certainly, lineage itself is based on a fine notion of locality[17] and locality as house and locality as community, if it is not often totemically (including shrines) exceptionally specific. It should be kept in mind that certain parts of Konkombaland, as with the area which Tait concentrated upon, had terms such as *bib^{w}órab* or "chiefs" (sing. *ubór* or *obwar*), sometimes given as *bibórb*, but that these were known as such (for Tait) only to the Dagomba Royal Chieftaincy (as *jaNabihinama*, *jaNakpambalnama*, and *janema*) and inside this kingdom,[18] and complementary fetish priests or *ub^{w}σσ* or *uboo*.[19] The standardised terms were *opwar* as "chief" (pl. *beb^{w}órab*) and *opwar* as "The Elder" (pl. *bipwòreb*). Full scale hostilities between Konkomba and Dagomba (Gonja, Nanumba, and Mamprusi) supposedly ended in 1923. Historically, Konkomba were enlisted as Kambonsi, probably in all Dagomba chieftancies. Continuing with Middleton and Tait (1958: 24 f.), who wrote, that

In societies of other types, and in particular of Group II [unitary state], the land or earth cult may be important, and the strongest sanctions on breaches of the peace by members of a congregation is that spilling blood pollutes land and threatens fertility. Whereas the ancestral cult in particular is a ritualization of organization based on descent, the earth cult is ritualization of organization based primarily on locality or community with a high degree of political interdependence of descent groups.

As much as the previous quotation applies to the centralised state, this, one assumes, is why locality and total localisation are often or usually expressed in the form of ancestor proper name + *-do*, for example, Udza**do** and Gbie**do** (*cf.* name + *-deja*, "people of," or "clan," "clansmen of"). Tait (1952: 118) thought this was in the "sense of descent lines." However, *do*, the family and extended family, is as well the house, *do*. To extend the use of the word "house," Umbwar (Uumwar, as it appears in Tait 1961: 226) is the High God, and one may say Umbar**do**, the House of God. Tait observed that the principal cults, the earth cult and the ancestor cult, "are in the end unified, in the final conception of the supreme deity" (1958: 193), but he denied the possiblity of a Konkomba cosmology. The emphasis is on the unison of locality and lineage as *onibaa* (pl. *benbam*). One should as well repeat Fortes (1953: 36) where he noted, that "… lineage and locality are independently variable and how they interact depends on other factors in the social structure."

16 Again to give a Wapuli example, the "Master" or "Owner of the Earth" is termed *tindaàn*, such terminology befits an area in close contact with a true statal organisation and domination of autochthons.

17 Locality is often tied directly to the notion of house and perhaps a specific related shrine, but there is also the more mundane sense of place as *kipepèg* in the northern Konkomba dialect.

18 This emphasis on true pyramidical offices no longer corresponds to the simplistic division of East and West Dagbon.

19 See also the role of the "diviner" in Tait (1954c) or where it is given as *obwa* (pl. *bêbwab*).

https://doi.org/10.5771/0257-9774-2013-1-117
Generiert durch IP '3.21.93.38', am 30.07.2024, 01:47:51.
Das Erstellen und Weitergeben von Kopien dieses PDFs ist nicht zulässig.

In this view, "lineage and locality" as with descent, filiation, and conceptions of the person vary independently. However, they can vary as the form of the ontology of lineality and contrapuntality. In consonance, ritual "allegiance" (observance, dedication, membership) follows (or creates) "genealogical" segmentation and each emphasised or superior structural discrimination (or exclusion) may be differentiated in ritual or its symbols.

The foregoing is largely the manner in which Tait presented the Konkomba. It can be added that each structural differentiation may have a specific "ritual symbolism" and be sanctioned in ritual. However, Fortes (1953) was concerned with locality as the compactness and exclusivity of the lineage to the limit of the importance of residence (e.g., Kroeber) and citizenship. How "lineage and locality" interrelate in social structure is as lineality and contrapuntality. The latter, lineality and contrapuntality, may have been, in turn, viewed as the general constitutive principles of acephalus and less acephalus social systems of the area.

As concerns locale, the situation is one in which the extended house or family as *do*, for Tait, is transient. But this transience is only such for a chosen level of segmentation. This understatement or lack of balance in the presentation of the significance of the lower levels of segmentation, in particular the minor and minimal lineage and its segments, as against the offices and such, of the domestic domain belies the importance of location and locality. More mundanely, the invocation of "house" and big or great house and the correspondence with agnatic segments and locales masks the more fundamental issue. It must be kept in mind that "house" is the dominant idiom in such systems while "compound" and "quarter" may only vie with it for importance. This is especially true when a knowledgeable discussion of a settlement as opposed to some superficiality is concerned.

Fortes initially saw locality as intra-systemic boundary and later he saw locality as congruent with social structure (1953: 22). He continued to argue that local bonds ("ties") do not seem to give rise "to structural bonds in and of themselves" (1953: 36) in this connection. That is, he was considering more than simply cases for which the lineage was not territorially and residentially compact as the contrapuntal village/clan considered here. Fortes would still, however, insist on "common political or kinship or economic or ritual interests for structural bonds to emerge" (1953: 36). The convergence of the three elements, political interest, economy, and kinship would seem demonstrated in the contrapuntal lineage and clan village.

More to the subject pursued here, Fortes (1969a: 234) wrote the following:

> The Tallensi provide an interesting example of a society in which there is a very strong tendency towards a general equilibrium in the collective life. What we have called Tale society is a social region demarcated by the range of the dynamic equilibrium that prevails within it. Non-Tale means simply outside this equilibrium; or rather, to be precise, it means on and beyond the circumference of this equilibrium. This is the essential difference between societies like the Tallensi and those that derive their unity from defined territorial boundaries and subjection to a common, all-powerful government. That does not mean that a segmentary social structure and a pyramidal social structure are necessarily mutually exclusive.

First, the expansive use of "region" is noted. Second, Middleton and Tait and then Fortes "play" with the applicability of the term stranger in relation to the segmentary lineage, while simultaneously relying on "ethnicity" to form their descriptive necessity. Third, Fortes did not see the slightly pyramidical structure of a state or proto-state as exclusive of a more acephalus rendering in "dynamic equilibrium" or vice versa. Certainly the Tale provides evidence of such dualism, without considering the "cult" of the Hill Talis as the external Bowar.[20] Fourth, and most important is the notion of "equilibrium" which Fortes generalised and which Tait had generalised in the extreme for the Konkomba though not in the same sense. Does the contrapuntal village or the contrapuntal lineage or clan in some way jeopardise the idea of parity *in equilibrio*? Perhaps there is as much to be learned in this sphere from the development of Islam, which was presented by Tait as negligible in the 1950s for Konkomba-proper.

Fortes stipulated that lineage organisation (the segmentary lineage system) required societal homogeneity. He relied on Radcliffe-Brown (1950) and the substitutability of equivalent persons, as the same customary practices or usages and body of knowledge. I would suggest that this extended Konkomba example finds that descent does appear to take precedence in the classification (identity) and association of individuals, but it is paralleled

20 It would be unwise to look for the reason of "region" in the opposition often expressed between plain and hill populations of the same people. Rather, such divisions are most often founded in revised ancestor cults and opposition to colonial rule – and that latter as likely as not in areal interethnic organisation. As is given elsewhere the limits of Fortes' analyses were often given as the shear fact of residence and citizenship. The latter is important since the cult of the external Boghar (Fortes 1975) permitted non-Tallensi "clients" of the Hill Talis Cult to travel under its protection.

https://doi.org/10.5771/0257-9774-2013-1-117
Generiert durch IP '3.21.93.38', am 30.07.2024, 01:47:51.
Das Erstellen und Weitergeben von Kopien dieses PDFs ist nicht zulässig.

by a principle of contrapuntality and, for instance, a strong congruence of a jural-political system, statuses "symbolised" in ritual in, at least, the expectation and anticipation of a holder-heir model, and the nature and extent of political authority.

More than this, however, one may accept "political interests" as, in part, contrapuntality and that as a basis for renovation or renegotiation or a polity. Tait (1952: 236) acknowledged order or "good order" in the Konkomba political system. Contrapuntality itself, along with descent, constitutes an ontological order of interactive principles which are primary to structural "bonds." They generate apparently non-homogeneous systems where stability, rigidification and equilibrium are variable in an analytical sense. For Tait, "[i]n the Konkomba system all structuring from the family to the clan are unstable" (1952: 161). It should be remembered that Fortes' implicit principle, secondary to lineage, was parity.

The origin of parity, as a principle, is most obvious in "Kinship and the Social Order" where a chapter of "ethnographic specimens," titled "The Kinship Polity" (Fortes 1969b: 101–121), are uniquely Australian, "[i]nternal structural controls operate in the Australian kinship polity" (119). And somewhat differently: "In such a polity the domain of kinship … constitutes *eo ipso* also the domain of political and jural relations" (118).

Recall the previous citation of Tait (1958: 200) where territorial groupings, localised clans, and clan segments are "kin groupings." Kinship "groupings" constitute a generic collectivity. The extreme of Radcliffe-Brown's Australia to one side, Fortes would have acknowledged the universality of polity as points one and two following,

(1) corporate organisation with "metaphysical" (Fortes 1969b: 121) allocation of rights and responsibilities, and,
(2) in which developed political systems, corporation represents allocation of the rights and responsibilities of goods and resources[21] generally.

And it may be added, recalling Fortes (1969a: 234),

(3) the polity inherent in the specific form of contrapuntal lineage "hamlet," and contrapuntal clan-village, both internal and external of social structure, which is also reinforcement and realignment as a "Council of Elders" (Tait 1958: 180), and one such structural bond is *manto*. The contraposed village goes beyond "moral obligation" in Evans-Pritchard's sense. It is not formulated on a "breach of law" or a "breach of customary standards"; there is no question of contravention of custom or moral requisite or jural entitlement in its general consideration.[22]

That is, goods and resources considered against region and district [sic., territory], office, rank, warfare, property, trade, natural and other resources (e.g., cultural resources) and technology or an empirical corporateness. A statement of point (3) (above) allows an agnatic kinship polity; and, second, seemingly, or by inference, a polity marginally congruous with state organisation. Again, as with Fortes (1969a: 234) neither is mutually exclusive except as typology and "government" in a stricter sense.

The definition which one searches for is first the autonomy of the lineage, second the autonomy of a territory or district as completed corporation in a localised clan or clan segment – "In Africa one comes up against economics …" (Fortes 1953: 18). This is not necessarily in conflict with Fortes and Evans-Pritchard in "African Political Systems" (1940). Third, there is the approaching political economy of an estate proposed by the contrapuntal lineage as a nascent corporation conceptualised as, or in terms of polity. However, in this view, the "hamlets" and/or compounds (*letsheni*), whether contrapuntally organised or not, simultaneously as domestic groups, *do* in its polysemy, are an equivalent and usually homomorphic unit, group, and corporation which may seem to conflate the estate.

Society is equated to a political order, the clan, but equally a polity. This is because it is generalised beyond the standard and major operational and analytical units of social structure in the fact of contrapuntality. It is no longer the source of the totality of the "moral person" as its "well marked social frontiers" (Morgan 1877 and the *gentes*) are, on the one hand, evidenced in the multiplicity of Konkomba-proper districts (their composition and fragmentation) and the presupposed equation of district and clan; and, on the other hand, precise in their completeness and density, as residentially compact, contrapuntally-organised lineages and clans. Traditional discontinuous groups, like the Konkomba, are reformulated in, for example, "Councils of Elders," and the contrapuntal clan village. This is probably why Tait, in a number of senses and on a number

21 One example of such reordination, aside from the contrapuntal lineage and clan themselves, may be concomitant exogamy of the contraposed village.

22 It is a voluntary association at one level, which does not preclude *la politique*.

https://doi.org/10.5771/0257-9774-2013-1-117
Generiert durch IP '3.21.93.38', am 30.07.2024, 01:47:51.
Das Erstellen und Weitergeben von Kopien dieses PDFs ist nicht zulässig.

of occasions, was careful to assert the Konkomba lineages as somewhat impermanent and temporary (cf. Fortes 1969a): "I do not believe the Konkomba major lineage to be a permanent structure, although Konkomba believe it to be so" (Tait 1958: 201).

From the vantage of a non-culturally oriented social anthropology, a Sudanic worldview or ontology will in part be found here in the brief ontology which was presented, and its mirror image in the manipulation and fashionability of sets of shrines and their congregations. In the end, it seems that the developed ordered ontology underlies the concept of region and simultaneously generates the region.

Part III: Fortes and Contrapuntal Village

We might exploit Fortes from a different perspective. In "On the Concept of the Person among the Tallensi" (1973) Fortes observed that the Tallensi and the Tallensi person are different from "some" other West African societies. These other societies, it seems, view the person (*personne morale*) as "… incarnating a mythological genesis of culture and humanity and where he is supposed to implement a pattern of life modelled on that mythological design" (Fortes 1973: 317). There is the "abstract person," but no "idiosyncratic individual."

In the 1930s, the Tale was a society defined and imposed on the person as "distinctive signs and indices" (Fortes 1973: 286) that formed the moral, and in particular, the jural capacities and aspects "that constitute," the *"personne morale"* (286). Here, again, and absolutely (289), Fortes distinguished Tale emphasis on patterned action "rather than belief and ideology." He found this common to the "Sudanic worldview" – a seeming contradiction, but, in a sense, a confirmation of sociology.

Altars or *bagher* [*boɣar*] are only the sitting-place or *zi-ziiga* of ancestors and pertain to all shrines. Ancestors (sing. *paa banam*) and ancestorhood remain definitive of the person. It is the *sii*, or soul, which is the medium of the person and it is objectified in a granary and all intimate possessions (*meng* or self).[23] Konkomba *ungwin* [sic., *ngwin*] is alternately glossed by Tait as "spirit" and "soul." It may be that as "soul" it has a content as substantial as *sii*. Although that seems unreasonable, functionally, it can be seen that the collective person of the lineage and that of the person-proper as the abstract person (*nit*) are co-equivalents in Fortes' presentation. That is the jural-political statuses are the only framework available; hence the reference to an extrinsic Sudanic ontology. Now as Fortes refers to the Tallensi as a trans-voltaic tribe he reserved the term region for that Gur-speaking "region." That is, region is used only to refer to cultural contiguity and is primarily linguistic. A single social structure was, for Fortes, a single culture, and a society was a socio-geographic region.

Tait began his thesis in uncovering one, then six, then seven contrapuntal clans, and then quietly assuming that contrapuntality was the rule rather than the exception for the old Konkomba tribes.[24] What has been attempted here has assumed the universality of contrapuntality. The changes necessitated by such a formulation are few. The fundamental change, however, is this: Fortes (1961: 180) found that authority is by "transmission and assumed devolution from ancestors." It has been proposed that there is an equivalent ontological principle in the Western Sudanic area, and that is the value of contrapuntality manifested and expressed in the form of the contrapuntal lineage, clan (and village) which are,

(1) a demonstration of "heterogeneous interest" (Barker 1991) fundamental to polity; and,
(2) that it is an hierarchical value, again a "structural term."

In the West African etic mode it was assumed that the lineage principle is primary and pre-extant. Analytically, it may be expected that the hierarchical value of contrapuntality along with the lineage principle, again, form the initial statement of an ordered ontology. This ordered ontology exists analytically as the reality and "spirit" or "esprit" (Izard 1992: 35) of intra-systemic and inter-systemic transformation and as statal and non-statal forms.

At its most basic one might assume that a village (as distinguished from a settlement, a hamlet, a compound, or a collection of houses, or simply "a house"), does not appear except as, at least, an artefact of contrapuntality. This may seem an erroneous manner with which to begin such a discourse. Given the use of the phrases "contrapuntal lineage" or "clan," it might be assumed that the referent, rationally, is the dominant lineage and its spatial distribution and valid ascendency or legitimacy. This would, of course, find it incorporated in Fortes' meaning of the lineage principle and allusions to centrality in

23 Now this is very different from state organisations like the Anufo where "pollution" or *fi* is the *incunabula* of lineality and location.

24 There is, in this text, no mention of "side", nor of deictics proper. I have elsewhere (Barker 2001–2005; 2006) given "side" as deriving from hybridization, from mutation, which is usually imparted much later in a series of epochalisations.

https://doi.org/10.5771/0257-9774-2013-1-117
Generiert durch IP '3.21.93.38', am 30.07.2024, 01:47:51.
Das Erstellen und Weitergeben von Kopien dieses PDFs ist nicht zulässig.

various spatial manifestations of lineage. However, by electing two ontological values, the lineage and contrapuntality, a number of possibilities emerged.

As has been discussed, the "Konkomba village"[25] is, or was a product of the contrapuntal lineage. These are the two ontological principles in operation. Simultaneously, the structuro-functional weakness and strength of the village – as opposed to the hamlet or settlement or relatively even dispersal of homesteads (Tiv) is its permanence of location,

> This permanence is exemplified in rigidification of territoriality and the imposition of the ideology of lineality on key role complexes. It cannot undergo fission and remain a "village" (Barker 1991: 12).

That is, the contrapuntal village, as contrapuntal lineage or clan, in a real sense represents the "disconsonance" between that village and the acephalus clan, and cumulative and transitive assemblages. One may correctly speak of the contraposed village or contraposed clan-village to denote the object of study. It cannot accept fission as legitimate process, only segmentation. In the example, lineage fission is a true artefact of local history.

The contraposed village, the village established as a polity through structurally contrapositioned lineages is the norm, or it is the norm in that local history. In such a village the relative position of the major segments is of a new order. The condition of contrapuntality is pre- and post-fissiparous/segmentary selection within the segmentary descent system as identity, one complex element of which is lineality itself. Contrapuntality, simultaneously reflects the ideology of the dominant ("that right") which contracts the "centripetal force of prior fission" (Barker 1991), and the possibility of contrapuntal organisation maintains the meaning and process of lineage fission itself, and segmentation.

This is the model, which in all likelihood allows contrapuntality as a hierarchical value prior to the lineage principle, or at least the fully elaborated jural aspect of the segmentary lineage (see Izard 1992: 91–97, 145–150). However, at one point, Tait surreptitiously offered that the origin of the contrapuntal lineage was the arrival from outside a district (as defined by clan relations) of a (minor) lineage "segment." This is the reason for the classifications of "contrapuntal clan village," "contrapuntal lineage," and contrapuntal village, and, as will be indicated later, contrapuntal clan regions.

There is, in general, a situation in which lineages may not go into contrapositioning. They are only less likely to be contraposed, if they are of another "people," another culture, or another social system. In such circumstances, or in those which are highly distinguished, they may remain as Fortes' "attached" lineages, if they are tolerated or entertained at all, save in the context of a market, as caste and trade guild. I would suggest that even with the qualification of gross cultural identity (*be-*), and language (*le-*), and place (*ke-*) that the possibility of a lineage or one of its segments "attaching" itself is not available unless the object of attachment is already a contrapuntal clan village, and not an acephalus and dispersed clan parish or district. Those "attached" lineages which Fortes observed, fasten themselves to their hosts, before the fact or after the fact, through the MB and ZS relationship for the most part. There is no indication of such a pattern among the Konkomba. Those which are beyond the gross details of pertinent ethnic identity remain as endogamous isolates, which function economically as a guild, caste, or often in the form of a *zongo*, which is a liberal approximation of the same thing. This does not deny Fortes' assertion that such West African castes are, like the resources they command, owned by opposed lineages. In practical terms, for Konkomba the form of the contrapuntal clan was as singular "pairing."

In this connection, Tait associated *ti nji bi* or "we know them" (1952: 132) with kith. It is a rather critical point given the internality of contrapuntality which Tait envisaged.[26] Tait (1952: 216) states that:

> The tie of kithship does not, in Konkombaland hold between members of different tribes. In some places Mossi who have settled alongside a Konkomba clan are invited to certain rites as kith.

The Mossi guilds and traders were actually attached to Konkomba marketplaces and not Konkomba villages. One must proceed carefully since an example of opposed tribal segments as Konkomba and Mossi was not as opposed Konkomba tribal segments. Later Tait (1952: 255) adds:

> … the relation between neighbouring clans as they formed would be parental/filial relations, which in the course of time would become relations of *mantotib* and kith once the [p. 266] relation of affiliation was forgotten.

25 The view of the Dagomba was that Konkomba "came without villages." This was always used to disparage Konkomba.

26 The obvious point to be made in this connection is that the Konkomba were subject to two national governments, and as many as three primary and three secondary states, not to mention the at least seven local government councils, and at one point three European colonial administrations, with the added complication of the Anglo-German Neutral Zone.

https://doi.org/10.5771/0257-9774-2013-1-117
Generiert durch IP '3.21.93.38', am 30.07.2024, 01:47:51.
Das Erstellen und Weitergeben von Kopien dieses PDFs ist nicht zulässig.

Kithship becomes an aspect of clanship evidenced processually. That is, segmentation yields lineage segments with definitive affiliation and that affiliation is generalised as filiative. Processually, over time, precise genealogical affiliation is obliterated, or suppressed, and relations of *mantotib* and kithship dominate. The emphasis is on clans of the same tribe, which acknowledge a mechanism for the end of blood feud (Tait 1952: 243) and quarrels (*bi sub twar*). It is precisely here in quarrels and feuds, which represent the complete panoply of "offences" (and most valued acts), that the proposition of a "Council of Elders" (1952: 245) is to be found. As concerns a previous reference to *bibaba* as autonomy and perhaps non-contiguity, more specifically, the pair do not attend each other's rites.

Elsewhere (Tait 1961: 127–132, 137, 140 f., 148 f.), *manto* became "common descent, kithship, and membership of a common tribe." That is, kithship is presented as being interior to the *manto* clanship and, in fact, was clanship as inter-clan relations, and refracted tribalism. It is refracted tribalism because of features already mentioned, and mainly because of *ti je mfum mba*, "we are one," in agnation.[27] To enlarge on this point, Tait attempted to maintain kithship "as a relation between structures" and one may agree with the observation if the complexity of the contrapuntal lineage is allowed. In the same manner, Tait (1952: 215) acknowledged that: "Though the *mantotib* relation may arise in agnatic kinship I am more inclined to regard it as a relation between a clan and the closest of its kith."

In other words and in practical terms, *mantotib* is formulated in the context of ordinary agnatic kinship. Its sturdiest manifestation would be as the contraposed lineages of the contrapuntal clan village with its convenience of a common, if often unremembered, apical ancestor. In any event, *manto* is not extended beyond the tribe (Tait 1952: 216), and supposedly "holds only between clans of the same tribe".[28] Since there are examples of different tribal lineages being contraposed, it may be assumed that the statement requires qualification (e.g., Najil District composed of segments of Begbem and Nakpantib tribes – Tait 1952: 191).

It is proposed that in the contrapuntal clan village the temporal and juridical form of a "Council of Elders" is superior to kithship, although it is its complement, and circumscribes the *manto* relationship. This is the converse of the view which principally equates *manto* (pl. *mantotib*) with "membership" in a tribe, or becomes the principal active and ritual expression of that unit. It is this aspect of the contrapuntal clan village as region which, again, demonstrates the density and convergence of relations beyond simple symmetry and equilibrium, and parity and its concomitant amity. This, in a grander perspective may not be so far removed from Fortes. In "The Dynamics of Clanship among the Tallensi" (Fortes 1969a: 233) one finds that:

> This system of regions or communities constituted primarily by the operation of the ties and cleavages of clanship is the foundation of a scheme of ritual values and relationships which serves to reinforce the clanship organisation by means of mystical sanctions and by co-ordinating the interrelations of lineages and clans at a higher level.

It might tentatively be suggested that the limit at which a lineage fragment, lineage or, clan fragment or clan, is not identifiable as a possible, appropriate, or legitimate contrapuntal pair is the limit of "society" and "region".[29] This may be the principal referent of Konkomba *gemelléité*.

27 This is not agnation conferred as a status, or the acquisition of such a status.

28 In some instances, Tait restricted *mantotib* to relations of assistance between clans "on ritual occasions," to the extent of redeeming vows at shrines (1952: 208). He did, however, see that "… when a clan is segmented in two major lineages, each major lineage regards the other as *mantotib*" (208). Filial clans or "offshoots" are not classified as *manto* since the relation is asymmetrical (212). Contradictorily, Tait added that, "[i]t is not to be supposed that the relation of *mantotib* arises from that of descent, though they are clearly of a very similar kind." This was given in the context of Nakpando-proper and Mwagan where the *mantotib* relation and filial-parental clan relation were congruent (213).

29 Fortes (1969a: 233) saw that patterned or systemic interactions between individuals and corporate maximal lineages were social relations. And these social relations were delimited by jural, ritual, and moral norms. This maximal lineage itself appears because of the "ties and cleavages" between itself and at least one other maximal lineage again expressed as morality, ritual, and the juridical. The relation between them is segmentary and this determines the "emergence" of new like "units." This is the foundation of the field of social relations as the differentiation and *accouplement* of lineages. He saw that clanship as a specific field of social relations and overlapping clanship or that reticulation produced three major zones of centricality of clanship in Taleland, implying obviously many subzones of increased articulation of clanship. One may in the present exercise consider that theoretically and analytically structure has been extended to the field of clanship or "clanship organisation" and the form of the facts of segmentation themselves, and fission and elision in this regard.

The prior citation of Fortes considered "regions or communities" as a system based in clanship (ties and cleavages) but he limited the basis of such a system or system of regions to "ritual values," and primarily, mystical sanctions, and secondarily "relationships." For our part this "higher level" coordination (Fortes 1969a), and one might add reordination, of lineages and clans can be communities as regions, that is, can be given as the contrapuntal lineage and clan, a structural function.

In more practical terms it was given in a note that extra-

https://doi.org/10.5771/0257-9774-2013-1-117
Generiert durch IP '3.21.93.38', am 30.07.2024, 01:47:51.
Das Erstellen und Weitergeben von Kopien dieses PDFs ist nicht zulässig.

In the system of the Konkomba, as described by Tait, the term "region" would refer to a contraposed clan village and its non-partible "territory,"[30] an estate in a significant economic sense, at minimum, a mandate. In the proposed general model, since there is a graduation and replication of "territorial" units corresponding to the modes of segmentation and fission, the attribution of economic functions does not result in reification of descent groups. To recapitulate, the contrapuntal clan village in a real sense represents the disconsonance between that village and the acephalus clan, and the latter's mirage of discontinuous groups to the horizon. It is in the contrapuntal clan-village that clanship begins to approach lineality for a second time, but then sometimes under political license.

An important point to be made for the Konkomba system is that – and this is ramifying – there is probably no contemporary *nteŋbe* or earth shrine except until indicated by the contrapuntal lineage as a "district" and its determined territory. That is, there would have been no earth shrine as determinately different from one form or another of an ancestor shrine or *luuwa*, but the variant uses of the earth shrine were dictated by the fact of contrapuntal organisation, or prior organisation as a segmentary state, or as a functionally integrated part of some form of existing state.[31]

One of the virtues of this approach is that it means that the reasoning by which Fortes proceeds from the person to the corporation and back remains essentially unchallenged or unchanged. The corporation as a person, a descent group, or, to use Fortes' words, a "political community," on the basis of this lineage principle alone allows full rein to that other Sudanic worldview. The construction of a village and its implied social and economic permanence in the model does not necessitate the determination or even influence on social structure by exogenous factors. It, however, remains a curiosity that Konkomba should have a term for "farmer," *okapaa* (pl. *bekpam*), the "pure horticulturalist."

In summary, the transformation of normative categories as they relate to groups and relations and status-role-office complexes has been presented neither as a negation nor as an inversion, simply as something which is somewhat paradoxical to social anthropology. What has been pursued is not a cultural model of hierarchy but bounded in value. This I take it, is what Kopytoff referred to as a "hierarchical ethic" (1987: 36) – that sort of normality which he applied to kingship, and might well be applied to ancestors and elders. The contrapuntal clan village and contrapuntal lineage, the former representing an extension of the latter, as (possible) regions, by contrast with the unitary and compound clan districts, is a matrix of relations which can link apparently contradictory empirical states so that although they appear to be contradictory or indicative of a non-normative order they represent, again, only an objective paradox, something quizzical. This is why "value" in ontology has been relied upon. It is, equally, why Dumontian contrariness has been continued, with allusion to a possible Fortesian Sudanic ontology.

> What I call hierarchical opposition is the opposition between a set (or more particularly a whole) and an element of this set (or of the whole)… The opposition is logically analyzable in two contradictory partial aspects: on the one hand, the element is identical to the set in that it forms a part thereof (a vertebrate is an animal), on the other hand there is difference or, more strictly, contrariety (a vertebrate is not *solely* an animal, an animal is not *necessarily* a vertebrate). This double relation – identity and contrariety – is stricter when a proper whole is concerned than when a more or less arbitrary set is involved (Dumont 1979: 809).

Tait (1955b) makes essentially the same but minimalised statement in referring to Radcliffe-Brown's (1952: 114 f.) "union of opposites." He appeared more comfortable with the phrase an "opposition of structures," which structures were not "hostile." His thought was founded on Nadel (1938, 1949) and owed more to functional identification of groups and their integration in accompanying ritual.

maximal lineage segments do go into contraposition on occasion, although perhaps it is non-"normative," avoided, or such an option presents itself less often – the latter is more likely the case. It can be seen that contrapositioning of lineages occurs at the level at which Fortes considers and at that of localised lineage segments or clans and sub-clans, which I assume is why "ties and cleavages" between such units were designated "clanship." In overly generalised terms Fortes and Evans-Pritchard (1940) emphasised minimal groups and locality as the interaction with territorial segments to form a political system(s). Differently, Fortes (1969a, 1969b) relied heavily upon lineage segments. That is to say, and the point cannot be emphasised enough, because of the lack of a systematic portrait of the kinship system and transactional forms and content, generally one is confined to the clan and its segments as the juridically, politically, and "morally conscious body" (Tait 1952: 11).

30 It should be apparent that both Tait and myself had occasionally used "district" to refer to a contrapuntalized village.

31 In consideration of the principles of fission and segmentation, from a more familiar perspective the following observation is made. Fission and segmentation were given as fundamental to contrapuntal organisation and contrapositioning (Fortes) generally, for Konkomba-proper and Sanga Dogon in the ethnographic present. This apparent dichotomy likely directly reflects the opposition, again respectively, of the discursive "city-state" orientation of the Nanumba and perhaps Dagomba, and the expansive segmentary state formation of the Nakambé.

https://doi.org/10.5771/0257-9774-2013-1-117
Generiert durch IP '3.21.93.38', am 30.07.2024, 01:47:51.
Das Erstellen und Weitergeben von Kopien dieses PDFs ist nicht zulässig.

As given in a note, in the time, Tait (1955b) in reference to Fortes (1936, 1940, 1969a) found contraposition in social organisation to be a loose lineage contraposition. It was to be a "technique" in the segmentary structure of "Tale society" which identifies an individual or "social group" in contrast with his "social identity." He does this in referring to the "most inclusive grouping" which disallows ambiguity of identification. This is a differentiation of "structures" (Tait), and refers to the "constitution" of descent groups. Tait (1955b: 526) thought there may be a "… process of cultural differentiation within structures such as descent groups, rather than differentiation and opposition of whole descent groups."

The result is that differentiation by role within the structure or groups finds the person "differentiated" by category and does not support corporate (sic., "enduring") groups. These formulations are supposedly witness to conquest or its absence. For Sanga Dogon, Tait (1950b, 1955b) did not allow contraposed lineages (which I have accepted). This is because (1) there was no demonstrated conquest of substance; and (2) Tait placed emphasis on a ritual division (ritual statuses) which had, in his view, also to depend on a conqueror-autochthon fact. The weight of his argument was the ritual division of *inneomo/innepuru*, living and dead men. This was to be demonstrated in the transmission of *nani*, usually of the agnatic line for males, or at least as agnatic kinship, while for females it largely followed from the uterine line. He concluded that it did not "divide the lineage into corporate groups within the lineage framework" (Tait 1955b: 526). He saw that it did not follow a strict agnatic principle. It only produced two "ritual categories," rather than an element internal to structure and itself structural. Contrarily, here, it is believed that the generation of regions and sub-regions evidence the contrapuntal lineage in strict terms. That is, "region" is a relevant structuro-political space, and is in the fact of segmentation, thus making the *inneomo/innepuru* categorisation quite secondary.

Part IV: Dogon in Detail and Gross Forms of Regionalism

In this section, I have elected to follow Tait's abrupt commentary on the social structure of the Dogon of Sanga – reflecting, perhaps poorly, Griaule and company. The Dogon of the Sanga region are considered only in the extremely limited terms offered by Tait in 1950. The reasons for this are: (1) the issue at hand is the possibility of "contrapuntality," and, (2) it is beyond the scope of this essay to deal with the massive Dogon literature (sociological and administrative), e.g., the statement of *cercle*, *canton*, and dialect areas in "Les dialectes dogon" (Calame-Griaule 1956) and elsewhere.

Tait (1950a: 176) viewed Dogonland (*gána*, world, country, and region[32]) as a unity, one assumes it to be a racial, cultural, and linguistic unity, to a large extent. The largest political unit he identified was the region, one example of which was Sanga, composed of Upper and Lower Sanga as sub-regions. Tait was more than somewhat ambivalent in the use of the term "region" and "district" in this respect, both of which could encompass "tribes" or "clans." The division of the sub-regions represents contrapuntal clan villages in the strict sense. Two tribal segments are recognised in Sanga, and Dyon is the dominant lineage. All, the then reported five Dogon "tribes," recognised an epynonymous clan ancestor, Dyon. Villages are thought of as being composed of one or more segmented lineages. They are divided as named *quartiers* and villages may have "attached" lineages as castes of leather workers and cloth-dyers, and, blacksmiths. Villages themselves are regrouped as "cantons." Administratively Sanga was represented as a "canton." Each named Upper Sanga (sub-regional) village may have its paired segmentary opposite, as did several villages in the Lower Sanga (sub-region). The four major lineages of Upper Sanga are "coordinated" after the fact of segmentation. The hierarchical organisation of shrines parallels the seniority of the segments of the lineage system. These lineages are "ritually superior and ritually inferior" (Tait 1950a: 184) – at the very least.[33] Without claiming validity – it came subsequently – Tait (1950a: 185) gives

32 See Calame-Griaule (1968: 92). "Space" is *gánu*. Its archaic form, guarded here is *ganá*. The village is *àna*, while "man" is *ána*, or *áyne*. The universe or world is *aduno*, the practical and historical world is as *gana*. When one refers to the "first-built houses" it is as that system, in reality a local model, or order objectified as the "houses of the old world." It refers to a historically integrated system, the outline of a region (*gana*), and an estate, and successive adjacent regions and estates. "Houses of the Old World" implies these facts but its truncative nature, the implication of a modern world system, or another system, is as sub-region and region as described.

The statal formation's counterpart to this view is most often the "world house" as the female earth deity, and wife of the epynonymous ancestor of the conqueror. It is again, indicative of an integrated system. The acephalus system, for example, Sanga Dogon recognise "force" as *góno*, *sême*, and above all, *pangá*.

33 Fortes noted two gross forms in which expansive political unity might be achieved. One form was the extension of the lineage to the greatest extent possible. His second form was for the "… common interest of the political community to be asserted periodically, as against the private interests of the

https://doi.org/10.5771/0257-9774-2013-1-117
Generiert durch IP '3.21.93.38', am 30.07.2024, 01:47:51.
Das Erstellen und Weitergeben von Kopien dieses PDFs ist nicht zulässig.

the minor lineage as *togu*.[34] The minimal lineage is *tire togu*. The minimal lineage may form a *ginna* [sic., *jinna*] or "large house." One *ginna* of a *togu* is ritually superior and "senior"[35] (185) to the others as genealogical depth. Most importantly, the *tire ginna*, the house of a minimal lineage is superior to the "Houses of the Old World."[36] It contains the *anayimung* and the *yayimung*, dead man and dead woman shrines. A maximal lineage is represented by the *lébé ginna* and the *lébé* shrine.[37] It seemed that because of the adherence of the members of Upper Sanga lineages to the *lébé* shrine in the *lébé ginna* that they constituted a maximal lineage. In the same manner, the Arou "tribe" of Lower Sanga sub-region, is dedicated to a *lébé* shrine, but that shrine is at some distance in a village called Arou, and lies outside of the region. In the same way, the lineages or the houses of the sons of the founder, Dyandoulou, each have an altar or *wagem* which may regroup them again as a major lineage. As noted in the discussion of the Konkomba, Tait used the term "region" because Sanga itself is neither a single tribal unit nor a single ritual unit. However, the political – not the ritual – authority of the *hogon*[38] extends to the Lower Sanga sub-region. The elder extends his authority through the "Council of Elders" or *ogonu seru*.

A minimal lineage is as *tire togu* with a "house" or *ginu na*, "great house" ("one in each quarter"). Descendants of founders, the first-built house "owned by the lineage" but at the minimal lineage level, are as an extended family. They are "entitled" to live in one of the "Houses of the Old World." Land is allocated to these houses. This is also the level of segmentation where the *ommolo* or family shrine is located. In contrast, a *ginu na* or "great house" is for the elder of a maximal lineage. At this level is found the *wagem* or altar, the ancestor shrine proper. Such an elder is *ginna bana* [sic., *gínna bangá*] (Guardian of the Great House, or *propriétaire de la grande maison*). He is head, probably of his *quartier*, head of his "House in the Old World," and/or head of his village if it is not divided.

To characterise the region of Sanga, Tait (1950a) suggested that all the lineages of Sanga, with the exception of the four major lineages of Dyandoulou, centred on the "Great House of Do," with its now divided *lébé* shrine, and were attached lineages in Fortes' sense. These attached lineages existed as sister's sons or sister's children. They are ineligible for the *hogon*ship. Essentially, because of the apparent rigidity of the shrine type according to the level of segmentation, he assumed that superiority or seniority was a function of ritual hierarchy. For the Konkomba, Tait reversed the formulation, "The orders of segmentation also give rise to a ritual hierarchy" (Tait 1958: 201).

---

component lineages, through religious institutions and sanctions" (Fortes 1953: 28).

The latter is the mechanism of the Tallensi and Yakö, arguably it encompasses the Dogon, although his first form would seem appropriate as well. To lend some sophistication to the matter, from the very large Dogon literature a related idea might be exemplified. Tait's emphasis on the term *togu* is noted. In a variant form the "first arrival," or founder of a village, plants the *pyègu* which is given as a specific fetish in Toro dialect. It accompanies the laying out of fields and terraces, and the construction of the *togu*. However, here the *togu* is both house (more specifically, here, the "first-built house") and lineage or lineage segment or clan. It is added that, "[e]ntre celui qui, le 'premier', a planté le *pyègu* et celui qui a construit le *togu*, qui a qualité à exercer le pouvoir, et quel pouvoir? Ces distinctions aboutissent à une véritable casuistique: un tel a planté le *togu* (sous-entendu: de ses mains), un autre l'a fait planter" (Gache 1993: 243). It is given form in a following footnote (1993: 243, note 14), "*Togu* signifie causerie; *togu na* ("causerie-mère") désigne, par extension, l'abri où se déroule la mère de toutes les discussions: la discussion politique."

The foregoing may be understood to be the exercise of Fortes' second form of unity, or more correctly a possible basis for it. It encompasses lineality, totemic segment, and house. It is couched in terms of first and later arrival, but indicates lineage and clan foundations against "la maîtrise de la terre" for the first arrivals (*à l'aîné*), and political power to the second arrival (*au cadet*). Certainly, today, the manner in which Dogon would reflect on this local model is as *panga*, force. It should be noted that the example chosen was the region of Aa and Aru. In another light, Tauxier (1917), and perhaps Tait, referred to the presence of the Rawa Naa at Sanga and Doubaré.

34 *Togu* or *tɔ̀gu* (Calame-Griaule 1968: 283) is given as "famille, espèce, catégorie, peuple, caste." One may speak of *árou tògu*, the "Arou tribe." And, "[a]u sens de 'famille', le term /tògu/ désigne 'tous les individus appartenant à une famille indivise exogame et rattachés au même /ginna/'". Again, from Calame-Griaule (1968: 277), evidentially this *togu* is not to be confused with *tógu*, as "abri," the meeting place of men, more correctly, *tógu nà*.

35 Senior and junior as "aîné" and "cadet." Concerning the Konkomba, Tait was careful to insist that "juniority" applied to ritual contexts, e.g., the filial clan, but was not an "organizing principle such that political consequences followed and larger units than the clan were built up" (Tait 1958: 174).

36 Somewhat artistically, the "House of the Old World" to which land is attached, seems, against contemporary houses, to be indicative of preceding layers of contraposed arrangements. That is, they are such in the association of "Houses of the Old World" with land, autochthony, and "first arrivals."

37 In referring to Calame-Griaule (1968) there is reference to *gána ème* [sic.] *lébé*, "the *lébé* of our region." It should be noted as well that *lébé* as a shrine is identified as an earth shrine, and central to the cult of the earth as fecundity and fertility, etc. It represents fecundity as the association of the python Lébé.

38 The office of *hogon* is better transcribed as *ogõ* [sic., ö'ö] (Tait 1955a: 208) and understood as the elder of a maximal lineage on some occasions.

https://doi.org/10.5771/0257-9774-2013-1-117
Generiert durch IP '3.21.93.38', am 30.07.2024, 01:47:51.
Das Erstellen und Weitergeben von Kopien dieses PDFs ist nicht zulässig.

Tait changed Fortes' and Evans-Pritchard's (1940: 6) emphasis on the lineage where unilateral descent groups create "corporate units with political functions." He laid all emphasis on the economic, ritual, and jural activities of clans and clan segments, i.e., on local groups. In fact, Tait would attribute the "coordination" of lineage segments and a repeated "coordination" of those segments to adherence to shrines (1950a: 185) as a function, again, of ritual superiority and seniority. The apogee of the relations is found as the *hogon* of the maximal lineage of Sanga and the *lébé* in the "House of Do."

As far as totemism was concerned *babinu* (*bínu*) or totemic ancestor[39] [sic., *biná viáy*] was, as suggested, the "father totem" (*bá bínu*) and the *bínu í* or "small" or lesser totem which was abandoned when its "owner" died (1950a: 189). *Binu* is a sign left by the ancestor, and the secondary representations of which, as stone amulets, are manipulated by the fetish priest or *binukedine*. *Binu* is also an animal representing the four standard prohibitions. These totems are transmitted patrifilially. A child must be *wagem i*, "child of the ancestors" and *binu i*, "child of the totem." In this connection, the ancestor is responsible for the totem; that group observes sacrifices to the totem shrines or *binu-turu*, later to become the clan. The *binu-turu* is in fact the *babinu* or "great totem," in the Sanga case, *yébéné*.

This Dogon clan is not exogamous, rather exogamy falls to the level of the minor lineage. In the majority of examples, *togu* was used to refer to any segment of the clan. One may speak of *togu turu*, "all one *togu*," and *togu tumoy*, "*togu* by itself." Tait saw the *hogon*, ideally chosen from the *inneomo*, the line of the living (*nani*) descending from the ancestor, and the *hogon*ship itself as rituo-political office;[40] with envoys, *ogono tire anye*, and assistants or *polugene*, other assistants as *buno kuknani* and a "Council of Elders." The complete set of office-role complexes finds incumbents, when it was necessary, consistently, and regularly, having moved to the house of the appropriate lineage, minimal lineage, and house with shrine specific to their office. The *hogon* had final authority over deliberations on discord and violence, in fact, all those actions and events requiring adjudication as settlement. This authority included homicide, incest, and theft, etc., the penultimate sanction being banishment from "the region." The caste of blacksmiths is charged with a ritual authority similar to the *hogon*. In the course of the second burial and the *awa* ceremony, the *hogon*'s "ritual power" and jural power is held in abeyance.[41] However, each sub-region of Sanga had its own *awa* and attendant officers. Then too, the long awaited *sigi* ceremonial apparently linked multiple regions in its enactment in a prescribed order. More importantly, the *mangu* or joking relationship is given as linking "peoples, regions, and lineages." It offers prohibition on marriage, familiarity, and mutual assistance. However, it seemingly included the Bozo, e.g., Léolguéou, within the "canton." Not to put too fine a point on it, the *mangu* was a joking relationship. Finally, Tait suggested that maximal lineages were linked by clanship, except where they were not contiguous and then became a joking relationship (1950a). The *gala* relationship was seemingly straightforward.

Because, as indicated in the Konkomba consideration, contrapuntality and lineage are an ordered ontology, akin to principles in theory, contrapuntality of lineages can occur where its empirical and analytic form is variant. The "contraposed lineage," in the example, is a literal contrapuntal lineage and clan. It is the addition of "clan" which lends complexity since, like "ethnicity," it is both an analytical construct and operational unity. That is, in the idiom of agnation, the lineage apparently is contraposed as senior and junior, first arrival and late arrival, founder and "those who helped." This lineality can, as well, and is more likely to be, expressed as "territoriality," the *quartier* distinguished by name, lineage, and clan totem and sub-totems and location as house and perhaps shrine. The region, in the example of Sanga divided as Upper and Lower Sanga, is as a group of villages. At least, once there, one would have to deal with them independently.

The contraposition is between Dyon tribe, constituting the villages of Upper Sanga, while Lower Sanga is of the Arou tribe (Tait 1950a: 178 f.). The first arrivals and founders were probably Dyon. The Dyon and Arou lineage segments appear to have been made structurally "coordinate." It is an example of inter-clan contrapuntality – this is a somewhat misleading statement. As such, the villages of Upper and Lower Sanga were separated by a distance of approximately 400 to 550 metres.

39 A mythic ancestor is given as *bínu sè:ru*.

40 In the context of the Dogon it is usual to refer to the "quality of chief." Griaule (1938: 514) refers to the *hogon* as a "religious chief." Repeating, generally the *hogon* is considered the elder and representative of *lébé serou* [chief as *sẹ́ru*] and "Master of the Earth," a "priest." There is a *hogon* for each region. The paramount *hogon* is at Arou.

Classificatorily *inneomo/innepuru*, living and dead male, is referred to by Tait (1950a: 186) as "segmentation," not only ritual categories.

41 Additionally, in the context of the *awa*, during its ascendency the sub-regions of Sanga must find jural and political authority separately.

https://doi.org/10.5771/0257-9774-2013-1-117
Generiert durch IP '3.21.93.38', am 30.07.2024, 01:47:51.
Das Erstellen und Weitergeben von Kopien dieses PDFs ist nicht zulässig.

In the view taken of Tait's commentary, under conditions of pervasive cumulative segmentation, that is of a single lineage, synchronised with a "territorial" system represented apically in totemism (house, *quartier*, village, *canton*, and region) and where the compact village is normative, the result is a compound contrapuntality. It is a compound contrapuntality with the possibility of "attached" lineages, and absorbed former "attached" lineages. Contrapuntal clan villages exist and are contraposed against their subsequent segmentary paired village, and one imagines now, in Mossi style, by *quartier*. Then determined "tribal" sub-regions, as Dyon and Arou, as conceptually homogeneous, become opposed to form a "region," or a contraposed clan region, an imaginable contrariety. Under such conditions the definition of the region may be the extension of the political authority of the *hogon* over the contraposed tribal unit in this case, the segments of Arou, apparently consistent with the ritual category of *inneomo*. This is the obverse of the Konkomba. Although phrased predominantly in the idiom of the segmentary lineage and the rigidity of shrines at the nodes of segments, it is the pre-eminent example of the contrapuntal clan village/villages and contrapuntal lineages. In those areas where the rigid and compact defensive village is subject to "territoriality" as house and shrine, encompassing land, and the "Great House" encompassing *quartier* (made complex by the founding of *quartier*s and the nature of their sponsorship), and villages and their pairs, within the analytical and empirical processual rapport and framework of a single clan, the concept of region is salient.

Part V: Conclusions

The compact and rigid village structure is, or might be, a product of contraposed lineages in acephalus structures.[42] The Dogon of Sanga do not qualify as an acephalus unity in the usual meaning, nor as a proto-state. However, today, settled in the same "canton" are Bozo, Kurumba, Mossi, Peul, Bambara, Samo, and Songhay, effected by the former or current centralised states of Ghana [sic., Gana], Mali, Songhay, Segu, Macina, Toucouleur, and Mossi at the very least. Where settlement is normatively as the compact village and where lineage or ancestrality and fertility are indissolubly linked, the tendency is to produce contraposed clan-villages which articulate as lineality and adherence to ancestor-fertility shrines, the precursors of the earth shrine in its statal and proto-state context. They may do so, however, appearing to follow the shrine-types representing the level of segmentation since land accrues to the village, or segment of it, and is not as a territory in the expansive sense. They remain contraposed clan-villages in the literal sense of that phrase.

In the final analysis the variation between Konkomba, which Tait generalised, and Sanga Dogon is coordinate with the difference between contrapuntality based predominantly on fission,[43] and that based predominantly on relatively unobstructed segmentation, respectively (cf. Goody 1958; Barnes 1970: 20), each generating large numbers of commensurate regions and sub-regions of a distinct type. Correspondingly, it is the difference between political and ritual authority which is embodied in the *hogon*, yet extended in unification of the region as political authority. The Konkomba contraposed village is divided as political and ritual authority.[44]

42 This is why pretotalisation was alluded to, and also the reason for an initial reliance on ontology, finally a sociological ontology. If pressed to give a definition of pretotalisation, it would be as a "trans-historical" continuity of an englobing kind. It would be simultaneously a statement of things or objects, and individuals as roles, statuses, and offices. It most likely relies on a specific and consistent ranked icon set. Contrapuntality is a related term. It is one thing to demonstrate contrapuntality in terms of a clan or a lineage system or political system. Stated in another way, as a discourse, literal contrapuntality may be viewed as a concise, primary indexicality of behaviour. It serves in the essential constitution of local policy and methods, or procedures and strategies (the supports to polity). It is simultaneously a compounded reflection on statements of the local determination of classical social structures and an index of behaviour through the ranked icon sets of their various domains. It expresses consistent and determined transformation which may be cyclical or noncyclical and transitive. This characterisation of the value contrapuntality, and its pair in lineality, is its presentation as a sociological ontology. In less esoteric terms, contrapuntality can be the foundation of a new lineage or the formal dissolution or transformation of an old one.

43 It was entirely possible for the Sanga Dogon, as observed by Tait (1950a: 188), that fission was expressed in the idiom of totems, as their maintenance or reduction. Thus a *babinu* "given over" to one "family," finds the family in question considering it *babinu* while the "clan" considers it *binu i*.

44 Tait (1958: 186 ff.) contrarily, understood the "Council of Elders" as senior men who present and argue the case of their "followers," without arbitration or judicial decision. Tait's statement of the matter is extensive, but one might accept, with the compounded emphasis on political office in the forms of contrapuntality, Fortes (1969a: 230) "… all jural relations involve a configuration of rights on the one side and a configuration of responsibilities on the other, both corresponding to the range of lineage segments involved. And no jural transaction is complete until the whole configuration of rights and responsibilities, on both sides, is brought into action."

There is no necessity of an "Owner of the People" nor an "Owner of the Land," for example, where only "moral authority" (Tait 1958: 188) is exercised, nor would it be required to describe a political system for such a people at any

https://doi.org/10.5771/0257-9774-2013-1-117
Generiert durch IP '3.21.93.38', am 30.07.2024, 01:47:51.
Das Erstellen und Weitergeben von Kopien dieses PDFs ist nicht zulässig.

The Dogon region (and regions) was united in its punctual lapse of political authority, and, exercise of ritual authority beyond the analytical units usually considered, and alternately, the quotidian exercise of political authority beyond, again, the units usually presented. What could be more normative?

In this proposal there are four levels that have been considered: Locale as village, sub-region, and region – while a tentative approach to ethnicity has been largely omitted for the instant. In one example, the stability and integration evidenced led to the identification of contraposed villages and environs as regions (sub-regions), while in another regions are co-incidentally founded on expressed or developed stability and integration as the segmentary lineage system, which produced multiple regions and complex sub-regions. One might assume that what has been evidenced is a multiplicity of patterns of the single and compound clan district, dual clan districts, contraposed lineages, contrapuntal lineage villages, and contrapuntal clan-villages. These may extend, and often do extend, in the formulations of Griaule and Tait, to a systematic organisation of regions and sub-regions. The contrapuntal clan-village is indicative of a polity and hence a region or sub-region, and that similarly constructed set of regions. The fact of, or analytical attribution of, sub-region and region is as indices of, in a sense, an achieved complex clanship, interpenetration, and generally organised and highly stable permeability. These elements appear to be consistent and seemingly can be stated at the levels of theory and ontology, ethnographic data, substantive analytical statement, and subsequent formal analytic modes. The systemic patterns or forms of systemic interaction considered were given as holding within and between communities (in the restricted sense), sub-regions, and regions.

Contrapuntal forms have been made to exemplify political systems and concomitant polity which tend to go beyond the idea of social reproduction as necessarily exclusively anchored in the simple or mundane segmentary lineage system and its requirements. History and contingency, which for both, Konkomba and Dogon, were extensive and turbulent, still do not eclipse the formulation of contrapuntality as a principle of social structure and social organisation presented here. The institutions represented, and one may take the contrapuntal lineage, clan, village, and region as such, and associated practices are coterminous with the rights, duties, and obligations of social relations in many instances – if these in fact change in recognisable fashion at all. However, beyond statements of this order, contrapuntality, in its physical politico-ritual systems, can represent the symmetry and asymmetry of localities and regions and their extension sometimes in concert with the fabric of lineality, and its associated functions and processes.

Underpinning social reproduction (the reproduction of the totality of social relations and political relations) is not simply historical contingency, but an essential ontology (the ordered values of lineality and contrapuntality as formulated) which simultaneously expresses it, and which is fundamental to the reproduction of society and polity. Society and polity represent a totality. The gross features of which may be thought of as essentially pre-totalised in the ontology presented in the context of the Konkomba as society, polity, and on occasion, as systemic region. As Fortes (1953: 22) observed, "… a group of people bound together within a single social structure have a boundary, though not necessarily one that coincides with a physical boundary [sic.] or is impenetrable."

Similarly, I recognise Izard's (1986) autochthony as ethnographically (locally), partially consistent with contrapuntality as presented. His elements of power/ancestrality/autochthony (the ABCs) are presented in a *complexe ontologique* against l'*existence*, *la durée*, and *l'étendue*, where definitive individuation is conceptually associated with the *djinn* (Mooré *zini*), like the Dagare (Goody 1987). As the earlier references to Dogon *togu*, Izard finds autochthony not experiencing closure (like ancestrality in its statal formulations, and unlike its acephalus presentation), but as a "horizon" of history and that associated with the *djinn* (the autochthons of human beings), in part, and, one supposes *l'étendue*, as again, individuation and extension in definitive historiography and historicity. This constitutes the heroes and heroic acts of hunter, warrior, *commerçant caravanier*, the now *paysan* or *villageois* and the use of proverb, and the *griots* and their use of song perhaps (Izard 1992). This heroic aspect is neglected in this formulation for the assumption of a more conservative and contractual appearance to things.[45] However, the idea of "calm segmentary societies" is underlain, in this day, by the suspicion of who or

great length. Ritual relations cannot substitute for jural-political relations nor can they be definitive of the range of levels of analysis. That is the elder cannot be confined to a "ritual and moral" ascendency, that ascendency constituting the "political unit of Konkombaland" (193).

45 Unlike Izard I would find individuation as ontogeny and that related as the individual and its development of identity through ritual, while a second ontogenesis sees the subject as the empirical object of history and in history.

https://doi.org/10.5771/0257-9774-2013-1-117
Generiert durch IP '3.21.93.38', am 30.07.2024, 01:47:51.
Das Erstellen und Weitergeben von Kopien dieses PDFs ist nicht zulässig.

what occasioned the hierarchical organisation of lineages, clans, villages, and fully regions in the succession of "old people's places." Durkheim (1954: 363–367) on "force" similarly stated that

> [t]he mind posits this connection before having any proofs of it, under the empire of a sort of constraint from which it cannot free itself; it postulates it, as they say, *a priori*.

The intention of this essay has not been to produce exegesis, although one might think so given the reliance on, first, the general opposition of ontogenesis and phylogenesis; and, second, ontology as metaphysics. It is not to deny the second opposition so much as to take advantage of the security and continuity of thought which it offers. There is, however, a gulf, or disunity which is possible in the blatant reduction of social reproduction to "historical persistence."

In the end, one has still not achieved *l'homme moyen sensuel*. The question simply did not appear forthrightly in this context at all. Although West Africa is where one might find him in his most sophisticated form. If this view of "contrapuntality" seems to generate sub-regions and regions which are minor by comparison with other sweeping interpretations, perhaps they represent the constituent elements and processes of that other possible domain, ethnicity (Izard 1985, 1992) where *l'homme moyen sensuel* will be found (cf. Barker 1994). In a manner of speaking, what has been attempted is a statement of the way in which the reproduction of a structure becomes its own transformation. More cogently perhaps one may consider the weak "structural term" at the commencement, with intra- and inter-structural elements which converge as region and variant orders of region (Pouillon 1972). This, however, is very different from Max Weber's concern for the subjectivity of devolved custom and tradition, "… the notion of ethnically determined social action assumes phenomena that a rigorous sociological analysis … would have to distinguish carefully …" (1947: 394). What appears to be the echoing of the same sentiment by Fortes and Evans-Pritchard (1940: 3):

> [t]here is evidently an intrinsic connexion between a people's culture and their social organization, but the nature of this connexion is a major problem in sociology and we cannot emphasize too much that these components of social life must not be confused.

If one looks to social structure and concomitant ontology in the West African context, one cannot dispense with the dialogue of power and force, and "l'étendue" may as well be formulated in asking that, "'[w]hen a victim's throat is cut on the Market Lébé, who comes to drink the blood'?" (Griaule 1965: 204).

I was indebted to Michel Izard for his fortuitous comments. I am indebted to the libraries of Michigan State University, University of Toronto, University of Ghana at Legon, and University of Western Ontario.

References Cited

Barker, Thomas R.
1991 Small Bands of Strangers. The Contraposed "Lineage" Reconsidered. *Anthropos* 86: 1–18.
1994 The Nasara. Groupings and African Traditional Religions. *Anthropos* 89: 571–577.
2001–2005 Papua Shrines. 2 Vols. [Unpubl. Ms.]
2006 The Ateker. The Theoretical Beginning. [Unpubl. Ms]

Barnes, J. A.
1970 Sociology in Cambridge. An Inaugural Lecture. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Binger, Louis Gustave
1892 Du Niger au Golfe de Guinée par les pays de Kong et le Mossi par le capitaine Binger. Paris: Hachette. [Microfilm]

Calame-Griaule, Geneviève
1956 Les dialectes dogon. *Africa* 26: 62–72.
1968 Dictionnaire dogon (dialecte tɔrɔ). Langue et civilisation. Paris: Librairie C. Klincksieck. (Langue et Littératures de l'Afrique noire, 4)

Cohen, Ira
1987 Structuration Theory and Social Praxis. In: A. Giddens and J. H. Turner (eds.), Social Theory Today; pp. 273–308. Stanford: Stanford University Press.

Durkheim, Émile
1954 The Elementary Forms of Religious Life. London: Allen & Unwin.

Dumont, Louis
1979 The Anthropological Community and Ideology. *Social Science Information* 18: 785–817.

Fortes, Meyer
1936 Ritual Festivals and Social Cohesion in the Hinterland of the Gold Coast. *American Anthropologist* 38: 590–604.
1940 The Political System of the Tallensi of the Northern Territories of the Gold Coast. In: M. Fortes and E. E. Evans-Pritchard (eds.); pp. 239–271.
1953 The Structure of Unilineal Descent Groups. *American Anthropologist* 55: 17–41.
1961 Pietas in Ancestor Worship. *The Henry Myers Lecture*, 1960. *Journal of the Royal Anthropological Institute* 91/1: 166–191.
1969a The Dynamics of Clanship among the Tallensi. London: Oxford University Press. [1945]
1969b Kinship and the Social Order. The Legacy of Lewis Henry Morgan. Chicago: Aldine.
1973 On the Concept of the Person among the Tallensi. In: La notion de personne en Afrique noire. Paris 11–17 octobre 1971; pp. 283–319. Paris: Édition du Centre National de la Recherche Scientifique. (Colloques internationaux du CNRS, 544)

https://doi.org/10.5771/0257-9774-2013-1-117
Generiert durch IP '3.21.93.38', am 30.07.2024, 01:47:51.
Das Erstellen und Weitergeben von Kopien dieses PDFs ist nicht zulässig.

1975 Strangers. In: M. Fortes and S. Patterson (eds.), Studies in African Social Anthropology; pp. 229–253. London: Academic Press.

Fortes, Meyer, and **Edward E. Evans-Pritchard** (eds.)
1940 African Political Systems. London: Oxford University Press.

Gache, André
1993 L'identitié au forçage de l'histoire. À propos de l'occident Dogon. *Cahiers d'Études africaines* 130/33–2: 233–246.

Giddens, Anthony
1984 The Constitution of Society. Outline of the Theory of Structuration. Cambridge: Polity Press.

Goody, Esther N.
1973 Contexts of Kinship. An Essay in the Family Sociology of the Gonja of Northern Ghana. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. (Cambridge Studies in Social Anthropology, 7)

Goody, Jack
1958 The Fission of Domestic Groups among the Lodogaba. In: J. Goody (ed.), The Developmental Cycle in Domestic Groups; pp. 53–91. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. (Cambridge Papers in Social Anthropology, 1)
1987 The Interface between the Written and the Oral. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Griaule, Marcel
1938 Masques dogons. Paris: Institut d'Ethnologie. (Travaux et Mémoires de l'Institut d'Ethnologie, 33)
1965 Conversations with Ogotemmêli. An Introduction to Dogon Religious Ideas. London: Oxford University Press for the International African Institute.

Izard, Michel
1985 Gens du pouvoir, gens de la terre. Les institutions politiques de l'ancien royaume du Yatenga (Bassin de la Volta Blanche). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
1986 L'étendue, la durée. *L'Homme* 97–98/26: 225–237.
1992 L'Odyssée du pouvoir. Un royaume africain. État, société, destin individuel. Paris: Éditions de l'École des Hautes Études en Sciences Sociales. (Recherches d'Histoire et de Sciences Sociales, 53)

Kirby, Jon P.
1983 Renegotiating Fate. An Analysis of the Role for Shrines in Problem Solving among the Anufɔ of Northern Ghana. Cambridge. [PhD Thesis, University of Cambridge]
1985 The Nonconversion of the Anufɔ of Northern Ghana. *Mission Studies* 2/2: 15–25.
1986 God, Shrines, and Problem-Solving among the Anufɔ of Northern Ghana. Berlin: Dietrich Reimer Verlag. (Collectanea Instituti Anthropos, 34)
1993 The Islamic Dialogue with African Traditional Religion. Divination and Health Care. *Social Science and Medicine* 36: 237–247.

Kopytoff, Igor
1987 The Internal African Frontier. The Making of African Political Culture. In: I. Kopytoff (ed.), The African Frontier. The Reproduction of Traditional African Societies; pp. 3–84. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.

Middleton, John, and **David Tait**
1958 Introduction. In: J. Middleton and D. Tait (eds.), Tribes without Rulers. Studies in African Segmentary Systems; pp. 1–31. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.

Morgan, Lewis Henry
1877 Ancient Society. Cleveland: World Publishing.

Nadel, Siegfried F.
1938 Social Symbiosis and Tribal Organization. *Man* 38: 85.
1949 The *Gani* Ritual of Nupe. A Study in Social Symbiosis. *Africa* 19/3: 177–186.

Pouillon, Jean
1972 Postface. Leach, Lévi-Strauss et les Kachin. In: E. R. Leach, Les systèmes politiques des hautes terres de Birmanie. Analyse des structures sociales kachin; pp. 361–379. Paris: F. Maspero.

Radcliffe-Brown, A. R.
1950 Introduction. In: A. R. Radcliffe-Brown and D. Forde (eds.), African Systems of Kinship and Marriage; pp. 1–85. London: Oxford University Press for the International African Institute.
1952 Structure and Function in Primitive Society. Essays and Addresses. London: Cohen & West.

Stanford, Edward
1897 Stanford's Map of British Possessions in West Africa. London: Edward Stanford.

Steele, Mary, and **Gretchen Weed**
1966 Collected Field Reports on the Phonology of Konkomba. [Legon]: Institute of African Studies, University of Ghana. (Collected Language Notes, 3)

Tait, David
1950a An Analytical Commentary on the Social Structure of the Dogon. *Africa* 20: 175–199.
1950b Review of M. Leiris, La langue secrète des Dogons de Sanga. Paris 1948. *Man* 50: 90–91.
1952 The Political System of the Konkomba. London. [PhD Thesis, University of London]
1953 The Political System of Konkomba. *Africa* 23: 213–223.
1954a Konkomba Friendship Relations. *African Studies* 13: 77–84.
1954b Konkomba Nominal Classes. (With a phonetic commentary by P. D. Strevens.) *Africa* 24: 130–148.
1954c Konkomba Sorcery. *Journal of the Royal Anthropological Institute* 84/1–2: 66–74.
1955a History and Social Organisation. *Transactions of the Gold Coast & Togoland Historical Society* 1/5: 193–210.
1955b Language and Social Symbiosis among the Dogon of Sanga. *Bulletin de l'Institut Français d'Afrique noire* 17/3–4: 525–528.
1956 The Family, Household, and Minor Lineage of the Konkomba. Part 1. *Africa* 26: 219–249. Part 2. *Africa* 26: 332–342.
1958 The Territorial Pattern and Lineage System of Konkomba. In: J. Middleton and D. Tait (eds.), Tribes without Rulers. Studies in African Segmentary Systems; pp. 167–202. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul. (Routledge Library Editions, 18)
1961 The Konkomba of Northern Ghana. (Edited from His Published and Unpublished Writings by J. Goody.) London: Oxford University Press for the International African Institute and the University of Ghana.

Tauxier, Louis
1917 Le noir du Yatenga (Mossis, Nioniosses, Samos, Yarsés, Silmi-Mossis, Peuls). Paris: E. Larose.

Weber, Max
1947 The Theory of Society and Economic Organization. (Transl. by A. M. Henderson and T. Parsons.) New York: Oxford University Press.

https://doi.org/10.5771/0257-9774-2013-1-117
Generiert durch IP '3.21.93.38', am 30.07.2024, 01:47:51.
Das Erstellen und Weitergeben von Kopien dieses PDFs ist nicht zulässig.

https://doi.org/10.5771/0257-9774-2013-1-117
Generiert durch IP '3.21.93.38', am 30.07.2024, 01:47:51.
Das Erstellen und Weitergeben von Kopien dieses PDFs ist nicht zulässig.