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INTRODUCTION

The purpose of this paper is to depict the social organization of the Dizi, an agricultural people who live in the southwestern part of Ethiopia. I have conducted research among them, focusing particularly on their chieftainship and their social hierarchy. Before taking up the main subject, I shall outline the background in which my study has been conducted, and the presentation method of interpreting data for this paper.

I stayed in Ethiopia from August 1989 to February 1990. I was able to proceed with my fieldwork among the Dizi for approximately three months. The research was conducted in the mountainous district of Sai, located ten hours away on foot from the town of Maji in the Kaffa region, southwestern Ethiopia. As will be mentioned below, Sai is a chiefdom ruled by a traditional chief called the Saikiyasu.

During my stay in Sai, I constantly referred to an essay written by the German ethnologist, Haberland (1984). This essay is less than four pages, but it concisely summarized the social structure, especially the hierarchy of the Dizi in the Adikas chiefdom, and served as a starting point to study the social relationships and kinship of the Sai people. While the Japanese version of this paper (Deguchi 1992b) was in press, I came across a book by Haberland, Die Dizi in Sud-Athiopien: Studien zur Kulturkunde und Geschichte (Haberland 1993). Based on the same research as the 1984 paper (Haberland undertook his research in May 1970 and in March and September 1974), this book contains many more details on the Dizi social hierarchy and history. However, having reviewed this book, I found that there was no necessity to alter my criticism of Haberland.

Arens (1983: 2) pointed out that the anthropologists who have conducted studies among the same ethnic peoples tend to have different viewpoints of their own and are antagonistic to each other, which was applicable to my case as well. This is because the data I collected proved to be quite divergent from those of Haberland. Haberland was trying to reconstruct the social structure of Adikas during the 1890s, based on the oral traditions of those people. The social structure he analyzed is not the same as that of current Sai society. However, it appears to me that this difference should never be ignored.

For this reason, in discussing the social structure of Dizi in the Sai chiefdom, I
shall first quote Haberland's description regarding each theme, followed by my comments and evaluations, and then, in the end, discuss what issue this divergence raises.

**GENERAL SURVEY**

"Linguistically the Dizi, together with the related Shako in the north and the Na'o in the northeast, form a branch of the West Cushitic or Omotic language group."

(All statements in quotation marks are from Haberland (1984). Due to the brevity of Haberland's essay, I will omit the page numbers.)

K. Fukui, who stayed in Sai for two weeks, and I have discovered, based on the oral tradition, that the ancestor of Chief Saikiyasu was originally a Shako. However, people of Sai nowadays do not understand the Shako language at all. Rather, what they understand now is the language of the Tishana of the Surma group, due to a close relationship through intermarriage, or the language of the Bodi, whose first chief was identified as the descendant of Saikiyasu.

Historically, the most significant event was the conquest by the Ethiopian Empire during the 1890s, equated by the Dizi to the Amhara. The result of invasion and conquest was:

subjection to the *gabbar* system—and linked with this—economic exploitation and oppression; the abduction (e.g. when new Amharic governors were appointed) of innumerable people as slaves, servants or carriers, only a few of whom were able to return; famine, disease and a growing sense of hopelessness and resignation, engendered by a total absence of justice. These things not only caused the number of the Dizi to shrink (in 1974 there were probably scarcely more than 20,000) but shook their whole culture to its roots.

In the Dizi myths of the separation of heaven and earth which are, at the same time, myths on the origin of death, the Amhara are described as the root of all evil. The following is such a myth told us by Zalaka, an old Dizi. "Once upon a time, heaven (= God, both described as *saagu*) and earth were closer to each other than now. People were living happily together, and there was no death on earth. However, when the Amhara came, people started to deceive, steal, and hurt each other even within the same community. Heaven and earth became separated far apart, and from then, people started to die." Zalaka had a son inducted into the army by the Amhara at that time, and seemed to have a strong anti-Amhara sentiment. This myth was not known by all, and did not necessarily describe the Amhara as the cause of the separation of heaven and earth or the origin of death.

The subsistence of the Dizi is based on the cultivation of sorghum, ensete, tef, barley, and maize. Haberland wrote that "cattle must have been of some importance before the coming of the Amhara although today their role is virtually insignificant." In Sai even now cattle play an important role as sacrificial beasts and
as means of bridewealth. The bridewealth consists of some heads of cattle and there must be one bull included. It is slaughtered and its skin is placed on the bed of the father of the bride (see Note 3). Cattle are killed for every ritual of purification, divination (using intestines), or rain control.

Haberland wrote about the chiefdom: “Until they lost their independence, the Dizi were divided into over twenty chiefdoms, with shifting boundaries and allegiances.” The chiefdoms were distributed from southeast to northwest as follows: “Kolu, Adi, Muy, Tsiski, Maji (Kyerts, Gelkamo, Kuri), Wor, Say, Mash, Gobi, Aro, Duku, Dam, Kanta, Ezkolu, Kasi, Ber, Gay, Gar, Jabba, Bay.” These chiefdoms, which Haberland has outlined, have somewhat changed. My informants said that Duku is included in Dam, and Kasi in Jabba. Also, the power of each chief is considered rather ceremonial than political, but not all the chiefs possessed the ritual power of rain control (see Appendix 1).

**HIERARCHICAL SOCIAL ORGANIZATION OR CASTE?**

"Hierarchy" in Sai society

On the “caste system” of the Dizi, Haberland states:

Their social structure was characterized by a caste system which, even by Ethiopian standards, could be termed hypertrophic, and by a strong emphasis on the principle of primogeniture. Society was organized hierarchically into five castes: nobles (karyab), freemen (nyank), bondsmen (zaku), geymi and hunters (kwogyi). Geymi is a special caste, closely associated with the nobility, with manifold functions as craftsmen and in the sacramal sphere. Each caste was distinguished by a large number of prerogatives, obligations, taboos and special ‘languages.’ The nobility was in turn divided into seven hereditary ranks, although these did not form a hierarchy in the political sense: they had more to do with the ritual status of the holder than with his political power.

These seven hereditary ranks were as follows: “Kyaz, Burji, Tso’ani, Koyz, Bar, and Keyst.”

The point where my view differs with that of Haberland concerns the hierarchy and castes. If all the social classifications of people are to be regarded as a “hierarchy,” then the “hierarchy” seen in Sai society today, is organized as follows:

a. Chief (Seikyasu), koichiezi (a village headman, or the head of an area) and their relatives (kaariyab), baabaishi (a ritual expert, both Sai and uruki [see immediately below]) and his relatives;

b. uruki (a man not originally Sai, and his patrilineal descendants);

c. geima (the retainer) which corresponds to geymi of Haberland.

The caste that Haberland called the kwogyi class does not exist in Sai today. The word nyank is occasionally used as a name of a person, or the rank of a village headman, but I could not get any information from Sai people that this word is
currently used to indicate the freemen.

According to the informants, everybody is allowed to possess his own land as he wishes, instead of having to borrow somebody else's property for cultivation. When newly reclaimed land is cultivated, a koichiezi may occasionally perform a ritual (the detail is unknown). However, this does not mean that the koichiezi possesses the ownership of that land. The land of Sai is ultimately in the possession of Saikiyasu, but people are not required to ask Saikiyasu for permission when they wish to reclaim land for their own use, nor are they considered tenant farmers. This point was confirmed also by the headmaster of Sai Elementary School whose father is an Amhara and his mother Dizi, and by the vice administrative officer of Tum. Therefore, it seemed that the notion of distinguishing freemen and bondsmen was unheard of for these informants. The term zaku still exists in Sai, but does not mean a serf, or a bondsman. Zaku in Sai is a synonym for koichiezi, and therefore, the following statement of Haberland has lost its validity.

The bondsmen, for example, even though they constituted the majority, could not own the land which was distributed to them by the local petty chiefs, nor did they have any political organization, nor could they express their opinions openly. They were subjected to a very strict tribute-system and had to deliver a major part of their grain (mostly sorghum) to their superiors after each harvest. They could not even slaughter their cattle without the consent of their chiefs. And even worse: if they did not fulfill these obligations, they lost their status of bondsmen and temporarily or permanently became slaves.

As for the kwoygi whom Haberland describes as the “hunters’ caste,” I was told that there are no hunters in Sai, but there are kwoygi engaged in fishing or hunting on the Omo River. In short, kwoygi is not one of the caste ranks in Dizi but rather corresponds to the Koegu (Kwegu), among whom Hiroshi Matsuda and Osamu Hieda have carried out research (see their papers in this volume). When I returned to Tum, the nearest town to the airport, after finishing my research at Sai, I happened to meet the linguist Dr. Harold Fleming. His assistant for collecting Dizi words at that time was “S,” a Dizi high school student, who used to live in Adikas, the land where Haberland conducted his research. His cousin, “A,” who lived in Tum, was there too, so I asked them some questions about kwoygi.

According to A, kwoygi are hunters and from Dizi. Kwoygi lived in Adikas, Maji, Jabba, and Gobi. There are some among the Surma (Tishana) called nyara. Kwoygi and nyara mean the same. When geima of the adikiyasu were not present, kwoygi conducted rituals on their behalf. Geima and kwoygi are of different peoples. For most of the people, eating meat of cattle which have died from an illness is considered a taboo, but kwoygi would eat it.

However, S explained that there are no kwoygi in the land of Dizi. Instead they only exist in the surroundings of the Omo River. From the story he heard from his grandfather, when the elders of the village and the adikiyasu gathered to
drink coffee, it was a taboo to call somebody a kwoygi, for this word conveyed some contempt. The two young men had completely different opinions. Furthermore, when I asked a middle-aged man from Java about this matter, he told me there were no kwoygi in Jabba, but there are some in Grafalda. However, he did not clarify whether the kwoygi are Dizi. In any respect, the identity of the kwoygi was not clarified, and I hesitate to classify kwoygi as the lowest rank in the caste system. The oral tradition on the history regarding Sai and kwoygi-Koegu (Kwegu) will be discussed later.

Uruki
The Dizi language term zuru corresponds to “blood relationship” or “blood relatives.” It refers to the cognatic kin as opposed to the affines, who are toozu. There is no folk term meaning the agnatic kin or a patrilineal descent group. However, if one continues to live in the land where he was born, in general, the actual form of inheritance would be patrilineal. Marriage tends to be virilocal, and the couple reside on land near the groom’s father. But occasionally, people leave the chiefdom where they were born and move into the chiefdom where the mother’s relatives (especially the mother’s brothers) live. In this case, as Haberland pointed out, they are free to migrate to different lands and it is quite easy for them to obtain their own land in the new chiefdom where they have immigrated. But even if one was a kaariyab in the original land, he changes to uruki in his new land, is not recognized as kaariyab any more, and his patrilineal descendants remain uruki regardless of how many generations pass. In a broad sense, a marriage between two kaariyabs of the same chiefdom is avoided, unless it is clear that both the bride and the groom are not of the same zuru. However, in contrast, marriage between a kaariyab and an uruki within the same chiefdom is allowed. That is to say, marriage between two different “classes” is possible.

Geima
A geima has to marry a geima and remains geima even if they move into a different land. However, I happened to run into a geima woman getting married to a kaariyab man. The daughter of Zalaka Zer, who was geima, married Keishi Komtu, a relative of the Saikiyasu, to be his third wife. She had no child yet. The elders made some comments that such a marriage had been impossible in the old days and that things are changing abruptly, but in fact, it may be open to further discussion whether this is a recent trend or not. It is not certain whether the geima marriage rule had been strictly observed or not, and secondly, this particular marriage was not spoken of as horrifying or scandalous.

The roles played by the geima are mainly to assist a chief, to help a koichiezi conduct rituals, and to transport or bury their bodies in funerals. It is predetermined which chief or koichiezi a geima would serve. Unlike the Hindu castes, there is no conflict between the upper class groups of the caste over the service of the lower class. The geima elders are so well informed about events in the
past or the precise genealogy of the people who live in the area, and the names of the successive Saikiyasu, that they could be called knowledgeable seniors.

The geima are not allowed to use the same containers, when they drink local alcoholic beverages, as those from the other classes. The chief and the koichiezi must also use different containers. The gourd container, used by the chiefs and the koichiezi, which has three or four engravings on the grip, is called geini. The one without such engravings is called kofu. Baabaishi never drink alcohol from geini. Those who hold the chieftainship or headmanship can only use geini, but their relatives (kaarlyab) cannot. The Kaarlyab are not necessarily distinguished from other classes in regards to geini usage. The geima are obliged to use kofu, however, and are not allowed to use the same kofu as other people from different classes. They cannot drink from geini. Thus, with regards to tableware and marriage, the geima are largely distinguished from other people, but their freedom to choose a place to live or to possess farmland is ensured.

Chief, koichiezi, and kaarlyab

The seven hereditary ranks which Haberland outlined are not the sort of ranks in which all the kaarlyab are divided and classified into seven groups, but are rather the ranks of occupations as chief or koichiezi (or a classification by type). According to Fukui, who conducted research in the same place as Haberland had done, the hierarchy of ranks is as follows:

kiyazu > kiyam > burzi > koizi ≡ nyangu > ts’ooni > zaaku > baabu

kiyazu is the highest rank. The people who belong to this rank eat and drink together, and never dine with people from other ranks. However, the people who are of a higher status within burzi and kiyam are allowed to dine together with kiyazu. Koizi and those who are ranked lower, regardless of how high their rankings are within the group, never dine with those who belong to burzi or higher ranks. Ts’ooni and zaaku are allowed to eat and drink together. (Fukui, personal communication.)

The Sai informants told me that they did not know anything about baabu. In addition, they said that zaku (zaaku) means the same as koichiezi. I obtained the information concerning the rank orders by asking the informants which was the “bigger” or “smaller” of the two ranks. Considering their answers as to which is “bigger” or “smaller,” the criterion the informants used is whether that group is allowed to drink from the same geini as the other group. The following are the results:

1) kiyaza > burzya > kyama > ts’ina, burzya ≡ chiezya > koiza
2) kiyaza > nyangu = koiza = chiezya = burzya (inside Sai)
3) kiyasu > burzi > kyam = nyang = tswoni > chiezi > koiza
4) kiyaza > burzya > kyam = tswoni = koiza > keishi
5) kiyaza > kyam > burzya > tswoni > koiza > nyang = chieza = zaku > keishi
6) kiyaza > kyam > burzya > koiza = chiezya > tswoni > nyang = keishi
7) burzya > kyam (from the same informant 2).
The words in the lists are rank names. So, for example, the Maiburzi is the koichiei whose rank is burzya and who lives in Mait (see Appendix 1 and 2).

As can be seen from rankings 1 to 6 listed above, all the informants selected kiyaza (the rank name of Saikiyasu and Adikyasu) for the highest rank, but apart from this, their opinions greatly differ. No. 1 clarified the ranking between chieya and kyama, whereas for No. 2, within Sai, all the koichiei other than Saiktyasu were in the same ranking. No. 5 was obtained from two geimas and probably provides the most reliable information among these seven rankings. However, one of these two informants came to me on another day with another informant, and did not particularly express any objection while No. 6 was being recorded, as above. No. 6 was obtained from a koichizi called the Baasu, from an area of Gelt. The Baasu belonged to the rank of kyam. He is regarded as very ambitious and I presume that he gave me information in such a way as to uphold his position as predominant over others. The aforementioned geima asked Baasu if his opinion was true, and when Baasu nodded with full confidence, he did not seem to insist on his own viewpoint. Zaku appeared in ranking No. 5, but this was to say that zaku signified the same as (koi) chiezi.

It is obvious from the various opinions listed above, in Sai the ranks are not always strictly distinguished or fixed. Or as can be seen from No. 2, the ranks, apart from the specially treated Saikiyasu, do not seem to have much significance within Sai society. Many of the informants stated that all the koichizi were allowed to drink the local alcoholic beverage from the same container, or dine together, and they all emphasized that there were no ideological differences in the ranks. Apart from kiyaza, the informants did not seem to put much significance on rank and were normally not aware of it. The reason for the diversity of the opinions as seen above could be because of their embarrassment at an unexpected question from an anthropologist.

We should, perhaps, consider the ranks not as a matter within one chiefdom, but rather as differences in the authority of the chiefs of different chiefdoms. When, for example, one chief visits another chief, ranking occasionally comes into question for deciding the seating order for dining. Since there is no king or paramount chief who dominates the Dizi as a whole, within each chiefdom, the chief is superior in any case, and the informants do not seem to take much heed of other ranks.

The tasks of the chiefs, koichiei and baabaishi, as Haberland also stated, are very ceremonial. The chief conducts the ritual to control rainfall by offering sacrifice, and "ceremonially supervises" the abundance of the harvest and the health of the people in his entire domain. During the ritual to eliminate contagious disease, for instance, where only goats are sacrificed, I was told that the Saikiyasu, as a priest, smeared himself with the blood of the victims (I did not have any chance to witness this). The koichiei prayed for the health and prosperity of the area he dominated. For example, Baasu, as a koichiei of Gelt, invited his relatives and neighbors to his house, and conducted a ritual plastering of gray-green colored soil
on their foreheads and right elbows (not to let disease get into their body), so that people would not suffer from illness, and that the Tama, Surmic pastoralists, would not invade their territory. The soil he used is called chiizi, and the ceremony of plastering it is described as chiizi sieeri. However, since Baasu is also renowned as a diviner, it is difficult to judge whether he conducted this ceremony as a koichiezi or as a diviner. On the other hand, baabaishi are not allowed to conduct these rituals as the chief does. What is often witnessed during these ceremonies of praying for good harvest and prosperity is that the people who normally drink the local alcoholic beverage during a break in farmwork pour the remaining liquor in the bottom of the gourd onto the ground, while koichiezi and baabaishi utter prayers to God (saagu). If a geima is present, it is his role to pour the liquor onto the ground. This ceremony of pouring liquor onto the ground is called choi choin.

Haberland stated that the five castes “were distinguished by a large number of prerogatives, obligations, taboos, and special ‘languages’.” However, from my research, I discovered that the various obligations and taboos are specific to the office of chief and koichiezi, not to a whole class or a whole rank. For instance, there are containers for their exclusive use, such as geini, and the chief and koichiezi do not dine using the same container as kaariyab and geima. Uruki are not allowed to cough while eating with them. There are two types of food made from ensete: udu and imbu. The chief and koichiezi can eat udu made with ensete, but are prohibited to eat imbu. Besides beef, they do not eat any meat of other animals. Barley and tef are not to be touched by them, unless they are cooked. The Saikeyasu do not drink any liquid, including the local alcohol, in the town of Maji. This taboo is only for the Saikeyasu. Cultivating yam in the compound of Saikeyasu in the central area of Sai is not allowed.

However, the above restrictions apply to the office, not the caste. Therefore, I doubt the validity of the following statement of Haberland:

All five castes were separated by an extremely large number of regulations and prescriptions. This was true, in a rather hypertrophic manner, especially for the nobility: who was addressing whom with which expressions; who could sit together with whom, eat with whom and drink with whom; even who could see whom. The same referred to the taboos on food, and the different kinds of meat which one could eat. The castes were also separated by different methods of slaughtering animals. There were even regulations as to which plants one could eat or touch: thus the nobility could not even see raw cereals except sorghum. Members of the nobility had a ‘language’ of their own, i.e. they used more than one hundred different words for the house or the ceremonial staff, etc. of a noble.

As for the special linguistic expressions, unfortunately, I was not able to confirm them during my research.
THE CUSTOMS AND TRADITIONS THAT ERODE THE CASTES

Haberland considered the Dizi society to be a caste society. However, what is a caste in the first place? According to the definition of Hatton, quoted by Leach, its features are as follows: Endogamy; Restrictions on dining together with members of different castes; Hierarchical classification of the caste. Brähmans are positioned on the top; When the upper caste come into contact with a member of the lower caste, especially with regard to food and sex, either directly or indirectly, the upper caste is considered to be “polluted”; It is related to the traditional occupations; The position of a person in the caste is determined upon birth; The overall system is focused on the prerogatives of Brähmans (quated in Leach 1960: 2-3).

Concerning the usage of the word caste, Leach gave us a warning: “Caste, in my view, denotes a particular species of the structural organization indissolubly linked with a Pan-Indian civilization.... Consequently I believe that those who apply the term to contexts wholly remote from the Indian world invariably go astray” (Leach 1960: 5). Also, there are some scholars on India today who argue that caste itself is not specific and indigenous to India, but was actually invented by Europeans during the course of colonization (cf. Fuller 1976). Therefore, it is all the more necessary to be careful in applying this term to other societies.

Haberland seems to have taken into consideration the aforementioned warning by Leach, as he wrote, “one cannot speak of a real ‘caste system.’... Whereas in Ethiopia one could speak of the special castes in the sense of ‘occupational’ castes, this could not be applied to the Dizi.”

Nonetheless, Haberland used the word “caste” frequently. This was because he presumed that the Dizi society was remarkably hierarchical and that there were various taboos and obligations for each rank, and also because he assumed that the history of the invasion of a foreign culture into the original native culture was the cause of such a hierarchy (Haberland 1993).

However, from my own field data, it is highly doubtful to use the term “caste” for describing Dizi society. It is evidently endogamous by the fact that the child of the chief marries the child of another chief, and that a geima is obliged to marry a geima partner. But there is no problem with marriage between kaariyab and uruki, and as I have mentioned before, there is an example of a marriage between kaariyab and geima. Also, if an old koichiezi meets a young kaariyab of Saikiyasu, the kaariyab has to bow to the older man. The ranks do not seem to be related to occupation, nor is the perception of being polluted too strong. Not only this, but there are other customs and traditions in Dizi which are difficult to understand if we insist on relating them to the caste model.

Ritual of Naali (friendship)

Naali is the ritual, regardless of the hierarchy or the category, to affirm friendship between people of the same sex, and to become close friends. When two people
start to like each other and decide to become naali, the ritual is conducted in the house of one of them. During this ritual they tap each other’s shoulders (diyeem) with goat hide four times; first right, then left (repeated twice). First the person of the house starts tapping the other’s shoulder, then vice versa. They must call each other’s name when tapping the shoulders. When this is finished, the persons concerned are not allowed to speak to each other until a second ritual in the other person’s house is completed. They communicate with each other through a third person. After three months to one year, the second ritual will be conducted in the other person’s house. At this time, many local people gather around with some local liquor in their hands. New kofu are prepared. There are broken into two and the two persons who are becoming naali separately drink liquor with the fragments. The fragments of the broken kofu would then belong to each of them. Then, as was done before, they tap each other’s shoulders several times with the goat hide. The one who conducted the first ritual presents the other with a cow. The one who is given the cow has to raise it for about three years and breed at least one calf. This will be given to his partner. Such is the outline of the ceremony. I did not have an opportunity to witness this naali ceremony and these descriptions were given by several informants.

After the naali courtesy is completed, the two people concerned become quasi-relatives. Therefore, the descendants of naali are not allowed to marry each other. This is because they are recognized as naali as well. This ritual is possible even between persons of different ranks. Therefore, a kaaliyab man and a geima man can become as close as relatives as a result. This sort of relationship must be something that contravenes the “caste” system. This ritual is completely approved in Sai, although in fact, it does not take place too often.

It may be objected that this ritual represents a kind of so called “communitus” and therefore does not contravene the caste structure. Nonetheless, it should be recognized that Dizi society is not composed of a monolithic rank system.

The legend of the Shanguu, the founder of geima
The founder of the geima in Sai is a man called Shanguu. There are various legends with regards to the first Shanguu, some of which are summarized below. They are also closely related to the origin of the Saikiyasu.

A. When the first Saikiyasu came from the direction of the Shako, the first Shanguu came from Omo. They met with each other in Sai. Before then, kwoygi did not live in this land. This was the land of the first Ulumburzi and the first Bookuchiezi. (After the conquering of Sai by the Saikiyasu, they became koiuchiezi.) The first Shanguu was a kwoygi. After he arrived from Omo, he lived in Gaazunbaal, near Muit. The first Saikiyasu, too, when he arrived in Sai, after he plundered the land by fighting with Ulumburzi, Bookuchiezi, and Orukugaju, lived in Gaazunbaal. The Shanguu and the Saikiyasu met then, and since Saikiyasu was higher in rank, the Shanguu decided to serve the Saikiyasu.

B1. The first Shanguu was in Sai from the beginning and he was the kwoygi-
burzi, the chief of the kwoygi. At that time, he was living in the area where Aluburzi (one of the koichiezi) is now living. When the first Saiktyasu came and conquered Sai, both Shanguu and Urumburzi became his followers. Later, Merukiyasu, the son of Saiktyasu moved into the land of Bodi. At that time, half of the kwoygi escaped to the land of the Bodi, accompanying the Merukiyasu.

B2. When the ancestor of Saiktyasu came from the land of the Shako, the child of Saiktyasu who came with him was only the first Demtkoishi. The other children were born after he arrived in Sai. The geima who accompanied him to this land then were Gaazun and Diiizu. They became the ancestors of geima. Shanguu was in this land and was the chief of kwoygi. When the Saiktyasu arrived, some kwoygi escaped to the Omo River and became the Kwegu of today. Other kwoygi moved out together with the son of the Saiktyasu when he escaped to the land of Bodi. The Shanguu remained and became the geima of the Saiktyasu.

C. The first Shanguu came from the land of the Shako with Chubiyab and Goru, as the geima of the Saiktyasu.

As can be seen from legends B1 and B2, the Shanguu, originally the native burzi or koichiezi, was in the same position as Urumburzi in legend A (present tsuwooni), Bookuchiezi, Orukugaju (before the Saiktyasu’s arrival, the highest ranking, but now a baabaishi), and Dechiburzi (present baabaishi).5

On the other hand, legends A and C tell us of the foreign origin of Shanguu. It is also interesting that legend A resembles the following legend about Yiemburzi.

D. At the time when the first Saiktyasu came to this land, the first Yiemburzi also arrived at this land from the southeast direction of the Omo River. They met in Sai. The Saiktyasu and Yiemburzi became nairibab (for this word, see below). Since they became nairibab, the relatives of Saiktyasu and the relatives of yiemburzi were not allowed to marry each other.

According to these legends, both Shanguu, who is the geima of Saiktyasu, and Yiemburzi, came from the southeast and met Saiktyasu in the land of Sai. Because of these identical circumstances and direction of the origin, it is likely that both Shanguu and the Yiemburzi play a similar role within the relationship with Saiktyasu. The similarity of the ritual roles of nairibab in legend D and geima could be significant.

The nairibab is important, because it is the key to understanding that geima is not only equivalent to koichiezi in the legend (particularly in D), but equivalent and interchangeable even today. A nairibab is a person indispensable to conduct rituals such as divination, using the intestines of animals. Only when a nairibab is present the ritual is started by killing a cattle or goat and smearing its blood on the nairibab’s body, after which people drink the local liquor. For example, the Saiktyasu does not start the ritual until the Yiemburzi arrives. There is a stone in the courtyard of the chief, koichiezi or baabaishi on which they pour liquor. This stone is called miili. When the ritual is conducted at Saiktyasu’s place, the only person who is allowed to pour liquor on miili is the Yiemburzi. When it is conducted at the Yiemburzi’s house, only the Saiktyasu is given the privilege to
pour liquor on *miili*. The *Yiemburzi* is the *nairibab* of not only the *Saiktyasu* but also of his relatives.

The ritual role of *nairibab* is quite similar to that of *geima*. The major task of *geima*, especially the *Shanguu*, is to prepare for the ritual which is to take place at the *Saiktyasu*’s home, kill the cattle, and smear its blood onto the body of the *Saiktyasu* and himself. It is also said that no ritual may be started without the *Shanguu*. With regard to the ritual role, there seems to be no particular difference between a *nairibab* and a *geima*. Also for the installation ceremony of the *Saiktyasu*, the *Yiemburzi* and *Shanguu* are indispensable.

Actually, we had an opportunity to witness a ritual in which a *nairibab* of the *Saiktyasu* acted on behalf of the *Shanguu*. It was when Fukui and I requested the *Saiktyasu* to perform the ritual of praying for the prosperity of the *Dizi* and *Bodi* (whose chief is said to have come from *Sai* and among whom Fukui has conducted his research). A cow was killed, but the persons who were smeared with blood were the *Saiktyasu* and the *Orususu*, a *baabaishi*. This was because the *Shanguu* had passed away and there was nobody who would inherit his position at that moment, so the *Orususu* substituted for the *Shanguu*. The *Orususu* is one of the *nairibab* of *Saiktyasu*, and he is an *uruki* as well as a *baabaishi*.

From the above legends and rituals, we may assume that the *koichiezi* and *baabaishi* are structurally equivalent to the *geima*, especially the *Shanguu*, at the bottom rank of the hierarchical society of *Dizi*, within legend and ritual. Also, a *geima* told me that the *Saiktyasu* and the *Shanguu* were the same. It is possible, of course, to consider this opinion as an overstatement of his actual role, that the *geima*, the lowest ranking caste, was in fact indispensable to the chief. However, even so, the identical nature of the ceremonial activity of the chief at the top of the society and that of *geima* at the bottom, should not be ignored. Moreover, legend C. narrates that the *Shanguu* and the *Saiktyasu* have always been together from the beginning. That is to say the *geima* could be considered structurally identical to the *Saiktyasu*. I would like to advance my interpretation at least to encourage reconsideration of the previous view that *Dizi* society is a strict caste society. The social structure of *Dizi* seems far more flexible than that of a caste system. The point that it cannot be understood in reference to a simple caste model is also true for the *Kumu*, who is described below.

### The Kumu

The *Kumu* is said to be “the mother of the people (*yabko*)”: he was the first human being to obtain fire. Holding the fire in his hand, which he started by rubbing pieces of wood together, he moved from Gemo-Gofa near the Omo River to a land called Kwomo in *Mui*. The *Kumu*’s descendants now live in *Mui*. The person who takes up the title of the *Kumu* is a male. However, the *Kumu* is not the chief of *Mui*. The chief of *Mui* is the *Muikyam*, while *kumu* remains in the rank of *burzya*.

As for the *Kumu*, I was able to collect an oral tradition as follows: When *Saiktyasu* came from the land of the *Shako* to *Sai*, *Sai* was already the territory of
the Kumu. After the Saikiyasu conquered this land, the Saikiyasu became the follower of the Kumu. The chiefs other than the Saikiyasu, under the Kumu, were the Daagburzi, the Woruburzi, the Muikyam (Muigaju), the Gobitiyaar, and the Majikurit (Adikas, Kworu, and Chiski are not the ceremonial territory of the Kumu). The ranking of the Kumu is burzya, but is higher in rank than the Saikiyasu, and there is nobody else who is higher. The founders of some baabaishi in Sai are said to be the children of the Kumu. When a baabaishi or koichiezi dies, the Kumu comes to Sai and conducts the ritual. A cow is killed then, and given to the Kumu.

In 1988 (?), a ritual was conducted in Sai to pray for recovery from illness, prosperity, and abundance. That was the year when dysentery was prevalent all over the land. The Kumu came then from Mui and attended the ritual. The ceremony took place in the Saikiyasu’s home. One cow was sacrificed and the Kumu smeared the body of the Saikiyasu with the blood. The right legs (the best part) were given to the Kumu. While the Kumu was in Sai, he did not stay at the Saikiyasu’s house but stayed at the house of a geima (who was the candidate to succeed the Shanguu). When the Kumu came to Sai, the Saikiyasu pleaded to him that there were no women, children, grain, or cows in this land, but only a few elders. The Saikiyasu implored him to provide some cows, grain, women and children. The Saikiyasu ordered the people to prepare food and local beer to entertain the Kumu. When the Kumu arrived at Sai, instead of immediately visiting the Saikiyasu, he bided his time on the way. When the feast was prepared, the Saikiyasu called the Kumu and chanted the implorations above. In response, the Kumu said that he would give him food, and they all ate beef and then smeared the blood of the killed cow onto the body of the Saikiyasu. While the Kumu took the right legs, the Saikiyasu ate the left legs. The Kumu took the meat back to the place where he stayed and ate it alone. When the Saikiyasu and the Kumu were together in the same room, the Kumu sat on a platform higher than the Saikiyasu. They drank beer from different geini.

The relationship between the Kumu and the Saikiyasu is not a so-called double sovereignty system, where one represents the mundane political power, while the other is the religious authority, but rather both represent only the ritual authority. It should be noted here that the Kumu of burzya is higher in rank and possesses dominant power over the Saikiyasu of kiyaza. If we are to recognize Dizi as a caste society, as Haberland did, it is impossible for somebody from burzya to be superior to someone from kiyaza. In fact, those who bear the titles of kyum and burzi exist even among the chiefs as well as the koichiezis, and those titled as nyang among the baabaishis.

I propose a Dizi social model in which, although the people are classified by their categories or their offices, they share something in common in the cosmological dimension represented by ritual and myth—one may imagine the Kline bottle as this model, in which the top is at the same time the bottom—rather than a model where each category is strict and hierarchically systematized.
DISCUSSION

So far I have presented an account regarding the social organization of Sai, relying on a critical review of Haberland's study. However, I have no intention to insist that my data or interpretation is solely legitimate. My research also, after all, was conducted only in a short period of time, and I did not master the language. What I have written should be deliberated by others in the same critical way as I have done to Haberland. Haberland and I, after all, should be a starting point.

In this last section I would like to discuss the regional diversity that may have led to the disparity between my observations and Haberland's. I carried out my research in Sai, whereas Haberland chose Adikas (Adi). The difference in social organization and customs may have been a reflection of this regional diversity. This point should not be ignored when studying the "ethno-system" of northeast Africa. Introducing this new concept, Fukui insists on recognizing the mutual relationships among various ethnic groups as one single system (quoted in Kurimoto 1994: 64). However, there is a concern whether we should consider those peoples as a single unit, within which mutual relationships take place. We may not ignore the variations within a people, as well as among the peoples. Rather, it seems that internal variation is an element in any ethno-system. For example, the Dizi and Kwegu are related by the oral tradition of kwoygi (hunters). However, Sai and Adikas may disagree on whether to recognize the kwoygi as the independent ethnic group of Kwegu. Moreover, even given the myth of Sai that indicates kwoygi as Kwegu, the relationship between Dizi and kwoygi is still dynamic. Also, there may be a full spectrum of interethnic relations between confrontation and peaceful coexistence, although the possibility of this spectrum is not taken into consideration in Fukui's analysis (Fukui 1994: 36). It may be safe to say that not all Dizi are in a hostile relationship with the T'ama, Surmic pastoralists, just as not all the Nuer are hostile to all the Dinka, everytime, everywhere (Johnson 1994). Moreover, historical transformations must be taken into consideration.

The next point is the issue of informants. Haberland collected his information mainly from the Adikiyasu. According to Fukui, who interviewed the same person, when the Adikiyasu mentioned the rank of the chief, koichiezi, he referred to "ranking in the army" as a metaphor: The person on top, i.e. the general, was the Adikiyasu. My informants, although most were geima, included some koichiezi and uruki. I did not have a chance to ask the Saikiyasu himself about rank, and this may be one of the reasons for the disparity with Haberland.

In studying the social orderings, offices and categories of people, if one informant's perception of social orderings or classification may differ from that of another, it is impossible to define such social systems as "caste." If the social organization of Sai and that of Adikas resemble each other, the mutual relationship between the social categories of Dizi people, I believe, is similar to the relationship among the colors of a rainbow. That is, around the top of the arch, the color red is above all layers, yet, towards the root of the arch, all the colors are at the same
level. I liken the social “hierarchy” of Dizi to this rainbow, whose superior/inferior relationships differ subtly depending on the point from which one views it. However, just as the outermost and the innermost colors of the rainbow are fixed (red and violet), the social positions of the chief and geima seem to be nearly fixed.

The ranking order of chief > koichiezi > baabaishi is, like the color arrangement of the rainbow, fixed. A baabaishi relative is not kaariyab, yet, there are almost no taboos or rankings between them. Nor is the kaariyab of the chief “in a higher position” than the kaariyab of koichiezi. The kaariyab does not have any prerogatives or special taboo until he becomes the chief or the koichiezi. A young man said that in Dizi, there are only kaariyab and geima. There seems to be not much difference between the relatives of baabaishi and kaariyab. Uruki could have possibly been kaariyab in the chiefdom where they or their ancestors originated. In any case, the “caste” society of Haberland is no more than merely a very “fictive, abstract and general” “illusion,” that is very remote from, and does not account for, any individual or specific “events” of Dizi social reality.
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NOTES

1) I obtained some of my data in Amharic, the official language of Ethiopia. Most of the people of Dizi who lived in the chiefdom of Sai spoke Amharic. However, my Amharic speaking ability was not such as to comprehend complex issues, so that I had to rely on elementary school teachers who could speak English as interpreters. I made little progress to communicate in the Dizian language, apart from some daily salutations, due to my short stay.

2) For example, Nagashima, who studied the Teso of Kenya, said of Ivan Karp, who also conducted research among the same people: “I realized that there is a huge difference between the Teso society which he described and the actual state of Teso society which I observed with my own eyes, and in fact his research has taught me the contrary, rather than become the basis of my study (my translation)” (Nagashima 1987: 10).

3) As for the lists of koichiezi and baabaishi, see Appendix 2. Including that of the chief, all the names are hereditary. Therefore, for example, when the eldest son takes up the office
of koichizi which is called the baasu, after succeeding his father, he also inherits the name Baasu as his personal name. From then onwards, it is discourteous to call him with his name before the inauguration.

4) With regards to kinship in Dizi, it is not possible to track the genealogy for more than three generations. Although the Saikiyasu and the koichiezi of the villages are exceptions, even for them, only the names of the chiefs and koichiezi (before the inauguration) of the preceding generations are remembered and not the entire relationships of their children and grandchildren. Moreover, those who remember all the names of the chiefs and the koichiezi are only a part of the people called Geima, explained later on, who are categorized as the followers of the chiefs and the koichiezi. It is not true that the descendants of the chiefs remember the genealogy of their own family. As for the general survey of Dizi kinship, see Appendix 3.

5) According to the old geima, Zalaka Zer, who was one of my main informants, Dechiburzi was in Sai before the first Saikiyasu, and at the beginning he was koichiezi and drank from geini, but after he lost the battle against Saikiyasu, he was “demoted” to baabaishi. Since then, all Dechiburzi could not drink from anything else but kofu.

6) The way Yiemburzi conduct their funeral is different from the rest of Sai people. They bury the body under a pile of rocks. They say this custom is similar to the peoples along the Omo river. The reason why they do not bury the body under the soil is that it would be eaten by hyenas. Yet only the males, the brothers or sons of Yiemburzi, are buried under rock and the females, the daughters and sisters, are buried under the soil.

7) Not only koichiezi and baabaishi, but also geima sometimes perform as nairibab to the chief and koichiezi. Tuubu Geltitch and the Nuibab, who are geima, are nairibab of the Baasu, and their role is to transport the body to the graveyard when the Baasu dies. They are the only ones who are allowed to enter the graveyard of the Baasu. The Nuibab is also the nairibab of the Saikiyasu, and will transport the body of the Saikiyasu to the graveyard. (The relationship is one-sided and when the Nuibab dies, neither the Saikiyasu nor the Baasu transport his body to the graveyard). The Shanguu does not play this role. Perhaps because of all these complications, there were times that the Orusuusu, the baabaishi, performed on behalf of the Shanguu of geima, and some informants were not able to clearly distinguish nairibab from geima.

The nairibab relationship is observed not only between the chief and geima, or between the chief and koichiezi. For example, Zalaka Zer who is geima and Tuutn who is baabaishi are both nairibab for generations and both are involved in the funerals of each other’s families. After a funeral is over, they throw a white cloth, which they wear, over the threshold of the house of the dead. The nairibab plays the very important ceremonial role of sprinkling water on that cloth. It is also often seen that one person becomes nairibab of several others.

8) James (1988) inferred, on the basis of the history of the Uduk people, who live on the boundary of Sudan and Ethiopia, that they may have a hunting culture as an “archive.” The same presumption may also be applied to the Dizi, if we further pursue the tradition of kwoygi.
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### Appendix 1: Dizi chiefdoms and chiefs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Chiefdom</th>
<th>Chief</th>
<th>Chief's power over rainfall</th>
<th>Executor of Chief's rainfall ritual</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kolu (Kolu)*</td>
<td>Koluburzi</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>Chiskiyasu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adikas (Adi)</td>
<td>Adikiyasu</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Chiskiyasu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chiski (Tsiski)</td>
<td>Chiskiyasu</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>Chiskiyasu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gaaru (Garo) (Keltskumbit)</td>
<td>Gaaruburzi</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Chiskiyasu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mushi (Mash)</td>
<td>Meshkiyasu</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>Meshkiyasu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sai (Say)</td>
<td>Saikiyasu</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>Meshkiyasu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dui</td>
<td>Duikiyasu</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Saikiyasu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gelkamo (Galkam)</td>
<td>Duuruna**</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Woruburzi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dagbury</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Chobikiyasu</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woru (Wor)</td>
<td>Woruburzi</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>Woruburzi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kelt (Kyalt)</td>
<td>Keltiyam</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Woruburzi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gobi (Gobi)</td>
<td>Gobitiyaar</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>Woruburzi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meru (of Gobi)</td>
<td>Merutiyar</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Gobitiyaar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maji (kurit)</td>
<td>Majigaju</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Woruburzi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kaaltsu (Karts)</td>
<td>Kaaltsuyam</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Woruburzi, Gobitiyaar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aaro (Aro)</td>
<td>Aarouru</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>Woruburzi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dami (Dami)</td>
<td>Damiveryu</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>Woruburzi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duku (of Dami) (Duku)</td>
<td>Dukuburzi</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Damiveryu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kanta (Kanta)</td>
<td>Kantiaburzi</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Osklu (Ezkolu)</td>
<td>Oskuburzi</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Damiveryu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jaba (Jabba)</td>
<td>Jababurzi</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>Woruburzi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kaishi (of Jaba) (Kasi)</td>
<td>Kaishiburzi</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Jababurzi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bay (Bay)</td>
<td>Bayburyu</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>Woruburzi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Byero (Beru)</td>
<td>Byerburyu</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>Woruburzi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mui (Muy)</td>
<td>Muikiyam</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>Woruburzi</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Words in parentheses indicate the expression by Haberland.

** Duuruna is not a traditional chief, but dominated the land with armed force.

# The chief who conducts the rainfall ritual for another chiefdom in the case that its chief does not possess ritual power over rainfall.
## Appendix 2: Koichiezi and baabaishi within Sai

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Koichiezi</th>
<th>Residential area</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>1. The children of successive Saikiyasu who became koichiezi</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demtkoishi</td>
<td>Diimt of Orukut*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ilichikoishi</td>
<td>Mait</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tarumkoishi</td>
<td>Tarum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Udumkoishi</td>
<td>Udumt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Danchiezi</td>
<td>Danga (Dyanga)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yizukoishi</td>
<td>Yiista</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kamchiezi</td>
<td>Kammo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baasu (koishi)</td>
<td>Gert</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diizikichiezi</td>
<td>Dyamt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tookinyang</td>
<td>Toogu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bworuchiezi</td>
<td>Bworu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuulutkoishi</td>
<td>Tuulutu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2. Koichiezi whose ancestors came from other lands</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yiemburzi</td>
<td>Yiemt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>3. Koichiezi whose ancestors were the natives of the lands</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maiburzi</td>
<td>Mait</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aaluburzi</td>
<td>Ayilut</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bookuchiezi</td>
<td>Booku</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urumtsweni</td>
<td>Tuufu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Birikoishi (?)</td>
<td>Yiemt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gudiburzi</td>
<td>Gert</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Baabaishi</th>
<th>Residential area</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>1. Natives who had already been in Sai before the first Saikiyasu came</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dechiburzi</td>
<td>Yiemt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iibu</td>
<td>Zagunt, Saing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orukugaju</td>
<td>Nenkiga</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuutn</td>
<td>Jyaatu of Orukut,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ibutibaasu</td>
<td>Zagunt, Saing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kaarubab</td>
<td>Ilutut</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Baini Donkale)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Airibab**</td>
<td>Ilutut</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baishibab**</td>
<td>Ilutut</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gotuburzi</td>
<td>Zagunt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2. The people who are related to koichiezi</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suurukinyang</td>
<td>Delgit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motbab</td>
<td>Gert</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3. The people who are uruki

Baakeishi  Muit of Orukut
Orususu    Tarum
Fyeete     Tuufu
Kworuku    Chuudarkut of Orukut
Kooruna    Delgit
Kelsi      Zagunt
Nebushi    Zagunt

* Orukut indicates a wider area in which the residence of Saikiyasu is constructed.
** Dead, no successors

The classification indicated as 1, 2, and 3 in this list is based on the opinion of Zalaka Zer

Appendix 3: Notes on descent, kinship and marriage

The Dizi vocabulary has the word zuru, which indicates kindred, but there are no lineages or clans, with proper names. There is even no word that corresponds to "family," and there are no surnames. Even so, in daily life, emphasis is emotionally put on paternal relationships. As seen in the genealogy of the Saikiyasu in Figure 1, upon the death of a Saikiyasu, his son or younger brother succeeds him. Of course, there are exceptions. As seen in Figure 2, the reason the present Demtkoishi, one of the koichiezi, managed to obtain the current position, was not by the patrilineal principle in a strict sense. Also, when a younger brother dies, it is taboo for an elder brother to inherit the property and the family of the deceased. When a son marries, in general, he keeps his residence near his father or in the same village, and marriage is virilocal, that is, the wife moves into the residence of the husband. Therefore, under such patrilineal tradition, even when a person is born and raised in the land of Sai, if his/her father or patrilineal ancestors have been an uruki, he/she is also uruki. In contrast, even if matrilineal ancestors were uruki, if the father was not, then the descendant is not considered uruki. As such, the uruki descent plays an important role in the social structure. It assures the possibility of intermarriage within the village. The "son" and "daughter" of the chief often marry the relatives of other chiefs in different areas. It is not so unusual that the koichiezi of the village, baabaishi, and their relatives arrange a spouse from another area. Even so, some prefer to find a spouse from the same area, whom they are familiar with, instead of taking the trouble to have a stranger as a spouse. In such cases, it is very convenient to have uruki within the village.

As I have mentioned already, marriage between kin is not allowed. The kin are called zuru in the Dizi language. When you ask somebody from Sai what zuru means, the response you will get is, "flesh is one, blood is one." Marriage with zuru is alkuz (taboo), and therefore, the cross-cousin marriage, which is well-known
among anthropologists, is not approved in Dizi society. Other than this taboo, there are some other alkuz, especially among close relatives. For example, there is an expression called "oh swidee" which is quite often used to express amazement. Swidee means "the private part of a woman" and it is taboo to use this expression in front of a married sister. It is also taboo to sleep in the same house as the married sibling. This relationship is called kob. However, a man and his yaami (FZ) is not kob, but his yaami can sleep in the man's goat skin for a bed. This is not considered alkus. The relationship between a woman and her aku' (MB) is also not considered kob.

There are some taboos among affines. For instance, a man must not use the expression "oh swidee" in front of the "mother" of his wife (including the classificatory mother), nor is he allowed to be seen naked. When these taboos are violated, he has to repay his mother-in-law and the aforementioned married sisters with cattle. These cattle will be ritually killed for sacrifice, and the mother-in-law and the sisters smear its blood onto their bodies to purify themselves.

The cattle paid as bridewealth is called ashum. The most common custom is to pay three in total, one bull and two cows. However, it is expected for persons in a higher social rank, such as the close relatives of the chief, to pay more cattle. The cattle as bridewealth does not have to be paid at once before marriage, but may be
Uruku married a man of Gobi (1) but her husband (1) died while she was pregnant. Uruku returned to Sai and Chiezi was born. Chiezi married Daamin, the daughter of a former Demtkoishi (2). However, Chiezi and Uruku were killed by Tama of Surmic pastoralists. Daamin was pregnant at that time. The former Demtkoishi had no other children than Daamin (some say that other children all died without leaving any descendants). Thus the child of Daamin, Keishi, succeeded to the position of Demtkoishi.

paid even after the bride and the groom start their new life or even after a child is born. However, one bull must be paid to the "father" of the bride first. This bull belongs to the "father" and he is free to do whatever he wants with it. The hide of this bull is used as the bed of the "father" and nobody is allowed to infringe on the right of the father. In case the wife runs away from her husband with her child, the relatives of the wife must pay back the cattle they have been paid by the relatives of
the husband. But the bull paid to the "father" of the wife is an exception, and does not have to be paid back. When the wife runs away leaving her child behind, the cattle do not have to be paid back.

For the kinship terminology, refer to Figure 3. Note that the terminology for the male descendants of the brothers resembles the Omaha type, and that the grandfather (MF, FF) and the great grandmother (FFM, FFM, MFM, MMM) are indicated with the same term, *aku*. 