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BRIDewealth Among the Iteso of Kenya: A FURTHeR NOTE ON THEIR AFFINAL RELATIONSHIP AND ITS HISTORICAL CHANGE

By NOBUHIRO NAGASHIMA*

I

The aim of this paper is to supplement and modify my previous papers on marriage and affinal relationship among the Iteso of Kenya by presenting 121 cases of marriage and bridewealth payment, analysing them from a historical point of view, describing concomitant changes in value and behaviour, and considering causes which brought about these changes.

Briefly, main points of my previous arguments about bridewealth payments among the Iteso of Kenya ought to be repeated:

(1) Formerly, cattle of bridewealth were handed over in a lump sum, even before the bride was taken to her husband's home, which took the form of 'capture.' In modern times, bridewealth which consists of cattle, goats and money is paid gradually over a considerable number of years and an exact agreement as to what and how to pay is not necessarily made at the initial stage. It is, therefore, assumed that the radical change from a lump sum payment to a piecemeal one must have occurred in a fairly recent time.

(2) I suggested that the transitional period was after the Second World War, that is, late 1940s and early 1950s, on the basis of scattered evidence (scattered because I did not have time to sort out marriage cases I recorded at the time of writing). The reasons given by Iteso elders were twofold. First, soldiers who returned from the service introduced the piecemeal payment together with cash as a part of bridewealth. Second, the radical change was the result of adopting the idea of piecemeal payment from neighbouring peoples, espe-

---

* Professor (Kyōju) of Social Anthropology.

1 Nagashima 1978, 1980 & 1981. The first paper, written in Japanese, is mainly a description of the general pattern of the affinal relationship. The second one is partly a summary translation of the first with a critical assessment of Karp's propositions with regards to the Iteso affinal relationship. The third one is a modified version of the second.

2 The material was mainly collected during my third field work conducted among the Iteso of Kenya from August through October, 1981, although some are taken from previous researches, which had been made from June, 1977 to January, 1978 and from September, 1979 to January, 1980. These field researches were a part of the East African Studies Project organized at this University and sponsored by the Japanese Ministry of Education with its Scientific Research Fund, to which I should like to express my gratitude. I am also grateful to the Kenyan Government and administrators of Busia and Bungoma Districts for having permitted me to conduct research and for their various assistances rendered to me. I should like to thank Dr. B.E. Kipkorir, Mr. G. Mathu and other staff of the Institute of African Studies, University of Nairobi, for their kind assistances. My warm thanks are due to all the Iteso people who helped me in various ways.
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This suggestion diametrically opposed to Karp's assumption that the piecemeal payment among the Kenyan Iteso was a long established custom. He also strongly asserted (or, rather, took it for granted) that the wife-giver was politically superior to the wife-receiver on the basis of the former's position as the creditor. I failed to support his proposition both ethnographically and analytically and concluded that the affinal relationship was independent of the leader-follower relationship.

(3) As regards to concomitant phenomena with the change of bridewealth payment, I mentioned the following aspects. First, demands for additional gifts (extra-bridewealth gifts) by the wife-giver are very high. Second, the manners of wife-givers can be rude, although it is regarded as bad. Third, demands from wife-givers for financial help such as school fees are considerable. Fourth, conflicts among brothers are often very serious because the accumulation of wealth for younger brothers' marriages tend to be upset by elder brothers whose priority is to meet unpredictable demands of their own wife-givers. Fifth, uncertainty and confusion are, as it would seem, spreading as to how to demand, or meet, the outstanding claim after the initial payment is made, since any systematic adaptation, or adjustment, to the basic change does not seem to have been achieved.

I shall have to reconsider and modify these points by referring to new materials obtained during my third visit.

II

Before going into analysing the data presented at the Appendix, their nature and limits as evidence should first be noted. Most of 121 marriage cases collected are based on interviews at ten families living in Kolanya Sub-Location (north-eastern part of North Teso Location, Busia District). Some others are from individuals of Angurai and other Sub-Locations of North Teso Location. Whenever possible, I cross-checked the information from affines concerned and any discrepancy arising from different accounts between the wife-taker and the wife-giver was rechecked so as to find its source. Such a discrepancy was usually a matter of a head of cattle, or of the exact year of payment and in most cases I could detect the reason. I would not claim that every figure listed in the Appendix is accurate, although it may be contended that the possible margin of errors may not alter the conclusions obtained from the general patterns discernible in the data.

The original data contain names of each couple, those of their respective fathers, clan names, place of marriage and present residence, the person who was responsible for, or sponsored, the payment, the number of children out of the marriage and rituals which have been held for the wife, but these are omitted from the list because they are not directly relevant to the present discussion.

8 Absorption of the Iteso population by the Luyia, especially by the Bakhayo and the Bukusu has been very noticeable. The former are friendly to the Iteso, while the latter are, generally speaking, not so much. It is not deniable, anyway, that the Iteso have adopted various kinds of cultural ideas from the Luyia groups.

4 Karp maintains that 'Bridewealth is never paid in a lump sum' (1978, p. 79) and that if the radical change occurred it should have been before the turn of the century (personal communication).

People's memory about the year of marriage seems surprisingly clear and it indicates that the sense of chronology in terms of, or created in the form of, the calendar year was very quickly developed among men; women are generally not inclined to identify the year of events, while men are proud of doing so.\(^6\)

References to court cases by which additional bridewealth was made to pay came spontaneously (5 cases) and if I pressed harder there could have been more of such cases. The number of goats paid as bridewealth is the most inaccurate part of the present data, because no reference to it does not necessarily mean that goats were not included; rather, it is because the number was easily forgotten in the case of an old marriage.

The amount of money cannot always be accurate, for there are several kinds of money to be paid for a marriage and although by definition bridewealth money is only one kind, that is, that repayable upon divorce, informants might have included other kinds of money, such as the money for the bride's mother, that of 'accompanying cattle' etc.

In spite of these defects and varying degree of quality and quantity of information about each marriage case, the overall tendencies emerging from statistical treatments as shown below can not be said to be affected or distorted by these defects of data. In the following sections, I shall first be concerned with the change in the form of bridewealth payments, with that in the number of bridewealth cattle, with the introduction of cash, and then with the causes which seem to have brought about these changes. Concomitant phenomena that have accompanied these changes will be considered later.

### III

In order to grasp historical changes in the form of bridewealth payments, I have divided 121 cases into the three categories, 'Payment completed' [C], 'Payment not Completed' and 'Payment not Started' [N]. The second category is sub-divided into 'Those of which total amount is agreed' [A] and 'Those of which total amount is not yet agreed' [Y]. Then, each category except the third one [N] is broken-down according to the number of times of payments, thus creating eight classes, namely, [C1, C2, C3], [A1, A2], [Y1, Y2, Y4]. These are broken down according to periods of ten years' range, although the first (up to 1919) and the last (1980 & 81) are irregular in terms of the length of years. The result is shown in the Table 1. I shall enumerate certain characteristic features discernible from the table below.

Among the first category [C], those paid at once [C1], or in a lump-sum, though Karp denied the existence of such cases in his data, not only numerically exceed those of twice or thrice payments [C2, C3], but also occurred continuously till very recent time. Closely examined, however, some cases may better be omitted from this category [C1]. The case No. 415 is exceptional because the payment appears to have been incomplete, but the death of the husband and evasion of the responsibility by his agnatic kinsmen prevented the wife-taker from further claims. Both No. 601 and 605 involve barrenness of the wives which made wife-givers give up the claim. The case No. 701 (1976) is another exceptional case, since the wife-taker was the Marachi of the Luyia and wanted a quick settlement of bride-
TABLE 1. TYPES OF BRIDEWALTh PAYMENT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Period</th>
<th>Completed</th>
<th>Not Completed</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Total Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C1 C2 C3</td>
<td>Agreed A1 A2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1919</td>
<td>7 1 8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td>6.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1920-29</td>
<td>5 3 8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td>6.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1930-39</td>
<td>2 4 6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1940-49</td>
<td>7 7 15</td>
<td>2 1 3</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>14.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1950-59</td>
<td>4 2 6</td>
<td>9 4 13</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>20.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1960-69</td>
<td>3 1 5</td>
<td>3 4 7 7 2 9 1</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>18.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1970-79</td>
<td>1 1</td>
<td>1 5 5 13 1 14 7</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>22.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1980 &amp; 81</td>
<td>1 1 2</td>
<td>2 14 21 18 19 5</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>103</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Key: Completed; Bridewealth payment was completed.
C1 Paid at once.
C2 Paid twice.
C3 Paid thrice.
Not completed; Bridewealth was partly paid.
Agreed; Total amount was agreed.
A1 Paid once.
A2 Paid twice.
Not Agreed; Total amount is not yet agreed but some payments have been made.
Y1 Paid once.
Y2 Paid twice.
Y4 Paid four times.
N; Payment is not yet made.

TABLE 2. LENGTH OF PERIOD FOR BRIDEWALTh PAYMENT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Period</th>
<th>1919</th>
<th>1920s</th>
<th>1930s</th>
<th>1940s</th>
<th>1950s</th>
<th>1960s</th>
<th>1970s</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Paid Within 3 Years</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Longer Period</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>103</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

wealh payment, which consisted mainly of cash (3,000 shillings). To sum up, the type of lump sum payment was normal up to 1940s and was still existing in 50s and even in 60s.

The type of piecemeal payment, however, also seems to have been practiced in early periods. Examining again closely these early cases, it is found that they are in some respect exceptional. The case No. 103 involves a court case after thirty years from the first payment and there must have been conflict rather than agreement from the right beginning. Among three cases of 1920s, only one, the case No. 203, seems to be a genuine type of plural payments. Case No. 202 is the first case involving cash payment (after 19 years) while in case No. 204 the remaining debt was cleared within three years. This also applies to the three cases out of four in 1930s, Nos. 301, 303 and 304, while the other case of No. 302 was settled through a court case. It is, therefore, safely assumed that until 1940s, the general norm was to pay
bridewealth at once or within a short period, say three years, after the first payment. This is well indicated by the Table 2. The upper column of the Table, “Paid within three years,” is made up of \([C1-37] + [\text{Those payment completed within three years among } C2 \text{ and } C3]\), namely, \(29 - 3 + 8 = 34\). The lower column of “Longer Period” consists of \([C2 + C3 - \text{Paid within three years}] + [A1 + A2 + Y1 + Y2 + Y4] = 20 - 8 + 20 + 9 + 26 + 4 + 1 = 72\). But I omitted 3 cases of 1980/81 and therefore the total number of the lower column of the Table 2 is reduced to 69.

My previous hypotheses, that the radical change from the lump sum payment to the piecemeal payment must have occurred, and that the transitional period must have been between 1940s and 50s, are well supported by the result shown in Table 2, in so far as the areas of North Teso Location, where I mainly conducted my field work, are concerned. Then, how this can be compatible with Karp’s denial of the presence of lump-sum payments in his data? The only possible answer I can think of is that it is due to the regional/historical difference between North Teso Location and Amukura Area of South Teso Location where Karp made strenuous efforts of surveying 200 households, but he also denies this possibility stating that intermarriages between the population of the two Locations should have resulted in a common custom. I can only point out that among the 121 cases recorded here there are ten cases of inter-ethnic marriages but are only three cases of inter-Location marriages. It remains, therefore, as an unresolved question and we certainly need Karp’s detailed data in place of his categorical statement.

Returning to Table 1, it is surprising to find three cases in 1940s of incomplete payment (A1, A2). This means that the wife-takers have not paid up for more than thirty years from the first payment. This delay becomes more prominent in 1950s when not only “Agreed” cases increase but also “Not Agreed” cases emerge. Altogether, those “Not Completed” cases occupy 76% of the total marriages (25 cases), and it can be said that the piecemeal payment was firmly established in this period. The case 680 is the first of “Not Yet”, that is, no payment has been made. This type naturally increases in 1970s, when it amounts to twenty five percent.

IV

Now, let us turn our attention to the number of cattle for bride-wealth and its historical change, as indicated in Table 3. The average of the total cases is 11.2 heads of cattle, and the dominance of 12 heads of cattle is remarkable, especially during 1950s. It is also noticable that the range of distribution in number becomes narrower, though with some exceptions, in modern times.

The first period (-1919) shows the widest distribution and does not confirm a generally held view that at the beginning of this century the number of cattle for marriage was far greater than that of today, although the case of 20 h/c (No. 001) might reflect such a tendency in the late 19th century. The case of 2 h/c (No. 102), which is extremely small in

---

7 These three are Nos. 415, 601 and 605.
8 Personal communication. I myself did not try to confirm his claim in Amukura area, since it seemed a waste of time in view of Karp’s strong claim.
9 I have described the process of bridewealth negotiations elsewhere (Nagashima, 1981, pp. 58–65).
### Table 3. Number of Cattle for Bridewealth

| Period      | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 | 14 | 15 | 16 | 17 | 18 | 20 | Total | Average |
|-------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|-----|--------|
| 1919        | 1 | 2 | 1 |   | 1 |   | 1 | 1 |    | 1  | 1  |    |    |    |    |    |    |    | 8   | 9.9   |
| 1920-29     | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |    | 1  | 1  |    |    |    |    |    |    |    | 8   | 10.5  |
| 1930-39     | 1 | 1 |   | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |    | 1  | 1  |    |    |    |    |    |    |    | 6   | 12.3  |
| 1940-49     | 3 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 1 | 5 | 1 | 1 |    | 1  | 1  |    |    |    |    |    |    |    | 18  | 11.9  |
| 1950-59     | 3 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 1 |    | 1  | 1  |    |    |    |    |    |    |    | 19  | 12.0  |
| 1960-69     | 1 | 1 | 2 | 5 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |    | 1  | 1  |    |    |    |    |    |    |    | 12  | 11.7  |
| 1970-79     | 1 | 1 |   | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |    | 1  | 1  |    |    |    |    |    |    |    | 6   | 8.3   |
| 1980-81     | 1 |   |   |   | 2 | 3 | 6 | 10| 5  | 21 | 5  | 10 | 1  | 2  | 2  | 2  | 1  | 78  | 11.2  |

number against such a view, is of particular interest. This is a marriage of Omudek, 'the most powerful sub-chief in what was to become North Teso Location.' I collected this case from Mr. C. Odera, one of Omudek’s son and himself an ex-chief of North Teso Location. According to Mr. Odera, the wife-giver would not claim many heads of cattle, since they expected from Omudek as their patron various kinds of favours. He also said that this kind of small payment was usual for bigmen, or chiefs, for exactly the same reason. According to Karp’s theory, a wife-giver was politically superior to his wife-receiver, “but that is,” said Mr. Odera, “a sheer nonsense.” “How could a big man become inferior to his own follower simply because he married the latter’s daughter?”

Mr. Odera also told me that in 1920s the local government had decided that seven heads of cattle should be the minimum and compulsory, and be paid at once. This was intended to protect the custom of bridewealth from the misconception of ‘Purchase’ marriage. This compulsory measure was, according to him, abolished in early 1930s. In fact, only one case (No. 202) out of eight cases was below the standard, but in this case the amount of 30 shillings was paid in addition nineteen years later. The same standard appears to have been working during 1930s, and Mr. Odera was the first person to pay cash (400 shillings; No. 306) as a part of bridewealth among the 121 cases.

The range of the number of cattle became narrower during 1940s and 1950s, twelve heads being at its centre. Twelve became, as it seems, the standardized number and the tendency is also noticeable in 1960s. Both of two cases of small number of cattle in 1970s (No. 701, No. 762) and a similar case of 1981 (No. 853) are all marriages with the Luyia and thus do not correspond to the general pattern of intra-Iteso marriages. Excluding these exceptional two cases, the average number of cattle in 1970s is 11.3 and becomes closer to the standard average.

The recent tendency to make the number of cattle around twelve may be a counterpart of the very wide range of amounts of money as bridewealth. That is, while familial differences in wealth in early days were reflected in the number of bridewealth cattle, they are nowadays represented by the amount of bridewealth money on the top of a more or less fixed number of cattle, although a bride’s education level is also considered as an important factor to decide the amount of money.

---

10 Karp, p. 45. He calls Omudek’s family a ‘chiefly dynasty’ (p. 44). A ‘chief’ here means an administrative chief.

11 I made exactly the same point against Karp’s proposition (1981, p. 52).
V

Having established main features of the change in bridewealth payment and contents, it is necessary to consider factors which brought about its change. I have already referred to two kinds of them above, the Luyia influence and soldiers. An entirely new factor had, however, emerged during my third field work, which eventually proved to be connected with the Luyia factor. Whenever I was told by elders that they used to pay bridewealth cattle at once in a lump sum, I asked them why the way to pay had changed. One day, an elder answered that it was chiefs who first advocated the change. These chiefs were Eunyusat and Alexander Papa of South Teso. Asked again why they should have done so, he replied that it was because their mother was a Wanga (Wanga was a small chiefdom among the Luyia). In fact, Eunyusat and Papa were full brothers and the latter succeeded the former in 1937 as the chief and they seemed to be in favour of the Wanga customs, one of which was the piecemeal payment of bridewealth. Papa also married a Mukhayo girl thus establishing two cultural channels with the two different groups of the Luyia, namely, the Wanga through his mother’s brothers and the Bakhayo through his wife’s brothers.

The extent to which Papa, the chief, advocated the change is not yet well known to me, but in view of Karp’s claim he must have been very enthusiastic in persuading people to change the custom. I asked Mr. Odera, who worked in the Bungoma court from 1950 to 65 as a prosecutor and assessor and became the first chief of the newly created North Teso Location (1959–73), about this, but although he was willing to accept that it was administrators including himself who introduced the change he was quite adamant to acknowledge the Wanga/Luyia influences. I was in fact advised not to write any such a nonsense, because “It was we Iteso people who brought about the change. We did not imitate other peoples’ custom.” Well, I feel sorry to him for having written the possible Wanga/Luyia influence but the established date of the change, that is, 1940s, clearly indicates that the administrative influence was strongly exercised during the period of Papa’s chiefship.

It may be too naive to stress only the administrator’s efforts to account for the radical change from the lump sum payment to the piecemeal payment; certainly, more natural process of change through intermarriages, social intercourses, and acquaintance with the idea must have contributed to it. Nevertheless, it is to be noted that deliberate efforts by administrators could have much wider and deeper influences in modern age. In view of this, it is regrettable that neither Karp nor myself had not learnt of the factor till the almost last moment when I was enlightened by an elder; a bitter lesson indeed.

VI

We are now entitled to proceed to consider phenomena concomitant with the change of bridewealth payment. It must first be stated that the exchange of a woman with bridewealth involves the transfer of the right in her procreative ability. In other words, the balance of the exchange is achieved when the wife has given birth to children. Under the lump-sum payment form, it was difficult to claim return of some of bridewealth when the wife proved
barren, but under the new system, there should be no problem about this situation, since payment can be made in parallel with the developmental cycle of the family concerned as the cases of No. 601 and No. 605 exemplify.

Second, the average age of marriage of men has considerably gone down, since younger brothers do not need to wait for the accumulation of wealth after their elder brother's marriage. This is one of the basic advantages of the piecemeal payment. It can also create, however, serious conflicts among brothers, because demands from respective wife-givers do not necessarily come in the order of seniority of brothers.

Third, affinal relationship has become more complicated than before because of the introduction of various kinds of additional, or extra-bride wealth, gifts. There are two kinds of them. One is what go with the four formal meetings between the affinal groups as I described before. This also strains agnatic relations among the wife-taker, since various kinds of contributions are expected (and necessary) from agnates. The other is what Karp called 'other, less onerous ones (than bride-wealth).'

At the initial stage of marriage negotiations, wife-givers come 'almost everyday to get sugar, soap, and other commodities.' These are not to be regarded as a kind of substitute for bride wealth, nor as an indication of the superiority of the wife-giver. People simply say that they (wife-givers) are testing the heart of the husband in order to see if he would become a good affine (ally) in future.

Fourth, I have got to moderate, or correct, my previous statement that 'demands from wife-givers for financial help such as school fees are considerable.' How to raise school fees is certainly one of the most difficult financial problems for ordinary Iteso today. People try to make use of as many connections as possible and affines are definitely counted as possible sources for help. It is misleading, however, to call it 'a demand,' since a wife-giver has no right to 'demand' for school fees. He simply asks for help and can be helped if his affine can afford to do so. Moreover, such a help is regarded as a credit, probably written down on a paper with signatures of the both parties concerned, but never as a part of bride wealth, which must be negotiated collectively. Once, an administrative officer told me that as he had helped his wife's brother so many times in school fees that he would never claim for the outstanding bridewealth. This means that the debt of the wife-giver was converted for convenience to bridewealth, or its remaining credit, thus cancelling each other.

Fifth, there are two points of reference in time to settle the outstanding claim in the case of "Agreed but Not Completed", or to decide the total amount in the case of "Not Agreed." The first is a ritual called Egwasit by which a bridewife (ateran) is promoted to the status of a full wife (aberu). This takes place more than fifteen years after marriage and the wife should have children. At this ritual, the wife-giver offers a cow for sacrifice and if the payment of bridewealth is not completed at this time, one cow is added to the total number of bridewealth cattle. This is why there is often a discrepancy in the number of bridewealth cattle when asked about it. The second occasion is the death of the wife's father. I observed twice at funerals that wife-takers promised to pay up bridewealth in near future. It is therefore not accurate to maintain that uncertainty is spreading as to how to demand, or meet, the outstanding claim, but all the same these two occasions are not necessarily properly used for this purpose.

---

13 Karp, 1978, p. 79.
14 From the interview with Mr. C. Odera, 21/9/81.
Lastly, a mystical factor seems to be contributing to the establishment of the piecemeal payment. This is a notion of *akipied*, which roughly means 'to do something wrong to oneself by overdoing something' in Kenyan Ateso. (In Ugandan Ateso,\textsuperscript{15} it means 'to bewitch, curse, to cast evil eye on.') For instance, if you talk boastfully, you may suffer from an illness. It is a kind of mystical punishment upon excessive pride and deeds. I would conclude this paper by quoting one such a case narrated to me;

In 1980 at Moding Sub-Location, a group of wife-takers brought 10 heads of cattle and four thousands shillings as the first payment of bridewealth after ten years of marriage. The wife's father advised them not to bring so much at once in fear of inviting *akipied*. The wife-taker, however, refused to bring back some of them and handed over everything they brought to the father. The husband died suddenly in 1981 and people were convinced that the death was caused by *akipied*.
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## APPENDIX

### 121 Cases of Marriage and Bridewealth

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case Number</th>
<th>Year of Marriage</th>
<th>Type of Payment</th>
<th>First Payment</th>
<th>Second/Third Payment</th>
<th>Balance</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Number of Cattle Paid</td>
<td>Number of Goats Paid</td>
<td>Number of Cattle Paid</td>
<td>Number of Goats Paid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1920–1919</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>001</td>
<td>19e</td>
<td>C1</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>002</td>
<td>19e</td>
<td>C1</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>101</td>
<td>19e</td>
<td>C1</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>102</td>
<td>19e</td>
<td>C1</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>103</td>
<td>19e</td>
<td>C1</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>104</td>
<td>19e</td>
<td>C1</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>105</td>
<td>19e</td>
<td>C1</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>106</td>
<td>19e</td>
<td>C1</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1920–29</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>201</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>C1</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>202</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>C2</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>203</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>C2</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>204</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>C2</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>205</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>C1</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>206</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>C1</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>207</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>C1</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>208</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>C1</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1930–39</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>301</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>C2</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>302</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>C2</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>303</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>C2</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>304</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>C2</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>305</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>C1</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>306</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>C1</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

W died early.

C.C.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Notes</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1940-49</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>401</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>C1</td>
<td>41 14 9 400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>402</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>C2</td>
<td>43 8 44 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>403</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>C2</td>
<td>43 8 2b 150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>404</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>C1</td>
<td>44 17 8 300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>405</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>C1</td>
<td>44 17 30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>406</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>C2</td>
<td>44 7 58 7 4 160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>407</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>C2</td>
<td>45 9 46 200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>408</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>C2</td>
<td>46 8 2 60 2 10 2 60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>409</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>C1</td>
<td>47 9 60 9 60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>410</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>C3</td>
<td>47 6 48 3 50 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>411</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>C2</td>
<td>47 7 49 7 300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>412</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>C1</td>
<td>47 11 4 150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>413</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>C2</td>
<td>51 8 6 30 55 3 6 100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>414</td>
<td>40s</td>
<td>C1</td>
<td>— 12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>415</td>
<td>40s</td>
<td>C1</td>
<td>— 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>416</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>A1</td>
<td>49 9 30 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>417</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>A1</td>
<td>49 10 50 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>418</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>A2</td>
<td>50 4 52 3 4 800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1950-59</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>501</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>C2</td>
<td>51 6 62 6 1* 12 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>502</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>C1</td>
<td>53 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>503</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>C1</td>
<td>53 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>504</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>C1</td>
<td>54 12 14 230</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>505</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>C2</td>
<td>57 7 150 66 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>506</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>C1</td>
<td>52 10 1 1* 10 1 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>551</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>A1</td>
<td>50 6 5 300 11 300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>552</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>A1</td>
<td>50 6 6 100 6 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>553</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>A1</td>
<td>51 6 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>554</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>A2</td>
<td>50 8 150 65 3 3 200 14 350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>555</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>A1</td>
<td>52 9 1 50 3 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>556</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>A1</td>
<td>54 10 2 100 4 50 14 2 150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>557</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>Y1</td>
<td>55 6 X* — — —</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>558</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>A1</td>
<td>55 7 6 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>559</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>A1</td>
<td>55 8 300 5 700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>560</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>Y1</td>
<td>55 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>561</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>Y1</td>
<td>55 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>562</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>A1</td>
<td>55 10 1 50 2 1 50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>563</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>A2</td>
<td>56 8 69 2 100 2 250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>564</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>A1</td>
<td>56 9 3 4 300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>565</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>A2</td>
<td>57 8 61 4 300 2 14 300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>566</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>Y2</td>
<td>59 6 100 59 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>567</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>A2</td>
<td>58 6 70 77 4 3 3 230</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>568</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>Y4</td>
<td>58 4 X* 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>569</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>Y1</td>
<td>59 4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### BRIDWEALTH AMONG THE ITESO OF KENYA

#### 1960-69

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>601</th>
<th>61</th>
<th>C1</th>
<th>61</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>240</th>
<th>3*</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>240</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>602</td>
<td>60s</td>
<td>C1</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>603</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>C2</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>604</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>C3</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>605</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>C1</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>400</td>
<td></td>
<td>8*</td>
<td>400</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Cancelled because of barrenness.*

| 651 | 60 | Y1  | 60 | 7  | 90  |    |    |     |
| 652 | 60 | Y1  | 60 | 7  | 90  |    |    |     |

*No more claim because of barrenness.*

| 653 | 61 | A1  | 61 | 5  | 150 | 5  | 1  | 30  |
| 654 | 62 | A2  | 62 | 7  | 78  | 3  |    |     |
| 655 | 62 | A2  | 62 | 6  | 100 | 7  | 30 | 13  |
| 656 | 62 | Y1  | 62 | 8  | 6   | 300|    |     |
| 657 | 62 | A1  | 62 | 7  | 100 | 5  | 12 | 3  |
| 658 | 63 | A1  | 64 | 8  | 4   | 12 | 0  |     |
| 659 | 64 | Y2  | 69 | 4  | 7?  | 2  |    |     |
| 660 | 65 | Y1  | 69 | 4  | 76  | 3  | 100|     |
| 661 | 65 | Y1  | 65 | 9  |     |    |    |     |
| 662 | 66 | Y2  | 66 | 3  | 1   |    |    |     |
| 663 | 66 | A2  | 66 | 6  | 70  | 67 | 100|     |
| 664 | 66 | Y1  | 66 | 9  |     |    |    |     |
| 665 | 67 | Y1  | 80 | 4  |     |    |    |     |
| 666 | 69 | Y1  | 69 | 5  | 1b  |    |    |     |
| 680 | 65 | N   |    |    |     |    |    |     |

*OT T Mugisu C.C.*

One bull for goats.

#### 1970-79

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>701</th>
<th>76</th>
<th>C1</th>
<th>76</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>3000</th>
<th></th>
<th>3</th>
<th>3000</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>751</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>Y1</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>752</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>A1</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2500</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>753</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>Y1</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>754</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>Y1</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>755</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>A1</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>756</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>Y2</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>757</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>Y1</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>800</td>
<td></td>
<td>1100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>758</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>Y1</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>759</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>Y1</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>700</td>
<td>300</td>
<td></td>
<td>1000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>760</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>Y1</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>761</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>Y1</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>400</td>
<td></td>
<td>600</td>
<td></td>
<td>1000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>762</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>A1</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6000</td>
<td>2225</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>18225</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>763</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>A1</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>400</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>764</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>Y1</td>
<td>77</td>
<td></td>
<td>500</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>765</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>Y1</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1700</td>
<td></td>
<td>1000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>766</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>Y1</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>300</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>767</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>Y1</td>
<td>78</td>
<td></td>
<td>120</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>768</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>Y1</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>769</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>A1</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>780</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>781</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>782</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>783</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The marriage is said to have been made in 1910s.
The payment was made at once.
The payment was completed at the second occasion.
The total amount of the bridewealth was agreed and the first payment was made.
The total amount of the bridewealth was agreed and paid twice.
Y1, Y2, Y3 The total amount was not decided but the payment was made once (Y1), twice (Y2) or thrice (Y3).
No payment is yet made.
The payment (usually second one) was made after a court decision.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Wife-Taker</th>
<th>Wife-Giver</th>
<th>Payment</th>
<th>Date of Payment</th>
<th>Purpose</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>851</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>Y1</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>852</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>Y1</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1500</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>853</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>A1</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1790</td>
<td>230</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2020</td>
<td>OT G Luyie (Samiya)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>881</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>882</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>—</td>
<td>OT G Bukusu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>883</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>—</td>
<td>OT G Bukusu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>884</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Key:**
- 10s The marriage is said to have been made in 1910s.
- C1 The payment was made at once.
- C2 The payment was completed at the second occasion.
- A1 The total amount of the bridewealth was agreed and the first payment was made.
- A2 The total amount of the bridewealth was agreed and paid twice.
- Y1, Y2, Y3 The total amount was not decided but the payment was made once (Y1), twice (Y2) or thrice (Y3).
- N No payment is yet made.
- C.C. The payment (usually second one) was made after a court decision.
- T Wife-Taker
- W Wife
- OT Other Tribes
- G Wife-Giver
- H Husband