

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 Kenya¹ by presenting 121 cases of marriage and bridewealth payment,² 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.

cially from the Bakhayo of the Luyia (a southern neighbour) through friendship³ and inter-marriages.

This suggestion diametrically opposed to Karp's assumption that the piecemeal payment among the Kenyan Iteso was a long established custom.⁴ 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.⁵

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.

³ 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).

⁵ Nagashima, 1981, p. 65.

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 can not 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-giver 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-

⁶ There are of course means to check their accuracy through various events of which year are well known, such as the first World War, years of named famines, etc.

TABLE 1. TYPES OF BRIDEWEALTH PAYMENT

Period	Completed				Not Completed								N	Total	Percentage
	C1	C2	C3	t	Agreed			Not Agreed							
					A1	A2	t	Y1	Y2	Y4	t				
19c -1919	7	1		8										8	6.6
1920-1929	5	3		8										8	6.6
1930-1939	2	4		6										6	5.0
1940-1949	7	7	1	15	2	1	3							18	14.9
1950-1959	4	2		6	9	4	13	4	1	1	6			25	20.7
1960-1969	3	1	1	5	3	4	7	7	2		9	1		22	18.1
1970-1979	1			1	5		5	13	1		14	7		27	22.3
1980 & 81					1		1	2			2	4		7	5.8
Total	29	18	2	49	20	9	29	26	4	1	31	12		121	
Percentage	24.0	14.9	1.7	40.5	16.5	7.4	24.0	21.5	3.3	0.8	25.6	9.9		100.0	

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 BRIDEWEALTH PAYMENT

Period	-1919	1920s	1930s	1940s	1950s	1960s	1970s	Total
Paid Within 3 Years	7	6	5	10	4	1	1	34
Longer Period	1	2	1	7	21	18	19	69
Total	8	8	6	17	25	19	20	103

wealth 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 $[C1-3^7] + [\text{Those payment completed within three years among } C2 \text{ and } C3]$, 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.⁸ 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.⁹

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 noticeable 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	8	9.9	
1920-29				1		1	1	1	1				1	1	1				8	10.5	
1930-39						1	1		1				1				1	1	6	12.3	
1940-49								3	2	3	4	1	4				1		18	11.9	
1950-59									3	1	11	1	3						19	12.0	
1960-69							1	1	2		5	1	1			1			12	11.7	
1970-79	1	1						1		1	1	1							6	8.3	
1980-81	1																		1	2.0	
Total	3	1		3	1	2	3	6	10	5	21	5	10	1	2	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.'¹⁰ 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?"¹¹

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 an 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 ballance 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-bridewealth, gifts. There are two kinds of them. One is what goes with the four formal meetings between the affinal groups as I described before.¹² 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).'¹³ At the initial stage of marriage negotiations, wife-givers come 'almost everyday to get sugar, soap, and other commodities.'¹⁴ These are not to be regarded as a kind of substitute for bridewealth, 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 bridewealth, 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.

¹² Nagashima, 1981, pp. 58-63.

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,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*.

REFERENCE

- Karp, I., 1978, *Fields of Change among the Iteso of Kenya*, Routledge & Kegan Paul, London.
- Kiggen, Rev. Fr. J., 1953, *Ateso-English Dictionary*, Mill Hill, London.
- Nagashima, N., 1978, "Marriage and Affinal Relationship among the Iteso of Kenya" (in Japanese), *Minzokugaku-Kenkyu* (The Journal of Japanese Society of Ethnology), vol. 43, no. 3.
- , 1980, "A Note on Marriage and Affinal Relationship among the Iteso of Kenya, with Special Reference to Ivan Karp's Proposition," *Hitotsubashi Journal of Social Studies*, vol. 12, no. 1, Hitotsubashi Academy, Hitotsubashi University, Tokyo.
- , 1981, "Is the Wife-Giver Superior? : The Affinal Relationship among the Iteso of Kenya, with Special Reference to Ivan Karp's Propositions," in Nagashima, N. (ed), *Themes in Socio-Cultural Ideas and Behaviour among the Six Ethnic Groups of Kenya*, Hitotsubashi University, Tokyo, printed with a Scientific Research Fund of the Japanese Ministry of Education, not for sale.

¹⁵ *Ateso-English Dictionary*.

APPENDIX

121 CASES OF MARRIAGE AND BRIDEWEALTH

Case Number	Year of Marriage	Type of Payment	First Payment			Second/Third Payment			Ballance			Total			Note
			Year of Payment	Number of Cattle Paid	Number of Goats Paid	Amount of Money Paid	Year of Payment	Number of Cattle Paid	Number of Goats Paid	Amount of Money Paid	Number of Cattle Remaining	Number of Goats Remaining	Unpaid Amount of Money	Number of Cattle	
19c-1919															
001	19c	C1	—	20								20		0	C.C.
002	07	C1	—	10								10		0	
101	11	C1	—	18								18		0	
102	16	C1	—	2								2		0	
103	19	C1	—	3	49	2						5		0	
104	10s	C1	—	5		2						5	2	0	
105	10s	C1	—	6								6		0	
106	10s	C1	—	13								13		0	
1920-29															
201	21	C1	—	16								16		0	W died early.
202	23	C2	—	5	2	42		30				5	2	30	
203	25	C2	25	5		48	4					9		0	
204	26	C2	—	8		29	6					14		0	
205	27	C1	27	10	2							10	2	0	
206	29	C1	29	7								7		0	
207	20s	C1	—	8								8		0	
208	20s	C1	—	15								15		0	
1930-39															
301	32	C2	32	10		33	4					14		0	C.C.
302	33	C2	33	6		62	2	4				8	4	0	
303	37	C2	37	12		39	6					18		0	
304	38	C2	38	12		38	5					17		0	
305	30s	C1	—	7								7		0	
306	30s	C1	—	10	6	400						10	6	400	

1940-49															
401	41	C1	41	14	9	400						14	9	400	
402	43	C2	43	8			68	2				10		0	
403	43	C2	43	8	1b*		44	6				14	1b	0	*One bull for goats.
404	44	C1	44	17	8	150						17	8	150	
405	44	C1	44	13		300						13		300	
406	44	C2	44	7			58	7	4	160		14	4	160	C.C.
407	45	C2	45	9			46			200		9		200	
408	46	C2	46	8	2	60	60	2				10	2	60	OT G Luyia (Nyole)
409	47	C1	47	9		60						9		60	
410	47	C3	47	6			48	3				12		0	
							50	3							
411	47	C2	47	7			49	7		300		14		300	
412	47	C1	47	11	4	150						11	4	150	
413	49	C2	51	8	6	30	55	3	6	100		11	12	130	
414	40s	C1	—	12								12		0	
415	40s	C1	—	9								9		0	H died soon.
451	48	A1	49	9		30				3		12		30	
452	49	A1	49	10		50				2		12		50	
453	49	A2	50	4			52	3		4	800	11		800	
1950-59															
501	51	C2	51	6			62	6				12		0	
502	53	C1	53	10						1*		10		0	*One died soon.
503	53	C1	53	10								10		0	OT T Sabaot
504	54	C1	54	12	14	230						12	14	230	
505	57	C2	57	7		150	66	5				12		150	
506	51	C1	52	10	1					1*		10	1	0	*Borrowed.
551	50	A1	50	6						5	300	11		300	
552	50	A1	50	6	6	100				6		12	6	100	
553	50	A1	51	6						6		12		0	
554	50	A2	50	8		150	65	3		3	200	14		350	
555	52	A1	52	9	1	50				3	4	12	5	50	
556	54	A1	54	10	2	100				4	50	14	2	150	
557	54	Y1	55	6		X*						—	—	—	*Some amount.
558	55	A1	55	7	6					5		12	6	0	
559	55	A1	55	8		300				5	700	12		1000	
560	55	Y1	55	6								—	—	—	One died, replaced.
561	55	Y1	55	7								—	—	—	
562	55	A1	55	10	1	50				2		12	1	50	
563	56	A2	56	8			69	2	100	2	250	12		350	OT T Sabaot
564	56	A1	56	9						3	4	12	4	300	
565	57	A2	57	8			61	4	300	2		14		300	C.C. in 1961.
566	57	Y2	59	6		100	59	2				—	—	—	
567	58	A2	58	6		70	77	4	J	3	230	13	3	300	
568	58	Y4	58	4			X*	6				—	—	—	X* paid 3 times.
569	58	Y1	59	4								—	—	—	

1960-69											
601	61	C1	61	10	240		3*	10	240	*Cancelled because of barrenness.	
602	60s	C1	—	12				12	0		
603	62	C2	62	8		79	4	6	700		
604	65	C3	66	7		69	3				
						79	6				
605	69	C1	71	8	400			8*	400	*No more claim because of barrenness.	
651	60	Y1	60	7	90			—	—		
652	60	Y1	60	1				—	—		
653	61	A1	61	5	1 50		5	1	30		
654	62	A2	62	7		78	3		12	0	
655	62	A2	62	6	100		7		300		
656	62	Y1	62	8	6 300				—	—	
657	62	A1	62	7	3 100		5		12	3 100	
658	63	A1	64	8			4		12	0	
659	64	Y2	69	4		7?	2		—	—	
660	65	A2	68	6		76	3	100	5	200	14 300
661	65	Y1	65	9							— — —
662	66	Y2	66	3	1	?	2				— — —
663	66	A2	66	6	1 70	67		100	3		9 1 170
664	66	Y1	66	9							— — —
665	67	Y1	80	4							— — —
666	69	Y1	69	5	1b						— — —
680	65	N									One bull for goats.
1970-79											
701	76	C1	76	3	3000			3	3000	OT T Luyia (Marachi)	
751	70	Y1	70	5				—	—		
752	71	A1	73	6			6	2500	12	2500	OT G Luyia (Wanga)
753	71	Y1	74	5	2			—	—		
754	73	Y1	73	6				—	—		
755	73	A1	75	2	2 250		11	100	13	2 350	
756	73	Y2	75		400	77	6	2	—	—	
757	74	Y1	76	7	2 300		—	—	800	—	— 1100
758	75	Y1	77	5				—	—		
759	75	Y1	77	6	2 700			300	—	— 1000	
760	76	Y1	76	4				—	—		
761	76	Y1	77		400			600	—	— 1000	
762	77	A1	77	2	1 6000			2225	2	1 8225	OT G Luyia (Nyole)
763	77	A1	77	5	200			—	9	— 400	
764	77	Y1	77		500			—	—	— 1000	
765	78	Y1	78	6	1700			—	—	—	
766	78	Y1	79	3	300			—	—	—	
767	78	Y1	78		120			—	—	—	
768	78	Y1	78	3	1			—	—	—	
769	79	A1	80	4			7		11	—	
780	76	N									
781	77	N									
782	77	N									
783	78	N									

784	78	N								
785	79	N								
786	79	N								
787	79	N								
851	80	Y1	80	5	500			—	—	—
852	80	Y1	80	6	1500			—	—	—
853	81	A1	81	2	1790		230	2	2020	OT G Luyie (Samiya)
881	80	N								
882	80	N								OT G Bukusu
883	80	N								OT G Bukusu
884	80	N								

- 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