



Ceremonial Co-Operation and Networks: A Reanalysis of the Navajo Outfit

Author(s): Louise Lamphere

Reviewed work(s):

Source: *Man*, New Series, Vol. 5, No. 1 (Mar., 1970), pp. 39-59

Published by: [Royal Anthropological Institute of Great Britain and Ireland](#)

Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/2798803>

Accessed: 16/03/2012 20:15

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of the Terms & Conditions of Use, available at <http://www.jstor.org/page/info/about/policies/terms.jsp>

JSTOR is a not-for-profit service that helps scholars, researchers, and students discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content in a trusted digital archive. We use information technology and tools to increase productivity and facilitate new forms of scholarship. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.



Royal Anthropological Institute of Great Britain and Ireland is collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to *Man*.

<http://www.jstor.org>

CEREMONIAL CO-OPERATION AND NETWORKS: A REANALYSIS OF THE NAVAJO OUTFIT

LOUISE LAMPHERE

Brown University

Studies of Navajo social organisation describe a kin group which is larger than the household, or extended family, and which is composed of kinsmen who co-operate in ritual and economic activities. The most commonly-used label for this group is 'outfit', a term proposed by Clyde Kluckhohn. He defines an outfit as follows:

This Western term is used to designate a group of relatives (larger than the extended family) who regularly cooperate for certain purposes. Two or more extended families, or one or more extended families linked with one or more independent biological families, may habitually pool their resources on some occasions—say, planting and harvesting, and the giving of any major ceremonial for an individual member (Kluckhohn & Leighton 1946: 62).

Kluckhohn stresses that an outfit may be scattered over a good many square miles, that co-operative work is not absolutely regular, and that membership is fluid. There is, usually, according to Kluckhohn, a male who is recognised as a leader and who has prestige through age, ceremonial knowledge and wealth. The Navajo will constantly attach the name of this individual to the aggregate of kin they have in mind.

The Navajo are nominally matrilineal with named, dispersed, matrilineal clans and a tendency to uxorilocal residence. The only functions of the clan are to regulate marriage and hospitality. Clansmen in general, and even those members of a clan who live in the same area (the 'local clan element', Aberle 1961),¹ display little solidarity in the contemporary organisation of political, ritual, and economic activities. These considerations have contributed to the emphasis of many anthropologists on the significance of 'middle-range' groups, such as the outfit, which is larger than the household and extended family, but smaller than the clan or 'local clan element'.

Terms similar to 'outfit' have been proposed by other students of Navajo social organisation. Kimball and Provinse suggest 'land use community' (1942). Collier (1951) uses the term 'cooperating unit' to describe groups at Navajo Mountain and Klagetoh, and Adams (1958) suggests the concept of 'resident lineage' to describe these groups at Shonto.² It is not clear whether these are exactly equivalent to Kluckhohn's outfit since few authors, including Kluckhohn, publish both hoghan maps and genealogical data describing the exact composition and residential placement of members in a community. The major exception is Collier's useful thesis, based on 1938 field data and completed in 1951. Using maps, genealogies, and case material, she shows that at Klagetoh co-operating units are composed of two or more camps of either married siblings, or a parental couple

and married children, who pool livestock and farming resources. At Navajo Mountain, in contrast, these activities are performed by members of a single residence group, or camp. Whether these co-operating units are equivalent to, or smaller than the outfits described by Kluckhohn is impossible to decide. Anthropologists who have published since Kluckhohn's initial definition include William Ross (1955), Jerrold Levy (1962) and James Downs (1965);³ these authors have continued to use the term 'outfit' in analysing social organisation in Fruitland, Tuba City and Pinon. Kluckhohn, in his final statement on the Ramah community (1966), still discusses the outfit as an important group, and his definition and description remain unchanged. In a recent article with two other participants in the Harvard-Columbia NSF Field School, I attempted to clarify the meaning of 'outfit', suggesting a more precise genealogical definition of these groups, in order to describe their formation and fission throughout Ramah's history (Reynolds *et al.* 1967).

Additional fieldwork, however, has convinced me that the term 'outfit' does not correspond to any group which the Navajo recognise, either in terms of their own concepts or in terms of their co-operative activities. Rather than redefining the 'outfit' and continuing to emphasise the structure and function of social groups, in this article I will present an alternative analysis, stressing the importance of networks. In contrast to previous studies I will not look for a 'group' with fixed membership criteria, joint economic or ritual activities, or a clearly definable set of rights and duties between members participating in various roles. The notion of 'group', defined in terms of one or more of these attributes, and employed as an analytical tool, does not adequately characterise the ways in which Navajo organise activities.

In arriving at a different interpretation, I will use data on ceremonial co-operation in a Navajo community in New Mexico to isolate ego-centred 'sets' of potential, co-operating kin. I will outline the principles of recruitment on which actual participation in ceremonial activities is based, and show how the operation of these principles generates a network of co-operating ties which links together the entire community. Navajo social organisation, beyond the domestic group level, has the properties of a network rather than a system of large corporate groups.

The Greenwater Navajo

My study of ceremonial co-operation was carried out between June, 1965 and August, 1966 in the Navajo community of Greenwater,⁴ north of Gallup, New Mexico. A Navajo 'community' is an unbounded unit: a vaguely-defined area of scattered hoghans focused on a set of facilities. The Navajo population within a given area utilises the same schools, trading post, and missions; those on the periphery may send their children to school in one location and trade at another. Communities are becoming more clearly defined due to the increasing effectiveness of local 'chapters' introduced by the Bureau of Indian Affairs and now an important part of the Navajo Tribal Organisation. These local political units have a president, vice-president and secretary, and meet regularly to discuss and organise various Navajo tribe- and government-sponsored development projects (including

Tribal Works Projects, Head Start and Vista Programmes, and sheep dipping and vaccination programmes). Since it is becoming less and less possible to attend chapter meetings and sign up for benefits in two communities, the population of many chapters is increasingly stable.

The community of Greenwater has at its centre a chapter meeting-house, a small trading post and cafe, and a Pentecostal mission; residents live in hoghans and cabins scattered throughout a ten-mile square area. Some children attend a public school ten miles north of the trading post; others attend a Bureau of Indian Affairs boarding school fifteen miles away. In the summer, many Navajo reside in the nearby Chuska mountains where there is a summer chapter house which provides a community focus. In determining a delimited population to study, I used the Chapter Census (collected under the auspices of the Navajo Tribe), adding to this a few nuclear families because of their close spatial, or kinship, ties with other families in the census.

Greenwater has a population of 1,000 Navajo, 750 of whom reside at present within the bounds of the community as I have defined it. The remaining 250 are younger couples and children who have moved to other parts of the reservation or to urban areas off-reservation to take wage jobs. Only 15 per cent. of the community income comes from such traditional sources as livestock (the sale of lambs and wool) and weaving, although most residence groups still have a few sheep and cultivate small fields. Welfare provides 25 per cent. of the income, and irregular wage work constitutes 50 per cent. The remaining 10 per cent. is provided by Tribal Works Projects where community members work on local projects (such as road repair, house building and weaving) at \$100 for ten days of labour. Most residence groups have access to a pickup truck or car, some have electricity and even TV sets, and many have transistor radios so that they can hear local programmes in the Navajo language. Despite the dependency on a wage economy, and the obvious signs of 'Anglo' material culture, Navajo is the main language of every household. The traditional religion, along with belief in ghosts and witches, flourishes. Kinship continues to play an important role in the organisation of daily activities even in the midst of economic modernity, making an analysis of kinship organisation relevant to an understanding of this present-day Navajo community.

The evidence against the existence of the outfit

During the course of fieldwork, I attempted to elicit Navajo terms for 'household', 'residence group' and 'outfit', all groups frequently mentioned in the anthropological literature. Although social groups are not necessarily labelled, it is important to investigate the relation between the language used to discuss social relations and concrete ways of organising activities. Significantly, I could not discover any terms for even the household and residence group, the smallest and most concrete Navajo social units which include 1) the nuclear family kin who live in a single hoghan, and 2) the cluster of extended kin living in several hoghans (Lamphere 1968: 85-92, 223-4).

Finding a word or phrase which describes the outfit as defined by Kluckhohn is even more difficult. Kluckhohn mentions the phrase 'so-and-so's folks' (Kluckhohn & Leighton 1946: 62), which probably is the Navajo term 'his relatives'

(*bik'éi*).⁵ Actually, this word refers to all an individual's kin, not only his close genealogical relatives but also members of his own clan, his father's clan, children of his clan, and those whose fathers belong to his father's clan. In some contexts, (e.g. when discussing marriage prohibitions), the term could indicate the entire range of widely dispersed kin, while in other instances a Navajo uses it to refer to a much narrower range of genealogically and spatially close kin. Clearly, it has no consistent and stable usage which allows the investigator to isolate a group of co-operating relatives.

There are three clusters of additional phrases which could be used to indicate an outfit, although none of these combines both kinship and co-operation in the way that Kluckhohn's definition does.

First, *'atai hajéé* refers to one sibling group of 'all those born from the same woman's womb' (literally, 'together, plural objects come up and out'). This separates sisters and brothers from clan relatives, but does not distinguish between siblings who have the same mother and different fathers. The phrase suggests the importance Navajo place on real siblings, but does not include children of these siblings, who are also members of the extended and nuclear families to which Kluckhohn refers in his definition. A second set of phrases does incorporate these relatives: a couple, their children, and their grandchildren. Taking the point of view of the grandparental couple, *Hastiin X ba' d'chíní da' ahiilchííhígíí* means 'Mr X, his wife and children, and their children or the ones who bear after them'. *Asdzan X ba' d'chíní da' ahiilchííhígíí*⁶ means 'Mrs X, her children and their grandchildren'. These two phrases could be taken as an indication of a 'group' of kin similar to a matrilineage, but including the son's children and, as mentioned in the first phrase, both the male and female founder. These phrases, however, are not found in daily conversation and my informants have used them only when pressed to give a description of kinship relationships in Navajo.

Finally, the terms *kéédahat' níí* or *kéédahat' níígíí* mean 'neighbours' or those who dwell near by. For example, *kindalazhini keedahat' níígíí* ('Blackhouse area, the people who live, they being') refers to all the people who live in the area of Black Mesa (the English name for a local Navajo place, *kindalazhini*). As used in Greenwater, these terms may or may not refer to a group of relatives who occasionally co-operate. If, as in the case of Black Mesa, several siblings have established contiguous residence groups, co-operation and kinship will coincide with the term 'neighbours'. This is not the case for other more heterogeneous areas in Greenwater. During the course of fieldwork, I became less and less convinced that Navajo discuss co-operative activities in terms of a group similar to an outfit. The difficulties my informants expressed in answering questions about the phrases which I thought might describe an outfit indicated that I was trying to validate a pre-conceived anthropological concept quite different from the Navajo interpretation of social relationships. Furthermore, questions about who should, or does co-operate in a particular activity, were answered vaguely by phrases like 'my relatives' or 'everyone helps'.⁷ If pressed, an informant would give a list of particular kinsmen who co-operated on a given occasion. Daily conversation did not reveal references to groups but to individual kinsmen who might be asked to provide aid.

Turning from verbal discourse to behaviour, data on actual participation in a wide range of co-operative activities also fail to reveal groups such as outfits.

In Greenwater, cooking, eating, and sleeping are done within the household; hauling wood and water is handled within this unit also. Sheep herding, shearing, and dipping, and the ploughing, planting, and harvesting of fields, are joint activities of households in the residence group (Lamphere 1968). Others outside the residence group are involved only if there is a large herd of sheep to be sheared, or if the owner of a tractor is asked to plough a field. Contrary to Kluckhohn's impressions, economic activities are the concern of the residence group and not of a larger unit.⁸

The major activities which involve kinsmen from several residence groups are ceremonial occasions, such as Navajo chants, girls' puberty rites, peyote meetings, and funerals. These activities take place in residence groups in the hoghan of the major participants rather than in public places such as the chapter house, trading post, mission or school where community chapter meetings, church services, or other large gatherings are held. Activities in these public places have been clearly influenced by Anglo-American political and social organisation, as well as by indigenous kinship patterns. Prior to a study of these newer institutions, an analysis of kinship co-operation is needed, so that the ways in which Anglo and Navajo principles are combined can be seen.

Ceremonial activities are thus those where the outfit, if it existed, should emerge as an effective unit. As I will show in this article, however, ceremonial co-operation has an ego-centred focus which shifts from situation to situation. Communication patterns indicate that instead of a leadership role which emerges within a stable group, generalised notions of authority and co-operation are used by the individual who is most concerned with a ceremony to recruit kin from a network of ties.

The connexion of abstract conceptions with actual kinship relations beyond the residence group will emerge, not from the examination of verbal discourse about groups; but from a discussion of the following: 1) the main concepts of authority and co-operation which lie behind the mobilisation of aid; 2) the individual's set of potential co-operators, which shifts throughout his life and provides the possible aid for a particular ceremonial occasion. These topics will serve as a background for the analysis of ceremonies themselves; here I will show how concepts concerning authority and co-operation are used to recruit kin from ego's set of potential collaborators. Several principles are isolated to indicate which kin actually participate and which do not.

Navajo concepts of authority and co-operation

An important Navajo phrase is *t'áá bee bóholnííh* which has been translated as 'he is the boss' (Wall & Morgan 1958: 23), but which is more accurately rendered by, 'It's up to him to decide'. This describes the individual's authority or 'right to make a decision' 1) over the use and disposal of his possessions, and 2) over his own actions and the allocation of his time. In some cases, parents are *t'áá bee bóholnííh* for their children (e.g. in the arrangement of first marriages), although Navajo children, in comparison with Anglo-American children, are allowed a great deal more latitude in deciding what they want to do, or where they want to go.

In a co-operative situation involving several individuals, there is someone who is *t'áá bee bóholnííh*, that is, someone whose 'decision right' is most salient. In this

sense, the phrase means, 'It's his business' or 'It's his area of concern', as well as 'It's up to him to decide'. In some instances being *t'dá bee bóholníth* is a matter of possessing relevant property,⁹ such as having the most sheep in a herd, or owning a pickup truck that is to be used for transportation to the trading post. In other cases, a person may be *t'dá bee bóholníth* because the situation concerns him the most; the adult patient in a ceremony is a case in point. Here the individual becomes the communication centre for most of the arrangements, and it is his decisions that influence the decisions of others.

Another use of the phrase *t'dá bee bóholníth* involves decisions of social support. In a society like the Navajo, where the emphasis is on the autonomy of individuals (who have 'decision rights' over their own actions and possessions), joint action is gained by consent of other free agents. Rather than hierarchical authority where A's decision is binding on B, or a group of B's, authority is egalitarian. A makes a decision and requests a similar one from B. If B's decision is congruent with A's, both are obliged to participate in joint activities.

For instance, in discussing the possibility of a second marriage, a young woman told me, 'If somebody wants to get married with me, I'd say *shimá bóholníth* or *shizhé' é bóholníth* ('It's up to my mother or my father to decide'). Making such a statement indicates the girl's own willingness, but that her parents' support is also needed. If she has no interest in the marriage, she would discourage the suitor immediately. In this case, stating: 'It's up to X to decide', indicates the person whose co-operation must be mobilised in order to carry out what the initiating individual has already decided upon as the best course of action.

In ceremonial co-operation, this same use of the phrase *t'dá bee bóholníth* indicates that social support is being mobilised. If a man is asked to be 'Stick Receiver' for an Enemy Way Ceremony¹⁰ (also known as a Squaw Dance), he might explain to the emissary making the request, *shi doo shóholníth da, 'ádji bidaholníth* ('I am not the boss, those over there, it is up to them', referring to other relatives such as his mother, sister and sister's husband). Another man might refer to his grown children as being *bidaholníth*, if they would be the main relatives to give co-operation during the ceremony. When these individuals agree, the man originally asked consents to be Stick Receiver. The reference to his relatives already indicates that he is willing to accept the obligations of carrying out the ceremony, but he needs the support of his close kin. If he had not been willing to expend the time and effort on the ceremony, he would have immediately refused by giving an excuse.

All these uses of the phrase *t'dá bee bóholníth* have implications for ceremonial co-operation. Depending on the context, the query, *Háásh bee bóholníth?* (It's up to whom to decide?), will elicit the following:

1. The name of an individual whose possessions (e.g. sheep, jewellery, pickup truck) are needed to carry out the ceremony, or to provide food for participants;
2. The name of the central decision-maker (e.g. the main adult patient, spouse, or parent) about whom the situation revolves and about whom it can be said, 'It's his business';
3. The individual or individuals whose support and aid is needed in order to carry out a joint effort such as a ceremony or funeral.

Also important to co-operation is the Navajo concept of 'help' or 'aid'. This is

expressed by using a form of the verb stem *-ghoł* which means 'to run' as in 'adeeshghoł' ('I'll run out of sight'). The phrase *bíká 'adeeshghoł* means 'I'll help him', or 'I'll run after him'. Similarly, *shíká 'anajaa'* means 'After me they are running along', or 'They are helping me' (Young & Morgan 1943, part 1: 84). The Navajo feel very strongly that helping is a good thing, and that aid should be given when requested or when it appears to be needed. This injunction is highly generalised and applies to all Navajo adults no matter what specific kinship role is relevant to a particular situation. For those who fail to co-operate, gossip and witchcraft suspicion are generalised ways of registering public disapproval. Individuals are said to be 'mean', 'jealous', 'stingy', or 'lazy'—all terms which give a picture of the anti-social Navajo in contrast to the helpful, co-operative one.

Both the Navajo concepts of authority and co-operation (exemplified by such phrases as *t' dá bee bóholníih* and *shíká 'anajaa'*) are highly generalised and are relevant to a great many situations. The implication of these concepts for ceremonial co-operation has been briefly mentioned and will be treated more fully when the process of request-making is discussed. First, however, it is important to understand the relationship of kinship to those co-operative activities which are not handled within the household or the residence group.

Ego's potential collaborators

Co-operative situations which involve collections of individuals recruited from outside the household and residence group have an ego-centred focus. There is always an individual or pair of individuals, such as a patient in a sing or peyote meeting, or the parents of the patient, who are the primary organisers of co-operation. With the absence of 'groups' other than the household and residence group,¹¹ it is necessary to utilise concepts appropriate to the analysis of shifting ego-centred activities.

Anthropologists who have discussed kinship in societies with bilateral kindreds or cognatic descent groups (Freeman 1958; 1960; Pehrson 1954; W. E. Mitchell 1963; Keesing 1966; Appell 1966; 1967) make analytic distinctions relevant to Navajo co-operation despite the matrilineal aspects of Navajo social organisation. Both Freeman (1960: 203) and Keesing (1966: 347) find it necessary to distinguish between the kindred as a category of kin, and the kindred as a group which participates in joint activities. Freeman states that the kindred as a category is not bounded, but rather there is a shading off as degrees of relationship increase in distance (1960: 210). This category of kin gives the individual a wide range of optative relationships. Among the Iban 'a man's kindred represents a field in which he is able to move largely at will' (1960: 211) and, like the Lapp kindred (Pehrson 1954), it provides him with a wide range of alternative courses of action. In addition to the optative nature of recruitment, Freeman finds that many kindred-based groups are 'action groups' which are temporary, formed about an individual, and recruited for a particular purpose (1960: 213). Among the Iban there is no compulsion for an individual to associate with any particular member of his kindred and there is an extensive network of interlocking kindreds which has importance for political affairs.

Many of these distinctions—the presence of a social field rather than a bounded

group, optative relationships within this field, ego-centred recruitment, and a network of relationships—have also been used in recent studies of networks (Barnes 1954; Bott 1957; Epstein 1961; A. C. Mayer 1966). Since the concepts of 'set' and 'network' have been defined to include the above properties, I have found them useful in interpreting Navajo co-operation.

The ego-centred 'set' is distinguished from the socio-centred concept of 'network'. The network is an 'unbounded system of relationships between pairs of people making up a field of activity' (A. C. Mayer 1966: 102). Some individuals are directly in touch with others and these in turn are linked to additional individuals. Such linkages can indirectly connect many persons, although no particular individual necessarily has a relationship with all or even a significant number of the others in the network (see Barnes 1954 for the initial definition of network). In contrast, the 'set' is a finite number of linkages initiated by an ego which forms part of such a network (A. C. Mayer 1966: 102).

There are difficulties in isolating and describing sets and networks which have not been completely resolved by those using these concepts. First, all types of ties are usually considered to be of equal strength. For instance, Bott (1957) analyses kin, neighbour, and friend ties as if they were equivalent in determining the connectedness of networks among working-class Londoners. To avoid this problem, I have used the concept of 'set' only for ties among genealogical kin and have treated clan kinsmen and neighbours separately. This is based on evidence that Navajo interact more frequently with genealogical kin than with neighbours or relatives only related by clan, even though genealogical kin and clan kin are not distinguished terminologically. As I will show, however, for those Navajo who have few genealogical kin, clan relatives and also neighbours are important. Unfortunately, I have not yet devised a way of incorporating them into the analysis of ego's set so as to show how they can substitute for genealogical relatives.

Second, even in describing ties of the same type (e.g. between ego and two kinsmen or between ego and two neighbours) no one has suggested a method of measuring the strength of these ties, either in terms of content, frequency of contact, or value. For instance, dealing with content would entail a scheme which estimates equivalences between various joint activities, requests for aid, and favours granted. Then it would be possible to compare the strength of the tie between ego and X who helps him in activities a, b, and c (and is given aid by ego in similar activities), and the tie between ego and Y who helps in activities d and e (but is given no aid in return by ego). I have not yet been able to determine such equivalences for comparing the content of Navajo co-operative activities, nor have I been able to deal with variation in the frequency of aid, or the value placed on particular kinds of ties. I have differentiated only between those who contribute goods and services on a particular occasion and those who do not. Because of these considerations which point to the need for more accurate methods, I will use the concepts of set and network in a rather loose, heuristic sense, and will concentrate on isolating principles which account for the recruitment of actual co-operators from sets of kin.

In analysing Navajo sets I will consider that each ego has a number of living genealogical kin who form a set of 'ideal' or 'potential' co-operators. Like a bilateral kindred, the composition of this potential set shifts from one ego to another

as one moves within the same genealogical space. Like Freeman's category of kindred, the boundaries of this potential set shade off with increased genealogical distance from ego. The size in terms of genealogical distance and number of living kin within this range varies greatly from individual to individual. For a Navajo the important kin are usually all those within a three-generation range, and the number of these living at one time can vary from 1 or 2 to 50 or 60.

In calculating potential co-operators, I have counted only adults within one or two genealogical links, as this includes all the important adults within a three-generation range on whom an individual is likely to call. The potential set is distinguished from actual co-operators who participate in particular activities.

There is a shift in ego's potential set throughout his lifetime. As a child the most relevant ties are through his parents: a contrast between two sets of consanguines of own and ascending generations. On the maternal side, this includes the mother, her parents, her siblings and their children, and possibly the siblings of maternal grandparents. On the paternal side stand the father, his parents, his siblings and their children. Which of the two collections of relatives is more important depends on whether the parents are living uxorilocally or virilocally.

After marriage, and as the grandparents and older relatives die, ties shift to a contrast between consanguines and affines. On the one hand are parents, married and unmarried siblings, and children. On the other hand are the spouse's parents, siblings and children. As a couple become older, their children, children's spouses, and grandchildren emerge as important, with their own siblings and siblings' children thrust into a secondary position. The locus of support begins to shift to consanguines and affines of descending generations.

My own fieldwork and observations of Navajo in many co-operative situations have led me to believe that at any given phase in an ego's life cycle there are two important variables which differentiate between ego's potential co-operators. These are genealogical distance and residential distance. These variables of kinship and locality are not recognised in Navajo terminology, nor even implicitly verbalised by Navajo if asked about relatives who might provide aid in any given context. However, they seem essential in any analysis of the kinsmen who actually participate.

I find it helpful to differentiate between primary and secondary kin. Following Murdock (1949) and Coult & Randolph (1965: 21), I have defined primary kin as those kin types in a genealogical space radiating out from ego which consist of 'two types of units (male and female) that are connected by two basic links (descent and affinity) and a derived link (the sibling link)'. These eight resulting kin types are: mother, father, sister, brother, daughter, son, wife and husband.

Secondary kin are those connected to ego through doubling primary links. A complete list is provided by Coult & Randolph (1965: 22). For the purpose of analysing Navajo data, the most important are ego's grandparents, parents' siblings, siblings' spouses and children, spouses' siblings, and grandchildren.¹²

Due to flexible residence patterns and the developmental cycle of the residence groups, some of ego's primary kin (parents, siblings, and married children) live within the same residence group, while others live in the same neighbourhood or even in other parts of the community. These I have considered local kin, in contrast to non-local kin, or those who have moved to other communities or off the

reservation. The distinctions between primary and secondary, and local and non-local consanguineal kin is crucial in understanding which of ego's potential co-operators are actually mobilised in particular ceremonial occasions. This analysis will be taken up in the next section. For the present, it is important to see that rather than a group of kin such as an outfit, co-operation which entails a large number of individuals is ego-centred. There is an ego-oriented set of potential co-operators who are ego's primary and secondary kin. This does not, of course, exhaust all the possible collaborators upon whom ego may call. He may utilise ties with more distant kin (cross-cousins, for example), clan relatives, or neighbours. The notion of a 'set' is employed only as a heuristic device so that I can analyse ceremonial co-operation without first looking for a group structure, and so that I can discover the principles behind recruitment of aid in situations where co-operative patterns seem extremely flexible and where each case appears very different from the next.

Ceremonial co-operation

Within the framework of the previous discussion of 1) Navajo concepts of authority and co-operation, and 2) ego's set of potential co-operators, ceremonial co-operators can now be analysed.

During my stay in Greenwater I collected data on twenty-nine 'ceremonial' occasions. I observed who participated, and who did not, and in some cases was able to witness the entire process of making requests, mobilising kin, and organising (very indirectly) the progress of co-operation. The English term 'ceremonial' is used here to describe occasions when Navajo, in addition to those living in a residence group, were called upon to provide goods and services. These include:

1. Eight five-night sings or *hatáádl*;
2. Six peyote meetings;
3. Four girls' puberty ceremonies or *kinaaldá*;
4. One Fire Dance (the nine-night version of Mountain Top Way);
5. Two Squaw Dances (Enemy Way);
6. Eight funerals.

All except the funerals involved a ritual and a ritual specialist (either a 'singer', or *hataali*, or a Peyote Road Chief). Even some funerals entailed ritual specialists of a sort (i.e. Anglo Missionaries), and some included a short church service (i.e. a ritual). Other funerals, however, involved only the preparation of the deceased for burial and the observance of the customary two or four day mourning period.

All the occasions chosen for analysis have one important aspect in common: the preparation and eating of 'customary' Navajo food (mutton, stew, fried bread or flour tortillas, and coffee). These may be supplemented by delicacies from freshly butchered sheep (such as braised ribs, liver, intestines) and by yeast bread baked in an earth oven. The major part of co-operation is focused on cooking and attendant activities such as hauling wood and water, butchering and washing dishes. A substantial portion of the ingredients (flour, coffee, lard, potatoes, sheep to be butchered, etc.) are donated by the co-operators. For traditional sings, co-operators may also aid in the ritual by collecting herbs for medicine to be administered to the patient, helping with the sandpaintings, and assisting in a ritual bath.

Jewellery or clothing may be loaned for the patient to wear, and cloth or money may be given to help pay the singer.

Women prepare and cook the food while men usually haul the wood and water. Both share in the butchering, wood chopping, and ritual tasks. Men may also be called upon to build a ceremonial hoghan or a cooking shelter for a sing or to dig the grave for a funeral.

There are activities which differentiate some ceremonial occasions from others. During a girl's puberty ceremony, a large corn cake (*'atkaan*) is baked in the ground and the grinding, mixing, and pouring of the batter occupies most of the female helpers, especially on the last day of the ceremony. For a funeral, new clothes may be bought for the deceased as well as a traditional blanket; jewellery is often retrieved from pawnshops and missionaries are often contacted to perform a burial service.

Each of the twenty-nine occasions studied focuses around one or two primary organisers. This individual or pair are *t'dá bee bóholníth*; they make requests for aid from their kin and they see that tasks are accomplished; they co-ordinate communication about what is to happen and who is providing which goods and services. This co-ordination and direction are extremely non-directive. Some direct requests are made, but more often a person who is *t'dá bee bóholníth* makes his plans known and awaits general agreement and offers of aid from kinsmen who hear of his plans.

If the patient in the sing or peyote ceremony, or the deceased individual, is a child, it is the parents (both the mother and the father) who are *t'dá bee bóholníth*. The same is true for the *kinaaldá* where a pubescent girl is the patient. Again there are two relevant 'sets' of potential co-operators: kin and spouses of the mother and of the father.

If the patient is a married adult, he or she is the prime organiser and his or her kin are potential co-operators. However, many decisions are made in co-operation with the spouse and even the decision to have a ceremony is dependent on the consent and tacit support of this person. This gives direct access to a second set of potential co-operators: the relatives of the husband or wife.

When the patient is an older person with married children or in the event of the death of an older man or woman, it is the children who are *t'dá bee bóholníth*. Potentially this may involve more than two individuals, but actually one or two of the children who live at the residence group where the ceremony is to be held make most of the arrangements. In the event of a death, the surviving widow may be *t'dá bee bóholníth*. This means her kinsmen are potential co-operators, including the married children; the kin of the deceased (i.e. his siblings and their children) are a possible second set.

In sum, at almost all twenty-nine occasions there were two sets of potential co-operators, though the composition of these sets shifted with the age of the patient or deceased individual. At larger ceremonies (the Squaw Dances, notably) more sets of potential co-operators were made available by incorporating more patients into the ceremony. There are, of course, non-kin who often help, and at any ceremony one is likely to find neighbours, clan relatives, and relatives of the singer or Peyote Road Man who attend and aid in the preparations.

Given two persons who are *t'dá bee bóholníth* and the two sets of potential co-

operators, how are goods and services actually mobilised? In the case of sings or a peyote meeting, the principal decision maker(s) decides to hold a sing or peyote meeting. (For a sing, this is often after consultation with a handtrembler, or other diviner, to find out the supernatural cause of the illness and the appropriate sing which will cure it.) A *kinaaldá* follows the onset of the girl's first menses, and both the father and mother discuss and plan the ceremony, although much of the requesting and organising is particularly the concern of women. Decision-making concerning a funeral immediately follows the death of an individual and falls to the parents, spouse, or children of the deceased.

The primary organisers tell relatives and neighbours of the plans for the sing, *kinaaldá*, or funeral. Patterns of communication follow those of the residence group (Aberle 1961). Parents, siblings and children (primary kin) are notified directly and they in turn tell their spouses and children. The word is also spread at more public places such as at the trading post, the laundromat, or the chapter house, and when Navajo meet casually on the streets of Gallup. This 'spreading the word' in a generalised way is a request for aid. Particularly for a large ceremony (e.g. a Squaw Dance), the news is circulated several weeks in advance that 'X is planning to have a ceremony'; in letting everyone know of his plans the patient or parents are asking for help. Kinsmen hear about the ceremony and may make a special trip to the hoghan of the patient to offer their help. Also the patient and spouse, or the parents, will make special trips to relatives who do not live in the same residence group in order to tell them of their plans.

A consultation as to where to hold the sing or peyote meeting is a direct and crucial request. It usually entails a visit by the patient, spouse or parents to the residence group where the sing might be held. Plans are outlined and the request is made indirectly by stating that a hoghan is needed. Possibly the hoghan will be offered without mention on the part of the prime decision maker of his need, but as a response to generalised talk about the plans. Lending a hoghan in a residence group to a non-resident daughter and son-in-law (as in three of the twenty-nine cases), or to a classificatory mother's sister (in one case), commits the whole residence group to participation. It might be possible in an extended camp for one or two of the younger couples to ignore the ceremony and not commit their time and labour to preparations, but their aloofness would undoubtedly be commented upon as a show of unco-operativeness. A possible exception would be a young son or son-in-law who was away on wage work. Those who take over the sheep-herding during the ceremony are considered to be helping in an indirect way, even though they would be absent from much of the preparatory activity.

Agreeing to have a ceremony at the residence group also allows members access to attend it. In Greenwater, many of the peyote meetings are held at the residence group of the officiating Road Man. Sometimes a member of the Road Man's own residence group is the patient, but in the case of a patient from another residence group, holding the ceremony at the Road Man's place encourages the attendance of his co-resident relatives (though they are not obliged to help in the preparation of the food for the morning meal). Relatives of an officiating singer (especially the wife and adult children) often attend part or all of the sing. They may travel a great distance to attend; even though they may be strangers, they are treated as welcome guests, given food and included in casual conversation.

The process of mobilising aid and the indirectness of requests can be best illustrated by a concrete example.

Dezba, a woman about seventy years old, went to visit her classificatory brother (a clan relative with whom she was brought up) and learned that Sam and his wife were going to have a second puberty ceremony for their daughter. Sam is the son of a clan sister of Dezba; this woman is not a genealogical relative but lives in the same neighbourhood. The two women are particularly close and help each other on ceremonial occasions. Dezba and her daughter Edna asked me to drive them to visit Sam, who is a Navajo policeman and lives in a modern house in the community ten miles north of Greenwater. The visit was made about a week after the original news was heard. By that time Dezba and Edna had learned that the daughter was stricken with a skin disease and that a five-day sing was to be given instead of a *kinaaldá*. Dezba and Edna consulted with Sam's wife, and Sam joined in the conversation when he arrived home. Dezba acted as spokesman and offered the use of her old hogan, but Sam's wife explained she wanted to have the sing at her mother's place because the girl's aunts and uncles (MZ and MB) and grandmother (MM) would be there. Dezba agreed by stating, 'It's o.k. with me', (*t'áá akot'é*), and offered to help out with some groceries and cloth for the singer. Sam and his wife said the sing would start in three days. That day they planned to go to Gallup to get supplies and then in two days they would drive over to Sam's mother's place and tell her and Sam's stepfather of the sing.

Arrangements had probably been made already with Sam's wife's mother and siblings, both to use an empty hogan at that camp and to get their co-operation in preparations. A singer had not yet been contacted. The beginning of a ceremony, of course, depends on when the singer can come, and he is contacted after most of the other arrangements are made. Often he arrives on the next day, but in this case he was unable to come until five days after Dezba's and Edna's visit.

This example illustrates the diffuse nature of organising ceremonial co-operation due in part to the scattered settlement pattern which impairs rapid communication. The start of the ceremony may be postponed several days beyond the original date. A visit to tell of plans for a ceremony may be delayed because of transportation difficulties, or because the relatives are not at home when the requester arrives. This case shows the way in which word is passed indirectly, and how relatives are contacted directly by visits. Both the husband's and wife's relatives participated in the requesting process and the couple worked as a team in much of the arranging (such as shopping, visiting, discussing plans). The wife's wishes about the location prevailed in this instance; she made the original request of her mother and siblings, although her husband may have accompanied her on the trip.

Another example of visits to make requests is provided by the case of a widow who was arranging a *kinaaldá* ceremony for her daughter. During the two days previous to the onset of the ceremony, she travelled to her neighbours' homes asking for traditional clothing and jewellery in which to dress the *kinaaldá* girl. She went directly to the person who was *t'áá bee bóholníih* (the owner of the clothing or jewellery) and explained, 'I need or want X'. She always explained the purpose of the request and what the object was to be used for; in one instance she prefaced her request with a general plea of 'Help me' (*shíkd'anajaa*). In like manner she also made arrangements to have water hauled from a nearby well by a couple who owned a pickup. Those asked were helpful because of the generalised obligations to fill such direct requests and also because of the high value placed on ceremonial co-operation over other kinds of mutual aid.

Given this outline of how news of a coming ceremony is spread and how both direct and indirect requests are made, which relatives actually attend and partici-

pate? Ceremonial co-operation shows a great deal of flexibility. An examination of a list of those participating and attending on each of the twenty-nine occasions cited, indicates that many variables are at work and that some are more significant than others in particular cases. Consequently I will attempt to isolate only a few simple and very general principles, concentrating on two variables: kinship and locality.

In a previous section, I outlined the potential set of co-operators available to an ego who is a prime decision maker or *t'dá bee bóholníth*. For each occasion there are usually two of these decision makers. Their relatives can be divided into primary kin (parents, siblings, and married children) and secondary kin (grandparents, parents' siblings, siblings' children). Some of these live within the same residence group, neighbourhood, or community, as the prime decision makers: these I have considered 'local' kin. Others I have called 'distant' kin.

Using these four categories, I have tabulated the number of kin who were potential co-operators in comparison with those who actually participated for all the twenty-nine occasions studied. Only adults have been counted; there are always a number of children and teenagers present at ceremonies who herd sheep, aid in the cooking and dish washing, or run errands. They come, however, with their parents and would not be there without them; the recruitment of the parents who are the adult kin linked to one of the central egos is thus more crucial than the absolute number of individuals present. Likewise, a spouse will not participate unless he or she comes with the linking kinsman (a relative of one of the individuals who is *t'dá bee bóholníth*). For this reason the possible number of spouses has not been tabulated, but spouses have been counted when they did appear to aid in co-operative activities.

Table 1 focuses only on the primary and secondary kin who participated in the twenty-nine ceremonies. It shows the proportion (given in percentages) of the active collaborators to the total number of potential co-operators of primary and secondary kin (both local and non-local).¹³ The data in table 1 can be summarised according to the following principles. First, as might be expected, a larger proportion of primary kin (parents, siblings, and adult children) than secondary kin (parents' siblings, siblings' children, and grandchildren) are recruited. In other words, the more distant the kinsman in terms of genealogical linkage, the less likely is it that he or she will be recruited. Second, spouses of primary or secondary kin often attend and co-operate. Third, non-local kin (those not residing in the community) are rarely recruited. If they are, they are likely to be primary kinsmen of one of the individuals who is *t'dá bee bóholníth*. Non-local attendance is especially marked for funerals where, in several cases, a special effort was made to bring the primary kinsmen of the deceased from distant points for the burial and part of the mourning period.

Table 2 shows the distribution of all adults, both kin and non-kin, observed in co-operative tasks in the same twenty-nine occasions. The chart indicates that almost one half of those participating are not primary or secondary kin but are either clan-relatives¹⁴ or non-relatives, including neighbours. There are several important points to make concerning these.

First, the clan relatives who come are not necessarily from ego's own clan, nor do they represent a substantial proportion of the members of his clan in the

TABLE 1. Comparison of actual and potential kin co-operators for 29 ceremonies.

Type of ceremony	No. of cases	Primary and secondary kinsmen				Spouses	Total kin participating
		Active	Potential	%			
1. Five day sings	8	<i>Local</i>					62 or 53% of all adult co-operators
		Primary	45	63	71.4	5	
		Secondary	7	21	33.0	1	
		<i>Non-local</i>					
2. Peyote meetings	6	<i>Local</i>					39 or 48% of all adult co-operators
		Primary	29	50	58.0	8	
		Secondary	1	10	10.0	1	
		<i>Non-local</i>					
3. Girls' puberty	4	<i>Local</i>					37 or 48% of all adult co-operators
		Primary	20	32	62.5	6	
		Secondary	9	24	37.9	1	
		<i>Non-local</i>					
4. Squaw Dance and Fire Dance	3	<i>Local</i>					58 or 51% of all adult co-operators
		Primary	28	33	84.8	13	
		Secondary	11	25	44.4	1	
		<i>Non-local</i>					
5. Funerals	8	<i>Local</i>					92 or 66% of all adult co-operators
		Primary	30	41	73.2	12	
		Secondary	14	30	46.7	4	
		<i>Non-local</i>					
Totals	29	<i>Local</i>					288 or 55% of all adult co-operators
		Primary	152	219	69.4	44	
		Secondary	42	110	38.2	8	
		<i>Non-local</i>					
		Primary	16	53	30.2	5	
		Secondary	15	47	31.9	6	

TABLE 2. Distribution of co-operators in 29 ceremonies.

Type of ceremony	Primary and secondary kin			Sub-total	% of all	Clan relatives		Non-relatives	Sub-total	% of all	Total
	Primary	Spouse	Secondary			Relatives	Spouse				
1. Five-night sings	49	7	6	62	53	21	3	30	54	47	116
2. Peyote meetings	29	1	9	39	48	17	0	25	42	52	81
3. Girls' puberty rite	21	9	7	37	48	12	0	28	40	52	77
4. Squaw dance and fire dance	28	16	14	58	51	17	9	29	55	49	113
5. Funerals	41	24	27	92	66	32	7	8	47	34	139
Totals	168	57	63	288	55	99	19	120	238	45	526

community. A 'clan cousin' (*bizéédi*: either someone 'born for' ego's clan or someone belonging to the clan ego is 'born for') is as likely to attend as is a member of ego's own clan. Recruitment is thus on the basis of particularistic ties rather than on universalistic principles (such as a norm that all members of ego's clan should attend).

Second, helpfulness on ceremonial occasions and generosity without thought of immediate repayment are highly valued by Navajo. Distant relatives or non-kin often appear for a sing (especially a large one), or for a peyote meeting, since this is consistent with the Navajo 'ethic of generalized reciprocity' (Sahlins 1965), and since there are benefits to the individual's health and security which accompany participation in the ritual aspects of the occasion. They often bring food or 'pitch in' without being asked because this sort of behaviour is considered a 'good thing'.

Third, the participation of non-relatives is a regular feature of some kinds of ceremonies. For instance, one half of the non-kin attending peyote meetings include the Road Chief, his spouse and other relatives. The other half consists of Greenwater peyotists, who are welcome as members of the cult. Older women are particularly interested in the *kinaaldá* ceremony which stresses the values and attitudes of womanhood to the young girl who is the patient. These *sanii* (older ladies) and their children from all over the Greenwater area account for many of the non-relatives or clan relatives who come to prepare the corn cake for this ceremony.

Table 3 reveals an additional factor in the recruitment of clan and non-kin participants. Where primary and secondary kin of one ego or both are lacking, clan kin, neighbours, or non-kin, will constitute a major portion of the participants. This chart examines three cases: a five-day sing, a peyote meeting, and a girl's puberty ceremony; in each, non-kin make up more than 60 per cent. of those involved. In addition to the importance of these non-kin, it is also clear that when the primary and secondary kin of one ego are lacking, those of the other ego will be utilised. In other instances, where each ego has potential local kin on whom to call, participants are more evenly distributed among relatives of both egos. Also table 3 shows that locality *within* the community plays an important role. If there is a decision to locate the ceremony in the residence group of one ego's relatives rather than in a residence group where relatives of the second ego live (e.g. in the camp of the husband's kin rather than the wife's kin), it is this set of kin which is more heavily involved in co-operation.

The particulars of each case give more precise details on how the lack of primary and secondary kin and residential distance influence participation. In case 2, the patient and his wife were living temporarily fifty miles from Greenwater and returned to the wife's camp for the five-day sing. The patient was not born in Greenwater and has no relatives there. The decision to hold the sing in the wife's natal residence group was part of the process of recruiting and guaranteeing the participation of the wife's mother and married siblings (i.e. her primary kin). The wife has no secondary relatives in Greenwater and though there may be some distant kin in her mother's natal community, 100 miles away, none attended this particular ceremony. Neighbours and distant clan relatives thus provided the additional aid needed in building the ceremonial hoghan; some also participated in various aspects of the ritual.

TABLE 3. Comparison of co-operation in three ceremonies.

Case no.	Central egos	Location	No. of co-operators	% Kin	% Other	Description of kin				Description of other			
						Active Potential	% Potential	Spouse Active Potential	% Spouse Potential				
2. 5-day sing	Wife and patient	Camp of wife	22	27.3	73.7	Local	5	100	2	1	1	100	6 distant clan relatives; 8 neighbours
						Primary	0	0	0	0	?	0	
						Secondary	0	0	0	0	?	0	
						Non-local	0	0	0	0	?	0	
12. Peyote meeting	Wife and patient	Camp of wife's clan relatives	17	17.7	82.3	Local	2	50	0	0	0	0	5 clan relatives, plus 3 spouses; 3 non-relatives; 3: Road Man, wife and sister
						Primary	0	0	0	0	0	0	
						Secondary	0	0	0	0	0	0	
						Non-local	0	0	0	0	0	0	
16. Puberty rite	Mother and deceased father	Camp of mother near relatives of deceased father (viri-local)	22	31.4	68.6	Local	4	80	2	0	2	0	1 own-clan relative; 2 distant clan relatives; 9 non-relatives (many of whom are neighbours); 1 affine
						Primary	0	0	1	5	20	1	
						Secondary	0	0	0	0	0	0	
						Non-local	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Likewise, in case 12, the decision to locate a ceremony in a particular residence group was crucial in determining co-operation. The patient has no primary or secondary kin in Greenwater and the wife has only a son living there (Sam, the patient's father in the case described on p. 51). The wife's closest 'relatives' are a classificatory clan sister (Dezba) and her married children (including Edna). The wife chose to request from Dezba and Edna the use of a hoghan for the peyote meeting. They also helped to prepare the hoghan and cook the food for the morning meal; other primary relatives of these two women and their spouses attended the meeting. Again, where the sets of potential co-operators for the two individuals who are *t'áá bee bóholníih* are small, clan relatives are called upon, as in this case, or neighbours and non-kin, as in other cases.

In Case 16, the widow whose requests were discussed above, held a *kinaaldá* ceremony for her daughter; she lives in an independent camp founded by her deceased husband, a half mile from his sister. The widow's brother and married children and her deceased brother's wife and children live in a distant part of the community; two sisters live in other communities. One married son of the widow lives within a half mile and a second married son lives several miles away, but within the bounds of the Greenwater community. The widow has two sets of kin on which to call: 1) her own siblings who are distant and possibly estranged and her married children who are closer and with whom there have been no disputes, and 2) the sister and children of her husband who are neighbours, and the brothers and children of her husband who live several miles away.

Within the widow's own set of primary and secondary kin, the two sons and their wives provided a great deal of aid; her siblings and children did not attend. Within her husband's set, only one of the sister's daughters and her husband helped. The sister and other married children were involved in planning a peyote meeting for one of the members of their residence group; on another occasion they were important co-operators (case 14). Residential distance, disputes, and other obligations eliminated many potential kin in this case. Neighbours and distant clan relatives were thus called upon as previously mentioned. The widow visited neighbours, including clan-linked relatives and non-relatives, to notify them of the ceremony and to request clothes and jewellery for her daughter to wear.

In sum, there is a hierarchy of priorities in the recruitment of actual participants: primary kin are preferred to secondary kin, and local to non-local kin. Since there are usually two individuals who are organisers, more members from one set of primary and secondary kin may be activated than from the other. This occurs under two conditions: 1) if one ego has few kin, or 2) if his or her kin are residentially distant from the camp where the ceremony is held.

The operation of these principles produces an organisation fundamentally different from one based on large corporate kin groups. The community of Greenwater is an unbounded network of ties; this network is the sum of individual co-operating 'sets' which are activated, particularly in ceremonial situations, and which acquire a certain amount of regularity over a period of time. Each residence group is connected with others in the community since residents have primary and secondary kin in other residence groups, and they, in turn, have primary and secondary kin in another portion of the Greenwater area. By examining the patterns of participation in ceremonial occasions all the residence groups in the area can be

shown to be linked together, although no residence group is directly linked to all the others. There are also important ties with primary kin outside Greenwater. These not only provide additional co-operators on ceremonial occasions but link Greenwater Navajo with Navajo in other sections of the reservation, and with those in towns and cities in the 'Anglo' world.

Conclusions

In the first section of this article I criticised the concept of outfit and suggested the need for an alternative interpretation of kin relations beyond the household and residence group level. I have focused on ceremonial activities since these are the major situations where a large number of Navajo co-operate on the basis of kinship relations. As background, I have discussed Navajo concepts of authority and co-operation, and have shown how these are related to the developmental cycle of domestic groups and to the establishment of stable daily co-operative and authority patterns. I have also suggested that the same notions of authority and co-operation are related to request-making and recruitment for ceremonial activities. Finally, I have analysed ceremonial activities themselves in terms of an ego-centred 'set' of potential co-operators composed of primary and secondary kin. For most of the twenty-nine ceremonial occasions studied, there were two relevant 'sets' of kin: those of the patient's two parents; those of the patient and spouse; or those of the deceased's spouse and children, on the one hand, and his or her siblings on the other. By comparing the potential sets of kin with those actually participating in a given ceremony, I have isolated several principles which predict which kin are most likely to participate. The operation of these principles within overlapping sets of kin over a long period of time creates a network of ties which links together the entire Greenwater community.

Networks have been used to analyse kin and non-kin relations in urban milieus, especially in Africa (Southall & Gutkind 1956; P. Mayer 1961; Epstein 1961; J. C. Mitchell 1966; Jacobson 1968) and England (Bott 1957). In this article, I have used network analysis to illuminate kin-based activities in a rural tribal setting where political and legal activities are vested in a modernised organisation (The Navajo Tribe), but where most economic and ritual activities are determined, not by large corporate groups, but by small domestic units and wider kin ties. This analysis may provide comparative data for the study of similar band and tribal societies which lack corporate descent groups, but where many economic, political and ritual activities are determined by kinship.

In offering a re-interpretation of contemporary Navajo social organisation, I have argued, in particular, against the utility of Kluckhohn's term 'outfit' and similar concepts which describe 'middle-sized' groups of co-operating kin. The outfit is a construct of the anthropologist rather than a term which adequately describes how Navajo conceptualise social relations or organise behaviour. Instead of stressing the definition and structure of groups, I have concentrated on the organisation of concrete activities. My analysis seems more appropriate than previous ones, since it takes into account Navajo concepts, since it is based on actual cases of co-operation, and since it proposes some principles around which co-operation is organised.

NOTES

The fieldwork on which this analysis is based was supported by a National Institute of Mental Health Fellowship (IFL MH 24, 103-01) with a Research Grant Attachment (MH 11631-91). I am grateful to David Aberle, George Hicks, Karl Heider, Robert Merrill, Philip Leis, Nancy Leis and Terry Reynolds for valuable comments and criticisms on various ideas presented in this article.

¹ Aberle postulates the 'local clan element' as a loosely-organised group of clan members in a given area who constitute a unilineal unit of collective responsibility and joint action (1961: 108, 113-19). He is one of the few investigators to place emphasis on the 'local clan element' rather than the outfit or similar group. My data contradict his view. Clusters of kin drawn from the several lineages of the largest clans in Greenwater do not co-operate for ceremonial occasions.

² Downs (1965: 1388) defines outfit in the way others use the term residence group or camp, i.e. members of an extended family who live in hoghans within shouting distance of each other. This, of course, hopelessly confuses the issue of the definition and composition of the outfit.

³ Adams characterises the resident lineage as several residence groups occupying a contiguous area; he emphasises the territorial aspects and says the group has no social viability (1958: 57, 58, 136).

⁴ The name Greenwater is a pseudonym used to protect the identity of the community and my informants.

⁵ Kluckhohn suggests that 'so-and-so's folks' does *not* include 'all of an individual's relatives within certain degrees' (Kluckhohn & Leighton 1946: 63). My data, however, do support this definition.

⁶ Aberle suggested this phrase to me in 1965: he says it is used in the Pinon area to refer to a matrilineage. Information from my informants suggests that in Greenwater non-matrilateral relatives (e.g. son's son) are included.

⁷ The notion that 'everyone helps' is part of an ethic of generalised reciprocity (Sahlins 1965). Since co-operation should be given freely and without expectation of return, Navajo are reluctant to suggest that some of their relatives do not help.

⁸ This is generally true in Ramah at the present time, as reported in Reynolds *et al.* (1967). It may also have been the case during the 1930's and 1940's, the period of Kluckhohn's early fieldwork in this community (see Landgraf 1954).

⁹ Navajo property (including livestock, jewellery, medicine pouches, cars, wagons) is individually owned. This is expressed not through a concept of ownership as in our phrase, 'He owns it', but through phrases that indicate 'use rights', such as *da' dibésh nee hólo?* (Do sheep exist by means of you?), or *da'tsinabaasish sintl'd?* (Do you cause a wagon to be at your disposal?) (Haile 1947: 4; 1954: 24). Ownership is also indicated by noun-possession as in 'his car' (*bichidí*) or 'his sheep' (*bidibé*).

¹⁰ The Enemy Way is a three-day ceremony to cure illness caused by the ghost of an alien or enemy. It requires the participation of two local groups: that of the patient and that of a Stick Receiver who lives at some distance from the patient and his relatives.

¹¹ There are three factors which qualify the notions of 'household' and 'residence group' as 'groups'. There is a vagueness in Navajo terminology describing those who live together in these two units so that neither is explicitly recognised and labelled by Navajo themselves. In addition, there are no major discontinuities in the developmental cycle of the residence group (for a description of this cycle see Reynolds *et al.* 1967). The process of fission may be gradual, making it difficult for the observer to decide if parents and married children, or married siblings, living near each other constitute one residence group or two. Finally, there is an absence of a joint estate either in land or livestock which would establish the 'corporateness' of residence groups and provide a means of establishing the rights and duties of extended family members toward each other in regard to common property. On the other hand, the stable patterns of communication, authority, and co-operation make the household and residence group more easily identified as 'groups' than are larger collections of relatives.

¹² Tertiary kin are those connected to ego by tripling the primary links. The most important of these are cross-cousins (MBD, MBS, FZD, FZS).

¹³ I have not performed tests of statistical significance on the data since the twenty-nine occasions do not represent a random sample, and since, in some cases, I was not able to identify all those who attended.

¹⁴ Clan relatives include those related to ego through one of four possible links: his own clan, his father's clan (i.e. the clan he is 'born for'), children of his clan (i.e. those 'born for' his clan), and those whose fathers are of the same clan as ego's father (i.e. those 'born for' the same clan ego is 'born for').

REFERENCES

- Aberle, David F. 1961. The Navaho. In *Matrilineal kinship* (eds) D. Schneider & K. Gough. Berkeley: Univ. of California Press.
- Adams, William Y. 1958. *Shonto: a study of the role of the trader in a modern Navaho community* (Bull. Bur. Am. Ethnol. 188). Washington: Government Printing Office.
- Appell, G. N. 1966. Residence and ties of kinship in a cognatic society: the Rungus Dusun of Sabah, Malaysia. *SWest. J. Anthrop.* 22, 280-301.
- 1967. Observational procedures for identifying kindreds: social isolates among the Rungus of Borneo. *SWest. J. Anthrop.* 23, 192-207.
- Barnes, J. A. 1954. Class and committees in a Norwegian island parish. *Hum. Relat.* 7, 39-58.
- Bott, Elizabeth 1957. *Family and social network*. London: Tavistock Publications.
- Collier, Malcolm Carr 1951. Local organization among the Navaho. Thesis, Univ. of Chicago.
- Coult, Allen & R. R. Randolph 1965. Computer methods for analyzing genealogical space. *Am. Anthrop.* 67, 21-9.
- Downs, James F. 1965. Social consequences of a dry well. *Am. Anthrop.* 67, 1387-1416.
- Epstein, A. L. 1961. The network and urban social organization. *Rhodes-Livingstone J.* 29, 29-62.
- Freeman, J. D. 1958. The family system of the Iban of Borneo. In *The developmental cycle of domestic groups* (ed.) J. Goody (Camb. Pap. social Anthrop. 1). Cambridge: Univ. Press.
- 1960. On the concept of the kindred. *J. R. anthrop. Inst.* 91, 192-220.
- Haile, Father Berard 1947. *Learning Navaho* (vol. 3). St Michaels, Arizona: St Michaels Press.
- 1954. *Property concepts of the Navaho Indians* (Anthrop. Ser. 17). Washington: Catholic Univ. of America Press.
- Jacobson, David 1967. Social order among urban Africans: a study of elite Africans in Mbale, Uganda. Thesis, Univ. of Rochester.
- Keesing, Roger 1966. Kwaio kindreds. *SWest. J. Anthrop.* 22, 346-53.
- Kimball, Solon T. & J. H. Provinse 1942. Navajo social organization in land use planning. *Appl. Anthrop.* 1, 18-30.
- Kluckhohn, Clyde 1966. *The Ramah Navaho* (Bull. Bur. Am. Ethnol. 196). Washington: Government Printing Office.
- Kluckhohn, Clyde & D. Leighton 1946. *The Navaho*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard Univ. Press.
- Lamphere, Louise 1968. Social organization and cooperation in a Navajo community. Thesis, Harvard Univ.
- Landgraf, J. L. 1954. *Land-use in the Ramah area of New Mexico* (Peabody Mus. Pap. 42: 1). Cambridge, Mass.: Peabody Museum.
- Levy, Jerrold 1962. Community organization of the Western Navaho. *Am. Anthrop.* 64, 781-801.
- Mayer, Adrian C. 1966. The significance of quasi-groups in the study of complex societies. In *The social anthropology of complex societies* (ed.) M. Banton (Ass. social Anthrop. Monogr. 4). London: Tavistock Publications.
- Mayer, Philip 1961. *Townsmen or tribesmen: conservatism and the process of urbanization in a South African city*. Cape Town: Oxford Univ. Press.
- Mitchell, J. Clyde 1966. Theoretical orientations in African urban studies. In *The social anthropology of complex societies* (ed.) M. Banton (Ass. social Anthrop. Monogr. 4). London: Tavistock Publications.
- Mitchell, William E. 1963. Theoretical problems in the concept of the kindred. *Am. Anthrop.* 65, 343-54.
- Murdock, George Peter 1949. *Social structure*. New York: Macmillan.
- Pehrson, Robert N. 1954. Bilateral kin groupings as a structural type: a preliminary statement. *Univ. of Manila J. East. Asiatic Stud.* 3, 199-202.
- Reynolds, T. R., L. Lamphere & C. E. Cook Jr 1967. Time, resources, and authority in a Navaho community. *Am. Anthrop.* 69, 188-99.
- Ross, William T. 1955. Navajo kinship and social organization: with special reference to a transitional community. Thesis, Univ. of Chicago.
- Southall, A. & P. C. A. Gutkind 1956. *Townsmen in the making: Kampala and its suburbs* (East. Afr. Stud. 9). Kampala: East African Institute of Social Research.
- Sahlins, Marshall 1965. On the sociology of primitive exchange. In *The relevance of models for social anthropology* (ed.) M. Banton (Ass. social Anthrop. Monogr. 1). London: Tavistock Publications.
- Wall, Leon & W. Morgan 1958. *Navajo-English dictionary*. (U.S. Dept. Int., Bur. Indian Affairs.) Window Rock, Arizona: Navajo Agency.
- Young, Robert & W. Morgan 1943. *A dictionary of the Navaho language*. (Published as part of Robert Young and William Morgan, *The Navaho Language*.) (U.S. Indian Service 1962.) Republished, Salt Lake City, Utah: Deseret Press.