Waiting on a Friend: Hospitality and Gifts to the "Enemy" in the Daasanach

TORU SAGAWA

Keio University

The Gift by Marcel Mauss showed that gift giving has multiple factors that seem to contradict each other. Freedom and obligation are constantly described as being two sides of the same coin in the book. This study focuses on the ambiguity and polysemy of hospitality and gifts that Mauss suggested. The Daasanach, who live in the border area of Ethiopia and Kenya, fight with their neighboring groups. Nevertheless, many Daasanach have friends who belong to these groups. When a violent conflict ends, members of the two groups voluntarily visit each other's lands, interact peacefully, and form friendships. The friendships among them are neither formed as a result of acts of social obligation nor are relationships formed as a means for an individual to seek one's own profit. They are relationships that are formed when two parties with different daily lives happen to encounter one another, with one party providing hospitality and/or gifts to another who cannot do anything but "wait." In this paper, I will analyze the emerging process of friendship and emphasize the coincidental aspect of hospitality and gift giving.

Key words: *The Gift* (by Marcel Mauss), reciprocity, inter-ethnic relation, pastoralist, East Africa

1. INTRODUCTION

The Gift, a book published by Marcel Mauss in 1925, has garnered much praise and generated many interpretations up to the present day. Regarded as the "sacred text" of anthropology (Parry 1986: 445) and as a "master narrative" in economic anthropology (Gudeman 2001: 459), one of the appeals of *The Gift* lies in the fact that the gift giving has two factors that seem to contradict each other (Mauss 1990). Freedom and obligation, and self-interest and altruism are described as being two sides of the same coin. This comes from his understanding of the act of giving as being ambiguous and always polysemantic. Human beings possess characteristics that are contradictory when viewed from a social scientific perspective. Gift giving is a phenomenon that expresses the nature of human complexity, subverting a category that at first glance appears self-evident (Osteen 2002).

However, it is also true that *The Gift* emphasizes the aspect that gift giving is more obligatory than voluntary. In fact, a large number of pages especially emphasize the "obligation to return." Mauss explains why in each case the recipient of the gift needs to return one to the giver. However, if one were to express the common trait in these answers, it would be that there is a collective norm that forces the recipient to give back to the giver. In this sense, gift as described by Mauss is a two-way transference of objects mediated through temporal intervals conducted between individuals or groups that share the rule of "obligation to return." As indicated by the fact that Lévi-Strauss developed an

Nilo-Ethiopian Studies 24: 1–16 (2019)

exchange theory of women from Mauss' ideas, *The Gift* could be read as a work that primarily discusses gifts as part of a reciprocal exchange.

In contrast, many researches analyze gift giving from the point of view of the individual strategy. While Mauss focused on the question of "why do the recipients reciprocate?", these discussions frequently focused on "why do the givers give?"[1] Although there is a wide range of answers, the most common factor is that the acting agent perceives gift giving as a self-interested behavior based on their own economic rationale and/or to maintain and expand their political power. Major research studies include those by Blau (1964) and Barth (1966). Although these studies have been classified into the category of the "transaction theory" rather than the "gift theory," they possess significant implications for discussions surrounding gift giving. They expand the semantic content of "reciprocation" to the acquisition of non-tangible objects such as prestige and reputation. In other words, the main reason they give now is so that they can earn some type of return in the future.

The image of individuals mentioned earlier who act in accordance with the collective norm is in contrast with the latter group of calculating individuals. However, the assumption of the former argument is maintained even within the latter argument, in that the agent who gives/receives shares the rules related to the "obligation to return." In other words, the reason someone who can easily pursue profit is at ease even when they do not receive immediate return is because they believe that, at the point of giving, the recipient is thinking about reciprocating. In addition, they also believe that the recipient will be tormented by some type of guilt if they do not reciprocate.[2] In a sense, those who do not share the rule of "obligation to return" do not become an object of gift giving.

However, gift giving is frequently conducted by people whose recipients do not share the "obligation to return." As shown in an example by Testart (1998), a pedestrian offers a gift to a beggar in a coincidental encounter, even though the two will probably not meet again. Even if they do meet, the beggar will most likely ask for another contribution. If we were to follow Mauss's argument that places the "obligation to return" as the foundation of gift giving, we cannot designate this situation as one involving actual gift giving.[3]

French philosophers have questioned the acts of pure hospitality or gift giving and discussed whether they are possible by topicalizing the action whose objective is "to simply give." Derrida (1992) examined the above question by logically analyzing the action where "the giver does not acknowledge the fact that he has given, and the recipient does not acknowledge the fact that he has received" and labeling it as being an act of pure gift giving. On the other hand, concerning the trend toward limiting the meaning of a gift as a "pure gift," the social anthropologist Parry (1986) indicated that the concept of a pure gift itself was borne from the emergence of world religions. He criticizes the theorists who attempt to make arguments by applying such concepts to all societies in general.

The author of this paper has no capacity to judge whether the conflicting standpoints of the philosophers and anthropologists are logically or historically valid. The main objective of this paper is not to determine whether "pure gift" defined by researchers actually exists in the world. Instead, the author focuses on the issue that both sides give interpretations that are opposite extremes concerning the overall motivation for gift giving. According to philosophers, the act itself cannot be acknowledged for gift giving to be established. Therefore, both the giver and the recipient do not become conscious of their motivation. According to anthropologists, the parties involved in the act of giving or receiving are supported by a clear sense of purpose, such as the realization of collective obligation and the acquisition of personal gains.

However, there may be more ambiguous motives behind the many instances of gift giving that occur in actual social by the parties involved. For example, if one were to ask a pedestrian about their motive for giving a donation to a beggar, unless this question was asked within regions where strong religious norms toward charity are prevalent, the majority would probably answer, "I simply felt like it." Conversely, if one were to ask a beggar why he/she accepted the gift, in most cases the reply would be, "because the pedestrian gave it to me."

This paper will proceed to an argument where the parties involved in the action of gift giving feel uncertain as to why they have given or received from that person at that time. One can suppose that

the strongest of these feelings surface during gift giving, which is unnecessary from the perspective of collective norm or individual strategy. In other words, these are gifts given to others who do not share the "obligation to return." This paper asks the question—under what conditions does gift giving to those who do not share the "obligation to return" occur? In addition, how does the discrepancy between the giver and the recipient concerning this influence affect the development of the relationship afterwards? By exploring these questions, we succeed in validating Mauss's implication that gift giving is ambiguous and polysemic.

This paper will discuss cases of hospitality and gift giving conducted among people who do not share the "obligation to return." However, this paper will discuss the cases where, unlike the example raised by Testart of the pedestrian and the beggar, a requital was made despite not sharing the "obligation to return." They are the cases of friendship with the "enemy."

2. THE DAASANACH AND THEIR NEIGHBORS

The Daasanach are agro-pastoralists who live around the border areas of Ethiopia, Kenya and South Sudan. The regions where they live are located more than 600 kilometers away from the two countries' capitals. Due to this distance, the political and economic impact from the centers has been relatively small. During the late 1980s, a small city was constructed and since then, gradually, a market economy has been developing. However, most of the Daasanach were still living in villages with subsistence economies when I conducted an intensive fieldwork in 2006.(4)

Pastoralism and flood-retreat agriculture are the two primary means of subsistence for the Daasanach. The Omo River, which flows through the center of their settlement area, floods from July to August because of the rainfall from the Ethiopian highland areas. The fertile soil carried by this water increases the productivity of the land. When the water eventually recedes, people begin seeding crops such as sorghum. The harvest season takes place during the dry season between December and February. The land in which the Daasanach live is semi-arid with a precipitation amount of approximately 350–400 millimeters. When living in a region with such a small amount of precipitation, securing food during the dry season becomes the most difficult task. However, in this land, the Omo River makes it possible to produce abundant crops even during the dry season.

Six ethnic groups inhabit the areas surrounding the Daasanach. The Kara and Hor, who are classified as "our people" (*gaal kinnyo*), maintain friendly relations with the Daasanach. In contrast, the Nyngatom, Turkana, Hamar, and Gabra are considered "the enemy" (*kiz*). The Daasanach and their enemies have been fighting intermittently. In the Daasanach language, the word for "war" is *osu*, which signifies "organized battles composed of dozens of people to around a thousand." The battles themselves last for only a day or two. However, there have been large-scale battles in which the number of deaths has exceeded 30 people. In addition to *osu*, the word *sulla* means an assault, which occurs frequently, in which the degree of organization is small and generally comprises several youths. These violent conflicts are not just battles over natural resources such as pastureland or livestock but battles fought by youths in search of social recognition as "a brave man" within their respective communities (Sagawa 2010a; 2010b).

Despite the antagonistic relations between the groups, many Daasanach maintain friendships with those who belong to the "enemy" groups. When the battles are over, people voluntarily restore their amiable mutual visits. Friendships are formed by welcoming the "enemy" members into their homes as "guests" (*zeego*) and/or giving gifts (*sicho*). As will be explained later, visiting the land of the "enemy" comes with great risks. In addition, due to the deterioration of interethnic relations, members do not know whether the lifestyle of amiable mutual visits will be severed. Therefore, they welcome the visiting "enemy" even though they are not certain if their hospitality will be reciprocated. So why is it that people give gifts to the "enemy" when facing such risks? Furthermore, why does the party receiving the gifts re-visit the land of their "enemy" to return the favor?

A number of researchers have conducted studies focusing on the friendships that exist beyond the

ethnic boundary in this region. Sobania (1980) and Tadesse (2005) in particular analyze friendships as relations established to obtain things that one cannot obtain within the group they belong to or relations for seeking aid when one is in a difficult situation. Both arguments emphasize the economic rational aspect of the relationship. The author of this paper does not deny the functions that these relationships perform. However, this paper does not interpret individual actions of friendships by attributing specific functions in advance. Instead, it will address the question posed above by examining the process whereby the two parties establish a relationship.

This paper will vaguely define hospitality as "providing spaces, services, and goods necessary for the visitor to stay without seeking immediate return" and gift giving as "giving goods that the recipient will not consume on the spot without seeking immediate return." However, considering past discussions that have treated "gift" as a concept that encompasses these two actions, this paper will not make a strict separation in their usage.

3. OUTLINE OF FRIENDSHIP

This section will examine how friendships between the members of neighboring groups and the Daasanach are formed and what types of goods are reciprocally given as gifts.

The author surveyed 169 Daasanach males (from teenagers to those in their eighties) regarding their friendships with members of neighboring groups.[5] The results showed that 71% of them had a total of 384 friends. In other words, each male had an average of 3.2 friends. Examining the results by age cohort also revealed that males of every age had some type of friendship relations.[6]

3.1. Forming relationships

There are two major catalysts for forming friendships: barter trade and coresidence. The Daasanach maintain trade relations with six neighboring groups. People visit each other's settlements or livestock camps to exchange goods. Although most of the goods that the Daasanach acquire from their neighboring groups could be produced and processed by themselves, these goods are either not produced in abundance within the Daasanach or they are goods of better quality.[7] For example, the Daasanach primarily acquire goats and sheep from the Turkana, who generally possess a large amount of small livestock. The Daasanach exchange agricultural products such as sorghum, which are more abundant here than in the neighboring groups.

Coresidence as discussed in this paper refers to members who, although belonging to another group, live in the same settlement or livestock camp for a period of time. The Daasanach and the members of their neighboring groups live together mainly from April to October in their livestock camps. When the big rain season starts in April, the Daasanach, who graze livestock on the floodplains, migrate to the pasturelands in the east or west in search of fully grown grass and watering places. Through repeated migration, they move closer to the camps of their neighboring groups, who also migrate in search of pasturelands. As the two groups meet each other at the watering point, they engage in conversations and become acquainted. One group eventually moves their camp into the other group's camp.

However, trade and coresidence are relations that occur only once. When the transaction of goods is complete, the two groups return to their respective settlements. In the instance where the grass of the coresidence land dries up, both groups separately move to find new pasturelands. Since both groups are semi-nomadic, there is no guarantee that they will ever meet again. Therefore, to establish continuous relations with those who can help them in bartering and coresidence,[8] the people form friendships (*beel*).[9]

The language spoken by the Daasanach is different from those of their neighboring groups and there is no common regional language in that region. However, through repeated mutual migration, many members learn the "foreign" languages of their neighboring groups. Therefore, even if a group member does not speak the other group's language, friendships can still be formed through conversa-

tions interpreted by such members.

When forming a relation, members generally gather to drink coffee at one's house and celebrate the occasion by exchanging words such as "we have now become friends" and "peace to us all." Moreover, as proof that a friendship has formed, members at times kill small livestock and eat the meat together after wearing the abdominal fat (*muor*) around each other's necks. Furthermore, there are times when one party or both parties simultaneously give gifts before or after this celebration.

3.2. Giving goods

Goods that are usually given and/or received during the formation of relations differ from group to group. Major gifts that are usually given among friends include sorghum and tobacco that the Daasanach give to the Turkana and the Hamar, while the latter two groups often give the Daasanach small livestock. In contrast, the Daasanach often give and receive sorghum and small livestock to the Nyangatom and the Kara. The difference in the ecology of the region in which each group lives greatly affects the type of goods gifted. Within the region inhabited by the Turkana and the Hamar, insufficient food is produced by rain-led agriculture. In contrast, the Daasanach are able to produce abundant crops because of the floodplains. Therefore, there are times where the Turkana and the Hamar visit the land of the Daasanach in search of sorghum especially during drought. On the other hand, the Nyangatom and the Kara engage in flood-retreat agriculture similar to the Daasanach. As a result, these groups frequently exchange goods that are lacking in the other groups during each visit.

3.3. Developing relationships

When the two parties that become friends undertake numerous mutual visits, there are cases when the friendships develop into stronger relations. It involves both parties entering into a "friendship of name giving"(*lil match meto*). The Daasanach conduct a naming ritual for newborns a few days after their birth. The name is chosen by the godparents, who are usually relatives or close friends of the parents. During this process, there are times when friends from a different group are chosen as godparents. In fact, 5.5% of the 384 relations with neighboring groups are "friendships of name giving." The friendships between parents and the godparents who were responsible for choosing their children's name are the most intimate. For example, the groom's relatives transfer a few dozen livestock animals to the wife's relatives as bridewealth. In these friendship relations, when the daughter of either family marries, a portion of the bridewealth is given to the "friends of name giving."

3.4. Characteristics of the Relations

The characteristics of the friendships between the Daasanach and members of their neighboring groups are summarized here by focusing on who forms the relations and what type of goods are given and/or received.

(1) Friendships are generally formed by individuals and not groups such as clans and ethnic groups. In Mauss's *The Gift*, gift giving is achieved between groups, and even when it is conducted between individuals, those individuals are engaging in gift giving as representatives of the group. As Sahlins (1972) later asserted after elaboration, individual actions simply reflect the structural distance between the groups to which they belong.

In contrast, the friendship relations that the Daasanach form with members of their neighboring groups do not reflect the amity/antagonism between the groups. In fact, the Daasanach not only form friendship relations with "our people," but also with the members of the four groups that are classified as "enemies." If a violent conflict occurs between the groups, the reciprocal visits of both groups are severed. However, after the conflict concludes, and the reciprocal visits restart, the previous antagonism between the groups does not deter friendships from being formed. Conversely, just because many friendships are formed between individuals does not mean that permanent friendly relations are formed at a group level.

This is related to the fact that their social relations are developed through individuals as the focus (Ohta 1986; Sagawa 2010a; 2010c). This characteristic becomes clear when compared to friendships

with other groups and regions. The Suri, who live approximately 100 km from the Daasanach, require the participation of ritual experts from their neighboring groups to perform a certain ritual. Interethnic cooperative relations have been confirmed in this ritual (Abbink 2005). However, as far as the author knows, such opportunities do not exist between the Daasanach and the neighboring groups aside from the peace ceremonies that rarely take place. The friendships are not formed through the co-hosting of rituals performed at a group level, but they are formed strictly through reciprocal visits and intentions at the individual level.

(2) The goods that are given and/or received between friends are something "secular." In Mauss's analysis, the recipient of a gift in Maori society reciprocates because the goods received are endowed with the "spirit" of the giver. Therefore, it forces the recipient to reciprocate. The focus on the personal value added to the gift develops into arguments on the inalienability of goods by Weiner (1992). Unlike goods that can be easily acquired or given during trade, the goods that are presented as gifts are things that are "kept while given," which are indispensable in the integration and the reproduction of the community.

In contrast, things that are given as gifts in this region are primarily those used in daily life, such as crops, livestock, household goods, and accessories. There are no strong religious meanings attached to these things or their transactions themselves, as Matsuda (2008) also pointed out in the case of the Muguji society. This is clear from the fact that every item used in gift giving can be acquired through trade. This means that if viewed from the perspective of the actor, there are two routes for obtaining goods from the members of the neighboring groups: through trade and gift giving by forming friendships. If one were to focus on the fact that group members acquire goods that are relatively difficult to obtain in their own community from members of other groups, friendships could be regarded as relations established for "acquiring goods." However, this does not explain why goods are obtained by going through the trouble of forming friendships. This implies that the friendships are not established for just "acquiring things."

4. PROCESS OF FRIENDSHIP FORMATION

The accounts so far may have given readers the impression that friendships are relationships that have been formed by members from both parties who simply "got along" after meeting during trade and coresidence. In fact, the majority of relationships with "our people" are such relationships. However, friendships with "enemies" are often formed through more difficult circumstances. From here onward, this paper will focus on this type of relationship with the "enemies."

4.1. Waiting in the Land of the "Enemy"

Mauss has analyzed that gift giving is a phenomenon composed of three obligations: to give; to receive; and to return. Below, some cases of friendship formation are provided to examine why people give, receive, and return gifts. The order will be changed, but first we will look at "why they receive."

> Case 1 (Male in his 30s, April 12, 2006)
> Three members of the Daasanach, including person "A," went to the Kokuro village of the Turkana to sell guns. As they rested midway in the shade, they encountered several members of the Turkana. They surrounded "A" and the others stating, "I bet you men came to raid our livestock." These men pointed their guns to "A" and the others and were ready to kill them. Then, a member of the Turkana stated, "They only came to trade," convincing the other Turkana men not to kill them. "A" and the others were subsequently invited to this Turkana's house where they were welcomed with tea, meals, and a night's stay. Because this man knew some of the Daasanach language, they were able to engage in conversation and form a friendship. The following day, this Turkana man found a buyer for the guns so that "A" and the others were able to exchange all their guns for livestock. When the time came to return to their village, "A" said, "If we walk alone in

the land of the Turkana with cows, we will be mistaken as raiders and killed." This Turkana man then accompanied the Daasanach men for protection stating, "These men are my friends" every time they came across other Turkana members. When they parted, the Turkana man said, "I frequently go to Omorate (the name of a Daasanach town), so we'll see each other there."

Case 2 (Male in his 40s, May 23, 2006)
A Nyangatom man came alone to the village of Daasanach to sell bullets. However, during his stay, a conflict between the Nyangatom and the Daasanach broke out at a livestock camp far away from the village. When news arrived that the Daasanach livestock was raided by the Nyangatom, the villagers aimed their guns at this Nyangatom man with the intention of killing him in revenge. He quickly ran into the house that was right in front of him. This was the first time that the head of the household "B" and this Nyangatom man had met. "B" then yelled several times at the other members, who had surrounded the house with guns, saying, "He entered my house. I do not wish for blood to be spilled in my house." After a while, the men surrounding the house left. When "B" offered the man a meal and coffee, this Nyangatom man said "You are my savior, let's be friends," thus forming a relationship. Because "B" could speak some of the Nyangatom language, they were able to converse. Later in the evening, he accompanied the Nyangatom man to a safe location.

These two situations are considered as extreme examples, because friendships are not always formed by overcoming such life-or-death crises. In most cases, the initial meeting of the two parties takes place in a more non-violent situation. However, since these two examples are extreme, they accurately represent the potential risk of visiting the land of the "enemies." This risk of becoming a target of violence is only based on the reason that one belongs to an "enemies".

The Daasanach and the "enemies" have a long history of bloody conflict. Violent conflict usually leads to the raiding of livestock and the death of their comrades. The Daasanach call such losses "debt (*eu*)." Members who have had their relatives killed seek to "retrieve the debt" by exacting vengeance on their enemies (Sagawa 2010a). Those who kill "enemies" or raid livestock are praised as being "brave men" by other members within the group. There are many known cases of Daasanach members who were killed while visiting the land of the "enemies" for peaceful purposes and vice versa. There were even times when a large-scale war broke out to "retrieve debts" for such killings. The above two friendships were formed when men saved the lives of their "enemy" who faced the risk of visiting the "enemy" land. The following two examples are less extreme.

Case 3 (Male in his 70s, April 11, 2006)
When person "C" was living in Nakwa village, a Mursi[10] man came to visit the village. His objective was to trade tobacco and eight pairs of shoes made out of giraffe skin. However, he did not have any acquaintances in Daasanach and was unable to find a person to barter with. Furthermore, when he asked a Daasanach for water, his request was rejected. All he could do was to simply sit in the corner of the village. There, "C" spoke to him and invited him over to his house for some coffee. Because "C" happened to have slaughtered a sheep that day, he cooked the meat and gave it to the Mursi man. "C" and this Mursi man were fluent in the Nyangatom language. Therefore, the two men were able to converse and form a friendship. The Mursi gave "C" the shoes and the tobacco, and "C" gave the Mursi man one gourd and a sheet of goat skin.

Case 4 (Male in his 30s, April 11, 2006)
Person "D" was on his way to his village after herding for the day. After noticing that one of his calves was missing, he went out of the village to seek the lost calf. On his way back home after finding the calf, he came across two Hamar men who were sitting in the shade. "D" took the two men to his home and served them coffee and meals. When "D" asked them about their reason for their visit, they said that they were seeking clay to put in their hair (*liwan*). "D" then said, "If

that's the case, I'll look for it tomorrow." The following morning, he himself provided 20 birr and bought this item from the other villagers. The Hamar men became friends with him saying, "Before we came here, we didn't know about you. Now, you bought clay for us. Let's be friends."

Based on the four examples above, the following four commonalities can be extracted: 1) A man visits the land of the "enemy" to trade even though he might become the target of violent attack; 2) He finds himself in an absolute passive situation where the only thing he can do is wait for someone from the other group to help him; 3) He accomplishes the objective of his visit through the hospitality and help of the "enemy" member who called out to him; and 4) a friendship is formed through this process.

In Case 1 and 2, the visitors were outnumbered in the land of their "enemies" and they would have been killed if the men who later formed friendships with them did not invite the visitors into their homes. In Case 3, a man, who was at a loss after his request for water was rejected by a Daasanach, was invited into the house of "C." In Case 4, "D" started a conversation with men who were simply sitting in the shade in a land where they had no acquaintances. In a state where all a visitor could do was wait, these visitors were greeted by people who eventually became their friends and welcomed them into their home.

Why do people accept hospitality and gifts? This is because they were placed in a situation where the only choice is to accept such offers.

4.2. Reaching Out to the "Enemy" Who Waits

It may appear that the party that reached out to the visitors who could only wait did so by making an active choice. The party that reached out is not simply inviting a stranger into their home. In Case 1 and 2, the parties also undertook the role of guards to prevent attacks from other members when they were returning home. In Case 4, the party that spoke to the visitors purchased goods that the visitors were after with his own money, thus giving the goods as a gift.

There are many other cases where a person gave an "enemy" member a gift after meeting them for the first time. For example, after the Turkana's land was hit by a serious drought, many Turkana members came to the land of the Daasanach to seek aid. Person "E" invited a Turkana man that he had never met before and gave him as much sorghum as four donkeys could carry to stave off hunger. At that time, "E" simply gave gifts without receiving any requital.

Why are such "good deeds" conducted with "enemies"? As explained at the beginning of this paper, there are two analyses in previous research that are frequently addressed to "rationally" explain this action that may seem "irrational" at first glance. The first analysis is that the action is an obligation based on collective norms. The other analysis traces the action to an individual's strategies.

The former analysis will be explained first. According to this explanation, the individual's action is a result of adherence to collective norms. The norm that is commonly referred to in the context of discussing hospitality and gift giving is that of mutual support where "relatives and neighbors should help each other." However, such norms do not exist between the Daasanach and the "enemy" members. If one were to search for something similar among norms that the two groups share, it would be a culture in which generosity is highly praised. The Daasanach describe themselves and other close groups as people "who give cowhides." This self-designation is based on the fact that the houses of the Daasanach have cowhides laid down inside of them. In the evening, the cowhides are then laid out in front of the house, and people then drink coffee, eat their meals, enjoy conversation, and later sleep on them. People who "give cowhides" refer to those who invite others into their own homes and generously prepare their guests' meals and sleeping places. Conversely, people who provide nothing to the visitors are known as "people with rotten stomachs," who are generally despised.

It is certain that this attitude of praising generosity toward others is a contributing factor in the hospitality and gifts given to the "enemies." However, this explanation is insufficient. Although generosity from one Daasanach member to another is almost always praised, generosity toward an "enemy" can sometimes become a subject of criticism. For example, a Daasanach man gave many gifts

and welcomed an "enemy" who visited their land. However, this "enemy" never returned to reciprocate. Therefore, other Daasanach members describe this person as a "man that was tricked by the enemy." Moreover, as seen in the above cases, people other than the men that helped the visitors have prosecuted the visitors, which is contrary to the attitude that values generosity. In Cases 1 and 2, people perceived the visitors to be "enemies" and attempted to kill them, while in Case 3, the request of the visitor for drinking water was rejected.

Now, could the reason for such actions be explained using the second explanation; the perspective of an individual's strategies? This analysis encompasses a long-term economic rationality and/or the maintenance and expansion of political power. Here the action will be examined with a focus on the former (and the latter analysis will be discussed later). As per this analysis, the reason a member called to the "enemy" is based on the fact that the member expects an economic return in the future by forming a friendship. Hospitality and gift giving are, in a sense, investments for the future or insurance for an uncertain future (cf. Woodburn 1998). As I pointed out, this analysis is dominant in prior research on friendship in the area.

There are important requirements to explain hospitality and gift giving from this perspective; that is, the actor has the necessary information to make "rational" judgments when giving hospitality and gifts. Such information includes: what kind of person is he?; does he have the kind of personality that will properly reciprocate the hospitality I have extended?; does he have sufficient property to reciprocate gifts suitably?; and if he does not reciprocate, will it be possible to force him to do so by pressuring people around him?

For certain, hospitality and gifts are provided after obtaining such information. These are given to members with whom the giver has shared his/her daily life to a certain extent and will continue to do so in the future. The giver assesses this by considering the other's personality as well as his wealth and social relationships. Almagor (1978), who analyzed the friendships among the Daasanach, states that such sorting indeed occurs during the formation process of relationships. A person who does not have a field to cultivate visits those who possess vast stretches of land and presents them with gifts such as coffee. In this case, this person is giving gifts in the hope that if a friendship relation ensues, the other person will give them the right to use their land for cultivation.

However, as seen in the four cases above, the party that called had almost no information on the other party at the time. All the cases show that the person who was called was someone who had just been met. For example, Case 2 features a stranger that unexpectedly enters the giver's home. It is unrealistic to suppose that in that situation, one could have instantly read the other person's characteristics and make logical calculations such as "doing him a favor will lead to something good in the future."

Perhaps such assessments were possible to a degree in Cases 3 and 4 because there was sufficient amount of time to observe others' conduct before speaking to them. Furthermore, in Cases 1 and 2, information was collected during a later conversation at home after the reaching out. However, even if this was the case, there is another factor that prevents them from calculating "long-term economic rationality." The person with whom they are forming a relationship is a member of the "enemy." If the intergroup antagonism worsens, mutual visits are severed, thus making reciprocation difficult. Since intergroup relations worsen frequently due to unexpected incidents, it is difficult to make long-term predictions as to how long the current amiable visiting will continue. This means that having an individual relation beyond ethnic boundaries does not mean that this will function at any time.

In other words, the information necessary to choose actions based on "long-term economic rationality" is insufficient when people provide hospitality and gifts to the "enemy." The author of this paper is not stating that friendships do not have an aspect of economic rationality, such as in the examples where people obtain scarce goods in their community from their friends. However, such aspects are the result of relations being formed and not the objective of providing hospitality and gifts.

If explanations based on "long-term economic rationality" are inappropriate, how should one perceive hospitality and gift giving to one's "enemy"? What is interesting here is the point that when I asked the people who reached out to the "enemy" regarding the motivation behind their actions, they

were unable to provide a clear answer. Their explanations would be "because he suddenly entered the house" as in Case 2, or "because he was sitting there after being denied water by the house next door" as in Case 3, or "because they happened to look at me" as in Case 4. When they describe their past behaviors, they do not base their reason for reaching out from a strategic viewpoint. Rather, they only stated the situation in which they encountered the other and reached out to them as if it were inevitable that they did so in that situation.

The author of this paper perceives that friendships were formed as a "relation as hospitality" described by Washida (1999). Hospitality is an act that waits for some sort of arrival, such as inviting strangers into a home. The encounter with strangers is a coincidence in which prediction and selection cannot be made in advance. According to Washida, "a relationship as hospitality is created under contingency where one does not choose the other, but one encounters the other" (Washida 1999: 241). Furthermore, he states that hospitality is related to people's vulnerability. Vulnerability is a characteristic whereby human beings can become hurt from either experiencing violence inflicted by others or sharing in other's pain and misery. Hospitality is not a "transaction" conducted after predicting the result that such a relationship with the other party would bring but simply an act of welcoming the vulnerable other.

Although it is slightly idealistic, this argument supports the scenario of encounters with the "enemies" in the cases above. The encounters in Cases 1–4 are characterized by a strong contingency. The two parties who formed friendships belonged to different groups with no prior contact. Thereafter, the series of actions from the initial reaching out to providing hospitality and gifts are actions that were conducted in situations that were impossible to predict in advance and in which responses had to be made immediately. Instead of regarding the action of reaching out to the "enemies" as conventional obligations or individual strategies, such actions were conducted because the "enemy" was in a difficult situation, and members at that time just "happened to be looking at me." According to Osteen (2002: 26), gift giving is conducted at times because we are caught up in the moment. Therefore, people cannot provide clear motivations for their actions.

What should be emphasized at the same time is the fact that the series of actions are executed only once after the person reaches out to the other party. This shows the existence of a strong individual who attempts an interaction with others with the positive assurance toward self as a support. In regard to the characteristics of the interactions of the Turkana, Kitamura (1990) describes their deep involvement in actions that a result of their being overcome by emotion, and this is also applicable to the interactions of the Daasanach and the cases in this paper. Especially in Case 1 and 2, the subject is saving the lives of the "enemy" by defying the action of "killing." Once the "enemies" are saved, the person who initially reached out to them accomplishes the series of actions such as inviting them into their home and providing them with gifts, in accordance to their own convictions.

Why do people offer hospitality and gifts? This is because they have encountered those who could not do anything but wait for someone to reach out to them.

4.3. Visiting a "Friend" Who Waits

After visitors are welcomed into the homes and/or provided with gifts, they return to their own settlement. During these instances, there are times when goods are given mutually on the spot, as seen in Case 3. However, there are times when visitors leave without giving anything in return, as seen in other cases. If the two parties do not see each other again, this becomes just a one-time encounter, like the relationship of the pedestrian and the beggar as discussed by Testart (1998).

However, correspondence between members who simply meet out of chance frequently continues and develops into closer relationships. Here, the gift of goods will be examined. Out of the 257 pairs of friendships with the "enemies," the gift of goods occurred for 191 of them with 79% of the cases showing that a reciprocated gift was given for the initial gift. These requitals were often accomplished through mutual visits that occurred over time. In other words, a continuous relationship was formed by subsequent visits to the home of the person from whom the other party received the initial hospitality and gifts, or through reciprocal visits by the initial giver to the other party's home. If we consider

this, in the case of the remaining 21% of pairs where a requital was not made for the initial gift, there is still the possibility that the party that has given but has not yet received will be reciprocated later.

Why is it that relations are maintained by making requitals? This question will be examined by making an association with the other argument concerning individual strategies, the perspective of maintenance and expansion of political power. This argument states that if one does not reciprocate a gift, the receiver feels a strong sense of indebtedness to the giver, thus becoming psychologically subordinate. Therefore, for individuals who pursue the expansion of their own political influence, giving becomes an opportunity to dominate others, and returning becomes a statement of defying subordination to the giver.

The reason this argument does not succeed in sufficiently examining the issue is that the sense of indebtedness is manifested in a certain social context, rather than being "human nature" that is inevitably generated by the act of receiving. There are many instances where those who do not reciprocate do not feel any guilt in the process. For example, Ohta (1986), who analyzed the action of begging by the Turkana, clarified that even if they received an object from other Turkana members, they did not experience a sense of indebtedness.

Graeber conducted a re-examination of *The Gift* to consider the social embeddedness of such a sense of indebtedness. Thereafter, in contrast to Mauss who argued the obligatory aspect of reciprocating, Graeber rephrased the question as "When do they [gifts] have to be paid?" after pointing out that gifts do not always have to be repaid (Graeber 2001: 217). His answer is that requital should be made when the recipient of the gift fears that the relationship with the giver will transform into a hierarchical one if the gift is not returned.

While some theorists state that reciprocation is simply a selfish action, Graeber's contention can be perceived as implying that reciprocation is, to be precise, conducted in consideration of one's future, which is under "society's" assessment. For Graeber, "society" for the actor is an audience that observes and evaluates one's actions; thus, it is an aggregate of third parties (Graeber 2001: 76–77). If this is the case, the evaluation of the relationship by third parties should become an indispensable element when the relationship between the giver and the receiver transforms into a hierarchical one. In other words, the hierarchy is not generated by the phenomenon of "not reciprocating" itself. Instead, it is generated by the existence of third parties, who praise the giver and criticize the recipient who does not reciprocate the initial gift. With the evaluation of third parties as a medium, the giver feels a sense of superiority and the receiver a sense of indebtedness.

Based on the cases provided in this study, was there any possibility that the relations of both parties could transform into hierarchical ones due to one party not reciprocating? As has been mentioned several times, the friends belong to different groups and live different daily lives. The members of the receiver's group do not generally know of the hospitality and gifts received in the land of the "enemy." Furthermore, as seen in one of the cases, the giver whose hospitality or gifts are not reciprocated by the "enemy" may be mocked by members of the same group. In other words, there are few third-party members who will negatively evaluate the receiver for not having been reciprocated and few who will praise the giver's act of giving.

Rather, reciprocation should be examined by emphasizing the point that the friendship between the Daasanach and the "enemy" is one that is absolutely between individuals. For example, when the author of this paper interviewed people about friendships with the "enemy," the following phrase uttered by many members merits attention: "I have not met my friend recently because there were so many battles. However, when peace comes, he will visit my village for sure and I will welcome him by slaughtering a goat (or I will visit his village and he will welcome me)." Among the interviewees, there were members who made such statements about friends they had not seen for more than 10 years.

Where does this trust in friends and the command to self come from? It would be appropriate to consider these aspects from the experience of "waiting" when they first met. As examined earlier, the series of actions may not have been active actions based on a clear awareness of objectives for the party who initially reached out to the visitor. However, for those who found themselves in a situation where

they had to continue waiting in the land of the "enemy," the welcoming by the other party is an irreplaceable action "done for none other than me." This strong emotion generated in the receiver toward the giver through such dramatic experiences has surfaced even in a location where the intergroup boundary is visible in the clearest manner: on the field of battle.

> Case 5 (Male in his 40s, March 27, 2006)
> Person "F" was known as someone who loves war and frequently headed out to do battle with neighboring groups. When the battle with the Turkana broke out, he joined the war and faced the "enemies" on the battlefield. However, among these "enemies," he met a friend who had given him a heifer. When he shouted, "There's a friend of mine, there's a friend of mine!" The Daasanach around him said "So what if that's your guy, so what?" "Kill, kill!" "Kill your people!" However, "F" left the troops stating, "I'm not going to kill, you guys kill," and subsequently joined the other troops to fight against the Turkana.

What is being indicated here is the rejection of "killing a friend" even if he is an "enemy" at a site of extreme interaction where "we" and "they" are separated at a group level. While the reaching out at the place of the first encounter is described as if it were something they had to inevitably do in that situation, the clear activeness of the actor can be seen here.

The factor supporting this activeness is the strong emotion toward the person who initially reached to him when he was waiting. With this emotion as a foundation, an awareness of trust toward the other party is formed. Luhmann (2017: 45–47) observes that "a risky advance" from one party to another, in other words, a certain type of gift giving with the risk of not being reciprocated will be necessary as a catalyst in the formation of mutual trust. The act of welcoming in an "enemy" that one has met coincidentally is understood as an experience of "a risky advance" for the party that was reached out to, regardless of whether the former had such intentions.

The party who initially welcomed and sent off the visitor is now in a position where they themselves "wait." It remains uncertain whether the other party with whom they formed a friendship will ever return. The helpless receiver, who once only had the option of waiting, remembers this friend who is now waiting for him and revisits the land of the "enemy" to reciprocate The reason why he reciprocates is not because of any consideration toward himself who becomes the subject of evaluation by third parties, but for "nobody else but you" that gave to "me," and for "nobody else but me" who will be evaluated by "you."(11)

Why do people reciprocate hospitality and gifts? It is to reach out to a friend who is waiting on him and who once reached out to him when he was waiting.

5. TIME AND RISKS ACCOMPANYING HOSPITALITY AND GIFT GIVING

This section will analyze how the processes of friendship formation are characterized from the perspective of time and the risks accompanying hospitality and gift giving.

Bourdieu (1979; 1990) noted the importance of the function of time when examining gift giving. According to him, gift giving is a contradictory phenomenon where one has to subjectively deny the pursuit of self-profit by giving without seeking requital, while objectively, it is an action where profit is obtained through requital. This contradiction does not manifest because the time interval between the initial gift and the reciprocated gift where the parties involved are prevented from being aware of the "truth," which is the calculation of private profit interest. He presented this analysis as a criticism of the theory by Levi-Strauss, who reduced the parties involved to "the status of automat or inert bodies moved by obscure mechanism toward ends of which they are unaware" with "the objective model, obtained by reducing the polythetic to the nomothetic, the detotalized, irreversible succession to the perfectly reversibly totality" in the name of "cycles of reciprocity" (Bourdieu 1990: 98). However, this criticism of reductionism may also be applicable to Bourdieu himself, who reduced one's "true"

motivation for gift giving to a strategy aimed at maximizing self-profit.

Time interval plays a significant role in hospitality and gift giving in the cases of this paper. However, this is not in the sense in which Bourdieu describes. From the time when the initial attempt to reach out was made to the time the other party revisits, it is difficult to predict whether hospitality and gifts will be given and returned. In a time that is progressing in "the detotalized, irreversible succession," new friendships are being made. What is important in this process is the overturn of an asymmetrical position mediated by time, where the person who was in the position to reach out is now placed in a position where they cannot do anything but wait, and the person who was only allowed to wait is now placed in the position of being able to reach out. Despite the need to encounter the other from an asymmetrical position due to interethnic antagonism, the two parties that shared the action of providing and receiving hospitality and gifts were then able to form a continuing and closer relationship.

The fact that time mediates between the initial hospitality and gift giving to reciprocation signifies that the first giver has a risk of losing something that was given. As mentioned in the beginning of the paper, because earlier arguments concerning gift giving were based on the premise of the "obligation to return," no sufficient examination was conducted on issues surrounding this risk. Gudeman (2001) states that gift giving is characterized by uncertainty. Gift giving is achieved with others who are located outside of the community, so it is difficult to predict whether they will reciprocate. Contrary to Marx's analysis, Gudeman seems to insist that gift giving will commence when the community ends. So, why do people give? Gudeman's argument refers back to the existing community. He places the gift giving as "tactical acts that extend the shared values of a community" (Gudeman 2001: 460). If the receiver reciprocates, it signifies that the person has accepted "our" rules, which expands the boundary of the community. In other words, gift giving is an opportunity to incorporate a stranger into "our" rules.

In the cases described in this paper, hospitality and gift giving are performed even when reciprocation is uncertain, and these are not attempts to incorporate others into "our" group. If reciprocations are made, a pathway opens for the friendship to become a closer relationship; however, the two parties continue to remain as members of different groups. Therefore, they remain unsure as to when the mutual visits between friends could be severed due to the possibility of antagonism between the groups. Both parties continue the relationship with a mutual acknowledgment of this fact. If one were to adopt the definition of "society" by Graeber, the two parties are not expanding the boundary of existing groups or "society" to which each belongs. Rather, by traversing such "societies," a new "society" is created between "me" and "you," where "my" hospitality and gifts are evaluated by "you," and "your" hospitality and gifts are evaluated by "me."

Lastly, the impact of this "society" on interethnic relations will be discussed. As has already been emphasized, the friendships with the "enemy" are strictly between individuals. Just because many friendships are formed does not mean that the conflicts between the groups will cease. However, such relations play a definitive role in the process of peace making after violent conflicts. "Peace" here does not simply refer to a passive state where "there is no war." In the Daasanach language, there is a word called *simiti*, which could be translated as "peace." *Simiti* refers to a process wherein the mutual visits that have been severed are restored, and individuals actively engage in amiable interactions with the member of other groups (Sagawa 2010c).

Although the violent attacks themselves last only a few days, the antagonistic relations between the groups continue, resulting in an ever-widening no-man's land between the two parties. In a scenario wherein these mutual visits are severed, the person who is the first to visit the land of the "enemy" is precisely the person who has friendships with the "enemy." They defy the "cold war" state between the groups and visit friends that they were unable to see for a long period of time and the party who receives the visitor warmly welcomes them. By continuing these actions, others follow suit and also resume their mutual visits, thus sometimes forming new friendships. By pursuing the value[12] of "society" composed by "you" and "I" and visiting friends who are waiting, they are providing an opportunity for peace at a group level.

6. CONCLUSION

The friendships between the Daasanach and the "enemy" are not formed as a result of actions obliged through collective norms nor are relationships formed as a means for an individual to seek one's own profit. They are relationships that are formed when two parties with different daily lives happen to encounter each other, with one party providing hospitality to the other who cannot do anything but wait. These relationships are maintained and strengthened through reciprocation, even when the parties involved part ways and their mutual visits are severed because of violent conflicts.

There are also relationships formed with smaller risks involving friendships with the "enemy." In this sense, it could be said that the situations discussed in this paper are extreme cases. These cases were used because hospitality and gift giving to others have aspects of being conducted within coincidences where "one does not choose the other, but one encounters the other" (Washida 1999: 241). With this coincidence serving as a catalyst, a new relationship that traverses existing group boundaries is created. In a situation where intergroup antagonism exists, friendships with the "enemy" that are formed against this background are well portrayed in a manner where the coincidental aspect of hospitality and gift giving is emphasized.

Osteen (2002: 7) criticizes the manner in which the analysis of hospitality and gift giving has been biased toward economism. He indicates the necessity of spontaneity of actions in place of calculation, risks in place of reciprocity, and altruism in place of autonomy as the focus of examination. However, just because there have been too many explanations that focused on the latter aspects, it does not mean that hospitality and gift giving needs to be attributed to the former aspects. Instead, this needs to be viewed as an opportunity to re-examine the framework that perceives these two groups of concepts as a dichotomy, writing down accounts, and conducting analysis while emphasizing the former aspects and aiming to relativize the latter aspects.

If this paper focuses once again on the ambiguity and polysemy of hospitality and gift giving that Mauss suggested, then the author's choice of extreme cases will be justified.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This research has been financially supported by the 21st Century COE Program "Aimed for COE of Integrated Area Studies" of Kyoto University and the Afrasian Centre for Peace and Development Studies at Ryukoku University.

NOTES

(1) *The Gift* briefly discusses the question, "why does one give"? Gasché attributes this to the fact that Mauss' argument is conducted within the framework of "the donor is already in the game at the start of the game" and "his prestation is always already a counter-prestation" (Gasché 1997: 111).

(2) According to Heath (1976), in the transaction theory of Barth, the acting agent can predict the remuneration gained by participating in the transaction in advance. The acting agent also participates in a transaction when the value gained is the equivalent to or higher than the value lost. The model is constructed with these two points being the unspoken conditions. Heath criticized this model as being based on choices without risk, indicating the need for considering uncertainty and risks during transactions.

(3) Testart (1998) states that clear distinctions should be made between gift giving and exchange; to give without seeking return is gift, while the transference of goods conducted in an institutionalized setting where legal sanctions exist toward members who do not fulfill the "obligation to return" is exchange. According to this standpoint, the word "gift exchange" that is frequently used would amount to a contradiction.

(4) The "ethnographic present" of this paper is the year 2006. Since the late 2000s, the building of large commercial farms in the area and the Gibe III dam in the upper Omo river have had a negative influence on

the subsistence activities of the Daasanach and neighboring communities (Sagawa 2016).

(5) See Sagawa (2010c) for a detailed analysis of the amicable inter-ethnic relations.

(6) Females rarely visit the settlement regions of neighboring groups by themselves, and therefore do not form friendships. However, the person who serves meals and coffee to the husband's visiting friends is the wife. At times, a relationship closer than that with the husband is formed between the wife and the husband's friend. The role of the wife when welcoming a guest is discussed in Sagawa (2006).

(7) Out of the major goods that the Daasanach acquire through trade, those that they cannot produce are potteries, guns, and bullets.

(8) Since the Hor do not directly neighbor the Daasanach, the friendships between them are usually formed during trade; when the Daasanach visit the Hor, who play an active role in this region as traders, to purchase guns and other goods from them, or when the Hor visit the Daasanach to sell them guns and other goods.

(9) Of the friendship relations surveyed (n=384), 47% were formed through trade, while 33% were formed through coresidence (Sagawa 2010c).

(10) The Mursi is a group that lives north of the Nyangatom. The Daasanach classify them as an "enemy." Since the 1970s, owing to changes in the pastureland, the two groups no longer come into contact.

(11) Such actions of the receiver correspond to the two demands of Gouldner's formulation of the norm of reciprocity: "1) people should help those who have helped them, and 2) people should not injure those who have helped them" (Gouldner 1960: 171). This paper emphasizes that such norms do not exist to begin with nor are they a result that was generated from an individual's objective rational actions. What has been described up to this point is the process in which two people, who lead different daily lives, encounter each other accidentally, resulting in a reciprocal relationship.

(12) Here, the definition of values stipulated by Graeber is used, namely, "Value is the way in which an individual actor's actions take on meaning, for the actor herself, by being incorporated into a larger social whole" (Graeber 2001: 67).

REFERENCES

Abbink, J.
2005 Of Snake and Cattle. In I. Strecker (ed), *The Perils of Face*. Münster: LIT Verlag, pp. 233–252.

Almagor, U.
1978 *Pastoral Partners*. Manchester: Manchester University Press.

Barth, F.
1966 *Models of Social Organization*. London: Royal Anthropological Institute.

Blau, P.
1964 *Exchange and Power in Social Life*. New York: John Wiley and Sons.

Bourdieu, P.
1979 *Algeria 1960*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
1990 *The Logic of Practice*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.

Derrida, J.
1992 *Given Time I*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Gasché, R.
1997 Heliocentric Exchange. In A.D. Schrift (ed), *The Logic of the Gift*. New York: Routledge, pp. 100–117.

Gouldner, A.W.
1960 The Norms of Reciprocity. *American Sociological Review* 25: 161–179.

Graeber, D.
2001 *Toward an Anthropological Theory of Value*. New York: Palgrave.

Gudeman, S.
2001 Postmodern Gifts. In S. Cullenberg, J. Amariglio, and D. Ruccio (eds), *Postmodernism, Economics, and Knowledge*. New York: Routledge, pp. 459–474.

Heath, A.F.
1976 Decision Making and Transactional Theory. In B. Kapferer (ed), *Transaction and Meaning*. Philadelphia: ISHI, pp. 25–40.

Kitamura, K.
1990 Deep Involvement in Social Interactions among the Turkana. *African Study Monographs, Supplementary Issue* 12: 51–58.
Luhmann, N.
2017 *Trust and Power*. Cambridge: Polity.
Matsuda H.
2008 The Economy of Affection Unites the Region. In I.N. Kimambo, G. Hyden, S. Maghimbi and Sugimura K. (eds), *Contemporary Perspectives on African Moral Economy*. Dar es Salaam: DarEsSalaam University Press, pp. 153–162.
Mauss, M.
1990 *The Gift: The Form and Reason for Exchange in Archaic Societies*. London: Norton.
Ohta, I.
1986 Turkanazoku no Gosyusei (Reciprocity among the Turkana). In Itan J. and Tanaka J. (eds), *Sizen Syakai no Jinruigaku*. Kyoto: Academia Shuppan, pp. 181–215. (in Japanese)
Osteen, M.
2002 Introduction. In M. Osteen (ed), *The Question of the Gift*. London: Routledge, pp. 1–41.
Parry, J.
1986 The Gift, the Indian Gift and the 'Indian Gift'. *Man* 21(3): 453–473.
Sahlins, M.
1972 *Stone Age Economics*. New York: Aldine de Gruyter.
Sagawa, T.
2006 Wives' Domestic and Political Activities at Home. *African Study Monographs* 27-2: 63–86.
2010a War Experiences and Self-Determination of the Daasanach in the Conflict-Ridden Area of Northeastern Africa. *Nilo-Ethiopian Studies* 14: 19–37.
2010b Automatic Rifles and Social Order amongst the Daasanach of Conflict-Ridden East Africa. *Nomadic Peoples* 14(1): 87–109.
2010c Local Potential for Peace. In C. Echi-Gabbert and S. Thubauville (eds), *To Live with Others*. Köln: Rüdiger Köppe Verlag, pp. 99–127.
2016 Furontia no Senzairyoku (Potentials of the Frontier: Land-Grabbing and Local Response among the Daasanach of Ethiopia). In Endo M. (ed), *Buryokuhunso o Koete*. Kyoto: Kyoto Daigaku Shuppankai, pp. 119–149. (in Japanese)
Sobania, N.
1980 *The Historical Tradition of the Peoples of the Eastern Lake Turkana Basin c.1840–1925*. Ph.D thesis. London: University of London.
Tadesse, W.
2005 Having Friends Everywhere. In I. Strecker. (ed), *The Perils of Face*. Münster: LIT Verlag, pp. 297–315.
Testart, A.
1998 Uncertainties of the Obligation to Reciprocate. In W. James and N.J. Allen (eds), *Marcel Mauss*. New York: Berghahn, pp. 97–110.
Washida K.
1999 *Kikukoto no Chikara (Capacity of "Listening")*. Tokyo: Hankyu Communications. (in Japanese)
Weiner, B.A.
1992 *Inalienable Possessions*. Berkley: University of California Press.
Woodburn, J.
1998 Sharing Is Not a Form of Exchange. In C.M. Hann (ed), *Property Relations*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp. 48–63.

TORU SAGAWA: *Faculty of Letters, Keio University, 2-15-45 Mita, Minato-ku, Tokyo 108-8345, Japan.*