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The squirming facts exceed the squamous mind,
If one may say so. And yet relation appears,
A small relation expanding like the shade
Of a cloud on sand, a shape on the side of a hill.

Wallace Stevens (1954:215)

The Kujamaat Diola of Southern Senegal practice two customs that, when considered together, provide a kind of structuralist’s showpiece that neatly illustrates the almost surrealistic allure of the method. On further and more serious reflection, these very customs provide more than a dramatic “opposition and correlation”; they furnish, as well, an opportunity to explore certain general problems of symbolization. The customs have to do with the disposal of a corpse; the one with a dead leper and the other with a hyena shot while hunting. Two issues will be shown to be at play. How are the symbols hyena and leper—and with them the forge, the blacksmith, dog, crested crane, a small red and black bird, python, and certain types of witches—linked together? And, more basic yet, what motivates the choice of the particular symbols in the first place? In order to engage these issues I shall argue that the symbols form linkages of two distinct yet intertwined sorts, one by unsystematic association and the other by systematic analogy. I shall also argue that the symbols are chosen a priori to any linkages, systematic or not. They are chosen because, in some way or other, they have been marked, and they have been marked before they have been linked together. A priori marking brings up two other points. First, the marking varies from symbol to symbol; and second, our major symbols in this case are “natural symbols,”

Taken together, the disposal of a dead leper and the funeral for a hyena shot while hunting provide a way into a set of categories developed in Kujamaat Diola thought. I begin with the funerals and proceed first to supply ethnographic background to Kujamaat ideas about lepers and hyenas; I then go on to consider the symbolics of each in relation to the other and to related categories. The symbolic analysis takes into account three interdependent processes: variable marking, associative linkages, and analogic systematics. [leprosy; hyenas; blacksmithing; marking; natural symbols; symbolic anthropology]
that is, their interpretation or “meaning” is transcultural and not specific to Kujamaat thought.

My program is as follows. First I describe the two customs, and with them the structuralist’s showpiece, and then I provide the background for the two customs. This permits me to show some of the linkages that bring the two together. It is in these sections that the associative linkages appear. I pause and note that, to avoid sounding ad hoc, it is essential to consider more than associative symbolization.

Here I enter the notion of marking, of natural symbols, and of analogic symbolization. In my conclusions I display the untidy nature of ethnographic analysis—one problem leads to the next and there is always going to be something more. Thus, in a second conclusion (see Appendix) I take the opportunity to mention two problems that were only implied in the paper, that of affect and that of the place of the customs in the overall framework of Kujamaat cosmology.

the two customs

disposing of a hyena  If a hunter kills a hyena while hunting in the bush, he and a companion must bring it back to the living area by placing it on a stretcher and carrying it on their heads with one man in front and the other in back. This is the way the Kujamaat traditionally carry their dead during public display before burial. Further, the women’s funeral dance (windikin) and the men’s funeral songs (buyansang or eling, depending on the region), should be performed in honor of the dead hyena, in this context addressed as anifan (elder). The Kujamaat, therefore, think of a hyena killed in the hunt as if it were a human elder. One informant said that “you pretend that it is a person,” and another said that “it might be a person.” Some say this funeral must always be performed, and others say it is performed only when the animal is to be eaten. If the hyena is poisoned rather than shot while hunting, these customs do not apply. Such an animal would be left to rot in the bush.

burying a leper  When a leper with active leprosy dies, his corpse is attached by the hands and feet to a pole, as one would a pig or a large game animal. Then, covered with leaves, the body is rushed into the bush where it is dumped into a shallow grave that has been dug in advance. This is called kabeten buying (to throw away the corpse), in contrast to efok buying (to bury a corpse), as in a regular funeral (nyikul). For the ride out, a dog is tied to the leper’s pole and corpse; it howls, yaps, and bites during the trip. At the grave, or just before it, the dog is dispatched by cutting its throat, and its body is thrown into the bush. With the leper in his grave and the dog in the bush, the carriers, along with the grave-diggers and still in a great hurry, fill the grave by kicking at the dirt with their feet while facing away from it. Such is their rush that they often fail to entirely cover the body. On leaving the grave, the participants run without looking back to wash themselves at a natural spring (as opposed to a man-made well). Throughout the entire proceeding the participants imitate the noise of hyenas. The Kujamaat say, in effect, that the carriers and grave-diggers, until they are clean, and the leper himself are like (and some would say are) hyenas.

the structuralist’s showpiece  The bald opposition between the two customs is striking: an animal accompanied with human song and dance is carried into a living area as though it were a person. In contrast, a person accompanied with animal cries is carried away from human habitation as though it were an animal. But if the two customs oppose each other, it is nevertheless true that these very customs, at a higher level, show that hyena and leper are similar. Within their respective category domains, among animals and among people
and invalids, hyena and leper are unique. It is only these two, and then only at death, that are treated overtly and explicitly in a way each is not treated individually in life: a hyena as a person, a leper as a hyena.

the ethnographic context

leper, leprosy, blacksmith, and the forge The Kujamutay root -fany glosses, depending on context, as “leper,” “leprosy,” “forge,” “to forge,” and “blacksmith.” It refers as well to the spirit (enâati) associated with the forge that is thought to be responsible not only for the welfare of the forge, but for leprosy as well. Moreover, the care of lepers is the responsibility of blacksmiths; the officiants at a leper’s funeral must all be blacksmiths, their agnates, or their sisters’ children. To deal with lepers, therefore, we must first deal with blacksmiths.

Although by no means associated with an endogamous “caste” system, as is the case in much of the Western Sudan, the social position of the Kujamaat blacksmith is unique. All blacksmiths belong to one general patronym, Jeju, which would be to say that only a Jeju may smith. Unlike their “casted” neighbors to the north, however, all Jeju must marry someone who is not a Jeju. They like everyone else are exogamous. Smithing is the only trade that is confined to a social group. Other specialties like basket making, pottery, salt preparation, and tailoring are not, being instead associated with sex, region, talent, interests, and the availability of resources and potential markets.

Outside of their rights to smith (and by no means do all Jejus smith), the Jeju are thought to be no different than other Ajamaat. They cultivate rice, grow peanuts (the cash crop), build their own houses, etc. Occasionally, a particularly good smith obtains sufficient payment for his work, in kind or in cash, to be able to hire crews to work his fields. But so too would any other wealthy Ajamaat.

Associated with the Jeju are three animals that can be called “group totems”: crested crane, a red and black bird, and python. The crested crane (engaat) is said to be an out-married sister of the Jeju (the Kujamaat are virilocal). The bird is not eaten by any Jeju nor by anyone who is cognatically related to a Jeju. When it flies directly overhead it is certain that a Jeju will die in the near future. The red and black ekäram bird (elsewhere called egeegem, perhaps a type of guinea fowl) is said to have instructed the Jeju in the art of smithing. The python (ejumpur), like the crested crane, is not eaten. (I have never heard of any Ajamaat ever having eaten either this or any other snake, nor any crane or heron-type bird). The python is believed to be a blacksmith itself. Adult pythons are said to make a kon kon noise in the bush that sounds like the hammer of a blacksmith. What is important for us is that Jeju is the only patronym that has anything that might be considered a totem (it has three, two avial and the other terrestrial); no other patronym has any at all.

The blacksmith’s forge is always located away from a living area. It might be as near as ten meters or it might be at some distance. It is located under a circular thatched roof, with no walls, and with a sunken dirt floor. One has to stoop down to enter. Under the roof and in the center is the anvil, a bending stake, and to the side are the bellows. The tools are, as we might expect, the hammer (etiig) and tongs (nyinyob). The latter are special, and they and the anvil are thought to be most important, the distinguishing features of the forge.

The forge, situated as it is under a low roof, looks very much like a shrine for important spirits which are similarly housed. And indeed the forge is, or contains, a spirit. In fact, it is one of the Kujamaat’s major spirits. The anvil is considered the shrine for the spirit and whenever the forge is addressed qua spirit, all attention is drawn to the anvil, where libations and sacrifices are made.
The Kujamaat say that the fire of the forge is special and not like ordinary fire at all, for only the forge's fire can melt—or, more to the point, transform iron. A black, solid substance becomes red and malleable. Its shape is transformed by the smith, after which it returns to its original color and consistency. One reason the tongs (nyinyob) are said to be so important is that they permit the smith to handle the red-hot iron, the iron that is immediately under the effect of the forge's fire.

But what makes the forge's fire notable is its direct association with leprosy. Leprosy is caused by the forge and is cured or stopped by the forge. You get leprosy when you steal goods or bewitch a child that is under the protection (-ben) of the forge. The protected goods are usually cattle but they could be grain. The Kujamaat make the analogy that the fire of the forge is to iron as the "magical fire" (sambun silima) of leprosy (its "rayons," as one informant translated it into French) is to the fingers and toes of the body. The black skin of the body, when afflicted, becomes red and is transformed to become black again when the leprosy passes.

A Jeju tersely summarized the symptoms of leprosy: "Kafanyak cuts the fingers, sits in the stomach, and then comes up everywhere. [The body] becomes red with sores. It pushes into the mouth and then death." Three types of leprosy are identified, with each linked to specific shrines. Designated under the generic term kafany are batim and kamungn. Clinically, the former "gets you inside first and hence it is bad because you don't know it is there . . . then only later on does the skin become red and the fingers affected." The latter "is the one that gets to your fingers the fastest." (Note that changing the class marker from ka to e gives emungon, a variant of emunguno [hyena].) Separated somewhat from the others is kanuk, which is described as "starting in the nostrils [one cannot talk properly] and producing large sores. It then goes to your stomach and can kill you before it ever gets to your fingers." I was not able to ascertain how it was so different from the other two varieties. Informants said simply that kanuk was different from kafany, but was nevertheless associated with the forge (kafany) and controlled by the Jeju.

Lesser manifestations of kafany are small bleeding sores and red eyes that afflict someone who has lost, without repayment, his kafany amulet. A baby may also be afflicted with a diarrhea characterized by blackish green stools if his mother, during pregnancy, inadvertently handled the tools and other paraphernalia of the forge.

The protecting amulet is made of a strip of iron shaped like the forge's tongs. By wearing the amulet a child or cow becomes like the hot iron of the forge. That object, child or cow, is "held" by the tongs in fire. Anybody who would touch the object with bad thoughts (to bewitch or to steal) gets burned by the forge's fire, which is the magical fire of leprosy. Even if the leprosy is cured or arrested with European medicine, as most cases are these days, the patient is still susceptible to becoming reinfected (reburned) when he returns home. The effect of European medicine was described as follows: "At the leprosarium the patient is given injections all of the time. And hence a big fight ensues between the medicines and the kafany spirit. Eventually the kafany gets tired and decides to leave saying that it will go back to the forge and wait for the patient to come home." For these reasons few cured lepers ever return home. But though he may remain absent or may die, other members of his immediate residential family and other cognates become vulnerable to the kafany until a restitution is made for the theft that originally provoked the spirit. And it is an expensive repayment necessitating a restitutive ritual (katennor) conducted by the Jeju owners of the shrine housing the afflicting spirit. The ritual involves a communal gathering of cognatic and agnatic kin at the leper's home and requires a confession of thievery by a spokesman for the afflicted family, a ritual washing of each family member and each cognate, an exorcism of the living area, and numerous payments.

When a leper dies, and before he may be touched, he must be decontaminated. First his
death is visually (never by touching) verified by a Jeju’s sister’s son. Then one member (and
only one) of the officiating Jeju household (or his immediate sister’s son, in the Jeju’s
absence) takes a large set of blacksmith tongs especially reserved for this purpose and with
them lifts up the corpse as one might a hot iron from the forge. The corpse is now decon-
taminated and other members of Jeju household may touch it and proceed to bury it in the
manner already described (i.e., “to throw it away”). Following the burial, and because some
of the kafany’s “rayons” remain present after the decontamination, the katemnor ritual and
a payment to the Jeju of a bull must both be made. Over and above other payments, the
 carriers and the gravedigger receive a pig for their work.

The symptoms of what modern medicine calls leprosy (Elephantiasis Graecorum, known
now to be caused by the mycobacterium leprae bacillus), and those of what the Kajumaat
call kafany, are for the most part fairly close, at least in their virulent forms. What charac-
terizes both is the highly visible bodily transformations that culminate in general disfigure-
ment and permanent loss of bodily extremities. Anyone diagnosed by Western medicine as
being afflicted with virulent lepromatous leprosy would be diagnosed by the Kujamaat as
having been caught by kafany. 3 But, as with medieval notions of leprosy, kafany includes
disfiguring diseases other than that caused by mycobacterium leprae: for example, yaws
(the kanuk variant of kafany?), perhaps myetoma and other mycotic diseases, and various
serious forms of scabies. Elephantiasis, generally thought in medieval times to be a variety
of leprosy (Brody 1974:53) is erajina in Kujumhatay; in Kujamaat thought it has no relation-
ship to kafany.

A leper is held in isolation only during the time he is afflicted by the disease. If kafany
should pass and the invalid survives, the leper is reabsorbed into his family. The Kujamaat
would never refer to a recovered leper as a “burnt-out case.” Aside from witchcraft and
thievery (common enough phenomena), they would not attach to an active leper the moral
reprobation the lepers had to endure during much of Western history.

Kafany fits at one end of a spectrum defining Kujamaat ideas about illness. At the other
end there are common colds and mild flu epidemics that make the rounds of ward and
village. These minor illnesses are called burus (cf. erus [wind]) and are never taken serious-
ly. There are also diseases with specific symptoms having obvious causes; these diseases
are treated by individuals possessing the appropriate medicines. Snake bites and gonorrhea
are examples. Finally, there are the majority of major and minor illnesses that are linked to
complex causes having to do either with witchcraft or the displeasure of spirits. Cures
necessitate divination, sacrifices, and confessions, as well as medicines. As likely as not,
they require the help of a native curer who through his open vision sets the invalid on the
way to a cure. Kafany is very much a part of this latter variety of illness.

hyenas among animals One way to classify animals is to place any particular animal
along a continuum running between everyday and supernatural experience. Hyenas figure
in both experiential worlds. Briefly, and starting with the general concept of supernatural
power, muyal, the place of animals and then hyenas can be sketched as follows.

Kujamaat thought makes a clear distinction between two classes of experience, that
which is ordinary and “of the day” (wati fulay) and that which is extraordinary and “of the
night” (wati kalim). The former is about everyday experience that is open and easily accessi-
able to understanding. It is experienced directly and is fully perceptible to the senses. Com-
mon sense and practical knowledge available to anyone would fit wati fulay experience.
The latter, wati kalim, covers all of the rest. Extraordinary experience is that which is felt
and not directly perceived or fully understood. It is “open and wide vision” that permits
someone to “see the unseen” and to use the power of the unseen, the supernatural power
of muyal. A witch (asay) has this vision and this power of muyal, but so does a native doctor
(alaaka), as do elders who are leaders, as does anybody who is in any way exceptional (e.g., a successful warrior, a wrestler, a beautiful man or woman, a rich man, a skillful craftsman).

Although they tend to think of the distinction between “night” and “day” in terms of human action and knowledge, the Kujamaat, when pressed, will liken the unseen power of muyal with the unseen power of spirit, of the sinâtti. Thus the forge and its fire that melts both iron and fingers is associated with the muyal of spirit. More directly involved with human muyal is the blacksmith’s skill at manipulating hammer and tongs to shape tools out of scraps of iron. It is a skill not available to everyone, not even to all Jeju. Also involved with muyal is the forge’s job of protecting people and cattle against the muyal of thieves and witches. The forge’s spiritual power, through affliction, controls and punishes the unseen and untoward power of man.

Animals “of the day” include ordinary wild and domestic animals whose relations with man are unequivocal. What you see of them is what is there; they afford no sign beyond themselves. Animal doubles (siwûûm) that correspond on a one-to-one basis with individuals are also thought to be “of the day.” Common doubles are antelopes, leopards, monkeys, lizards, and various types of harmless snakes (Sapir 1977b).

For the most part, animals “of the night” fall into one of two groups, were-animals (-lanya [transformed agents]) and animal familiars (-lima [agents of night], usually translated as “magical”). An animal familiar is owned by an individual and is said to “be like a gun, an arm,” used to guard the safety and the interests of its owner and his kin. Crocodiles and leopards are the common familiars. Some animal familiars are used on an ad hoc basis, as when a man obtains from a bush spirit (bugôn) the use of a poisonous snake in order to rid himself (and the world) of an obnoxious relative.

With muyal a person can transform himself into an animal so as to do some form of mischief. As were-animal, he is able to approach and touch or otherwise molest a victim so that the victim will take ill and die, after which he eats his soul (yut; which is located in the blood) or he exhumes the corpse and eats its flesh. Domestic animals (cats and goats particularly), along with numerous wild animals (especially those that frequent human surroundings) can serve as vehicles for the transformation. Becoming a were-animal is, of course, but one of many tricks of the witch’s trade.

The major characteristic of muyal animals is that they are used by man to increase and extend his power. This immediately excludes animal doubles. They are commonly seen and, even when leopards, are generally passive. Being vulnerable to attack they hinder more than help their correspondent. They have nothing to do with extended power, only extended being. They remain a part of ordinary life.

The association of animals with particular spirits occurs most frequently at a general and an ideal level when the shrine and spirit itself is designated by an animal eponym: etool (frog), egotir (lizard), yon (crocodile). The link between animal and spirit manifestation varies considerably and is usually very vague, though it generally recalls either the origin of the spirit or the symptoms that affect those caught by the spirit.

Across this field of animal categories the hyena takes a prominent but by no means dominant place. The natural animal is known to most Kujamaat. It is not especially common in the area, but its cries are heard at night, from time to time. The hyena is considered a nuisance for the damage it does to cattle, and those that repeatedly attack cattle are poisoned or shot. It is not hunted, as a rule, though occasionally a hunter will kill one if it should cross his path. Contrary to other peoples in West Africa, the Kujamaat may eat hyena, though it is hardly a preferred food.

Very rarely, a person will have a hyena as a double (I heard of only one case), though other animals usually fill this role. More conspicuous is the hyena’s use in witchcraft as a
common vehicle for transformation. Unlike other were-animals, the hyena's value is restricted to two specific uses: to permit a witch to kill and devour someone's cattle, or to dig up and eat a corpse (usually of a child).

The hyena serves as an eponym for one variant of a spirit called fuim. The spirit has to do with collective hunts and catches people by giving them symptoms of disorientation that are expressed in nervous wanderings and/or muscular tenseness. It has four variants, each represented by shrines and each named after an animal: Hare, Antelope, Leopard, and Hyena.

A person is susceptible of being caught by Hare or Antelope if at some time he or an ascendant had witnessed the actual birth of a hare or antelope, or had come upon the birthplace shortly after birth. He is susceptible to Leopard or Hyena if he or an ascendant had either been witness to the birth or had killed one or the other.

The symptoms of illness differ from one to the other and thus provide operational means for identifying the afflicting spirit. If the invalid wanders about hither and yon, he has been caught by Hare. If he strides, trots, or runs in one direction without purpose, it is a symptom of Antelope. If he does the same but with heavy footsteps and great force (like a charge, described in French as comme un poids lourd), then it is Hyena who has caught him. When Leopard catches someone, the invalid holds still and "shakes tensely, as a leopard in a crouch."4

To be rid of the illnesses, one or another ritual must be performed on behalf of the invalid. If the spirit continually returns, in spite of the rituals, a collective hunt must be organized. At this point, the invalid becomes an adept of the spirit and can himself perform the curing ritual in the name of the spirit.

The custom of carrying the dead hyena is attached to the fuim complex. To treat the hyena as an elder, and hence "with respect," is to take precautions (kasabor, in Kujamaat ritual terminology) against being caught by the fuim-Hyena spirit acting on behalf of the dead hyena.

Beyond designating an ordinary or supernatural referent, the term emūngūno is used figuratively. In interpersonal relations one person may refer to another as a "hyena" (emūngūno). The epithet ridicules someone as gross, slovenly, greedy, and of insatiable appetites. Other animal names are used pejoratively, but with less intensity than hyena: enyaru (monkey), someone who is obstreperous; kajeru (hare), someone tricky and quick. But with the diminutive ji- or personal a- prefix, even hyena can become an affectionate nickname. In contrast, praise animals are invariably enyaab (elephant), jimūkūr (lion), and esaama (leopard). These all are highly stereotyped praises and are mainly used as interjections which would gloss as "some guy"!

The expression emūngūno besofi (hyena is going to catch you), or ... betokonyi (... is going to crunch you up), is frequently used to scare children. The only substitute for emūngūno that I ever heard in this frame was alūllūm (European, whiteman). To my repeated chagrin, alūllūmaw besofi dejitumi (the whiteman will catch and take you away—at least it wasn't "crunch you up"!) greeted my arrival at villages where I was unknown and where one or more mothers needed a means to control their children or simply to amuse themselves at their children's expense.

Hyena occupies, as well, a very special place in a frame apart from cosmology and everyday interaction: folktales. There Hyena receives the diminutive ji and most frequently takes personal concord agreement: jimūngūno naje sinde yola (hyena he went to his home), rather than emūngūno eje sinde yoliyo (hyena it went to its home). In tales, Hyena becomes a vehicle for a very definite character type which combines the perceived characteristics of greediness (especially with food), aggressiveness, trickiness of a particularly crude sort that as often as not fails, and often plain stupidness. The characteristics that Beidelman (1961,
1975, 1980) has inferred for Hyena in Kaguru folklore are essentially those developed in Kujamaat tales. In fact, one can safely say that its role is fairly uniform across Africa.

The antics of Hyena, which the Kujamaat find very amusing, run through most of their animal tales. Other animals assume stereotyped roles, too, especially Hare, but they are much less developed.

This rapid outline of Kujamaat animal categories permits us to put hyena into a wider context. Hyena has its place both on the ordinary and the supernatural levels of existence. Although its presence in the latter at least is prominent, it does not at any point occupy a particularly privileged position. That is, at whatever place in Kujamaat thought a hyena might appear, other animals appear there as well: as a wild animal, as a were-animal and animal familiar, and as an eponym for spirit. This would be equally true for epitaphs and folktales, although in the latter its place is indeed conspicuous. Folktales aside, the one time hyena receives special treatment is when it is killed in the hunt. Among not only the fuim animals, but among all animals known to the Kujamaat, only the hyena at death receives human consideration. Being treated as a human ipso facto sets it apart from other animals.

**associative linkages** Some of what I have called associative linkages have now been established. Recall that the fire of the forge acts on iron as the “fire” and “rays” of leprosy act on the fingers. But can we demonstrate some other associative linkages as well? What of hyena and leper, and then hyena and elder? That the leper is (or stands for, is like, or, better still, is associated with) a hyena can be established quite easily. Note that the Kujamaat say that the leper might in fact be a hyena. People know that hyenas will or might eat the corpse of the leper; and they say that the corpse might instead join with the hyenas, making a leper’s funeral into a carnival of hyenas. How could a leper be a hyena? A leper was caught by leprosy (kañany) because he or an ascendant had stolen something protected by the forge, which primarily would be either cattle or children. Now to get at the corpse of a dead child that had been killed by other means, and to kill outright someone’s cow, a man can transform himself via muyal into a hyena. That is, if witchcraft is involved, then likely as not the witch was operating as a hyena. Hence, if you had leprosy, you were caught stealing something protected by the forge; and if you were stealing, you might have been stealing in the guise of a hyena. Also, and more simply, lepers steal either cattle or the corpse of a child. Hyenas (natural hyenas) kill cattle and exhume fresh graves to get at corpses. So a leper qua thief and a hyena qua hyena are similar. Thus the association is there by cause and effect—a man turns into a hyena and gets caught by leprosy—and by simple similarity. I might add, as well, that hyenas of the area are of the spotted variety, which might recall the sores and spots of a leper (though no informant volunteered this association).

What of the reverse, a hyena (an animal) that is like or stands for an elder, a human being? Recall that informants say that at the funeral the hyena might be a man. As an informant told me, “with hyenas you cannot tell, in killing one you might be killing a human.” This would indicate that the chances are more than trivial that any hyena at any time might in fact be a transformed human, a witch. As I have already said, a witch is a witch because he has at his disposal the power of muyal. This power, as informants are quick to point out, need not be evil; it is neutral. A witch has turned it to evil use, but a curer, who puts it to good use, has not. Elders, or some elders, have access to muyal, and their use of it is always suspect. It follows that an elder, because of his muyal, might be a witch and at times might become a hyena. Thus, reversing the process, a hyena that is killed might be an elder.

But this does not solve the immediate problem, for it has not been demonstrated why a hyena should be thought of as a human, only that there is a link between elders and
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witches. The best that can be done is to make a probabilistic statement. An elder might be a witch and a hyena might also be a witch, or more precisely, a vehicle for a witch. Therefore, the hyena might be an elder as well.

dog  Before building the associative linkages into a larger framework, it would be well to consider one further category that takes part in the leper’s funeral. Recall that accompanying the corpse is a dog to be killed near the leper’s grave. Why a dog? To begin with, a sacrificial dog strengthens the opposition of a leper’s funeral to that of any other person. The most conspicuous animals sacrificed at a regular funeral are cattle, normally one or two but sometimes, as in the case of a wealthy elder, as many as five to ten. There is, then, a direct contrast of dogs to cattle. They oppose each other along several lines. Cattle are kept as wealth, to trade, to multiply, and eventually to eat. Dogs are not, and if they are poor hunters they consume rather than furnish wealth. Cattle are constantly watched over to protect them from thieves, from getting lost, and to make sure they stay out of cultivated areas; they are routinely moved from pasturage to a tethering place which traditionally was the center of the courtyard, but now is nearby in a field needing manure. Dogs are never watched over; they are never the choice of thieves, are unlikely to get lost, and have no interest in gardens. Dogs come and go as they please—in the compound, in the hallways of buildings, in the fields, in the bush, and in the forest. Thus the movement of dogs, in direct contrast to cattle, is never regular in any socially defined way, nor is it regulated. Cattle are active only during the day. Dogs are generally more active at night than during the day. Cattle are killed to be eaten. Dogs are never eaten and, like people, are allowed to die. Finally, and perhaps most interestingly, cattle are always given individual proper names, dogs only very rarely.5

We might make an analogic argument for dogs. If an ordinary person has cattle sacrificed at his funeral, and if a leper is to contrast or oppose an ordinary person, then it follows that the sacrificial animal for a leper must contrast or oppose cattle. Thus, person is to leper as cattle is to X, with, and for the reasons I have just given, X equal to dog.

Beyond the contrast with cattle, two points support the appropriateness of dogs at a leper’s funeral. First, like a leper, a dead dog is disposed of in the bush. The phrase kabeten burying (to throw away the corpse) applies to a dog as well as to a leper. But more important are the functions assigned to dogs by the Kujamaat. They are kept for hunting and they are kept as house guards. In both roles they are active mainly at night or at dusk or daybreak. During the day they spend most of their time asleep, raising from their somnolence only to snap at flies and bark at strangers. As watch dogs they are said to warn of approaching thieves, and especially witches. It is this latter activity that associates them directly with lepers and hyenas. As we saw, thieves via witchcraft transform themselves into hyenas so as to steal. Dogs sense their presence and bark, yap, and howl to warn of their proximity and hopefully to scare them away. The contiguous relationship of dogs attuned to witches makes it appropriate for a dog to accompany a leper who might be a witch, and who surely was one once, to his grave. As the carriers run with the corpse, mimicking the cries of hyenas, the sacrificial dog helps by yapping and biting the (leperous-witch-thief) corpse, quite as watch dogs yap and snap at thieves and witches. In both cases they rid the living area of an undesirable intruder.

Like hyena, dog (eyen) can serve as a pejorative epithet. To call someone a dog would be to accuse him of being cowardly, dirty, and of a lower order of sociability. The only domestic animal regularly used as an honorific is jimūna (small bull), which is used like enyaab (elephant) in stereotyped praises. Thus, on one side is the pejorative eyen (dog) and on the other is the honorific jimūna (bull), which recalls our sacrificial contrast between the two animals.
The linkages I have been pursuing develop from the data, either by way of informant statements or as inferences from them. Separate categories from different areas of experience have been tied together by means of the varying tropes of the imagination, the associations of analogy, similarity, cause and effect, contiguity, and the like. I have called these associative linkages. But these associations, central and essential as they are, account for the inner workings of the set of ideas only. In the present case, they have not permitted us to establish my initial claim that the two funerals, the leper’s and the hyena’s, are conceptually related. Moreover, the associations taken by themselves have a decidedly ad hoc quality to them that in no way accounts for any overall structure that might be there, nor do they begin to explain why these particular categories out of all possible categories have been selected for elaboration. Restricting ourselves to a purely associative order of symbolism precludes assessing our study in the context of Kujamaat thought taken as a whole, as a general cosmology.

To get beyond step-by-step associations we must do two things: we must consider why each of the categories receives the attention it does, and then we must place the entire set into an overall framework. Four postulates will guide the discussion.

1. Each category is marked (in a free use of the linguistic sense of the word).6
2. The criteria for marking vary from category to category.
3. The symbolic elaborations of the sort we have been discussing are based on an a priori markedness. A hyena is a vehicle for a witch because it is marked, not the reverse (that a hyena is marked because it can be a witch).
4. There are two types of symbolic elaboration. One has to do with the category itself and the second has to do with the systematic relationship between categories. For example, a hyena is observed as being an animal of very notable characteristics, it is marked. These characteristics prompt an associative type of symbolism of the sort we have been considering so far. Hyena is a vehicle for witchcraft; it is like a leper. Then there is a second, or analogic, form of symbolism wherein hyena becomes part of a general structure that orders hyenas among animals in the same way the structure orders lepers among people, leprosy among diseases, smithing among crafts, and the Jeju among other patrigroups. The shift from associative to analogic symbolization can be characterized as charting a gradual conceptual move from “thoughts about an animal” in particular (as an individual or as a species) to “thinking with animals” in general (to use Lévi-Strauss’s famous and useful phrase).

variable markedness

The markedness of the Jeju patrigroup comes closest to the formal sense of the concept. It is defined as of a class but having attributes over and above those defining other members of the class: it has a monopoly on smithing and it has three totems. No other patrigroup has a similar monopoly nor any totems.

Tautologically, smithing is marked because it is the only craft restricted to a particular group (other than those restricted by sex). The skill and the strength needed to manipulate the hammer and tongs, and the skill needed to shape and transform iron, are much appreciated by the Kujamaat. No other craft is so difficult in execution. Smithing, because of its difficulty, requires jiya (a small quantity of muyal), something that is hardly necessary when it comes to basketry or pottery making. The Kujamaat do not associate the forge with chthonic power nor primordial creativity as is often the case.
The markedness of *kañany* as leprosy does not lie in its relationship to spirit, or in its complexity. These are features shared with many other illnesses, though *kañany* has the only distinguishing attribute of necessitating the isolation of the invalid from his kin, from other people, and from his residence. But the isolation develops from markedness; it does not define it. Rather, the markedness of *kañany* is in the disease itself. As the staid *Oxford English Dictionary* has it, leprosy is "a loathsome disease, which slowly eats away the body. . . ." The Kujamaat would concur. To them, as to the authors of the *OED*, or to our medieval ancestors, or to anybody familiar with the actual disease, leprosy is truly "loathsome." On the several occasions my Kujamaat informants pointed out a leper, they did so with a mixture of horror, curiosity, and disgust, as well as concern. And in doing so they would draw attention to the sores and the signs of loss of fingers. This intense set was never expressed in regard to any other illness or to any invalid, even where death was imminent. What seems to be the universal claim of leprosy on our attention is that the disease, over a protracted time, slowly diminishes, distorts, and "eats away" the human body. The invalid becomes something less than human; he is dissimilated from his physical (and, by extension, social) humanness.

By the same token, hyena's markedness is defined by its understood natural self. It is an animal that is normatively anomalous. This is an argument that has been nicely developed by Dan Sperber (1975) and is very much worth considering. As a class (or category), the taxonomic status of an animal like hyena is not in question. It is an animal of one type and not of another. It is not a tree. And even if a particular person has transformed himself into a particular hyena, he is, in this guise, recognizably a hyena. The "hyenaness" of the transformation is not problematic.

What is problematic is the relationship of an animal to norms about "animalness." What is it that makes an animal an animal in its form and in its behavior? Norms of this sort permit one to talk of ideal animals, ordinary animals, and of peculiar and anomalous animals. They also operate within a species and within a particular breed: pedigree dogs as opposed to mutts, which I once heard a breeder call "mistakes"; a prize-winning poodle, as opposed to a badly bred poodle.

To the Kujamaat the hyena is, as I said already, a nuisance in that it occasionally kills cattle. It is known to be mainly nocturnal. It is ugly, having a heavy stance and an awkward and peculiar gait. It is said to be the strongest predator around, stronger than a leopard (lions are absent from the area). It has a strange and very noticeable cry, and it is malodorous. It has an immense appetite, eating everything including bones. Unlike the vulture, it is not thought to be much of a scavenger, though it is known to occasionally root up freshly buried corpses.

The observations, shared for the most part by at least the Kaguru of East Africa (Beidelman 1975), and probably by many peoples in between, are confirmed by ecologists. Hans Kruuk (1972), in his classic study of the spotted hyena, describes the hyena as nocturnal, as more of a hunter than a scavenger (more so than a lion), and as a large eater (or at least capable of eating immense amounts, bones and all, in a short span of time).

The observations, shared for the most part by at least the Kaguru of East Africa (Beidelman 1975), and probably by many peoples in between, are confirmed by ecologists. Hans Kruuk (1972), in his classic study of the spotted hyena, describes the hyena as nocturnal, as more of a hunter than a scavenger (more so than a lion), and as a large eater (or at least capable of eating immense amounts, bones and all, in a short span of time).

From one set of figures Kruuk (1972:77) estimates that hyenas average about 1.98 kg. of food per day. However, on one occasion Kruuk observed a hungry hyena weighing about 45-50 kg. that ate 14.5 kg. of Thomson's gazelle (almost one-third of its weight) in 45 minutes. And it was still going strong when another hyena ran off with the remainder of the meat (1972:76).

Hyenas have a large repertoire of sounds of which several are very distinctive: whoop, "series of up to 15 . . . calls, . . . each call beginning low ending high. . . . Very loud, may be heard more than 5 km. away"; giggle, "loud, very high-pitched and rapid series of hee-hee-hee, total usually shorter than 5 sec. reminding one of human ‘mad laughter’"; soft grunt-
laugh, "rapid succession of low pitched long-drawn-out squeals of -eee- sounds, often with a staccato element (ee-ee-ee-ee'), very rapid" (Kruuk 1972:310-311).

The hyena’s odor derives from anal glands which it uses to socially scent its surrounds (Kruuk 1972:272). Its features—big, strong, ugly, ungainly, smelly, peculiar cry, huge appetite, and occasional killer of cattle and robber of graves—mark the hyena as a less than exemplary animal. They contrast in Kujamaat thought with those defining a leopard as a particularly fine and exemplary animal that is strong, sleek, graceful of movement, quick, and has a frightening but not a peculiar cry.

The dogs that frequent Kujamaat homes are of a breed common to most of Africa: short hair, brown with white splotches (occasionally the reverse), straight tails, pointed noses, and V-shaped ears (somewhat like those of a fox terrier). They are a pretty mangy lot, thin, full of ticks and fleas, surrounded by flies that eat away the soft parts of their ears, and infected with worms. They are owned but unnamed, individually referred to as “so and so’s dog.” The owner, depending on his disposition, regularly or only sporadically feeds his dog leftover rice and discarded bones. Otherwise, the dog fend for itself, scavenging whatever bits of food it can find—including human feces—and whatever small animals it can catch. The Kujamaat’s attitude toward dogs is fairly neutral. They are a part of the familial landscape; they are present to be occasionally patted; they are rarely kicked and for the most part are ignored; and they are appreciated for their help at hunting and at houseguarding, their primary function. Dogs seem to have a higher place in the Kujamaat’s esteem than do cats.

But the markedness of dogs is more social than natural. As Edmund Leach (1964) has argued, and Stanley Tambiah (1969) has elaborated, dogs, wherever they are kept, are members of the human family in that they live with humans and are not kept as food. But at the same time they are animals; in the Kujamaat context, they are particularly scruffy animals at that. It is the betwixt and between, the culturalness of their natural condition, that defines their markedness.

Of the categories we have been calling marked, three might well be termed liminal, that is, phenomena outside normal (normative) classification that are in a “neither-here-nor-there” area, an ambiguous place between categories (Turner 1967:93ff.). We have just spoken of dog in this way. Its social condition is liminal in that it is treated as an animal “human”—an animal member of the family, a kept animal not to be eaten but allowed to die. And so too, by their perceived natural condition, can leper and hyena be thought of as liminal. A leper is conceptually dissimilated from his humanness just as a hyena, as an unexemplary animal, is conceptually dissimilated from its animalness.

It would be incorrect to attribute liminality to our other categories. There is nothing in the social position of a Jeju that places him interstitially. To say that the Jeju are liminal because they have a monopoly on smithing would be to beg the question. There is nothing ambiguous or conceptually indeterminate about being a Jeju, as opposed to being of any other patronym (a Baji or a Koly); nor is there anything ambiguous about having sole rights to a craft. Smithing, insofar as its skill requires a measure of jiyal, might be said to imply liminality; but then just about everything associated for good or ill with muyal would be liminal. That is, anything that stands out in any way and is something other than ordinary would perforce be liminal. But that would remove from the concept whatever specificity it has. And the disease of kafany, leprosy, is one of many spirit-controlled illnesses. It is just nastier than most—a negatively exemplary illness, we might say.

In sum, the markedness runs as follows. Jeju are marked in the formal sense; smith and smithing are tautologically marked with respect to Jeju; leprosy, leper, and hyena are marked in their very nature; and dogs are socially marked by their place in the household. Of the set, the latter three—leper, hyena, and dog, are liminal, with the liminality being
natural for hyena and leper, social for dog. What is important to keep in mind is the variable markedness throughout.

**analogic symbolics and the overall scheme**

The associative linkages with the added points about marking permit us to state the systematics of our material. Each category that has been independently and variably marked with respect to its own domain becomes aligned with the other marked categories to form an extended and overarching analogy. Thus,

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{Jeju} & : \text{other patronyms} :: \\
\text{smithing} & : \text{other crafts} :: \\
\text{smith's fire} & : \text{ordinary fire} :: \\
\text{leprosy} & : \text{other diseases} :: \\
\text{leper} & : \text{other people} :: \\
\text{hyena} & : \text{wild animals} :: \\
\text{dog} & : \text{other domestic animals}.
\end{align*}
\]

In conjunction with this extension, the other process—the tropes of association—weaves some but not all of the categories together. Thus, hyena is like a leper (similarity), dog is associated with night and witches (contiguity), and the fire of the forge is the fire of leprosy (identity). These, as we have said, are restricted and non-systematic. Substitutions are not possible: dogs are not totemic of Jeju (crested cranes are); smithing was not created by hyenas, nor are they similar.

**the structuralist's showpiece, redux**

We can now return to my original assertion about the two funerals, that they are the same or say the same thing. I would put it this way: both rituals dissimilate their subjects from what they are, in their own proper domains, so as to assimilate them into what they are not, into their contrasting domains, where they can be fully absorbed and where they can be eaten. The leper is buried so it can be eaten by hyenas, and the hyena is given a funeral so that it can be eaten by the hunter. It is as though Kujamaat thought tolerates the ambiguity of leper and hyena (their decidedly unexemplary positions) during their lives only to void the ambiguity at death.

Such is an abstract reading of the two funerals, but it is one that develops from the full range of ideas about hyenas and lepers. I might add that although the funerals are but two features out of many that define lepers and hyenas—as well as dog, smith, and leprosy—the two, especially the leper's funeral, seem to focus more than any other event the totality of ideas developed by this set of interrelated categories.

**conclusions**

To provide our “squamous mind” with a means to engage some “squirming facts,” I have used several concepts that describe distinct aspects of an overall process of symbolization. It can be argued that two of the concepts run parallel to the structuralists' distinction between metaphor and metonymy. And the argument could be sustained. I have, however, drawn away from metaphor and metonymy not out of perversity, but because not all
metaphors are analogies; and, more importantly, the metonymy half restricts the types of association that operate at the level of direct linkage. Metonymy by definition describes a relationship of contiguity, of cause-effect, container-contained, the synecdoche of part-whole, etc. But as my material has shown, several of the direct links were metaphoric—involving similarity, identity, resemblance—and one of them, fire:iron::leprosy:fingers, was a formal analogy. The notion of association makes no prior claim to the formal relationships involved.

Of perhaps more interest is that my distinction draws fuller attention to the levels by which symbolic linkages are made. On the one level are the step-by-step linkages that appear immediately and are as likely as not the kind that crop up in native commentary and exegesis. On a higher, more abstract level are the linkages that organize discrete material into sets, that align disparate "codes" (in Lévi-Strauss's sense of the word) together. The two linkages operate simultaneously, but one explicitly while the other more implicitly, perhaps unconsciously.7

Whether one process—analogics or association—precedes the other cannot really be determined, of course. Do the Kujamaat say the leper is like a hyena because of an overall established analogy, or is it that they develop the analogy out of the felt similarities between the two? Although Lévi-Strauss (1962) would insist on the former, I for one fail to see that such is necessarily the case. What I believe is essential, however, is to appreciate the analytical distinction between the two processes, that of a more abstract and "thought"-out, extended analogy and that of a more direct and closely "felt" set of associations (Sapir 1977a:25-28; Crocker 1977:49-60).

My third concept, that of marking, led me to identify leper and hyena as natural symbols. The problem of natural symbols warrants, I believe, fuller consideration, for it is an idea that often meets resistance from anthropologists.

I have argued that both leper and hyena, by their very nature, are first susceptible to symbolic elaboration and then, when elaborated, restricted to a limited range of possibilities. I should say that anyone—myself as a Westerner, the Kujamaat, the Kaguru—who observes a hyena or leprosy would necessarily draw the same conclusions, that the former is powerful yet ludicrous and that the latter is a "loathsome disease."8 To someone untutored in the nuances of cultural relativism, my assertion should be obvious, a matter of common sense. But to one, such as I, who has always thought of the distant other as inseparable from his unmistakably different cup of clay, universals of content come as a surprise. How do we handle it? How can we add hyena and leprosy to a growing list of natural symbols that includes laterality, noise, colors, corpses, and bodily functions without immediate recourse to physiology or some kind of archetypum ex machina? Following common sense, my approach was ultimately based on the correspondence between what an ecologist and pathologists describe and what the Kujamaat (and the Kaguru, for hyenas) more casually observe.

On the surface, my position runs counter to an argument set out recently by Beidelman (1980), whose work on anomalous categories has yet to receive the attention it deserves. Beidelman argues that the proper approach to "tricksters," a term he would like to do without, is not to make broad comparisons of trickster-around-the-world, but rather to investigate on a case-by-case basis the precise place of the trickster within its social and cultural context. I entirely agree, and this is what I have tried to do. However, in exploring the particular hyena and the particular leper of the Kujamaat world, I was continually pushed to ask "Why hyena?" and "Why leper?" Even for a relativist, the "loathsomeness" of leprosy was utterly obvious. But what of hyena? Certainly not because it is a scavenger, hence neither a true carnivore nor a herbivore. It is no more a scavenger than is any other carnivore, and the Kujamaat know it. Not because it hangs around human habitations as a
kind of wild dog, a wild card in Kujamaat familial life. It appears only rarely, and anyway many other animals are more likely to be seen—hares, lizards, snakes, antelopes, bushrats, especially monkeys, and even leopards. Once marked, why is hyena thought of symbolically as something so ludicrous? How is it that we (any "we," I shall assert) cannot substitute hyena for lion in the phrase "the lion of Judah" without sounding disrespectful, sarcastic, or just plain silly? The questions are worth considering, for they lead us to the interface of social anthropology and the social and ultimately individual psychology of imaginative perception and conceptualization.

Taken together, my three concepts have given this study a kind of naturalistic slant. In working up my data I have tended to celebrate man's ability to size up his natural world. The division of my analysis into markedness, associative, and analogic symbolics has, using Roland Barthes's (1957) vocabulary, started with the sign, where hyenas are hyenas, where they are what they are as empirically conceived and understood entities. The analysis then moved to symbol, both associative and analogic, where a hyena is a lot more than just a hyena. This procedure has had one virtue to recommend it: it permits us to avoid the radical arbitrariness implicit in Lévi-Strauss's (1962) early pronouncement [one he often has not ignored himself] that symbolic structures are founded on the bits and pieces (Robert Lowie's shreds and patches) of history and past civilizations. To the contrary, the bits that are structured into myths, rituals, and cosmologies are not simply lying about unused as historical debris (whatever that means), but are rather determined a priori by man's living and vital knowledge of his social and natural surrounds. Nor, I might add, are the "bits" ever entirely transcended as they become structured. Sticking with the sign, they maintain throughout aspects of their conceived "real world" essence. To play on an epigram attributed to Freud: "Even a phallic cigar is essentially (in essence) a cigar."
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1 This was one of the very few times the Kujamaat offered any statement on color symbolism and the only time they ever spoke of a pair of colors, red for fire and black for iron. The two totemic birds fit primarily on the basis of these colors. The ekáram bird was described as being red and black and hence associated with the forge, and the head of the crested crane easily recalls the forge with its bright red throat lappet, black bill, straw-colored cheeks rimmed in black, and topped with a tufted and sparkling crest.

2 I mentioned to a friend the American slang for stolen property as "hot goods," and he said it was the same, offering the analogy:

   "hot goods": police ::

   fire-protected child (and iron): the blacksmith's tongs

3 Wilcocks and Manson-Bahr (1972:417), summarizing Ridley and Jopling (1966), give the clinical characteristics of lepromatous leprosy as follows:

Macules [altered patches of skin color], papules [small skin elevations], nodules [lumps] and plaques may all be present. Lesions are small, multiple distributed bilaterally and symmetrically with smooth shiny surface. Macules and plaques have vague edges and no hair loss. May be nasal ulceration, iritis [inflammation of the iris] and keratitis [inflammation of the cornea], madarosis [loss of eyebrows and eyelashes], leonine faces [lion faces], thickened ear lobes, testicular damage, oedema
[swelling due to effusion of watery fluid into the intercellular spaces of connective tissue] of the leg, and bone changes in limbs and skull.

4 Note the structural nicety of the entire system. Game animals (antelope and hare) are distinguished from carnivores (rarely game) on the basis of cause (birth + kill and/or birth only) and the symptoms lax/tense. Antelope is separated from hare by the symptom opposition straight/wander, and leopard is separated from the others by nonmovement/movement. Thus:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cause</th>
<th>Symptoms</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>kill + birth/</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>birth only</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5 In the ten-year period covering the time I was associated with the Jipalom ward of Boyas, only 2 dogs out of a population of 20 or more had been given names. One, a bitch, was called ejunk (limp with a stick). She was missing a paw and was extremely old. She died at about 16 years of age and was buried in the ward’s graveyard, a previously unheard of honor for a dog! The other was a large male called senkay (Fr. chantier, ‘work area’). The name referred to a road sign next to an abandoned British Petroleum prospector’s station where the dog had been raised and generously fed. On the departure of the engineers it became an elegant and quite friendly stray.

6 “The general meaning of a marked category states the presence of a certain (whether positive or negative) property A; the general meaning of the corresponding unmarked category states nothing about the presence of A and is used chiefly but not exclusively to indicate the absence of A.” (Jakobson 1957:5). The distinction was first developed for phonology but has subsequently been extended to grammatical and lexical semantics. An example of the latter would be man versus woman, where woman is the marked form, with the feature + female. Man is unmarked because in certain general contexts — man versus animal, for instance — the word “man” is devoid of sexual reference. (But note the reverse for aquatic birds: duck/drake, goose/gander, and certain social roles where + male would be marked: “every nursery school teacher has his favorite greeting” [Susan Ervin-Tripp 1976:147]; cf. Joseph Greenberg 1966 for an extended discussion of the topic.) My use of the concept is, as I said, loose — and necessarily so, especially since I am for the most part contrasting one category against all other categories within a class, rather than contrasting two opposed categories. I should imagine that the analysis of various dualist systems of classification where one property is morally less than another (left/right) could profit by using the concept of marking. Marking might very well have helped to clarify the obscurities in Lévi-Strauss’s 1956 article “Do Dual Organizations Exist?”

7 This is not to say that systematic linkages are unavailable to informants. In an earlier study on category separation, my major informant’s mother put her finger on the entire structure when she likened the separation of the new and old harvest to that between the living and the dead and the younger to the older generations (Sapir 1970:1337).

8 Hans Kruuk (1972), who has observed hyenas at very close quarters, might think otherwise. The anomalous status of hyena was impressed upon me most recently during a National Public Radio broadcast devoted to the virtues of otherwise stigmatized wild carnivores. The program on hyena demonstrated at some length the social excellence and even nobility of the animal. However, throughout the discussion hyenas were given a voice-over role where they expressed themselves in a constant stream of whoops and giggles, thereby shifting unalterably the discourse from a frame of flat reference and rational argumentation to a frame of ludicrous irony. How could an animal that makes that kind of noise be so noble? I am being homocentric here, and that is a far cry from being ethnocentric.

references cited

Barthes, Roland
Beidelman, Thomas O.
1961 Hyena and Rabbit. Africa 33:54-69
Brody, Saul Nathaniel
Crocker, J. Christopher  

Ervin-Tripp, Susan  

Greenberg, Joseph H.  

Jakobson, Roman  

Kruuk, Hans  

Leach, Edmund  

Lévi-Strauss, Claude  

Ridley, D. S., and W. H. Jopling  

Sapir, J. David  

Schloss, Marc  

Sperber, Dan  

Stevens, Wallace  

Tambiah, Stanley J.  
1969  Animals Are Good to Think and Good to Prohibit. Ethnology 8:423–459.  

Turner, Victor  

Wilcocks, Charles, and P. E. C. Manson-Bahr  

appendix

Two other matters implicit throughout much of the discussion deserve direct attention. One has to do with the place that our material occupies within the general framework of Kujamaat cosmology. The other has to do with affect. Let me briefly address these matters.

leper and hyena's place  
First the leper's funeral and then that of the hyena led me to the analysis I have presented. A question remains as to the fullness of my study. Did I leave anything out? How, in fact, do these categories as a system fit into a wider cosmology? Or do they? What about other marked categories, especially other liminally marked categories? I think that other categories probably would, on further investigation, intrude themselves into our system. Vultures are one such category; and perhaps more should have been made of elders. The latter are said to kill young initiates so as to transform them into sacrificial cattle in honor of the dead and in preparation for the vicennial circumcision festivals. There is an obvious parallel between the forge's fire and leprosy, on the one hand, and menstrual and birth blood, on the other. The Kujamaat make the same sharp distinction between ordinary blood and menstrual blood as they do between ordinary
fire and the fire of the forge. The latter, in both cases, receives ritual attention (menstrual blood in at least three contexts) while the former does not. The parallel continues when we remark that the only other "invalid" put, like the leper, into isolation from her kin and living quarters is traditionally (but not now) a woman during her menstrual period and, now as before, a woman during childbirth. But the parallel is latent. It does not come out in informant commentary (or in any I ever obtained), nor is it inferable from particular rituals. It does, however, appear in the cosmology of the Diola's neighbors, the Ehing, where our entire set (hyena, leper, leprosy, forge's fire, smith), plus the blood of menstruation, of birth, and of circumcision, plus the institution of kingship develop into an extensive cosmology (Schloss 1979). Much further afield, the Central Bantu make explicit associations between the iron smelter and a woman's body, between the forge's fire and menstrual blood (Edith and Victor Turner 1980: personal communication; see also Sandra Barnes 1980).

But beyond these possible additions the set is discrete within Kujamaat cosmology. Other ideas, and there are many, run parallel, but it would be ethnographically incorrect and analytically impossible to derive the lot from a single set of underlying assumptions. The Kujamaat entertain an open-ended cosmology made up of clusters of ideas that are ritually and intellectually developed. Some of these are very complex, others much less so. Although they often overlap, they are generally independent of each other, maintaining a sort of "family resemblance" especially as they pertain to ideas about spirit and as they employ a common set of ritual acts.

Throughout, I have avoided any mention of "affect," feelings like fear, loathing (just loathsome), disgust, or drollery. The avoidance is common coin among structuralists (where I place myself as a degenerate member). In this case it is not the absence of affect, but the nonsystematic quality to it that prompted its neglect. If pressed, I would in fact place the affect of our categories as basic and at the initial level of marking. The affect is as much the cause of the associations as the effect (if, that is, we must talk along such lines).

The Kujamaat have actual and stereotyped feelings about each of our categories, but they are not transferable from one to the other. Because leprosy is a loathsome disease is no reason to consider the Jeju as loathsome, nor to fear them because they are officiants to the spirit of the forge and of leprosy. A good example of what I mean is illustrated by the attitudes expressed by my informants on the occasions when they described the leper's and hyena's funerals. The leper's was characterized as a necessity and was performed with a sense of dread. The Jeju were obliged to carry it out, and one of my principal informants (not a Jeju) recalled the several times when he was witness to a leper's funeral and how unpleasant the whole affair was, how horrible was the howling of the dog. Everyone was in a terrible rush to get it over with as fast as possible. But to describe putting a hyena on a stretcher and honoring it with song and dance was, to them, to describe something very funny indeed. Everyone laughed a lot when one informant admitted to having performed the ritual. Granted the hyena's funeral is a kasabor ritual, a precautionary measure against fuim, while that for a leper is a katennor, a ritual of expiation, nevertheless there was more to the contrasting attitudes than the seriousness of the ritual involved. Although both were part of the same ordered system, the hyena's funeral showed the order as a cosmic joke while the leper's funeral showed the same cosmic order as no joke at all, but as a response to a very real and very dread disease.
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