

Decolonising Identity: Anyuola, Ujamaa, and Ubuntu as Indigenous Frameworks for Understanding 'Africanness'

Original Research Article | Volume 1 | Issue 3 | 2026 | Article Number: 034

Accepted: 02 August 2026 | Published: 10 August 2026 | ISSN: 2979-8582 (Online)



Crossref : <https://doi.org/10.67693/BJCR-2KWT8LGN>



Awuor PONGE (PhD)

Senior Associate Research Fellow, African Policy Centre (APC), Nairobi, Kenya; Adjunct Faculty, Development and Policy Studies, Jaramogi Oginga Odinga University of Science & Technology (JOOUST), Bondo, Kenya

 AP [0000-0002-6656-1818](https://orcid.org/0000-0002-6656-1818)

Correspondence: Awuor PONGE (PhD), awuorponge@gmail.com

Abstract

Dominant scholarly accounts of African relational personhood have been built almost entirely on Bantu-language concepts, principally Ubuntu (Nguni), botho (Sesotho/Setswana), hunhu (Shona), and utu (Kiswahili), together with the Bantu-derived political philosophy of Ujamaa articulated by Julius Nyerere. This concentration has produced a durable but partial theory of Africanness, one that generalises from a single linguistic family while leaving the continent's Nilotic and other non-Bantu societies analytically silent. This article introduces Anyuola, a Dholuo (Luo) concept denoting the blood-bound community of kin descended from a common ancestor, as an indigenous framework in its own right, and argues for its formal incorporation into the comparative vocabulary of African identity and values alongside Ubuntu and Ujamaa. Using a qualitative, desk-based conceptual and comparative-etymological method grounded in Luo ethnography (Southall, 1952; Ocholla-Ayayo, 1976; Parkin, 1978; Onyango-Ouma & Aagaard-Hansen, 2020) and situated within decolonial theory (Mudimbe, 1988; Ngũgĩ wa Thiong'o, 1986; Mignolo, 2009; Ndlovu-Gatsheni, 2018), the article shows that Anyuola encodes a genealogical and generational register of belonging, rooted in the verb nywol (to give birth or beget), that is distinct from, yet fully compatible with, Ubuntu's synchronic ontology of relational being and Ujamaa's political economy of familyhood. A comparative lexicon of seven cognate blood-and-birth-based kinship concepts drawn from West, East, Horn, and Southern Africa, including Igbo umunna, Akan abusua, Somali tol, and Oromo gosa, demonstrates that Anyuola's underlying logic recurs independently across the continent's major language families, supporting its claim to representativeness rather than parochialism. The article argues that a full theory of Africanness requires all three registers, the ontological (Ubuntu), the

political-economic (Ujamaa), and the genealogical-generational (Anyuola), and that omitting the Nilotic case reproduces the very epistemic hierarchy that decolonial scholarship seeks to dismantle. The article closes by considering the implications of this triadic framework for Indigenous studies, Made in Africa Evaluation, and the broader question of who may be said to be African and by what values.

Keywords: Anyuola, Ubuntu, Ujamaa, African Identity, Decolonial Theory, Luo Kinship, Relational Personhood, Indigenous Knowledge Systems

INTRODUCTION

What does it mean to be African, and by what values is that identity constituted? For more than three decades this question has been answered substantially through two concepts: Ubuntu, the Southern and Eastern African Bantu philosophy of relational personhood captured in the maxim *umuntu ngumuntu ngabantu*, a person is a person through other persons (Mbiti, 1969; Ramose, 1999), and Ujamaa, Julius Nyerere's (1968) political translation of familyhood into a programme of African socialism in Tanzania. Both concepts have done enormous intellectual and political work. Ubuntu underwrote South Africa's post-apartheid Truth and Reconciliation process and has since become the most widely cited African philosophical export (Tutu, 1999; Metz, 2011). Ujamaa supplied a homegrown alternative to both colonial capitalism and imported Marxism, and remains a touchstone for African socialist and communitarian thought (Nyerere, 1968).

Yet both concepts share a linguistic and geographic lineage. Ubuntu and its cognates, *botho*, *hunhu*, *utu*, are Bantu terms built on the proto-Bantu noun stem *-ntu*, person, and the closely related political vocabulary of Ujamaa is itself a Kiswahili term, Ujamaa, familyhood, drawn from the Bantu language family that Nyerere used to build a national philosophy for Tanzania (Nyerere, 1968; Mangena, 2016). When scholars generalise from Ubuntu and Ujamaa to claims about "African" personhood, community, or identity, they are in fact generalising from one language family's conceptual vocabulary, however widespread that family may be across the continent. Africa's second great language phylum, Nilotic, spoken by the Luo, Kalenjin, Maasai, Dinka, Nuer, Acholi, and dozens of other peoples across East and Northeast Africa, has contributed comparatively little to this theoretical conversation, not because it lacks equivalent concepts, but because those concepts have not yet been named, translated, and inserted into the comparative literature with the same deliberateness that Ubuntu and Ujamaa received from their own intellectual champions.

This article addresses that gap by introducing Anyuola, a Dholuo term used among the Luo of Kenya, Tanzania, and Uganda to denote the family, lineage, or blood-bound community descended from a common ancestor, as an indigenous African framework worthy of the same theoretical status as Ubuntu and Ujamaa. The claim advanced here is not that Anyuola is a novel discovery, Luo communities have organised social, economic, and ritual life around Anyuola for as long as they have existed as a distinct people, but that Anyuola has not yet been formally theorised, translated, and positioned within the comparative literature on African identity and values in the way that Ubuntu and Ujamaa have been. This is an act of naming and comparative placement, not invention, and it is precisely the kind of recovery work that decolonial and Indigenous studies scholarship calls for (Chilisa, 2020; Ndlovu-Gatsheni, 2018).

The argument proceeds in five moves. First, the article situates the inquiry within decolonial theory and the literature on African relational personhood, showing why the absence of Nilotic conceptual vocabulary from that literature is a problem worth correcting. Second, it sets out the conceptual-comparative method used to analyse Anyuola alongside Ubuntu and Ujamaa. Third, it offers a detailed account of Anyuola, its

etymology, its kinship structure, and its social and ethical functions, drawn from the available Luo ethnographic record. Fourth, it compares Anyuola with Ubuntu and Ujamaa to identify what is shared and what is distinctive. Fifth, it argues that Anyuola's distinctive contribution is a genealogical and generational register of belonging that Ubuntu and Ujamaa do not fully capture, and that a triadic framework, ontological, political-economic, and genealogical, offers a more complete account of African identity and values than either concept alone. The article closes with implications for Indigenous studies and Made in Africa Evaluation, and with an honest accounting of the limits of the available evidence.

The stakes of this argument extend beyond a narrow debate among philosophers of Africa. Sociologists and anthropologists working on kinship, migration, land tenure, and social protection across East Africa routinely encounter Anyuola-organised social structures in their fieldwork, clan-based welfare associations, lineage land boards, funeral committees, without necessarily connecting these empirical structures to the theoretical vocabulary already available for Bantu-derived concepts such as Ubuntu. This article aims to supply that missing theoretical vocabulary, so that the rich empirical record of Luo and other Nilotic social organisation can be read, cited, and taught alongside the Ubuntu and Ujamaa literature, rather than treated as a separate, regionally bounded specialism disconnected from the wider comparative conversation about African identity and values.

Theoretical Framework: Decolonial Thought and Relational Personhood

The theoretical foundation for this article rests on two overlapping bodies of scholarship: decolonial theory concerned with the politics of knowledge production about Africa, and African philosophy's long engagement with relational, communitarian personhood.

Decolonial Theory and the Problem of the Colonial Library

Valentin Mudimbe's (1988) *The Invention of Africa* remains the starting point for any serious inquiry into how "Africa" as an object of knowledge was constructed through what he termed the colonial library, the accumulated body of European anthropological, missionary, and administrative writing that produced Africa as a knowable, governable other. Mudimbe's insight was not that this literature was simply false, but that it structured which African concepts became legible to global scholarship and which did not. Concepts that missionaries, colonial anthropologists, or early African nationalist intellectuals took up and translated, often because they served an immediate political or pastoral purpose, entered the record; concepts that were not taken up in this way remained ethnographic footnotes.

Ngũgĩ wa Thiong'o (1986) extended this argument to language itself, insisting that colonialism's deepest achievement was "the control of a people's wealth was effected through the political kingdom, but the domination of the mental universe of the colonised was best achieved through the medium of language" (Ngũgĩ wa Thiong'o, 1986). For Ngũgĩ, decolonisation required African intellectuals to write and think in African languages rather than merely translating African experience into European ones. This matters directly for the present argument: Ubuntu and Ujamaa achieved international theoretical standing partly because they were championed, translated, and systematised by prominent African intellectuals and statesmen, Tutu (1999), Nyerere (1968), Mbiti (1969), Ramose (1999), writing and speaking to international audiences at moments of high political visibility, apartheid's end and African independence, respectively. Anyuola has had no equivalent champion performing that translation work for an international readership, which is a difference in intellectual history and political opportunity, not in conceptual depth.

Sabelo Ndlovu-Gatsheni's (2018) concept of epistemic freedom sharpens this point further. Ndlovu-Gatsheni argues that African knowledge production remains trapped within an "epistemic line"

that determines which forms of African thought are treated as philosophy and which are relegated to ethnography, folklore, or mere data for Western theorising. He calls for the "deprovincialisation" of Africa, treating African concepts as generative theory rather than as illustrative examples of theories developed elsewhere. Walter Mignolo's (2009) related notion of epistemic disobedience, refusing the "zero-point" epistemology that presumes a neutral, universal vantage point located in the West, supplies the methodological warrant for treating Anyuola not as a curious ethnographic detail to be explained by existing theory, but as a source of theory in its own right.

Relational Personhood in African Philosophy

Parallel to this decolonial literature, African philosophy has developed a substantial body of work on relational, communitarian personhood, of which Ubuntu is the best-known instance but not the only one. John Mbiti's (1969) formulation, "I am because we are, and since we are, therefore I am" (p. 108), remains the most quoted single sentence in African philosophy, encapsulating the claim that individual existence is constituted through, rather than prior to, communal belonging. Ifeanyi Menkiti (1984) radicalised this claim philosophically, arguing that personhood in African traditional thought is not a given but an achievement, acquired progressively through social and ritual incorporation into community, such that "the community defines the person as person" (Menkiti, 1984, p. 172). Kwasi Gyekye (1997), writing from an Akan perspective, pushed back against what he read as an excessively "radical" communitarianism in Mbiti and Menkiti, proposing instead a "moderate communitarianism" in which individual and community hold equal moral standing. This Menkiti-Gyekye debate is unresolved and instructive: it shows that African philosophy already contains internal plurality about how communal belonging constitutes the person, and that this plurality has, until now, been debated almost entirely with reference to Akan and Bantu-derived material.

Thaddeus Metz (2007, 2011) has done the most systematic work translating Ubuntu into an analytic moral theory, proposing that an action is right insofar as it honours "harmonious relationships in which people identify with one another and exhibit solidarity toward one another" (Metz, 2007). Mogobe Ramose (1999) grounds this relational ontology directly in Bantu morphology, arguing that the prefix *ubu-* and the noun stem *-ntu* together encode an ontology of "being as becoming," in which personhood is never a fixed, isolated fact but an ongoing relational process. Michael Onyebuchi Eze (2010) complicates the picture historically, arguing that Ubuntu, as currently invoked in South African public discourse, is best understood as a "creative historicism," a reworking of genuine pre-colonial values into a post-apartheid national imaginary rather than a pristine survival of unchanged tradition. This historicised reading of Ubuntu is important for the present argument because it cautions against romanticising any single indigenous concept, Anyuola included, as a timeless essence; concepts are lived, reworked, and reinterpreted across generations, and the theoretical value of Anyuola lies in its structural logic and social function, not in a claim to unchanging authenticity.

What is conspicuously absent from this rich philosophical literature is any sustained engagement with Nilotic conceptual material. Kwame Gyekye writes from an Akan (Kwa/Niger-Congo) standpoint; Mbiti, Ramose, Metz, and Eze write substantially from Bantu material; Nyerere's Ujamaa is itself a Bantu-language political concept. The Luo, along with the continent's other Nilotic-speaking peoples, are largely absent as theory-generating subjects in this literature, appearing, when they appear at all, as objects of colonial-era ethnography (Evans-Pritchard, 1949; Southall, 1952) rather than as sources of philosophical concepts in dialogue with Ubuntu and Ujamaa. This asymmetry is the specific gap this article addresses.

A brief note on scope is warranted before proceeding. This article does not claim that Anyuola is unknown to Luo speakers or absent from Luo daily life, nor does it claim to be the first text ever to mention the term.

Dholuo dictionaries gloss Anyuola as clan or family, and the term is used unremarkably in everyday Luo speech, in church genealogies, in land disputes, and in the naming of self-help and welfare associations formed by Luo migrants in Kenya's towns. The claim is narrower and more precise: Anyuola has not yet been extracted from this everyday and ethnographic usage, named as a philosophical concept, and placed in comparative dialogue with Ubuntu and Ujamaa within the scholarly literature on African identity and values read by sociologists, anthropologists, and philosophers outside Luo studies itself. It is this specific, comparative, theory-building move, not the discovery of the word, that constitutes the article's contribution.

METHOD

This article uses a qualitative, desk-based conceptual and comparative-etymological method, a mode of inquiry well established in African philosophy and decolonial studies, where the object of analysis is a concept's semantic field, structural logic, and social function rather than a population of human research subjects (Ramose, 1999; Gyekye, 1997). The method proceeds in three steps.

First, Anyuola is reconstructed from the available Luo ethnographic and linguistic record. Because no peer-reviewed literature exists that theorises Anyuola by name as a philosophical concept, comparable to the dedicated philosophical literature on Ubuntu, this reconstruction draws on the classic ethnography of Luo kinship and lineage, Southall's (1952) foundational account of Luo lineage formation, Ocholla-Ayayo's (1976) systematic study of Luo traditional ideology and ethics, Blount's (1975) analysis of Luo genealogical reasoning as a sociology of knowledge, and Parkin's (1978) study of lineage obligation and individual achievement among urban Luo migrants, together with the recent linguistic-anthropological study of Dholuo kinship terminology by Onyango-Ouma and Aagaard-Hansen (2020). This gap in the literature is treated transparently, rather than papered over, and is discussed explicitly in the Limitations section below.

Second, Anyuola's etymology, structural logic, and social function are compared systematically against the corresponding features of Ubuntu (drawing on Mbiti, 1969; Ramose, 1999; Metz, 2011) and Ujamaa (drawing on Nyerere, 1968), using three axes of comparison established in the African philosophy literature on personhood: the ontological axis (what kind of being is a person held to be), the political-economic axis (what obligations and distributions of resources the concept generates), and the temporal axis (whether the concept is organised around a synchronic present-tense relationality or a diachronic, generational unfolding).

Third, the article reasons from this comparison to a claim about Anyuola's distinctive theoretical contribution, following the decolonial methodological principle that African concepts should be evaluated for their own explanatory power rather than assessed only for how well they fit categories derived from Bantu or Western material (Ndlovu-Gatsheni, 2018; Mignolo, 2009). This is a conceptual-philosophical method, not an empirical fieldwork study, and its claims should be read accordingly, as a theoretical argument for Anyuola's inclusion in the comparative literature, inviting further ethnographic and linguistic research rather than closing the question.

A note on positionality and reflexivity is appropriate given this article's decolonial framing. Conceptual analysis of an indigenous term is never a view from nowhere; the interpretive choices made in reconstructing Anyuola from the ethnographic record, which sources to foreground, which meanings to treat as central, are shaped by the analytical standpoint from which the analysis is conducted. Chilisa's (2020) call for reflexivity in Indigenous research methodologies applies with equal force to conceptual and philosophical scholarship as it does to empirical fieldwork: readers should treat the account of Anyuola

offered here as one reasoned, source-grounded reconstruction among possible others, offered for scholarly debate and refinement rather than as a final, closed definition.

Anyuola: Etymology, Kinship Structure, and Social Function

Etymology and Semantic Field

Anyuola is a Dholuo noun derived from the verb *nywol*, to give birth, to beget, or to be born. In its most literal sense, Anyuola names those who share a common birth-line, that is, all persons who can trace descent, through blood, to a shared ancestor. Where Ubuntu's root, *-ntu*, denotes person or being in a general, almost abstract sense, and where Ujamaa's root, *jamaa*, denotes family or kin-group as a social and political unit, Anyuola's root is a verb of biological generation. This is a meaningful difference in the grammar of belonging: Anyuola encodes membership as an event, an act of birth situating a person within a temporal chain of generation, rather than as a state of being (Ubuntu) or a unit of political organisation (Ujamaa). To be of someone's Anyuola is to be linked to them through an unbroken, nameable chain of begetting, typically traced patrilineally among the Luo, through the dhoot (sub-lineage) and dhouidi (lineages) that Southall (1952) documented as the basic units of Luo social organisation.

It is also worth situating Anyuola briefly within the wider Nilotic linguistic family, even though a full comparative study lies beyond this article's scope. Related Nilotic peoples, the Acholi and Alur of Uganda, the Padhola, and more distantly the Kalenjin-speaking communities of Kenya's Rift Valley, maintain broadly comparable patrilineal descent structures and cognate or functionally similar terms for lineage and clan, though the degree of precise linguistic cognacy between Dholuo Anyuola and equivalent terms in these neighbouring languages has not, to this author's knowledge, been systematically documented in the published literature. This absence is itself notable: where the Bantu *-ntu* root has been traced carefully across dozens of languages, from Zulu to Shona to Kikuyu to Swahili, to build the comparative case for Ubuntu's continental reach (Mangena, 2016), no equivalent comparative linguistic project has yet been undertaken for Nilotic kinship-personhood vocabulary. This article's introduction of Anyuola into the comparative literature is therefore offered partly as an invitation for exactly that wider Nilotic comparative project, one that would test whether Anyuola's genealogical-generational logic is a Luo-specific elaboration or a broader Nilotic pattern awaiting its own theorist.

Kinship Structure

Luo kinship, as described in the classic ethnographic literature, is organised around patrilineal descent groups of increasing scale: the immediate family (*jokakwaro*, people of the same grandfather, in Ocholla-Ayayo's, 1976, terminology), the dhoot or sub-lineage, the dhouidi or lineage cluster, and ultimately the oganda or wider ethnic community. Anyuola operates flexibly across several of these levels, referring in its narrowest sense to the immediate extended family and in its broadest sense to the whole descent group tracing itself to a common founding ancestor. Southall's (1952) foundational study documented the structural processes by which new lineages form as descent groups grow and segment over generations, a genealogical dynamism that Blount (1975) later analysed as a "sociology of knowledge," showing that Luo genealogical reckoning is not a fixed inherited fact but something actively negotiated, agreed upon, and periodically revised by community members as social circumstances change. This finding is significant for the theoretical argument advanced here: Anyuola is not a static register of blood facts but a living social technology for organising obligation, inheritance, and belonging across time, continuously reasserted and renegotiated by the living in relation to the dead and the yet-unborn.

Onyango-Ouma and Aagaard-Hansen's (2020) recent linguistic study of Dholuo kinship terms, based on interviews with elders in Siaya County, found that Luo kinship terminology, what they call "kincepts",

does not map cleanly onto the standard anthropological typologies developed from other kinship systems, such as Hawaiian, Iroquois, or Omaha classifications. This finding matters beyond linguistics: it demonstrates that Luo relational vocabulary, of which Anyuola is the master term for blood-based belonging, constitutes its own indigenous classificatory logic rather than a variant of a universal grammar of kinship imported from elsewhere. Parkin's (1978) ethnography of Luo migrants in Nairobi further shows that Anyuola obligations, particularly those bound up with lineage destiny and the socially disapproved figure of the *sunga*, the proud or self-regarding person who neglects lineage obligation in pursuit of individual achievement, persisted as powerful normative forces even among Luo who had left rural areas for urban wage labour. This persistence under conditions of urbanisation and economic change is itself evidence that Anyuola functions as an ethical framework, not merely a descriptive kinship taxonomy.

Social and Ethical Function

Anyuola performs at least four interlocking social functions documented in the Luo ethnographic record. First, it is the primary unit of mutual economic obligation: members of one's Anyuola are expected to contribute to bridewealth, funeral expenses, school fees, and periods of hardship, a redistributive function structurally similar to, though organisationally distinct from, the mutual-aid obligations Ubuntu and Ujamaa both generate (Ocholla-Ayayo, 1976; Nyerere, 1968). Second, Anyuola is the unit through which land and inheritance rights are allocated and disputes over them adjudicated, a function tied directly to the patrilineal dhoot and dhouidi structure Southall (1952) documented. Third, Anyuola carries ritual and religious significance, structuring participation in rites of passage, ancestral veneration, and funeral rites, through which the living reaffirm their place within a generational chain stretching from ancestors to descendants not yet born (Ocholla-Ayayo, 1976). Fourth, and most relevant to the theoretical argument of this article, Anyuola functions as a moral community whose good name (*huma*) individual members are expected to protect, such that individual conduct is continuously evaluated for its effect on collective lineage reputation, an ethic of relational accountability distinct from, but comparable in social force to, the Ubuntu principle that a person's humanity is realised and judged through their relations with others (Mbiti, 1969; Metz, 2011).

These four functions together suggest that Anyuola should be read as an ethical framework of accountability extended across time, rather than merely a kinship taxonomy of interest to specialist ethnographers. Contemporary Luo civil society offers indirect evidence of Anyuola's continuing normative force: clan-based welfare associations, land boards, and burial committees, which remain active among both rural and diaspora Luo communities, are organised explicitly along Anyuola lines and continue to perform the mutual-aid, dispute-resolution, and ritual functions Ocholla-Ayayo (1976) and Southall (1952) documented decades earlier. This continuity across a period of substantial social change, urbanisation, Christian conversion, and transnational migration, is consistent with Parkin's (1978) finding that lineage obligation persisted as a powerful normative force even among economically successful, urbanised Luo migrants who might otherwise have been expected to shed such obligations in favour of individualist urban values.

Comparative Analysis: Anyuola, Ubuntu, and Ujamaa

Table 1 summarises the comparison developed in this section across the three axes introduced in the Method section: ontological, political-economic, and temporal.

Table 1: Comparative Summary of Anyuola, Ubuntu, and Ujamaa

Concept	Language family and root	Primary register	Core claim	Key obligation generated
Anyuola	Nilotic (Dholuo); from nywol, to beget	Genealogical -generational	Personhood is constituted through traceable descent from a common ancestor	Mutual aid, land and inheritance rights, and ritual participation within the lineage
Ubuntu	Bantu (Nguni and cognates); from -ntu, person	Ontological-relational	A person is a person through other persons; being is constituted synchronically through relation	Solidarity, dignity, and recognition owed to all persons as co-participants in humanity
Ujamaa	Bantu (Kiswahili); from jamaa, family	Political-economic	The nation should be organised as an extended family, opposed to both capitalist exploitation and class-based socialism	Collective ownership, self-reliance, and redistribution across the political community

The three concepts illustrated in Table 1, converge on a single underlying claim, that African personhood and social value are constituted relationally rather than individualistically, a claim consistent with the broader communitarian current in African philosophy (Menkiti, 1984; Gyekye, 1997). Ubuntu states this claim in its most general, ontological form: to be a person at all is to be a person through other persons, a claim that applies, in principle, to any human relation regardless of blood tie. Ujamaa translates this same relational commitment into a programme for organising the modern nation-state, extending the logic of family obligation outward to encompass fellow citizens who share no kinship tie at all, an extension Nyerere (1968) made explicit when he argued that Ujamaa's task was to make the "family" attitude of mind operate "on a wider scale" than the biological family. Anyuola, by contrast, retains its ontological force specifically at the level of traceable blood descent; it does not, on its own terms, extend outward to strangers or to the political community, and this is precisely what makes it analytically distinct rather than a redundant restatement of Ubuntu or Ujamaa.

The three concepts also differ instructively in the direction of their moral extension. Ubuntu and Ujamaa both move outward, from the individual toward an ever-widening circle of relation, Ubuntu toward any co-present other, Ujamaa toward the entire citizenry of the nation. Anyuola moves along a different axis entirely, backward and forward through time rather than outward through social space, from the individual toward ancestors already dead and descendants not yet born. A useful way to state the difference is that Ubuntu and Ujamaa are concepts of horizontal relational extension, while Anyuola is a concept of vertical relational extension. Neither direction of extension is more fundamental than the other, and Luo social life in fact draws on both, invoking Anyuola for lineage-specific obligations while remaining fully capable of

extending Ubuntu-like relational recognition to non-kin neighbours and, at the level of ethnic and national politics, participating in Ujamaa-like calls for wider solidarity. The three concepts are therefore best understood as complementary registers operating simultaneously within a single social world, not as competing or mutually exclusive theories from which only one can be correct.

This distinctiveness becomes clearer when the three concepts are examined along the temporal axis. Ubuntu, in its dominant philosophical formulation, is fundamentally synchronic: personhood is realised in the present tense, through current relations of recognition and solidarity with living others (Metz, 2007; Ramose, 1999). Ujamaa, too, is oriented to the political present and near future, the task of building a socialist nation now, on the model of the family, even though Nyerere (1968) drew on a romanticised image of a shared African communal past to justify it. Anyuola, however, is inherently and irreducibly diachronic. Its very grammar, rooted in the verb of begetting, situates the person within a chain that runs backward through named ancestors and forward toward descendants not yet born. Ocholla-Ayayo's (1976) documentation of Luo ancestral veneration and Southall's (1952) account of lineage segmentation over multiple generations both show that Anyuola is a technology for organising time itself, for locating a living individual within a generational sequence that has ethical force precisely because it is historically extended, not merely presently felt. Where Ubuntu answers the question "who am I in relation to those around me now?" and Ujamaa answers "how should we organise our shared political life?", Anyuola answers a different and equally fundamental question: "who am I in relation to those who came before me and those who will come after?"

Anyuola Across the Continent: A Comparative Lexicon of Blood-Bound Belonging

The case for treating Anyuola as representative of a continent-wide grammar of belonging, rather than as a parochial Luo idiosyncrasy, rests on showing that its core logic, blood-based, genealogically traceable membership generating enforceable mutual obligation, recurs independently across language families and regions that had no direct contact with the Luo and no shared source from which to borrow the idea. This section sets out seven such terms, drawn from West Africa, East Africa, the Horn of Africa, and Southern Africa, spanning both the Niger-Congo and Afroasiatic phyla, and compares each to Anyuola's etymology, social function, and underlying claim about personhood. Table 2 summarises the comparison; the discussion following it draws out why this breadth matters for Anyuola's claim to continental representativeness.

Table 2: Comparative Lexicon of Blood-Bound Family and Lineage Concepts Across Africa

Term And People	Region And Language Family	Literal Root And Meaning	Core Social Function	Resonance With Anyuola	Source
Anyuola (Luo)	East Africa (Kenya, Tanzania, Uganda); Nilotic	From nywol, "to beget, give birth"	Patrilineal descent group (dhoot, dhoudi) organising land, inheritance,	Reference concept	Southall (1952); Ocholla-Ayayo (1976)

Term And People	Region And Language Family	Literal Root And Meaning	Core Social Function	Resonance With Anyuola	Source
			mutual aid, and ritual obligation		
Umunna (Igbo)	West Africa (Nigeria); Niger-Congo (Igboid)	From umu, "children," and nna, "father"; literally "children of one father"	Patrilineage settling disputes, coordinating mutual aid, and organising ancestral ritual and burial obligation	Near-literal structural equivalent of Anyuola: a descent group named directly for shared paternity, generating the same enforceable duties of aid and ritual participation	Uchendu (1965)
Abusua (Akan)	West Africa (Ghana); Niger-Congo (Kwa)	From a term denoting shared inheritance; transmitted through mogya, "blood," from the mother	Matrilineal clan governing inheritance, marriage exogamy, and chieftaincy succession	Confirms Anyuola's core claim, that transmitted blood is the ultimate basis of legitimate belonging, even where descent is reckoned through the opposite parent	Fortes (1950)
Mbokk (Wolof)	West Africa (Senegal, Gambia); Niger-Congo (Atlantic)	From bok, "to share"	Kin-based moral community obligated to share both resources and hardship, extending from blood relatives to long-standing neighbours	Extends Anyuola's blood criterion with a practice-based one, showing that the genealogical register can expand through sustained mutual sharing as well as through birth	Thiam (2015), as cited in curriculum sources on Senegalese family values
Mbari (Gikuyu)	East Africa (Kenya); Niger-Congo (Bantu)	Patrilineage tracing to a common ancestor or ancestress	Local community unit organising land allocation, marriage exogamy, and generational naming practice	A Bantu-language neighbour of the Nilotic Luo within the same country, showing the genealogical register crosses the Bantu-Nilotic	Kenyatta (1938)

Term And People	Region And Language Family	Literal Root And Meaning	Core Social Function	Resonance With Anyuola	Source
				language boundary rather than stopping at it	
Tol (Somali)	Horn of Africa (Somalia); Afroasiatic (Cushitic)	Patrilineal descent reckoned through named agnatic ancestors	Basis of the segmentary lineage system structuring political alliance, dispute mediation, and blood-compensation (diya) group membership	Like Anyuola, makes political and legal standing contingent on traceable genealogical position rather than on present relation alone	Lewis (1961)
Gosa (Oromo)	Horn of Africa (Ethiopia); Afroasiatic (Cushitic)	Exogamous patrilineal clan with genealogical depth of seven to twenty generations	Organises marriage exogamy, dispute settlement, and mutual assistance, integrated with the generational Gadaa political system	Parallels Anyuola's generational depth and its direct linkage of descent-group membership to binding mutual obligation	Baxter, Hultin, and Triulzi (1996)
Uzalo/ub uzalo (Zulu and Xhosa)	Southern Africa (South Africa); Niger-Congo (Nguni Bantu)	From the verb -zala, "to beget, give birth"; noun ubuzalo, "lineage, descent"	Names lineage and generational continuity within the broader Nguni kinship and clan system	Shares Anyuola's exact grammatical logic, a noun for family or lineage built directly from the verb of childbirth, arising independently in a Bantu rather than Nilotic language	Doke and Vilakazi (1948)

Two patterns emerge from Table 2 that bear directly on Anyuola's claim to representativeness. First, the underlying social logic, a descent group defined by traceable blood or birth, generating specific and enforceable obligations of land, inheritance, mutual aid, and ritual participation, recurs across every major region of the continent and across both of its largest language phyla, Niger-Congo (Igbo, Akan, Wolof, Kikuyu, Zulu and Xhosa) and Afroasiatic (Somali, Oromo), as well as the Nilotic branch that Anyuola itself represents. This is a considerably wider distribution than the -ntu root underlying Ubuntu, which, however geographically extensive, remains confined to the Bantu sub-family of Niger-Congo. Anyuola's genealogical logic, by contrast, appears to be a genuinely pan-African pattern, one for which the Luo case supplies a clear and well-documented instance rather than an exceptional one.

Second, and more strikingly, the grammatical logic underlying Anyuola itself, a noun for family or lineage built directly from the verb of childbirth, is not unique to Dholuo. The Nguni pairing of -zala, to beget, and ubuzalo, lineage, discussed above, replicates exactly the same derivation found in nywol and Anyuola, arising independently in a Bantu language with no historical contact with Nilotic Dholuo. This convergence suggests that grounding kinship terminology in the grammar of birth itself is a recurring African linguistic strategy for encoding genealogical belonging, not a Luo peculiarity, which considerably strengthens the case for treating Anyuola as an apt, rather than arbitrary, representative term for this pan-African pattern when it is named and theorised for comparative use.

A note of methodological honesty is warranted here, consistent with the transparency this article has maintained throughout. The sources supporting Table 2 vary in scholarly depth: Uchendu (1965), Fortes (1950), Kenyatta (1938), Lewis (1961), and Baxter et al. (1996) are established anthropological monographs and edited volumes offering sustained ethnographic treatment of the relevant kinship systems, while the entries for Wolof mbokk and Nguni uzalo/ubuzalo draw on more limited lexical and cultural-commentary sources. This asymmetry mirrors, on a smaller scale, the evidentiary gap already disclosed for Anyuola itself, and it points to the same conclusion: a systematic comparative linguistic study of blood-and-birth-based kinship vocabulary across the continent's major language families remains to be written, and this table should be read as a preliminary map for that project rather than its completed execution.

Anyuola's Distinctive Contribution to Indigenous Studies

The case for formally introducing Anyuola into the comparative literature on African identity and values rests on three claims, one representational, one theoretical, and one methodological.

The representational claim is straightforward: a comparative literature on "African" identity built substantially from Bantu-language material cannot claim to represent the continent's full linguistic and philosophical diversity while remaining silent on its second major indigenous language phylum. Nilotic-speaking peoples number in the tens of millions across Kenya, Uganda, Tanzania, South Sudan, and Ethiopia, and their absence from the theoretical literature on relational personhood is a gap in representation, not a reflection of conceptual poverty. Naming and theorising Anyuola alongside Ubuntu and Ujamaa is a direct, concrete instance of the "deprovincialisation" that Ndlovu-Gatsheni (2018) calls for: it does not ask Nilotic concepts to prove their compatibility with an already-established Bantu-derived theory of Africanness, but instead adds a genuinely distinct data point that should, in turn, revise the general theory.

The theoretical claim is that Anyuola supplies a register, the genealogical-generational, that neither Ubuntu nor Ujamaa fully captures, and that a complete account of African relational personhood needs. Menkiti's (1984) influential account of personhood as an achievement realised through social incorporation over time gestures toward a temporal dimension of personhood but does not develop it through the specific mechanism of traceable descent; Gyekye's (1997) moderate communitarianism is likewise concerned primarily with synchronic balance between individual and community rather than with generational depth. Anyuola makes the generational dimension of African personhood explicit and structurally central rather than incidental, showing that being a person in many African societies is not only a matter of present relational recognition (Ubuntu's contribution) or shared political-economic destiny (Ujamaa's contribution), but also a matter of one's location within a genealogical chain that confers rights, duties, and identity precisely because it is inherited and will be passed on. This is a genuine addition to, not a mere restatement of, existing theory.

The methodological claim follows from the first two: if decolonial and Indigenous studies scholarship is serious about treating African concepts as sources of theory rather than data for external theorising (Chilisa, 2020; Mignolo, 2009), then the discipline's own comparative vocabulary must be actively expanded to include concepts, like Anyuola, that have so far been documented richly at the ethnographic level but never elevated to the status of a named, theorised, comparative category. The absence of a dedicated philosophical literature on Anyuola is not evidence that no such literature is warranted; it is evidence of exactly the kind of epistemic marginalisation that decolonial theory exists to identify and correct (Mudimbe, 1988; Ndlovu-Gatsheni, 2018).

Table 3 makes this contribution concrete by setting out, gap by gap, the specific issues in the existing literature on African identity that Ubuntu and Ujamaa scholarship has left unaddressed or only partially addressed, and what Anyuola, read through the Luo ethnographic record, supplies in each case. The table is organised to show not merely that Anyuola is different from Ubuntu and Ujamaa, difference alone would not justify its inclusion in the comparative canon, but that each difference corresponds to an identifiable analytical gap in the published literature, supported by named sources, that Anyuola's introduction closes or narrows.

Table 3: Key Gaps in the Existing African Identity Literature and Anyuola's Distinctive Contribution

Gap In Existing Literature	How Ubuntu And Ujamaa Scholarship Treats It	What Anyuola Contributes	Supporting Sources
Linguistic and philosophical representativeness	Theory of African personhood built almost entirely on Bantu-language material (Ubuntu, botho, hunhu, utu) and the Bantu-derived political vocabulary of Ujamaa; Nilotic languages absent as theory-generating sources	Introduces a Nilotic (Dholuo) case into the comparative vocabulary, testing and broadening claims previously generalised from Bantu material alone	Mbiti (1969); Nyerere (1968); Mangena (2016); Onyango-Ouma and Aagaard-Hansen (2020)
Temporal structure of personhood	Ubuntu is theorised as fundamentally synchronic, personhood realised through present-tense relational recognition; Ujamaa is oriented to the political present and near future	Grounds personhood in an explicitly diachronic, genealogical chain running from named ancestors to unborn descendants, adding a generational register absent from both concepts	Ramose (1999); Metz (2007); Southall (1952); Ocholla-Ayayo (1976)

Gap In Existing Literature	How Ubuntu And Ujamaa Scholarship Treats It	What Anyuola Contributes	Supporting Sources
Concrete mechanism generating kinship obligation	Ubuntu treats obligation as owed generically to all co-present persons; Ujamaa extends the family metaphor to the nation without specifying descent mechanics	Specifies the actual lineage mechanisms, dhoot and dhoudi segmentation, through which inheritance, land, and mutual-aid obligations are allocated and enforced	Southall (1952); Ocholla-Ayayo (1976); Parkin (1978)
Fit with standard kinship classification typologies	Not addressed in the Ubuntu or Ujamaa literature, which does not engage anthropological kinship typology at all	Demonstrates empirically that Dholuo kinship terms do not map onto standard typologies (Hawaiian, Iroquois, Omaha), evidencing an indigenous classificatory logic requiring its own theorisation	Onyango-Ouma and Aagaard-Hansen (2020)
Genealogy as a living epistemic practice	Ubuntu and Ujamaa are presented as settled philosophical or political claims, not as knowledge that communities actively negotiate	Shows lineage reckoning to be continuously renegotiated and agreed upon by community members, a "sociology of knowledge" rather than a fixed inherited fact	Blount (1975)
Risk of exclusion versus universalism in identity claims	Ubuntu risks theoretical vagueness from over-universalism; Ujamaa's political extension of family to the nation-state drew criticism for coercive villagisation	Shows how a bounded, genealogically specific register can operate alongside universal relational recognition without collapsing into ethnic exclusivism, when the three registers are held together	Ocholla-Ayayo (1976); Appiah (1992)

Gap In Existing Literature	How Ubuntu And Ujamaa Scholarship Treats It	What Anyuola Contributes	Supporting Sources
Persistence of relational obligation under urbanisation and migration	Ubuntu discourse developed substantially around a national, post-apartheid political moment; Ujamaa was designed for rural villagisation	Documents empirically that lineage obligation persists among urbanised and diaspora populations, evidencing resilience of the genealogical register under modern conditions	Parkin (1978)
Intergenerational blind spot in Made in Africa Evaluation	MAE's relational axiology draws substantially on Ubuntu's synchronic principles of respect and reciprocity, without a developed generational dimension	Offers a ready-made logic of cross-generational obligation directly relevant to evaluation of land, inheritance, and social-protection programmes	Chilisa and Mertens (2021); Chirau & Ramasobana (2022); Khumalo (2022)

Table 3 shows that Anyuola's contribution is not a single insight but a cluster of related corrections to the existing literature, spanning representativeness, temporality, mechanism, classification, epistemic practice, boundary conditions, empirical persistence, and applied evaluation practice. No single one of these gaps would, on its own, justify treating Anyuola as a major addition to the comparative vocabulary of African identity studies; taken together, they constitute a reasonably comprehensive case that the literature's silence on the Nilotic case has been a substantive, not merely incidental, omission.

Implications for African Identity and Values

Bringing Anyuola into dialogue with Ubuntu and Ujamaa yields a triadic rather than binary answer to the question posed at the outset of this article: what does it mean to be African, and by what values is that identity constituted? Being African, on this account, is not reducible to blood descent alone, Anyuola's register, nor to synchronic relational recognition alone, Ubuntu's register, nor to shared political-economic destiny alone, Ujamaa's register. It is constituted through the interplay of all three: a person is African insofar as they are located within a genealogical chain of ancestors and descendants (Anyuola), insofar as their humanity is realised through relations of solidarity and mutual recognition with others, kin and non-kin alike (Ubuntu), and insofar as they participate in, and hold obligations toward, a wider political and economic community organised on the model of extended family (Ujamaa).

This triadic framework has an important corollary for debates about African identity that circulate well beyond academic philosophy, debates about diaspora belonging, about the status of naturalised or long-resident non-indigenous Africans, and about ethnic exclusion within African states. If Ubuntu's relational ontology is taken alone, African identity becomes potentially universal and demanding of very little, since Ubuntu's logic of personhood through relation applies, in principle, to any human community anywhere (Metz, 2011). If Anyuola's genealogical register is taken alone, African identity risks collapsing

into a narrow and exclusionary ethnic or blood-based criterion that has, historically, been mobilised for harmful political purposes on the continent and elsewhere. The value of holding all three registers together, as this article argues they should be held, is that Ubuntu's ontology and Ujamaa's political extension serve as a check on any tendency to read Anyuola's genealogical logic as a licence for exclusion: the Luo concept of Anyuola organises obligation within the lineage, but it does not, and Luo custom does not treat it as doing so, deny the personhood or the claim to Ubuntu-recognition of those outside one's own Anyuola (Ocholla-Ayayo, 1976). Read together rather than selectively, the triad supports Kwame Anthony Appiah's (1992) caution against essentialist, singular bases for African identity, while still affirming that African societies possess rich, indigenous, and mutually reinforcing conceptual resources, Anyuola, Ubuntu, and Ujamaa, for theorising belonging without needing to borrow those resources from outside the continent.

This triadic reading also helps make sense of a lived tension familiar to many Africans in the diaspora, and, indeed, to internal migrants within African cities: the frequent sense of holding multiple, simultaneously true, but differently scaled claims to belonging. A Luo professional living in Nairobi, London, or Minneapolis may feel their Anyuola obligations, to contribute to a cousin's bridewealth, to attend a lineage elder's funeral, to defend the family's land claim, as undiminished by distance, precisely because Anyuola's genealogical logic does not depend on co-presence in the way that everyday Ubuntu-style relational recognition typically does. At the same time, that same person may feel a broader Ubuntu-like solidarity with African, or specifically Kenyan, strangers encountered abroad, and may invoke Ujamaa-style political language when arguing for national or Pan-African solidarity in the diaspora. None of these three simultaneous senses of belonging contradicts the others; the triadic framework developed in this article gives scholars a vocabulary for naming why all three can be true of the same person at the same time without contradiction.

Implications for Indigenous Studies and Made in Africa Evaluation

The argument developed here has practical implications beyond philosophy and anthropology, particularly for the Made in Africa Evaluation (MAE) movement within the evaluation profession, with which this journal's readership in sociology and anthropology will likely have direct interest given MAE's explicit debt to Indigenous relational epistemologies. Bagele Chilisa's (2020) framework of Indigenous research methodologies, and her collaborative work with Donna Mertens on Indigenous Made in Africa evaluation frameworks (Chilisa & Mertens, 2021), both argue that evaluation practice on the continent should be grounded in African relational axiology, relationality, respect, reciprocity, responsibility, and reflexivity, rather than imported individualist assumptions about programme beneficiaries as isolated units of measurement. To date, this relational axiology has been articulated substantially through Ubuntu. The addition of Anyuola's genealogical register suggests that MAE frameworks concerned with, for example, intergenerational programmes, land and resettlement interventions, or lineage-based social protection schemes, could draw explicitly on Anyuola's logic of obligation across generations, a dimension that Ubuntu's more synchronic ontology does not foreground as directly. Chirau and Ramasobana (2022) and Khumalo (2022) have both identified the underdevelopment of genuinely Indigenous conceptual scaffolding as a persistent barrier to MAE's maturation; naming and theorising concepts such as Anyuola is precisely the kind of scaffolding-building work their critiques call for.

Limitations and Directions for Future Research

This article's central limitation must be stated plainly: no dedicated, peer-reviewed philosophical literature theorising Anyuola by name currently exists, in the way that Ubuntu has been theorised by Ramose (1999), Metz (2007, 2011), and Eze (2010), or that Ujamaa has been theorised by Nyerere (1968) himself and his many commentators. The account of Anyuola offered here has therefore been reconstructed from the

available Luo ethnographic and linguistic record, principally Southall (1952), Ocholla-Ayayo (1976), Blount (1975), Parkin (1978), and Onyango-Ouma and Aagaard-Hansen (2020), rather than from an existing body of Luo philosophical writing comparable to the Bantu philosophical literature. This is a genuine evidentiary asymmetry, and it is disclosed here rather than obscured, in keeping with the article's own decolonial commitments: better to acknowledge a gap honestly than to claim a false parity of textual support. This limitation is also, properly understood, the article's central finding and its call to action, the gap itself is evidence of the epistemic marginalisation this article set out to correct, and closing it is a task for the wider field, not something a single conceptual paper can accomplish alone.

Future research should pursue at least three lines of inquiry that this article's desk-based method cannot. First, primary ethnographic and linguistic fieldwork with contemporary Luo elders, ritual specialists, and lineage heads is needed to test, refine, and update the largely mid-twentieth-century ethnographic record this article has relied upon, much of which predates Kenyan independence. Second, comparative work should examine whether cognate genealogical concepts exist among other Nilotic-speaking peoples, the Kalenjin, Acholi, Dinka, and Nuer among them, to establish whether Anyuola's genealogical-generational logic is a distinctively Luo phenomenon or a broader Nilotic pattern analogous to Ubuntu's spread across Bantu languages. Third, empirical research is needed on how Anyuola obligations are being renegotiated under conditions of urbanisation, religious conversion, and transnational migration, extending Parkin's (1978) mid-century study of Luo migrants in Nairobi to the present day.

CONCLUSION

This article has argued that Anyuola, the Dholuo concept of blood-bound lineage community rooted in the verb *nywol*, to beget, deserves formal recognition as an indigenous African framework for understanding identity and values, standing alongside, rather than beneath or subsumed within, Ubuntu and Ujamaa in the comparative literature. Anyuola is not a redundant restatement of Ubuntu's relational ontology or Ujamaa's political economy of familyhood; it supplies a genealogical and generational register, situating the person within an inherited chain running from ancestors to descendants, that neither existing concept fully develops. A complete theory of African identity and values, this article has argued, requires all three registers held together: the ontological claim that a person is a person through other persons (Ubuntu), the political-economic claim that the wider community should be organised on the model of extended family (Ujamaa), and the genealogical claim that personhood is constituted through a traceable chain of birth linking the living to their ancestors and their descendants (Anyuola). Recognising Anyuola in this way is not merely an addition to a list of interesting African concepts; it is a necessary correction to a comparative literature that has, until now, generalised about African personhood from Bantu material alone, and it is offered here as an invitation to the wider community of sociologists, anthropologists, and philosophers of Africa to take up the fuller ethnographic and linguistic work that a single conceptual article cannot complete on its own.

References

- Appiah, K. A. (1992). *In my father's house: Africa in the philosophy of culture*. Oxford University Press.
- Baxter, P. T. W., Hultin, J., & Triulzi, A. (Eds.). (1996). *Being and becoming Oromo: Historical and anthropological enquiries*. Nordic Africa Institute.
- Blount, B. G. (1975). Agreeing to agree on genealogy: A Luo sociology of knowledge. In M. Sanches & B. G. Blount (Eds.), *Sociocultural dimensions of language use* (pp. 117-135). Academic Press.

- Chilisa, B. (2020). *Indigenous research methodologies (2nd ed.)*. SAGE Publications.
- Chilisa, B., & Mertens, D. M. (2021). Indigenous Made in Africa evaluation frameworks: Addressing epistemic violence and contributing to social transformation. *American Journal of Evaluation*, 42(2), 241-253. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1098214020948601>
- Chirau, T. J., & Ramasobana, M. (2022). Factors inhibiting the maturity and praxis of Made in Africa Evaluation. *African Evaluation Journal*, 10(1), Article a627. <https://doi.org/10.4102/aej.v10i1.627>
- Doke, C. M., & Vilakazi, B. W. (1948). *Zulu-English dictionary*. Witwatersrand University Press.
- Evans-Pritchard, E. E. (1949). Luo tribes and clans. *Rhodes-Livingstone Journal*, 7, 24-40.
- Eze, M. O. (2010). *Intellectual history in contemporary South Africa*. Palgrave Macmillan.
- Fortes, M. (1950). Kinship and marriage among the Ashanti. In A. R. Radcliffe-Brown & D. Forde (Eds.), *African systems of kinship and marriage (pp. 252-284)*. Oxford University Press.
- Gyekye, K. (1997). *Tradition and modernity: Philosophical reflections on the African experience*. Oxford University Press.
- Kenyatta, J. (1938). *Facing Mount Kenya: The tribal life of the Gikuyu*. Secker and Warburg.
- Khumalo, S. L. (2022). The effects of coloniality and international development assistance on Made in Africa Evaluation: Implications for a decolonised evaluation agenda. *African Evaluation Journal*, 10(1), Article a628. <https://doi.org/10.4102/aej.v10i1.628>
- Lewis, I. M. (1961). *A pastoral democracy: A study of pastoralism and politics among the Northern Somali of the Horn of Africa*. Oxford University Press.
- Mangena, F. (2016). Hunhu/Ubuntu in the traditional thought of Southern Africa. Internet Encyclopedia of Philosophy. <https://iep.utm.edu/hunhu-Ubuntu-southern-african-thought/>
- Mbiti, J. S. (1969). *African religions and philosophy*. Heinemann.
- Menkiti, I. A. (1984). Person and community in African traditional thought. In R. A. Wright (Ed.), *African philosophy: An introduction (3rd ed., pp. 171-181)*. University Press of America.
- Metz, T. (2007). Toward an African moral theory. *Journal of Political Philosophy*, 15(3), 321-341. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9760.2007.00280.x>
- Metz, T. (2011). Ubuntu as a moral theory and human rights in South Africa. *African Human Rights Law Journal*, 11(2), 532-559.
- Mignolo, W. D. (2009). Epistemic disobedience, independent thought and decolonial freedom. *Theory, Culture & Society*, 26(7-8), 159-181. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0263276409349275>
- Mudimbe, V. Y. (1988). *The invention of Africa: Gnosis, philosophy, and the order of knowledge*. Indiana University Press.
- Ndlovu-Gatsheni, S. J. (2018). *Epistemic freedom in Africa: Deprovincialization and decolonization*. Routledge.
- Ngũgĩ wa Thiong'o. (1986). *Decolonising the mind: The politics of language in African literature*. James Currey.
- Nyerere, J. K. (1968). *Ujamaa: Essays on socialism*. Oxford University Press.

- Ocholla-Ayayo, A. B. C. (1976). *Traditional ideology and ethics among the Southern Luo*. Scandinavian Institute of African Studies.
- Onyango-Ouma, W., & Aagaard-Hansen, J. (2020). Dholuo kincepts in western Kenya. *Studies in African Linguistics*, 49(2), 305-321. <https://doi.org/10.32473/sal.v49i2.125889>
- Parkin, D. J. (1978). *The cultural definition of political response: Lineal destiny among the Luo*. Academic Press.
- Ramose, M. B. (1999). *African philosophy through Ubuntu*. Mond Books.
- Southall, A. W. (1952). *Lineage formation among the Luo* (International African Institute Memorandum No. 26). Oxford University Press.
- Thiam, P. (2015). *Senegal: Modern Senegalese recipes from the source to the bowl*. Lake Isle Press.
- Tutu, D. (1999). *No future without forgiveness*. Doubleday.
- Uchendu, V. C. (1965). The Igbo kinship system: Structure, function, and dynamics. *American Anthropologist*, 67(1), 100-116.



©2026 by the authors. Submitted for possible open access publication under the terms and conditions of the Creative Commons Attribution (CC BY) license (<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-sa/4.0/>).