It is generally agreed that kinship involves more than simply a set of consanguineal links, but the relative importance to be accorded blood ties and the question of what else besides consanguinity should be included in "the nature of kinship" remain open to debate. The theoretical implications of this controversy are great. At stake is a century of painstaking effort in the study of kinship systems and, ultimately, the validity and viability of comparative cross-cultural studies in anthropology (see Eggan 1972:8, 14; Ward Goodenough 1970).

In trying to decide what else kinship entails besides biogenetic ties, anthropologists have looked in two directions. First, consideration has been given to fictive and ritual kinship, especially to adoption and compadrazgo (see Berruecos 1972; Brady 1976a; Carroll 1970a; Gudeman 1972; and Pitt-Rivers 1968 for useful summaries of this work). Second, much effort has been expended on the systems of symbols that represent the meaning of kinship in different cultural settings (see Chock 1974; Geertz and Geertz 1975; Labby 1976; Schneider 1968; Schneider and Smith 1973; Silverman 1971; and Witherspoon 1975 for examples of "cultural" or "symbolic" analyses).

Although anthropologists have written about friendship for many years, the debate over the nature of kinship has given little attention to friendship. Perhaps this is because most of the anthropological literature on friendship is purely descriptive or discusses the ways friendships are used in adjusting to urban settings or in situations of modernization. Only recently has the suggestion been made that the study of friendship might aid our understanding of kinship (for example, Keesing 1972), and only in this same period have anthropologists begun to explore this suggestion (see especially Paine 1974; Pitt-Rivers 1973; Schwimmer 1974; Wallman 1974).

I shall approach the controversy over the nature of kinship by examining the connections between kinship and friendship in Truk District, Micronesia. I shall first review and clarify the ethnography for Greater Trukese Society on these subjects and then go on to present a Trukese model of interpersonal relationships. Finally, I shall relate this specific cultural model to our wider concern with what kinship is all about. This will improve our general understanding of the nature of kinship and it will show us

---

The problem of what is to be included in "the nature of kinship" is examined by focusing on kinship and friendship in Truk District, Caroline Islands, Micronesia. A cultural model of "intensive interpersonal relationships" is presented showing how natural kinship, created kinship, and friendship conceptually interlock for Trukese. It is concluded that the essence of kinship as a general cross-cultural construct is sharing and that cross-cultural studies of kinship must focus on the variety of symbolic actions that stand for kinship in different cultural settings.
how we can profitably draw upon cultural models without abandoning anthropology’s traditional commitment to the comparative study of human thought and behavior.

consanguinity and affinity in Greater Trukese Society

Since World War II many anthropologists have conducted research in GTS, providing a substantial data base for comparative purposes. Sorting through this information, one is struck by the consensus on what kinship is: Trukese kinship is based largely, if not exclusively, on consanguineal and affinal relationships, with special emphasis given the maternal line. It is agreed that persons in GTS belong to named, nonlocalized, exogamous matriclans (Goodenough’s sibs), and that these clans are divided into a number of smaller, localized, less inclusive, and more socially meaningful groupings: subclans, lineages, and descent lines. All who have written on Trukese kinship also agree that a person’s relationship to his patrilateral kin (afakur) is significant and important, though not of the same order of commitment and feeling as to his matriline. The spouse relationship is generally accepted to be somewhat fragile and to take a back seat to consanguineal ties, particularly to ties among siblings. Thus the dominant theme that recurs in the published literature is that in GTS, as in the United States, kinship is based fundamentally and most importantly on blood ties and secondarily on ties by marriage.

A moment’s reflection will show that this view of kinship follows very closely the traditional paradigm of what kinship is all about that has held a dominant position in anthropology since Morgan’s pioneering work of a century ago (Morgan 1871). In Schneider’s words, “kinship was about the way in which a people grouped and classified themselves as compared with the real, true, biological facts of consanguinity and affinity” (1972:34).

Unquestionably, consanguinity and affinity are important elements in the Trukese view of “the nature of kinship”: Trukese do talk about and attach significance to these ties. But what I wish to emphasize below is that matters consanguineal and affinal do not exhaust the set of relationships that Trukese call kinship. While this has been briefly noted before (for example, Goodenough 1951; Marshall 1975), nonconsanguineal, nonaffinal kinship relationships have not received the attention they merit. I believe that a thorough and systematic look at these relationships will reveal much about the nature of kinship in GTS and more generally.

created kinship in Greater Trukese Society

Kinship ties that are neither consanguineal nor affinal have been called many things in the anthropological literature (for example, “fictive,” “pseudo,” “ritual,” “artificial”), all of which imply that these relationships are somehow not “real.” I shall call these ties created kinship, in hopes of avoiding the implication that they are not an integral part of “the nature of kinship.” For immediate purposes, three kinds of created kinship in GTS are of interest: clientship (Goodenough 1951:70-73; Marshall 1975:171-176), määräär ties (Goodenough 1951:102-103; Swartz 1958:90), and adoption (Ruth Goodenough 1970; Marshall 1976a).

Goodenough calls those persons counted among a lineage’s members who were neither born into the lineage nor adopted into it as children “client members.” Once established for one or two generations, clientship usually alters clan membership, the application of incest and exogamy rules (see Marshall 1976b:190, n. 24), and matters of inheritance. Clientship provides a major vehicle for moving people to resources and resources to people in GTS (see Marshall 1975). Often, although by no means always,
Client relationships are established on the basis of some preexisting tie of kinship, common sib membership, or affinal relationship. When a recognized relationship already exists with its requirements of mutual cooperation, a client can be more readily integrated into the lineage with which he is affiliated. Otherwise the client relationship must be established on the basis of mutual good will, mutual need, and the services which the client can render as a member of the lineage he joins (Goodenough 1951:73; my emphasis).

Client relationships frequently develop from maaraar or friendship ties—a point that reinforces the italicized portion of the material quoted above.

Clientship thus provides a way to create kinsmen by means other than birth or marriage. Clientship is frequently resorted to when it is politically or economically expedient to recruit new members into a lineage, when it provides the major method for incorporating outsiders into a community on a permanent basis, and when it may be used to form or strengthen intercommunity and interisland alliances. Evidence from the history of clans in local communities in GTS presented by Caughey (1971), Goodenough (1951), and Marshall (1975) makes it clear that clientship has always been an important part of Trukese kinship.

Goodenough was also the first to discourse on the maaraar relationship in GTS:

A native may also have active kin relations with persons who are not strictly members of his futuk. Such persons are his maaraar, who may be defined as affinal relatives and consanguineal relatives who are remoter than those in the futuk, but with whom an active relationship is maintained. One’s maaraar may include persons who are not covered by any other kinship terms, but who wish to consider themselves related to one another by virtue of some affinal or remote consanguineal tie. The members of one’s futuk are automatically counted among one’s active relatives, but the maaraar relationship is one which must be activated by mutual consent, though based on the potentialities of a remote kinship connection (Goodenough 1951:102-103; my emphasis).

The important point above is the matter of choice: maaraar ties may or may not be recognized depending upon the participants’ own desires. Hence Trukese retain an option to create maaraar relatives or not to recognize them as kin.

A maaraar relationship is usually dyadic, whereas clientship links one or more individuals to a group of persons (the host lineage) and ultimately to many other persons as well, if the relationship endures (in which case, clients acquire kinship ties at the subclan and clan levels of their new kinship identity).

Maaraar lie well beyond the ambit of the subclan. They are drawn from among persons with whom only a vague belief in shared kinship exists, as opposed to persons who believe themselves to be closely related genealogically (subclan) or who can actually demonstrate genealogical connection (lineage or descent–line). To illustrate: two members of the same clan from different islands meet for the first time in the urban center on Moen Island and decide to become maaraar. The only consanguineal tie between such persons, if indeed it can be called that, is their shared clan name: “for practical purposes they consider themselves related in name only, though recognizing that in theory their common name presumes some ultimate common ancestry in the female line” (Goodenough 1951:65). For Goodenough, then, maaraar relationships offer a mechanism for remaking distant kinship ties into closer ones for purposes of social action.

Swartz worked on the same island as Goodenough several years later and has a slightly different interpretation of the maaraar relationship:

Somewhat the same group is referred to by the term “maaraar” [as is referred to by the term futuk] but this is used even more loosely and may include anyone who is related in any way, either affinally or consanguineally, or to whom one feels a close tie even though no kin relationship can be established (Swartz 1958:90; my emphasis).
Swartz's observation, "even though no kin relationship can be established," refers, of course, to the anthropologist's effort to trace a genealogical connection among persons who call themselves măārāār. Quite apparently, Trukese believe that a kinship relationship can be established in the absence of demonstrable genealogical connection.

Adoption is a third way for creating kinsmen in GTS that needs to be explored before we turn our attention to friendship. The two detailed accounts we have of Trukese adoption make it clear that this relationship ordinarily occurs among consanguineal kin (Ruth Goodenough 1970; Marshall 1976a). Ruth Goodenough recorded only live out of fifty-nine cases of adoption on Romonum Island where no blood tie existed between the adopted child and either of the adoptive parents (1970:318-319), and Marshall discovered only three such cases out of 108 adoptions on Namoluk Atoll (1976a:31).5

There are two important issues regarding adoption in GTS: first, like măārāār ties, adoptions are frequently used to convert "distant" kinship relationships into "close" ones; and second, adoptions can be and occasionally are employed as a way for creating kin out of nonkin. In this latter respect adoption resembles clientship, although adoption gives primacy to created parent-child bonds while clientship emphasizes created sibling ties.

Clientship, măārāār, and adoptive links constitute the kinds of relationships that anthropologists have called "fictive," or "pseudo," kinship. But if we label such relationships "fictive," what are we to make of "real" genealogical kinship in GTS? Presuming such methods for creating kin to have existed for many generations, we can see that over time a great many "fictions" have become "facts."

Resolution of this dilemma lies not in arguing over the purported accuracy of genealogies, but rather in reexamining the basic premises on which our anthropological notions of what kinship is all about are based (see Schneider 1972). In undertaking such a reexamination for Trukese kinship we come face-to-face with friendship.

**friendship in Greater Trukese Society**

To understand "friendship" in GTS one must first appreciate the importance Trukese attach to siblingship. Goodenough stresses that the bonds between siblings of the same sex are considered closer and stronger than those of any other relationship in the culture (1951:31, 101). This point is echoed by Gladwin and Sarason, who describe same-sex sibling relations as "exceedingly intimate" and as "in many respects the most important relationship to any Trukese" (1953:49). My own field research and statements by other anthropologists who have worked in GTS support these contentions.

Given the central importance of siblingship in Trukese kinship—particularly same-sex siblingship—it is significant for the argument being developed here that Trukese can create siblings in a manner analogous to the other categories of created kin discussed above. For the moment, I have chosen to discuss the created sibling relationship as "friendship" rather than as "sibling adoption" (Brady 1976b) because a review of the anthropological literature on friendship indicates that the created sibling relationship in GTS satisfies most of the criteria that anthropologists have used to define friendship in other societies. Some of the more frequently mentioned of these criteria are that friendship is voluntary (while kinship usually is not), that friendship is typically dyadic (while kinship is polyadic), that friendship often is characterized by great intimacy (while kinship may or may not involve intimacy and many times involves its opposite), and that friendship is mutable and sometimes of rather brief duration (while...
kinship is largely immutable and endures for a lifetime and beyond) (see, for example, Cohen 1961; DuBois 1974; Holzberg 1973; Paine 1974). Furthermore, by initially discussing created siblingship as friendship, I draw attention to a central argument of this paper, namely, that in reassessing our ideas of what kinship is all about we must also reevaluate our ideas concerning the nature of friendship. Most specifically, we must reexamine our Western-derived assumption that kinship and friendship are necessarily separate, mutually exclusive domains.7

Trukese use the idiom of siblingship to describe friendship and this has led to a variety of terms for “friendship” in the literature. Goodenough (1951) discusses “artificial siblings,” Gladwin and Sarason (1953) refer to “brother” and “sister” relationship, and elsewhere I have written of “formal friendship” (Marshall 1976a:39-40). No matter what anthropologists may call friendship in GTS, however, Trukese use a single generic term to talk about it: *pwiipwi*, a reduplicated form of the root *pwii*-, which means “same-sex sibling” when coupled with suffixed possessive pronouns.8 Henceforth I shall call the created sibling/friend relationship the *pwiipwi* relationship.

Goodenough (1951:99-100) has noted that Trukese categorize siblings into three types: (1) *pwiipwi chek*, those in one’s own descent line or lineage; (2) *pwiipwi winisam*, co-descendants of the men of a lineage; and (3) *pwiipwi winipunu*, “siblings by spouses,” persons who are married to *pwiipwi chek*. This classification requires slight modification. First, *pwiipwi chek* is regularly applied to one’s siblings in the same subclan (*fütük*), that is, its use is not necessarily restricted to siblings in the same lineage or descent line. In addition, this term is occasionally used in reference to individuals of the same clan either on one’s own island or from other island communities in GTS.9 Similarly, the term *pwiipwi winisam* is applied to all co-descendants of the men of a subclan, and occasionally this term may be extended to co-descendants of the men of a single clan when it becomes useful to do so.10

In addition to these minor changes in Goodenough’s list, the term for a fourth sibling category—the created sibling—must be added: *pwiipwin asineey*, literally, “sibling by recognition.” On Namoluk and elsewhere in the Mortlocks a synonym for this term is also employed: *pwiipwin le sopwone wa* “my sibling from the same canoe.” As explained on Namoluk, this term refers to men who shared a disabled canoe, drifted aimlessly together at sea for many days supporting each other’s flagging spirits and sharing completely what meager food and water they had until they finally reached land or were rescued at sea. Born of their mutual aid in adversity these men swore eternally to treat each other like brothers: they would *tumwunuu* *ffengen* “take care of or look after one another,” *ànninis* *ffengen* “cooperate,” *tipeuo* *ffengen* “agree or be of one mind,” and possibly *mwèngè chu* [*ffengen*] “share land or other resources.” These phrases encapsulate the essence of proper kinship feeling on Namoluk and elsewhere in GTS (Marshall 1976a), and in the present context they may be summarized as “brotherly love.”

Unlike *compadrazgo*, blood brotherhood, bond friendship, and other ritualized kinship relations, *pwiipwi* ties are not forged in a formal public ceremony. As with friendships in our own culture, two persons who are attracted to one another come to spend increasing amounts of time together and eventually agree to call each other *pwiipwi*. This decision is then announced to their close relatives to alert them to the new relationship.

*Pwiipwi* bonds are formed primarily in adolescence, somewhat more commonly among young men than among young women,11 and are often drawn from among age mates in the same community. While *pwiipwi* relationships are sometimes formed
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between distant clan mates, more typically they grow up between persons who are unrelated genealogically. Gladwin and Sarason emphasize that pwiiipwi relationships develop between members of the same sex, but cross-sex pwiiipwi ties are also possible, as has been noted above (see notes 8 and 11). The strictures governing the interactions of opposite-sex siblings apply also to cross-sex pwiiipwi; thus the degree of informality and intimacy that is the hallmark of same-sex pwiiipwi bonds usually does not arise between persons who call each other mwomwongey. This does not mean that opposite-sex pwiiipwi ties are thereby "weaker" or "less important" than those formed between persons of the same sex.12

Although the pwiiipwi relationship itself is dyadic, its consequences extend beyond the two parties to the arrangement and it involves them in appropriate relationship each with the kinsmen of the other, an integration which may become more or less complete depending upon the permanence and closeness of the relationship. Members of their respective lineages, however, would not consider themselves related to each other simply by virtue of the tie through the two "brothers" (Gladwin and Sarason 1953:50).

While it is true that pwiiipwi may become the closest sort of kin to each other, it is incorrect to assert, as above, that a created sibling bond is insufficient reason for members of two lineages to consider themselves related. At the very least, where a pwiiipwi relationship has blossomed and endured, lineage mates of the two pwiiipwi consider each other mààrààr. Like clientship, adoption and mààrààr ties, then, pwiiipwi relationships potentially create an additional network of kin for their participants.13 What begins as a dyadic relationship like friendship becomes a polyadic relationship like kinship: pwiiipwi effectively merges these two domains.

Anthropologists have argued that a major difference between kinship and friendship is that "you are born with your relatives but you can pick your friends" (see, for example, Schneider 1968:53). I suspect that this distinction reflects the Western cultural background of most anthropologists more than it accurately portrays the views of persons reared in other cultural traditions. We have already seen above, for example, that it is possible for Trukese to "pick" quite a few of their relatives. But along with the notion of choice as a distinguishing criterion of friendship in Western cultures goes the expectation that most friendships will not last a lifetime. In short, friendships are believed to be terminable in Western societies while kinship ties are viewed as ineradicable (see especially Schneider 1968).14

Pwiiipwi voluntarily choose each other in GTS and in this respect they resemble friends in Western societies. Pwiiipwi ties, like marital, client, and adoptive ties, are forged with the understanding that the relationships so created may or may not endure. As with marriages and adoptions in GTS, many pwiiipwi relationships fail to meet initial expectations and are terminated in their early stages. Also like marriages and adoptions, however, many other pwiiipwi relationships do prove rewarding and do develop into lasting arrangements. Gladwin and Sarason (1953:50) mention lifelong pwiiipwi relationships, and later they note that,

a measure of kinship obligation and behavior devolves upon each toward the relatives of the other, and this increases as the "brother" relationship endures over time, so that in some cases their children and children's children maintain a feeling of kinship stemming from their relationship (Gladwin and Sarason 1953:96).

The duration of pwiiipwi relationships varies widely. Some last only a few weeks or months; other are "quite permanent" and result in "fairly complete integration of each
into the lineage activities of the other” (Gladwin and Sarason 1953:96). Once again, the pwiiipwi relationship straddles the realms of kinship and friendship.

Not all pwiiipwi bonds are formed in adolescence. They may also be established during adulthood, and these often provide an individual with sources of hospitality in other communities. Besides this, a “signal and voluntary act of generosity or help by an unrelated man” commonly leads to a pwiiipwi tie (Gladwin and Sarason 1953:144). Put another way, to act like siblings is to become siblings by consequence of such behavior and a mutual agreement to recognize each other as pwiiipwi.

Another indication of how the pwiiipwi relationship combines elements of what anthropologists traditionally have viewed as the separate domains of kinship and friendship is in regard to rules governing marriage and sexual relations. Cross-sex pwiiipwi may not marry or engage in sexual intercourse, a rule that applies to all persons who call each other “sibling” in GTS. Likewise, those persons whose fathers are clan, subclan, or lineage “brothers” (those who are pwiiipwi winisam) should not marry or have sexual relations with each other, and this rule also applies to persons whose fathers are pwiiipwi (for more on this subject see Marshall 1976b). If two persons’ mothers are pwiiipwi, those individuals are enjoined from marriage or sexual relations on the same grounds that apply to matrilineal kin.

Gladwin and Sarason (1953) argue that pwiiipwi ties thrive because they are unfettered by sibling rivalry, squabbles over inheritance, and the other restraints growing out of ties among close consanguineal siblings. Pwiiipwi relationships offer an informality, intimacy, and confidentiality normally lacking in relations among uterine, lineage, and subclan siblings, and they are sought because they provide emotional support in a sea of rather tenuous emotional relationships (see Gladwin and Sarason 1953). Whatever the merits of this interpretation, it is important for our purposes that pwiiipwi ties appear to shore up a weak spot in the Trukese kinship system, namely, that consanguineal siblings must put their relationship above all others while competing with each other for parental love and an inheritance. Consanguineal siblings are thus born into an inherently ambivalent relationship, a matter that may account for the restraint that surrounds their interaction. Created sibling relationships are not only as good as natural ones, they are potentially better. They are an improvement on nature in the sense that they allow for the purest expression of “brotherly love” in Trukese culture. Pwiiipwi ties provide a source of close emotional support via a relationship of created intimacy that is isomorphic with the most important consanguineal kinship relationship in GTS. Once more, the pwiiipwi relationship links together the realms of kinship and friendship.

In summary, “kinship” and “friendship” may be useful categories for analyzing some Western societies, but the assumption that persons in all societies operate in terms of this bipolar scheme has obscured more than it has revealed in anthropological research. We now need an analytic approach that allows us to view all connections among persons in a single framework so that we might learn what they have in common and what differentiates them. Such an approach will put us well on the way toward understanding the Trukese view of kinship, but more importantly, it will facilitate a general reassessment of “what kinship is all about.” Once this has taken place, meaningful comparative studies of kinship and friendship in anthropology can proceed.

**Intensive interpersonal relationships in GTS: the cultural model**

It is an anthropological truism that each culture has its own interpretive symbolic system to explain the nature of the universe. Part of the universe every culture must...
Table 1. The kinds of relatives in Trukese kinship

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Matrilineal</th>
<th>Cultural (created relatives)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Client</td>
<td>Adoptive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patrilateral</td>
<td>Affinal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maaraar</td>
<td>Pwiipwi</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Explain is the nature of kinship. Two logical possibilities exist in the realm of kinship that can be developed and elaborated symbolically: natural (biogenetic) links among persons and cultural (created) ties among persons. Some cultures stress biogenetic relationships (for example, the Americans, see Schneider 1968), others emphasize created relationships (for example, the Telefolmin, see Craig 1969), and still others roughly balance the two. Trukese fall into this last category. In GTS the general class, "relatives," partitions into those persons with whom one is linked via physiological processes and those with whom one is linked via cultural processes (see Table 1). Discussions of Trukese kinship in the literature have done justice to the former category, but the latter category has received very little systematic attention. Indeed, when we have written about Trukese kinship, we have dealt in depth with only half the matter.

Table 2 illustrates that it is possible for a Trukese to create every kind of relative provided by nature. Adoption results in the creation of "parents" and "children"; pwiipwi and most client relationships create "siblings"; maaraar and some client relationships allow one to create "cousins" (classified as "siblings" in Trukese kinship). Moreover, all these relationships provide potential networks of kin including created "aunts," "uncles," "grandparents," and so forth (classified as "parents" or occasionally as "siblings" in Trukese kinship). Thus, contrary to Pitt-Rivers (1973:105), GTS provides an example of a culture in which kin outside the nuclear family can be created. All the consanguineal and created kinship relationships listed in Table 2 are governed by a code for conduct founded on mutual nurturing behaviors. Those that are particularly recognized and especially important for any individual form a set of intensive interpersonal relationships based on this mutually honored code for conduct. Should the code of nurturance and sharing be consistently ignored, the kinship relationship—whether founded in "nature" or in "culture"—may also be ignored.

Trukese kinsmen are those who share such things as land, food, labor, residence, support, and (not necessarily) genetic substance and who choose mutually to

Table 2. Natural and cultural kinship equivalents in Trukese kinship.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Kinship category</th>
<th>Natural (biogenetic)</th>
<th>Cultural (created)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>kinship relationship</td>
<td>kinship relationship</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'Sibling'</td>
<td>Pwiipwi chék</td>
<td>Pwiipwin asineey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'Parent'</td>
<td>Inei (genetrix)</td>
<td>Inei (adoptive mother)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Samei (genitor)</td>
<td>Samei (adoptive father)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'Child'</td>
<td>Nai</td>
<td>Nai muumu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nai afakur</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'Spouse'</td>
<td>N.A.*</td>
<td>Pwunuwei</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Descent line/lineage/subclan</td>
<td>Eu futük</td>
<td>Clients</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clan</td>
<td>Eu ainang</td>
<td>Maaraar</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Not applicable.
acknowledge each other as kin. In the Trukese view, those who nurture one another through acts of sharing validate their natural kinship or become created kinsmen as a consequence of these nurturant acts. It follows from this that persons who do not continue to nurture each other may cease to recognize each other as kin (compare Carroll 1968:7, 1970b:147; Smith 1977:477-478). For Trukese, then, kinship is “active”—it must be sustained by continuing nurturant behaviors.

To judge from the literature, GTS is not alone in giving primacy to performance and code for conduct in determining who is and is not a relative. For instance, Nukuoro (Carroll 1968, 1970b), Navajo (Witherspoon 1975), Marshallese (Rynkiewich 1974), Fore (Glasse 1969), Palauans (Smith 1977), and American Blacks (Kennedy 1976) are all reported to define kinsmen primarily on the basis of performance. Rynkiewich’s statement concerning Marshallese holds equally well for Trukese:

individuals determine the identity of kinsmen not only by genealogical linkage, but by behavior as well. Thus, when someone acts like a kinsman, he is often treated as one. Conversely, some people may not be called relatives although they are related by blood ties. They simply do not behave as kinsmen should (Rynkiewich 1974:131-132, my emphasis).

Figure 1 presents a model of the universe of persons encountered by any Trukese.
Some of these persons have no relationship with Ego, others have various kinds of mild relationships with Ego, and a few have intensive interpersonal relationships with Ego. Ego's connections with specific individuals in this universe of persons are always in flux. At any moment some will be waxing (for example, a new pwiipwi tie), others waning (for example, ties with one's consanguines when one enters a new lineage in another community via clientship), and yet others will be momentarily "in balance." All relationships in Figure 1 may be brought closer, maintained, or extinguished by Ego's conscious manipulation of nurturant acts. Thus the nature of nurture determines the quality of interpersonal relationships and the span and effectiveness of everyone's kinship universe.

It is important to emphasize that few persons are fixed permanently in one place in Figure 1—the possibility for altering most relationships always exists whether or not such alteration actually takes place. New persons may be drawn into the center ellipse of intensive interpersonal relationships and others may be expelled from it; the same thing is true for the circles of natural and created kinship. For example, an adoptive child or a new pwiipwi will be immediately drawn into an intensive interpersonal relationship with Ego. In like manner, a spouse, a pwiipwi, or even a uterine sibling who consistently fails to be nurturant may be "divorced" and the relationship broken off.

The outermost circle in Figure 1 represents the realm of strangers, that is, persons with whom Ego has no relationship. In a small community like Namoluk, no one in the entire population is a stranger, but Namoluk persons venturing off the island will encounter strangers. On larger islands in GTS, like Uman Island or Satawan Atoll, individuals will encounter persons from other communities on the same island or atoll with whom they are unacquainted, and in the urban port town on Moen Island no Trukese knows everyone else. Whether they hail from Tol, Palau, or California, strangers represent an untapped resource: they are persons who potentially may become acquaintances, friends, or even kin. In the words of a Hallmark "Charmers" cartoon: "strangers are friends we haven't met." As a Trukese matures and ventures away from home—whether for school, work, recreation, or other reasons—he meets strangers and establishes relationships with them. In this way persons are brought from the outer circle of Figure 1 into the inner circles.

Many strangers become chiachi “companions,” “acquaintances,” at which point they move into the acquaintanceship circle. Typically, this sort of relationship is struck up between former strangers who become classmates at the district high schools or between co-workers on Moen. Chiachi are persons frequently seen together. They have no specific code for conduct obliging them to care for one another (although they may do so); they simply “run around together.” Chiachi relationships are like many “friendships” in the United States although they do not begin to approach what Americans call a “best friend” relationship.

Strangers can be recruited directly as pwiipwi without first passing through a chiachi relationship. This is shown by the arrows going from the outer circle directly into the created kinship/friendship circle in Figure 1. Direct establishment of a pwiipwi relationship between former strangers is not as common as the formation of a pwiipwi tie between chiachi, but it does occur. In either case, the individual who is on his “home turf” initiates the transaction by suggesting that he and the outsider become pwiipwi and by taking his new relative to his home where their newly founded relationship is announced to everyone. Outsiders do not propose forging a pwiipwi bond because they are away from home and natal kin and hence cannot begin and sustain nurturing behaviors as easily.

The acquaintanceship circle includes several types and gradations of relationships. All
acquaintances are persons with whom Ego has at least a passing relationship, but he may have very little information about some of them. He may know only their name and place of work or their home community, for example. Practically speaking, Ego has no meaningful relationship with such individuals. Typically, they exchange pleasantries but nothing more. Others found in the acquaintanceship circle, however, are persons with whom Ego does have significant ties. These range from somewhat transitory and emotionally shallow relationships like fellow student or co-worker, all the way through more lasting ties like fellow islander,26 neighbor, business partner, fellow church or club member. Common to all acquaintanceships is a tacit agreement to maintain a certain reserve and distance. Intimate details of private lives are not shared by persons who interact at this level. There is an air of impermanence and “minimal investment” about most acquaintanceships.

Many acquaintances interact only in restricted contexts (for example, on the job or at church) and do not share leisure hours with each other. Likewise, whereas friends are always chosen, many acquaintances are simply acquired along with one’s several social identities. For instance, one does not normally choose one’s co-workers, he simply “inherits” them along with the job. In the United States acquaintances provide a pool of potential friends; in cultural settings like GTS acquaintances provide a pool of potential kinsmen as well.

The circles in Figure 1 labeled natural kinship and created kinship/friendship each contain a continuum. Graphically and conceptually, these continua lie at the very heart of the model. Running through the middle of Figure 1 is a heavy black line, in the center of which is a vertical line. The two continua run from the outermost ends of the heavy black line to the vertical line in the center ellipse, juxtaposed end-to-end. Moving from the outside toward the center along either of these continua, the following qualities progressively increase: (1) the degree of commitment to the relationship; (2) the amount of sharing; (3) the amount of “love” and diffuse solidarity; and (4) the amount of shared biogenetic substance (in the case of natural kin) or the amount of shared biographical experience (in the case of created kin/friends). In other words, moving toward the center along either continuum, the code for conduct specifying nurturance, sharing, and “brotherly love” becomes more intense and more binding.27

The continuum that runs toward the center of the natural kinship circle is marked off by different categories of kin. As one approaches the center of the diagram toward relationships characterized by increasing amounts of nurturance, one moves from more distant and inclusive natural kin categories to closer and more exclusive ones: from clan (or father’s clan) to subclan (or father’s subclan) to lineage (or father’s lineage) to parent-child relationships. Finally, as all who have worked in GTS have stressed, at the inner end of the natural kinship continuum lie the strongest relationships of all: those among uterine siblings.

Matters are not quite so clearcut in the realm of created kinship. Most māārāār ties are analogous to clan ties. They involve diffuse obligations of hospitality and mutual recognition of kinship but little more. Client relationships, however, run the gamut from simple acknowledgment of such persons as kin all the way through intense bonds of commitment reinforced by pwiiplw and/or adoptive ties. In like fashion, Ego’s pwiiplw relationships may be growing closer, fading off, or stabilized at a point along the continuum of commitment. Thus client and pwiiplw ties can range from relationships that require little commitment of self all the way through the most intense and binding sorts of links among persons. For this reason it is not possible to partition these ties in the diagram in the same way as the consanguineal data.

Most persons who become pwiiplw already have some sort of relationship with each
other as classmates, workmates, fellow islanders, or the like. Creating a *pwiipwi* tie makes a nonobligatory, somewhat ephemeral relationship over into an obligatory intensive one. Informants all were emphatic that *pwiipwi* are “more than friends.”

Most other created kinship ties are established between persons who already know each other at least peripherally. Thus clients, spouses, and some *māārāār* frequently are recruited from the acquaintanceship circle in Figure 1. Most *māārāār* and some clients are recruited from the circle of natural kinship into the circle of created kinship.

Few adoptions come about in the same manner since most adoptees are already linked to their adopters by natural kinship ties. Adoption is different from the other kinds of created kinship in that adoptive relationships nearly always fall into the area of intensive interpersonal relations. Most adopted persons are taken as infants (often right after weaning), and the ties that develop between adoptive children and their adoptive parents in all ways parallel the ties that grow up between natural parents and their offspring. Thus adoptive parent-child links occupy the right-hand edge of the innermost ellipse in Figure 1, just as natural parent-child ties occupy the left-hand edge. Trukese say that adoptive siblings are as close as natural siblings. Hence these relationships, like those among natural siblings, fall into the ellipse containing “intensive interpersonal relationships.”

I mentioned earlier that affinal ties appear to have much in common with created kinship and friendship in GTS and it is now appropriate to return to this matter. Affinal relationships are located in the created kinship/friendship circle (see Tables 1 and 2 and Figure 1) because marital bonds and the other relationships that flow from them are “created” by nonphysiological human actions, just as are other ties of created kinship. Grouping marriage with clientship, adoption, *māārāār*, and *pwiipwi* relationships clarifies the similarities among all these humanly constructed ties. All these relationships may be used to make kin out of nonkin; all have the potential for becoming very intense long-term ties of commitment and mutual succor rivaling consanguineal connections; all may also be dropped or destroyed if either party feels the relationship is not working out satisfactorily; some (most particularly adoptive, *pwiipwi*, and a few spouse ties) become part of the most intensive set of interpersonal relationships in which any Trukese participates. Affinal relationships have been placed more or less midway along the continuum of commitment in Figure 1 because other ties usually take precedence for Trukese. The only affinal bond that occasionally enters the area of intensive interpersonal relations is that between spouses, and even here sibling ties typically take the upper hand. In fact, the divided loyalties Trukese have between their siblings and their spouses are a widely recognized source of marital discord.

To summarize (as Figure 1 clearly shows), the core of Trukese kinship consists primarily of sibling ties and secondarily of parent-child bonds. Significantly, even at its core, Trukese kinship balances biogenetic ties with created ties of kinship/friendship. Uterine siblings find their counterpart in *pwiipwi* and adoptive siblings: natural parents and children have their created counterpart in adoptive parents and children. The most important kinship relationships for any Trukese are those he has with his natural and created siblings, parents, and children, which are all governed by the code of “brotherly love.”

Like any other social system, Trukese society contains a limited set of relationships to which individuals feel a very strong sense of commitment, which are characterized by a high degree of affect and sharing and which endure over time. In GTS, these “intensive interpersonal relationships” generally include some or all of the following features: intense commitment, complete trust, diffuse reciprocal obligations coupled with explicit rights and duties, intimacy, confidentiality, privateness, and regular,
unquestioning mutual aid, support, and cooperation. Features such as these receive expression in different cultures in a variety of distinct ways, but they all reduce to one central idea: sharing. This includes the sharing of time, things and thoughts, and these, in turn, are represented symbolically by a broad range of possibilities. Shared substance, shared residence, shared food, shared land, shared locale, common names, and a variety of other alternatives have been selected by different cultures to symbolize the essence of “intensive interpersonal relationships.” No matter what symbols are chosen, however, one thing remains constant: close significant personal relationships involve the concept of sharing. Recognition of this directs our attention away from the traditional view where only one symbol of sharing—shared genealogy—has been taken as viable for a cross-cultural definition of kinship and turns our sights instead toward sharing relationships as these are expressed through a variety of culturally specific symbolic and interactive media.

What is common to kinship, then, is not shared physical substance alone, but the concept of sharing itself. Once we understand which media must be shared in what ways for kinship to exist in any given culture, we shall understand what kinship “is” in that single ethnographic case. When we go on to examine the shared media that define kinship in many different cultures, we shall be in a position to distill from these studies certain recurring themes (for example, blood, land) that combine in various ways to give us the complex skein we call kinship and friendship in human societies.

Numerous statements in the published record for GTS indicate that close consanguineal kin share many different things, from blood to land to residence to a variety of material possessions to a preponderance of everyday tasks. Such persons also share most of the children who are adopted in GTS. Turning to the much less extensive commentary on created kinship/friendship, one discovers enough clues to support an argument that created kin share most of the same sorts of things in the same sorts of ways as consanguines. This supports the thesis that what is central to kinship is not shared genealogy alone but sharing itself.

A look at some of the things shared by pwiipwi should suffice to make the point. Gladwin and Sarason observe that pwiipwi share activities and escapades (1953:50), clothing, food, possessions, loves, and time together (1953:96), mutual support in times of crisis (1953:97, compare also 96, 162), wives (1953:102, 140; compare Lessa 1962:350), hospitality and gifts (1953:140-141), looking out for one another’s interests (1953:144), and support in times of need (1953:274). Others have noted that pwiipwi ties form the basis for some adoptions (Tolerton and Rauch n.d.:39; Marshall; field notes; compare also Lessa 1950:64, writing about the related society of Ulithi Atoll), and that pwiipwi share mwëngë “resources” at least occasionally (Marshall; field notes). Other statements in the literature express these points more generally:

Such “brothers” share more freely with each other in all respects than do actual brothers. . . . Such sharing is of course also the prerogative of actual brothers, but it appears to be much less freely accomplished (Gladwin and Sarason 1953:96).

Actual blood relationship through either the father or the mother, or a genuine community of interest or close friendship, provides greater claims on mutual assistance and hospitality than does common sib membership alone (Goodenough 1951:83-84; my emphasis; compare note 29).

Established pwiipwi ties are symbolically and interactionally indistinguishable from ties among consanguineal siblings, although this should not be taken to mean that
Trukese cannot distinguish between these relationships if asked to do so. All sibling relationships—natural or created—involves the height of sharing and ttong “feelings of strong sentimental attachment.”

The word ttong is important here. It carries many of the connotations of the English word “love” when applied to the realm of kinship (see Schneider 1968): “the word for love and pity (ttong) are [sic] the same in the Trukese language, and both feelings seem to evoke similar responses in that the person who feels pity will also attempt to care for the object of this feeling” (Fischer 1950:73). One expresses one’s love through overt acts—by taking care of the object of such feelings. In Trukese kinship, actions speak louder than words; ttong must be demonstrated by nurturant acts. Trukese kinship pivots on the fulcrum of nurturance, a fact partially understood by Ruth Goodenough (1970:331) who noted the “intense concentration on problems of nurture—taking care of and being cared for by others” in GTS. Nurture is the nature of Trukese kinship. Trukese kinsmen try to be “their brother’s keeper” and in so doing give meaning to their relationships, consanguineal and created, through acts of “brotherly love.”

Conclusion

Previously when we anthropologists have encountered persons calling themselves kin who have not fit our preconceived notion of what kinship is, namely, shared biological connections among persons, we have said that “real” kinship does not exist. On this account the ethnographic record is strewn with discussions of “artificial,” “fictive,” “play,” and “as if” relationships, and we have yet to deal adequately with friendship. As this paper and a growing literature demonstrate, a more open-minded view of what constitutes kinship in different ethnographic settings goes a long way toward eliminating problematic “fictive” relationships. Viewed from a culture’s own perspective, whether it be the Trukese, the Navajo (Witherspoon 1975), the Yapese (Labby 1976), the Banabans (Silverman 1971), the Balinese (Geertz and Geertz 1975), or the Americans (Schneider 1968), kinship relationships all make sense within their own cultural setting, and the natives do not have to resort to tags like “artificial” to describe their own system. But a major criticism of this “cultural” or “symbolic” approach to the study of kinship has been that it effectively eliminates the possibility of conducting meaningful cross-cultural comparisons, despite Schneider’s (1972:48) plea that “symbols and meanings can be compared just as easily as modes of family organization, the roles of seniors to juniors, or the methods of agriculture.”

What is common to kinship in all societies is sharing. Such sharing is symbolized in many different ways and expressed through a host of varying behaviors. Americans place major emphasis on the symbolism of shared biogenetic substance that derives from acts of sexual intercourse (Schneider 1968). For Banabans, the act of sharing land is symbolically equivalent to sharing biogenetic substance, and thus Silverman (1971) discusses what he calls the “blood and mud” view of kinship. Labby (1976) describes a somewhat similar “dialectic” in which the interplay between human beings and land estates defines the kinship universe for any Yapese. Balinese are mainly concerned with the symbolism surrounding acts of shared worship at a temple site as at least one major and important definition of kinship (Geertz and Geertz 1975). Navajo let acts of helping, protecting, and sharing define kinship: “where this kind of solidarity exists, kinship exists; where it does not exist, there is no kinship” (Witherspoon 1975:22). Trukese kinship consists in part of shared biogenetic substance. It also consists in part of shared land and similar resources. Shared biography and shared understandings about mutually created bonds likewise figure importantly in Trukese kinship. Common to all this is
ttong, the code for conduct, the belief that persons who take care of and nurture each other prove their kinship in the process. That such nurturant relationships overlay natural kinship relationships much of the time is beside the point: in Trukese kinship nurture is more than nature.

Schneider has argued that symbols and meanings are as easy to compare as anything else. But I believe that if we want to compare kinship systems cross-culturally without radically distorting them in the process we shall have to focus on what he calls "code for conduct." We must give our attention to the actions that symbolize kinship in any cultural setting. An approach to kinship that recognizes the universality of sharing behaviors and norms for those behaviors permits us to sustain the crucial anthropological enterprise of comparison and generalization while at the same time it allows us to exploit the important insights into the nature of kinship to be gained from the cultural approach.

In borrowing Schneider's (1972) rhetorical question, "what is kinship all about?," I offer this answer: kinship cross-culturally is all about intensive interpersonal relationships of commitment and diffuse enduring solidarity demonstrated through recurrent acts of sharing and nurturance and symbolized by a variety of culture-specific media. By focusing on these acts and relationships we shall be able to throw off the genealogical yoke and reach a closer approximation to what kinship is all about.

notes

1 This paper draws on data gathered while I conducted fieldwork in two different communities in Greater Trukese Society: on Namoluk Atroll and in Peniyese Village on Moen Island, Truk. The Namoluk research took place for eighteen months between 1969 and 1971, supported by a grant and fellowship from the National Institute of Mental Health (MH11871-01 and MH42666-01) and by the Department of Anthropology, University of Washington. The Peniyese study was carried on for seven months during 1976 with a Faculty Research Assignment from the University of Iowa and a grant from the American Philosophical Society, Johnson Fund. I am most grateful for all of this research support. Helpful critical comments on an earlier draft of this paper were provided by Ward H. Goodenough and Michael A. Rynkiewich, and Leslie B. Marshall assisted with data collection. Hereafter abbreviated as GTS, Greater Trukese Society refers to all of the island communities in Truk District, U.S. Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands (Micronesia). For ease of exposition I shall refer to all persons in GTS as "Trukese."

2 As a crude measure of the amount of anthropological attention GTS has received, thirteen Ph.D. dissertations and four Master's theses have been completed based on fieldwork conducted since World War II. In addition, at least three more doctoral dissertations are in preparation.

3 Māarā reit "my distant biogenetic and created kin" or, better, "my relatives" is synonymous with pacheriei in the dialects of Trukese spoken in Truk proper. Neither of these words is part of the language spoken in the Mortlock Islands, that part of GTS consisting of the low islands from Nama to Satawan stretching off to the southeast of Truk Lagoon. In the Mortlocks the term cognate with māarā reit and pacheriei is aramasei, although the Truk Lagoon terms are understood by Mortlockese and vice versa. I shall use the word māarā in referring to such relationships all over GTS to avoid confusion with previously published material.

4 Goodenough (1951:102) defined the futuk as a modification of the bilateral kindred (as defined by Rivers). Subsequent research in GTS has shown this definition to be in error. The futuk corresponds in all particulars to a subclan: "it is a group of people, arrayed in two or more lineages, who maintain a belief of being 'descended from one woman' in the comparatively recent past, although the exact genealogical relationship has been forgotten" (Marshall 1976a:37).

5 Significantly, neither of us thought to ask about possible created kinship ties that may have existed between the two sets of parents in these transactions.

6 Siblingship is of special importance in all Micronesian (and for that matter, all Oceanic) kinship systems. Writing about Micronesia as a whole, Mason (1968:286) observes: "generally the brother-sister bond is the strongest, marked by affection, obligation, and restraint. The tie between siblings of the same sex, also strong, is frequently the structural basis for extended families."

7 I happen to think it useful in comparative studies to retain analytical distinctions between these concepts, but I do not believe we should assume a priori that our analytic distinctions represent
cultural reality. Whether or not they do is an empirical question to be investigated through careful field research.

Taken literally, *pwiipwi* means “my created sibling of the same sex” and refers to same-sex relationships only; opposite-sex created sibling relationships are properly referred to as *mwomwongey* “my opposite-sex created sibling.” Although these distinctions by sex can be made, Trukese normally use the term *pwiipwi* to talk about all created sibling relationships regardless of the participants’ sex, and this is how I shall employ the word. *Pwiipwi* also has another sense when used between persons of opposite sex: “sweetheart.” In this slang sense the word connotes sexual intimacy or the desire for same, which is, of course, the opposite of proper sibling behavior. As such it figures in young men’s “sweet talk,” in love letters, and in *itenipwin* “love songs” (for more on these aspects of Trukese culture see Fischer and Swartz 1960; Goodenough 1949). An example from American English where a word takes on its opposite meaning in slang usage (“tough” used to describe a soft, delectable female, as in, “man, she’s really tough!”) should suffice to show that this verbal play with the word *pwiipwi* is not that unusual. I shall not be concerned with the slang meaning of *pwiipwi* in this paper.

The use of such terms actually extends beyond the confines of GTS to include the large Mortlockese community on Ponape and some of the atoll communities in the eastern portion of Yap District.

For example, Trukese would consider it useful to do this if a *maaaraar* relationship were to be created among distant patrilateral kin.

While the published literature maintains that *pwiipwi* relationships are much more common among males than females, this situation seems to be changing. Strictly in terms of statistical incidence, male-male *pwiipwi* relationships probably always have been more common because males have been the more mobile sex in GTS. With alterations now occurring in female role behavior, particularly in the port town on Moen, women are achieving a new mobility and with this has come an increase in the number of female-female *pwiipwi* ties. My informants all state that it is just as possible for two women to form a *pwiipwi* bond as for two men to do so, although they agree that cross-sex *pwiipwi* relationships are a bit less common than either of the other two possibilities.

Goodenough has correctly pointed out that “brothers and sisters are anything but intimate in most aspects of their behavior, yet they consider themselves extremely close kin and observe the taboos and obligations between them most scrupulously” (1951:100). The same is true for opposite-sex *pwiipwi*.

Although I have not yet discussed affinal kinship as created kinship, I wish to note here that marriage, like clientship, adoption, *maaaraar*, and *pwiipwi* relationships, provides Trukese persons with a way for expanding their effective kin universe. I shall return to this matter below.

This ignores the fact that affinal kinship ties frequently are terminated by divorce in Western societies, although I recognize that not all persons in American culture consider “in-laws” to be “relatives” (see Schneider 1968:21). Client members are usually (but not always) initially incorporated into their new kin group as *pwiipwi* of one or more sponsors. Hence sometimes *pwiipwi* ties and client ties overlap.

The “hospitality” aspect of *pwiipwi* ties for Trukese who find themselves away from their home communities has assumed a new importance in recent years as more and more persons from GTS have immigrated to the urban center on Moen Island. Bereft of a wide network of genealogical kin in the port town, many outer islanders have been pulled into networks of created kin with persons from communities in Truk Lagoon.

Some communities in GTS (especially in the Mortlocks) encourage preferential bilateral cross-cousin marriage (see, for example, Marshall 1972, 1976b). In such communities, children of cross-sex *pwiipwi* are encouraged to marry in keeping with the preferential rule.

Ann Fischer (1950:23) has summed it up eloquently: “you can be absolutely sure that a person who stands in this relationship to you will keep your secrets, deny your sins, however real they may be, and share with you without question all that he has with no expectation of repayment.”

Gladwin and Sarason’s interpretation of the function of *pwiipwi* relationships in GTS receives support in a brief note on the same practice in the closely related societies of the Central and Western Carolines: “my interpretation of the function of this arrangement is that it provides a much needed outlet from the rigid demands of the kinship system, particularly since the choice of a friend is purely voluntary. The friends have many of the rights and obligations of brothers without feeling caged in by them” (Lessa 1962:350).

The above discussion should convince Pitt-Rivers (1973:95) and other doubting Thomases “that genuine kin-status can be acquired other than by birth or by adoption in infancy.” In GTS persons who *sinei ffengen* “recognize or create mutual kinship ties” are “genuine kin.”

By natural or biogenetic kinship I refer explicitly to the concept of persons bound together by shared genetic substance as a consequence of descent from a common ancestor. Trukese also
conceive of natural kinship in this manner.

22 Table 1 separates relatives into either consanguines or created kin for analytical purposes, but it must be remembered that in the Trukese kinship system these two divisions actually overlap. Recall, for example, that most adoptive kin already are consanguines of the adopter, and similarly, that mārār and clients frequently already have a distant biogenetic link. Having noted this, I hasten to stress again that biogenetic ties are not a sine qua non for these kinds of created kinship relationships and moreover, that biogenetic ties rarely figure in affinal or pwiipwi relationships. The only major exception to this statement is in those communities (principally in the Mortlocks) that practice preferential cross-cousin marriage.

23 Having stated this I must admit to knowing of no case where natural parent-child ties were extinguished in GTS because sufficient nurturant acts were not performed. I do, however, have case material where other nuclear family ties (those between natural siblings) have been extinguished on these grounds. Consistent failure by natural kin to nurture each other, though infrequent, does occur in GTS. Trukese view such failure as “unnatural” and as one of the most morally reprehensible things a person can do, and it constitutes grounds for severing the kinship relationship. In such cases the “rejected” person will probably flee his natural kin and establish a new kinship identity in another community via created kinship.

24 In this way Trukese kinship is like American friendship.

25 The cognate word in Mortlockese is filafel, which derives from the same root as the verb filata “to choose.”

26 For some persons in GTS the fellow islander category may be coterminous with membership in a single community (for example, Namoluk), and in such cases all members of the community may be able to trace at least distant kinship connection with each other. More typically, however, islands in GTS are divided into several distinct communities (or districts). Where this is so, persons from different communities are much less likely to have any kind of kinship connection. Nonetheless, “fellow islander” remains an important identity for Trukese vis-à-vis persons from other islands (see Caughey 1971 for a good discussion of this).

27 While kinsmen who are not genealogically close may be emotionally close, the former generally have more “kin feeling” for each other than those more distantly related. Hence one would expect to find close blood relatives (for example, parents, siblings, and children) and close affines (for example, spouse) clustered toward the center of such a model for most ethnographic cases, with more distant consanguines and affines falling at various points along the continua from the close to the distant ends. Thus the natural kinship continuum approximates the degree of genealogical removal from Ego, on the assumption that this is reflected in the quality of Ego’s relationships with near and distant kin.

28 A major problem confronted by the anthropological literature on friendship has been how to distinguish “close” or “best” friends from a range of more casual ones. No satisfactory solution has been offered to this dilemma, although most writers on the subject note that the differences among kinds of friends have mainly to do with variance in the affective quality of friendships. The model represented in Figure 1 handles this by assuming that it is possible to distinguish relationships like pwiipwi according to their emotional tone and by the degree and intensity of commitment they engender in their participants. It is possible to obtain both normative statements about ideal friendship relationships and actual observational case material on friendship behavior when conducting anthropological research, and such data allow one to make the sorts of discriminations that are contained in the model. The continua in both the natural kinship circle and the created kinship/friendship circle, then, represent qualitative differences in the nature of interpersonal relationships, and these continua rest on the assumption that it is possible for such qualitative differences to be measured ordinally by the anthropologist.

29 That this is so is also shown clearly in Ruth Goodenough’s example of a male informant’s statement concerning those who would have the greatest difficulty in refusing an adoption request:

Those who would find it most difficult to refuse would be his own siblings or a close personal friend with whom he had a strong “brother” relationship. Next in order would be the members of his own matrilineal lineage. The third group in this descending scale would be the close members of his father’s lineage and below these he placed the more remote members of his father’s lineage, along with the children of the men of his own lineage. He would have much less leverage with more distant members of his matrilineal sib, who presumably would find it easier to refuse his request (Ruth Goodenough 1970:317; my emphasis).

Clearly this informant’s most intensive interpersonal relationships are with his uterine and created siblings (compare Figure 1).

30 This should not be confused with what Brady (1976b:9-10) calls “sibling adoptions.” As I use the term, adoptive siblings become siblings by consequence of a parent-child adoption. For
example, should a couple with a natural child adopt a second child, the two children become what I call adoptive siblings. This also should not be confused with the *pwiipwi* relationship.

31 Similarities between marriage and “friendship” seem to be widespread in Pacific Island societies. Both Finney (1964) and Gunson (1964) draw attention to this in their discussions of bond friendship in Tahiti, and Firth (1936) at least hints at a parallel situation on Tikopia. Ann Fischer (1950:23) says that *pwiipwi* relationships in GTS are “idealized in a manner which can be likened to the husband-wife relationship in America.” This whole area would profit from further investigation by Pacific scholars.

32 Numerically, the kinship universe of most Trukese consists of more consanguineal kin than created kin. This is because the network of consanguines is “given” at birth while the network of created kin is built up over a lifetime. Perhaps it is as much for this reason as for a bias toward biogenetic ties that we have slighted the realm of created kinship in GTS. But whatever the case this statistical superiority of consanguineal kinship must not blind us to the broader view of kinship that we must adopt if we are to grasp the fullness of the Trukese view of kinship and how it relates to “friendship.”

33 Most of us who have gathered land tenure histories for communities in GTS have viewed these strictly or largely from a genealogical paradigm (see, for example, Marshall 1972). I suspect that many apparent “anomalies” in the transmission of “resources” from one person to another in my data from Namoluk will turn out not to be anomalous at all when greater information about the parties to these transactions is at hand. Many nongenealogically related persons who obtain “resources” from one another will probably turn out to be created kin.
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appendix A. notes on figure 1.

a Many members of the same clan are strangers who have never met. Mutual recognition of their common clan membership provides the basis for a relationship and may move them either into the circle of natural kinship or into that of created kinship/friendship (as māārār). 

b As portrayed in the natural kinship circle, clan, subclan, and lineage represent both matrilineal and patrilineal relationships. It is a general rule that matrilineal ties are stronger and take precedence over patrilineal ones in GTS (see Marshall 1976a, 1976b). It is assumed that Ego’s ties with members of his own matrilineage normally are closer than with members of his own matriclan, and similarly, that his afakūr bonds are closer with members of his father’s lineage than with members of his father’s clan.

c The pwiipwi ties located within the ellipse of intensive interpersonal relationships are those that have blossomed and endured over time; some pwipli bonds never achieve this degree of mutual commitment.
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