

theory. On July 21–3, 2000, the first annual Neuro-psychoanalysis Conference was held in London entitled *Neuropsychology and Psychoanalytic Perspectives on Emotions*, addressed by the world authorities Jaak Panksepp, Antonio Damasio, and Mark Solms, and introduced by Oliver Sacks. The meeting was a heartening success, and the compatibility between the findings of the two disciplines was seen to be remarkable.

All references to Freud, other than those in the bibliography, are to the *Standard Edition of the Complete Psychological Works of Sigmund Freud* (1953–74) Strachey J (ed.) 24 Vols. Hogarth, London. For specific volumes and page numbers see Vol. 24.

See also: Adorno, Theodor W (1903–69); Allport, Gordon W (1897–1967); Bleuler, Eugen (1857–1939); Bowlby, John (1907–90); Defense Mechanisms; Dreaming, Neural Basis of; Ego Psychology and Psychoanalysis; Erikson, Erik Homburger (1902–94); Foucault, Michel (1926–84); Hypnosis, Psychiatry of; Hysteria; Janet, Pierre (1859–1947); Jung, Carl Gustav (1875–1961); Mead, George Herbert (1863–1931); Mental Health and Normality; Nosology in Psychiatry; Pavlov, Ivan Petrovich (1849–1936); Personality Development in Childhood; Personality Theories; Psychiatry, History of; Psychoanalysis: Adolescence (Clinical–Developmental Approach); Psychoanalysis: Current Status; Psychoanalysis, History of; Psychoanalysis in Clinical Psychology; Psychoanalysis in Sociology; Psychoanalysis: Overview; Psychological Treatment, Effectiveness of; Psychological Treatments, Empirically Supported; Psychology: Historical and Cultural Perspectives; Sexual Perversions (Paraphilias)

### Bibliography

- Abraham H C, Freud E L (eds.) 1965 *A Psycho-analytic Dialogue: The Letters of Sigmund Freud and Karl Abraham*. Hogarth, London
- Breuer J 1882 Report to Bellevue Sanatorium, Kreuzlingen, on Bertha Pappenheim. In: Hirschmüller A (ed.) (1989) *The Life and Work of Joseph Breuer*. New York University Press, New York
- Breuer J, Freud S 1893 *On the Psychical Mechanism of Hysterical Phenomena: A Preliminary Communication*. Hogarth, London
- Breuer J, Freud S 1895 *Studies on Hysteria*. Hogarth, London
- Eissler K R 1977 Comments on penis envy and orgasm in women. *Psychoanalytic Study of the Child* 32: 29–83
- Ellenberger H F 1972 The story of 'Anna O': A critical review with new data. *Journal of the History of the Behavioral Sciences* 8: 267–79
- Freud S 1891b *Zur Auffassung der Aphasien* [trans. Stengel E as *On Aphasia* 1953]. Imago, London
- Freud S 1932 Letter to Stefan Zweig, June 2, 1932. In: Freud E L (ed.) *Letters of Sigmund Freud, 1873–1939*. Hogarth, London
- Freud S 1954 The Origins of Psycho-analysis: Letters to Wilhelm Fliess, drafts and notes: 1887–1902. (Bonaparte M, Freud A, Kris E (eds.) Imago, London

- Freud S 1987 *A Phylogenetic Fantasy*. (Grubrich-Simitis I (ed.) Belknap, Cambridge, MA
- Freud S, Andreas-Salome L 1972 *Letters* [trans. Robson-Scott W, Robson-Scott E]. Hogarth, London
- Gay P 1988 *Freud: A Life for Our Time*. Dent, London and Melbourne
- Hirschmüller A 1989 *The Life and Work of Joseph Breuer: Physiology and Psychoanalysis*. New York University Press, New York
- Jackson J H 1884 Evolution and dissolution of the nervous system. In: Taylor J (ed.) *Selected Writings of John Hughlings Jackson*. Basic Books, New York
- Jones E 1953 *Sigmund Freud: Life and Work*. Hogarth, London, Vol. 1
- Jones E 1955 *Sigmund Freud: Life and Work*. Hogarth, London, Vol. 2
- Jones E 1957 *Sigmund Freud: Life and Work*. Hogarth, London, Vol. 3
- Kaufmann W 1980 *Discovering the Mind*, 3 Vols. McGraw-Hill, New York
- Luria A R 1979 *The Making of Mind: A Personal Account of Soviet Psychology*. Harvard University Press, Cambridge, MA
- McGuire W (ed.) 1974 *The Freud/Jung Letters* [trans. Manheim R, Hull R E C]. Hogarth & Routledge, London
- Masson J M (ed.) 1985 *The Complete Letters of Sigmund Freud to Wilhelm Fliess: 1887–1904*. Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, Cambridge, MA
- Shengold L 1993 *'The Boy Will Come to Nothing!' Freud's Ego Ideal and Freud as Ego Ideal*. Yale University Press, New Haven, CT
- Solms M 1997 *The Neuropsychology of Dreaming: A Clinico-Anatomical Study*. Erlbaum, Mahwah, NJ
- Solms M, Nercessian E 1999 Freud's theory of affect: Questions for neuroscience. *Neuro-psychoanalysis* 1: 5–14
- Wallerstein R S 1988 One psychoanalysis or many? *International Journal of Psycho-analysis* 69: 5–21
- Wallerstein R S 1990 Psychoanalysis: The common ground. *International Journal of Psycho-analysis* 71: 3–20
- Yorke C 1992 *Freud's impact on the twentieth century*. Paper read to the Freud Literary Heritage Foundation, New York, October 6
- Yorke C 1995 Freud's psychology: Can it survive? *Psycho-analytic Study of the Child* 50: 3–31
- Yorke C, Wiseberg S, Freeman T 1989 *Development and Psychopathology: Studies in Psychoanalytic Psychiatry*. Yale University Press, New Haven, CT

C. Yorke

## Friendship, Anthropology of

Friendship is an informal social relationship. Contrary to kinship, it is based on choice and voluntariness: friends are sought and must be won. Friendship is an acquired not an ascribed status. The relationship is often viewed as affective. However, the 'emotional content' of friendship can vary strongly (Paine 1969, p. 507). Mutuality, concerning interest in the relationship, appears to be one important requirement.

In fact, in some societies there exist asymmetrical friendships, sometimes being difficult to distinguish from patronage. Friendship is based on sharing: besides matters of material value friends share their time, their problems, plans, hopes, and thoughts. Therefore, trust and loyalty are basic requirements for friendship (Kennedy 1986, 128 ff.). But this aspect also involves dangers: if friends share secrets, and the friendship is eventually broken off, it can lead to gossip and enmity. Some authors note that generally no fixed role expectations are attached to friendship. But in fact many societies do have well-defined expectations.

From the perspective of comparative social and cultural anthropology it is obvious that besides common core aspects, notions of friendship are highly variable. To this day there is a lack of data concerning the different meanings friends and friendship can have in different societies, and even within one society. Most languages have many terms for friends (in English among others: *pal*, *chum*, *buddy*, *bosom friend*, *old friend/chap*, *acquaintance*, etc.), which differentiate between kinds and meanings of social relationships called 'friendship.' One also finds different concepts of friendship within one society relating to sex, age, social status, as well as the different places or contexts in which friendship takes place, e.g., neighborhood, school, or place of work. The 'growth' of friendship has also been an underestimated aspect in research. A friendship does not only change in the course of time, it also changes due to the period of its existence: after 20 years a friendship, like all other emotional relationships, is no longer the same as it was in the beginning. As Sarah Uhl (1991, p. 90) states, friendship is a type of 'noninstitutionalized institution' distinguished from blood-brotherhood and fictive kinship—overlooking the fact that with a new stage in a life cycle, friendships may be transformed to other more institutionalized relationships like co-parenthood.

### 1. Anthropological Interest in Friendship

Uhl (1991) states that research on friendship is difficult due to the fact that despite its being a public phenomenon, friendship is viewed as private. But the same can be said of marriage, and marriage has been one of the most important topics in anthropology since its beginnings. More probably anthropologists have focused too strongly on kinship (see *Kinship in Anthropology*), thus becoming unaware of sometimes even overlapping concepts of friendship.

Until now most empirical research has been conducted in industrialized societies, and basically there are only few studies by cultural anthropologists. If anthropologists have studied friendship at all, they have concentrated on formal relationships with well-defined mutual obligations such as ritual kinship, exchange, trade, or working relationships. These

anthropological studies—most of them conducted in Southern Europe—overemphasized male friendships and neglected friendships between females (Boissevain 1974, Gilmore 1975). For a long time it was supposed that adult women in particular form their most important social relationships inside the family and with relatives. Different forms of friendship between men are on the other hand an important part of public life. These factors have contributed to the lack of research concerning friendship between women, with the exception of some more recent studies (e.g., Kennedy 1986).

One finds very little information on meanings of friendship in nonindustrial societies. One exception is Thomas Kiefer's work, who in 1968 published a major article on institutionalized friendship and warfare among the Tausug of Jolo, in the Philippines. The Tausug perceive strangers and all people not related by kinship as potential enemies. In this context friendship—formally sworn to by oath on the Koran—is very important for forming alliances between kin groups, as well as, on a higher regional level, between local leaders. These can be former or—should the oath be broken—future enemies. This formal friendship in Tausug society derives its meaning from enmity—friends are allies against common enemies (Kiefer 1968). However, Kiefer's study once again focuses on highly formalized male friendship patterns. Institutionalized and formalized friendship patterns, trade and exchange partnerships, like the bond friendship' (*tau soa*) in Tikopia described by Firth (1967), are still today given priority in studies by cultural anthropologists. On the level of intercultural comparison (including more traditional societies), it would be of importance to investigate the assumed declining significance of kinship and the possibly growing importance of friendship.

### 2. Themes and Methods

Within the realm of anthropological research different dimensions of friendship have been stressed. Eric R. Wolf differentiates between 'emotional' and 'instrumental relations,' which both satisfy a deficit of some kind in each participant of the dyad (1966, 10 ff). The labels emotional/instrumental are somewhat misleading, because both types have a quite instrumental quality. Wolf's approach links friendship with wider societal forms: societies produce different deficits, which different types of friendship respond to. His conception is a useful starting point for further research, embedding friendship in a wider theoretical frame. In that way it differs from Robert Paine's (1969) above-mentioned conception of an emotional, more inward-turning modern middle-class friendship.

Jacobson's approach to research on friendship emphasizes the situational aspect. He is not only concerned with constant friendship and its character-

istics but 'with the labelling process itself, that is, with the situations in which a person gives and takes away the label of "friend".' (Jacobson 1975, p. 225). Both friendship and affiliation with an ethnic group can change depending on the situation. In combination with an examination of group identities, research on friendship could lead to important results in the investigation of interethnic relationships. Friends can be made across ethnic boundaries; besides binding themselves by marriage, people can form alliances between different ethnic groups. An example of the discussion of interethnic relationships in folklore about friendship is given in a story about a Kipsigis and a Masai, who exchange honey and arrows, cheating each other in the process (Dundes 1971, pp. 176–7). Dundes explains that the topic of making and breaking friendship in African societies is a common motif in narratives. In a story about a crippled and a blind person, for example, who join forces during an attack by enemies, the latter takes the first on his back and runs, while the crippled person directs him. No matter whether the failing of a friendship or its advantages are the central theme, exchange is always the constituent core of the described relationship. The different motifs in African narratives show the conflict between social norms and actual behavior. This discrepancy between a value system and behavior is another aspect of friendship that has not yet been thoroughly studied.

Reina (1959) discusses two concepts of friendship, existing parallel to one another among Indians and Ladinos in Guatemala. The Ladino term *cuello* means taking up many relationships and alliances, which can change under different circumstances. The Indian concept of friendship implies having only very few friends, who are made during adolescence. This example shows that divergent notions of friendship can prevent close relationships between members of different ethnic groups. But without more detailed descriptions of intraethnic concepts of friendship, studies about cultural differences and interethnic friendship are impossible.

In early network analysis the issue of friendship played an important role (Bott 1957). Network analyses seemed to be appropriate for research about weak institutionalized social relationships in complex societies. Friendship is one possible content of such social relations, but until now research has been restricted mostly to Western industrialized societies (e.g., Allan 1989, Fischer 1982). Analysis of networks of friends in more 'traditional' societies must be preceded by studies which describe who is referred to as a friend, and what kind of different categories of friends exist within a given cultural context. As shown above, it cannot be taken for granted that concepts of anthropologists and informants are congruent. With a better knowledge of the meanings and terms attached to the notion of friendship, network analysis and other quantitative methods might also be applied in inter-

ethnic situations. From the interplay between participation in everyday life, an evaluation of one's own experiences, and a systematic investigation, a more differentiated picture of the ambiguous term 'friendship' could emerge.

### 3. *Fieldwork and Friendship*

Friendship is not only an important research topic, it is also an important relationship during fieldwork (see *Fieldwork in Social and Cultural Anthropology*). The situation regarding friendship between anthropologists and people with whom they live, often for long periods of time, is hardly documented, even though it is quite probable that these are very relevant personal experiences during fieldwork and in some cases they are even the precondition of fieldwork. Exceptions being the articles by Friedman Hansen (1976), Hendry (1992), and Reina (1959). Friendship formed in the course of fieldwork has neither been treated very honestly, nor has it been dealt with systematically in anthropology to this day. Most anthropologists note having made many friends during their fieldwork. In publications it is obligatory to thank all 'friends,' without whom research would have been impossible. In most cases the nature of this friendship is not described, nor is the significance it had for the fieldwork. Therefore, the question of how anthropologists cope with unfamiliar concepts of friendship is left open. Most studies do not make explicit what is meant by friendship, and few authors relate whether friendship with informants is called so from the perspective of the fieldworker or from the emic view. Other intercultural forms of friendship—those between anthropologists and informants are only one special case—have gone unstudied.

In the literature on fieldwork, friendship is sometimes depicted from a very one-sided angle: 'Informants become friends. This creates another dilemma, for it leads to a very instrumental, and often dishonest, approach to friendship. The interest of science demands that you milk your informants. You do this by making them your friends, by exchanging confidences, giving presents, talking for hours about subjects that bore you. Are these friends or scientific objects? The subjects themselves often realize that they are being used. For some fieldworkers the scientific ends justify the means. They have no moral problem. For many others, however, the dilemma remains.' (Boissevain 1985, p. 273)

Other authors warn against making friends with informants on the grounds of possible role conflicts. Spradley, for example, advises anthropologists, repeating the same questions over and over again on their endless quest for explanations, to refrain from bothering their friends with this boring task. Apart from this, however, he has no objection to making friends during fieldwork (Spradley 1979, p. 28).

An exceptionally good account of friendship in the course of fieldwork has been published by Joy Hendry (1992). In detail she describes the changes within the relationship to her Japanese friend that spanned nearly two decades. She also compares, at least marginally, to what extent concepts of who is related to as a friend, as well as expectations regarding how friends should relate to one another, correspond in Great Britain and Japan. Hendry mentions that in Japan it is not possible to bring inequality in line with friendship. As long as she did research in rural Japan, similarities and equality dominated the relationship to her friend Sachiko, who also did not come from a rural area. Later, influenced by their respective cultures, their lives developed differently from one another. Apart from individual changes due to the respective transformations in their lives, i.e., from being students to married mothers of school children, the actual research project nearly caused a breaking off of their friendship. Conflicts arose when Hendry began to study manners of communicating in Sachiko's *nakama* (reference group). She integrated her into the project, which caused Sachiko to have role conflicts within her own *nakama*. However, the author gathered more insight out of this conflict than out of any other contacts with Japanese women. She evaluated her fieldwork experience as one aspect of participant observation—it having been, on the one hand, scientifically successful but personally nearly having led to a loss. The situation became more relaxed when Hendry left Japan, after enough time had elapsed, and she had analyzed and discussed the experience with Sachiko in a number of letters.

The example concerning Guatemaltecan Indians equally shows that friendship in the context of fieldwork may cause problems due to an initial unawareness of cultural differences between notions of friendship. Guatemaltecan Indians have clearly defined expectations regarding friendship, exclusiveness being one criteria for friendship. Ruben E. Reina states that not only his informants, but also those of his wife, terminated relationships, because both anthropologists had also formed contacts to other informants, thus not meeting the expectations of exclusiveness. Only through detailed explanations of why anthropologists carrying out fieldwork must speak to more than one person was the problem solved (Reina 1959, p. 48).

Role conflicts are one of the major topics discussed in writings by anthropologists on friendships formed in the context of fieldwork. In an article by Judith Friedman Hansen (1976), role conflicts are mentioned as the central problem. This is hardly astonishing, since not only during fieldwork but also in other work-related situations friendship can cause conflicts regarding loyalty, possessiveness, and role expectations. At home anthropologists have to play different roles within their families, partnerships, and within academia as well—thus, cross-cutting and intersecting

friendship patterns are not typical of fieldwork alone. The problem is only more obvious and perceived more consciously during fieldwork. Coping with these conflicts requires time, much talking, patience, and a deeper understanding of the rules of the other culture.

*See also:* Friendship: Development in Childhood and Adolescence; Interpersonal Attraction, Psychology of; Interpersonal Trust across the Lifespan; Patron–Client Relationships, Anthropology of

### Bibliography

- Allan G A 1989 *Friendship: Developing a Sociological Perspective*. Westview Press, Boulder, CO
- Boissevain J 1974 *Friends of Friends: Networks, Manipulators and Coalitions*. Basil Blackwell, Oxford, UK
- Boissevain J 1985 Ethnographic fieldwork. In: Kuper A, Kuper J (eds.) *The Social Science Encyclopedia*. Routledge & Kegan Paul, London, pp. 272–4
- Bott E 1957 *Family and Social Network*. Tavistock, London
- Dundes A 1971 The making and breaking of friendship as a standard frame in African folktales. In: Maranda P, Köngäs Maranda E (eds.) *Structural Analysis of Oral Tradition*. University of Pennsylvania Press, Philadelphia, pp. 171–85
- Firth R 1967 [1936] Bond friendship. In: Firth R (ed.) *Tikopia Ritual and Belief*. Allen & Unwin, London, pp. 108–15
- Fischer C S 1982 *To Dwell Among Friends: Personal Networks in Town and City*. University of Chicago Press, Chicago
- Friedman Hansen J 1976 The anthropologist in the field: Scientist, friend, and voyeur. In: Rynkiewicz M A, Spradley J P (eds.) *Ethics and Anthropology. Dilemmas in Fieldwork*. Wiley, New York, pp. 123–34
- Gilmore D C 1975 Friendship in Fuenmayor: Patterns of integration in an atomistic society. *Ethnology* 14: 311–24
- Hendry J 1992 The paradox of friendship in the field: Analysis of a long-term Anglo–Japanese relationship. In: Okely J, Callaway H (eds.) *Anthropology and Autobiography*. Routledge, London
- Jacobson D 1975 Fair-weather friend: Label and context in middle-class friendships. *Journal of Anthropological Research* 31: 225–34
- Kennedy R 1986 Women's friendships on Crete: A psychological perspective. In: Dubisch J (ed.) *Gender and Power in Rural Greece*. Princeton University Press, Princeton, NJ
- Kiefer T 1968 Institutionalized friendship and warfare among the Tausug of Jolo. *Ethnology* 7: 225–44
- Leyton E (ed.) 1974 *The Compact. Selected Dimensions of Friendship*. Newfoundland Social and Economic Papers, No. 3. Memorial University of Newfoundland, Newfoundland
- Paine R 1969 In search of friendship. *Man* 4: 505–24
- Reina R E 1959 Two patterns of friendship in a Guatemalan community. *American Anthropologist* 61: 44–50
- Spradley J P 1979 *The Ethnographic Interview*. Holt, Rinehart and Winston, New York
- Uhl S 1991 Forbidden friends: Cultural veils of female friendship in Andalusia. *American Ethnologist* 18: 90–105
- Wolf E R 1966 Kinship, friendship, and patron–client relations in complex societies. In: Banton M (ed.) *The Social Anthropology of Complex Societies*. Tavistock, London

B. Beer