

University of Pittsburgh- Of the Commonwealth System of Higher Education

Friendship in Fuenmayor: Patterns of Integration in an Atomistic Society

Author(s): David Gilmore

Source: *Ethnology*, Vol. 14, No. 4 (Oct., 1975), pp. 311-324

Published by: [University of Pittsburgh- Of the Commonwealth System of Higher Education](#)

Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/3773234>

Accessed: 22/06/2014 23:02

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of the Terms & Conditions of Use, available at <http://www.jstor.org/page/info/about/policies/terms.jsp>

JSTOR is a not-for-profit service that helps scholars, researchers, and students discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content in a trusted digital archive. We use information technology and tools to increase productivity and facilitate new forms of scholarship. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.



University of Pittsburgh- Of the Commonwealth System of Higher Education is collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to *Ethnology*.

<http://www.jstor.org>

Friendship in Fuenmayor: Patterns of Integration in an Atomistic Society¹

David Gilmore
University of Pennsylvania

Atomistic-type societies are defined as those in which the nuclear family represents "the major structural unit and, indeed, almost the only formalized social entity" (Rubel and Kupferer 1968: 189). Many anthropologists working in social contexts which fit this description have reached the conclusion that there has been an overemphasis on divisiveness in such societies (Galt 1973: 325; cf. Miller 1974). Although most observers would agree that the "amoral familism" (Banfield 1958) and "limited good" (Foster 1965) models are useful for conceptualizing some of the more striking aspects of group dynamics and community attitudes in atomistic societies, there is now an effort underway to delineate the less visible mechanisms which counteract these divisive tendencies and which promote co-operation—necessary to some degree in all societies—between individuals who live in atomistic-type milieux (Piker 1968; E. Cohen 1972; Galt 1973; Miller 1974).

This trend parallels the increasing analytical emphasis which anthropologists involved in community studies are currently placing on the range of microstructural interpersonal relations which nonkin enter into of their own free will in order to satisfy specific cultural needs (Wolf 1966; Honigman 1968) and which reflect what Firth (1951: 35ff) called the optative aspect of social relations. Some examples of this genre of interpersonal relations are "social networks" involving unstructured and potentially limitless groups, "egocentric" coalitions and "non-groups" involving bounded sets (Boissevain 1968), and voluntary "dyadic contracts" involving two individuals (Foster 1961).

One of these loosely ordered relationships has been cited a number of times as a mechanism which hypothetically mitigates atomism—that of friendship (Honigman 1968: 224; cf. Eisenstadt 1956: 94; Foster 1960: 178). The purpose of this paper is to substantiate this inference by showing how friendship works effectively to counteract individual alienation in a classically atomistic community characterized by a lack of alternative dyads like patronage and fictive kinship (Wolf 1966; Foster 1967: 9; Hammel 1968) and to explore more fully the nature and role of friendship in contemporary society. Our discussion is divided into three parts. In the first part, we de-

scribe three different patterns of friendship which are practiced concurrently in a Spanish community, showing how each friendship pattern unfolds on a distinct level of communal social interaction:² the first on the public level of peer-group interaction, the second on the level of household interaction, and the third on the private and purely individual level. In the second part, we show how these three friendship patterns devolve naturally and often sequentially in the life cycle in such a way as to neutralize atomistic isolation for many people. Last, we show how a superordinate ideology of friendship gives rise to correlative personality ideals which fortify and underwrite the informal ties which bind the society together at all levels.

FUENMAYOR: THE CULTURAL SETTING

Fuenmayor³ is a rural community (*pueblo*) of approximately 8,000 people located equidistant between the provincial capitals of Seville and Córdoba in the center of the Guadalquivir River Depression of Southwestern Spain. Seventy-eight per cent of the pueblo's economically active population are engaged in commercial agriculture, mainly the dry-farming of wheat, mill olives, and sunflowers. The rest of the population is involved in subordinate service industries or in the town's political bureaucracy. Pastoral practices—mainly sheep and goat herding—are weakly developed, involving only one per cent of the work force, and there is no important productive enterprise other than agriculture.

In regards to social structure, the people of Fuenmayor have definite ideas and divide their community into three discrete strata which they refer to as classes. Occupying the highest class position are the *señoritos* (little lords), an educated elite group of large landowners who make up one per cent of the total population and who control about 52 per cent of the productive land in the *término*, or municipal territory. Occupying the middle stratum are the *mayetes*, or small-holding cultivators. The *mayetería*, that is, the agrarian middle-class, constitutes about 22 per cent of the total population and controls about 44 per cent of the land in the *término*. Last in status are the *jornaleros*. These are landless day-laborers who work sporadically in the farms of the landowning classes for a daily wage (*jornal*), or who migrate seasonally to other areas in Spain or to Northern Europe to find employment. These rural proletarians make up about 56 per cent of the pueblo's population and control about 2 per cent of the land in the *término*. In addition to these three primary classes, the Fuenmayoreños recognize the existence of a parallel commercial middle-class of shopkeepers which is said to stand apart from the main three-fold class structure.

In this particular area of Southwestern Spain (Martínez-Alier 1971: 314-315), the extreme upper and lower classes are not socially integrated by traditional institutions other than the cash nexus of seasonal agrarian employment. Moreover, longstanding political tensions and class hostilities, exacerbated by memories of local Civil War violence and postwar reprisals, prevent the formation of co-operative informal vertical dyads like "patronage" between rich and poor (Gilmore 1975a; 1975b). Patronage, in fact, is

systematically extended by the rich landowners only to their permanent employees, who represent a tiny fraction of the pueblo's total work force.

Symmetrical social relations (Foster 1961: 1174) which unfold entirely within one class appear at first glance to be similarly strained. Informants claimed that no one outside the nuclear family can be trusted and that neighbors are the perpetrators of *lios* (entanglements), *engañas* (deceit), and *desfalcos* (chicanery). Moreover, the workers of the pueblo must compete with their class peers for daily employment in the market place and landowners are likewise engaged in competition with each other for land and employees. There are no co-operative associations or mutual aid groups in the pueblo, except among the upper-class, and the majority of non-elite people do not participate voluntarily in political or religious activities nor in clubs which might provide a basis for group membership. Trade unions and workers' syndicates do not exist because they are forbidden by state law. In a purely structural sense, therefore, each family operates independently, as a separate unit.

Curiously, Fuenmayoreños make very little use of the obvious and traditional Hispanic dyadic contracts to form interfamilial alliances. For example, godparenthood (*compadrazgo*) is almost always a "thing of the family," that is, a duplication of pre-existing kinship ties. Consequently, the fictive kin complexes of Latin America and South Italian communities (Mintz and Wolf 1950; Moss and Cappannari 1960) are lacking here.

The following discussion focuses exclusively upon adult male companionship in the *mayete* and *jornalero* classes and does not attempt an analysis of interclass friendship, but the statements made during the course of the analysis pertain equally to intraclass behavior among the commercial middle-class and among the *señoritos*. The data, however, do not apply to either women or children, both of whom practice quite different patterns of friendship from those described for men.

PATTERNS OF FRIENDSHIP

Fuenmayoreños recognize the existence of three distinct types of friendship relation, each having its own unique roles and norms. The first type is simply called *amistad* (friendship), a term which in this case may be characterized as an elipsis meaning "casual friendship" (Y. Cohen 1961). The second type of friendship is referred to as *compromiso*, or "commitment," and the third type of friendship is called *amistad de confianza*, or "friendship of trust."

Casual Friendship: Peer-group Integration

As in most societies in which male and female worlds are strictly segregated and in which people fear gossip, the inhabitants of Fuenmayor make a clear distinction between public and private space. Private space (*en casa*) is confined to the home (*casa*) and is experienced only by members of the nuclear family or bilateral kindred. Within the walls of the house, the family maintains a secluded and concealed existence. Access to this private realm is forbidden to all outsiders with the exception of close kinsmen, and nonkin

are admitted into the house during certain *rites de passage* and crises at which times limited areas of the house are opened momentarily and then just as abruptly closed.

Public space (*en la calle*) is the outdoors area of the pueblo which is necessarily and unavoidably shared by a number of nonkin. This includes the streets, the plazas, and the public places of business, but especially the bars, taverns, and casinos of the pueblo. The latter represent the main arena for daily social interaction and are the locales for casual friendship.

Every man in the pueblo has one favorite neighborhood bar, tavern, casino, or other public establishment where he goes every evening without fail to meet with his cronies. A typical bar begins to fill up about 7:00 in the evening and by 9:00 p.m. is usually crowded with its "regulars" who return home at 10:00 for dinner, but who sometimes reappear in the bar at a very late hour for a nightcap. The men spend the long evening hours chatting amiably, exchanging jokes and stories, and, in a contagiously convivial mood, inviting each other continually to *copitas* (drinks of beer or wine) and generously passing around packs of strong black tobacco. The men who interact nightly in this way are, as they themselves insist firmly, "good friends" (*mi amigo*). An "acquaintance" (*conocido*) is "someone you know only by name," that is, someone who lives in another part of town and who patronizes another neighborhood bar.

While the generous behavior of these friends seems to be motivated only by a disinterested companionship and to be devoid of calculations, one soon notices that a subtle etiquette is being scrupulously observed which has the effect of conjoining the entire company of "regulars" in a system of sanctioned reciprocal exchange. While the drinks and cigarettes are offered without apparent thought of repayment, a man who accepts an "invitation" is expected to "invite" the company to the next round. While it is not said openly, it is a gross delict for a man to accept more than two or three drinks in succession without "inviting" his hosts. On the other hand, it is viewed as equally inappropriate for a man continually to invite his friends without accepting anything in return. Such behavior would indicate that the actor was either "trying to get something" or was a "fool" (*bobo*) who was stupidly allowing himself to be exploited.

The underlying principle operating is an immediate and balanced reciprocity by which everyone benefits in the long run. Since everyone in the bar interacts on equal terms and joins in these transactions, there being no solitary drinkers or small cliques, the entire peer-group society is by definition enmeshed in an on-going system of continual reciprocations. This systematic exchange leads to integration in the sense of establishing commensurate expectations and values among the participants (Barth 1966: 13-14).

The emotional culmination of this transactional kind of friendship is the institution of the *juerga* (spree). Fuenmayoreños believe that a man cannot survive without resorting to periodic bursts of frenzied social activity in which he refreshes himself emotionally through drunkenness and high spirits (*ambiente*). The customary way of doing this is through the en-

listment of some of one's casual bar friends in an extended binge. The comrades who agree to join in the *juerga* skip work and meet in the usual bar where they begin to drink. Occasionally, only a few preparatory *copitas* are exchanged and then the friends will travel to a neighboring community to continue their revels there. This is in fact a common practice for gossip-shy townsmen, and the Fuenmayoreños are well known for their drunken romps in near-by pueblos, where they have acquired a certain measure of notoriety as *juerguistas*.

Despite the obvious pleasure which the casual bar friends find in exchanging invitations and the exhilarating fun of the *juerga* which they share together, the relationship of casual friendship is not one of intimacy. Aside from the material reciprocations of the bar and the observation of the social norms of the *juerga*, there are no important obligations of either a social or economic nature which are recognized by people who interact only on this superficial level. For example, it is considered inappropriate for a casual friend to ask for money or for the loan of a comrade's motorcycle or tools—things which are essential to the workers. Nor do the casual friends "open" themselves to each other by speaking of their domestic problems or private feelings. Such indiscretions are considered risky from the standpoint of possible gossip and inimical to the carefree spirit of the peer-group society.

The value of casual friendship is thus limited to the "public" arena: while uniting the participants in a benevolent exchange network and establishing the friendly norms for public conduct, such a relationship cannot counteract the individual's private doubts. The casual friends therefore still remain inwardly cynical and anxious about each other's motives. For example, many informants complained caustically in private that the patterned expressions of friendly intent such as invitations are only shams which mask an underlying self-interest and egoism. One man said, "What is *amistad*? Nothing but egoism. I buy you a drink, you buy me a drink. I give you tobacco, you give me tobacco. Each of us is getting something out of it." Therefore, in order to establish more secure personal bonds, Fuenmayoreños have devised more trustworthy forms of friendship which are fortified and protected by important obligations and sanctions. These bonds are called *compromiso* and *confianza*.

Compromiso: An Instrumental Bond Between Households⁴

When casual bar friends respect each other and come to accept each other's intentions as benign, they may begin to exchange favors beyond the limits of the bar. For example, two casual friends who have helped each other to find employment a number of times may find it convenient to protect their mutually beneficial relationship. These friends will demonstrate a deeper co-operative impulse by offering personal services of a type which will eventually involve the active participation of their respective families. The increased interaction which follows permits a change of locale from the bar to the private world of the home. These changes in role and locale involve both the male actors and their nuclear kinsmen in a new series of high-level obligations and duties which are inherited by successive genera-

tions and which therefore tend to form permanent alliances between families.

The households which are so bound are said to "have *compromiso*." The actors so involved are "friends who have *compromiso*." Friends who choose to "have *compromiso*" are committed to express their solidarity in certain prescribed ways. For example, if an *amigo* with whom one has *compromiso* falls ill, one must go to his bedside to render services to his household should the need arise. If a member of the committed family dies, one must attend the *velá* (wake) and the funeral the next day to demonstrate one's commitment. After the funeral, one must make the *pésame* to the survivors; this entails waiting in line to take the survivors' hand and murmuring *Ay, que me pesa* (How sad I am). People who are not bound by *compromiso*—casual friends for example—may simply "nod the head." This silent condolence is called the *cabezá* (nod), and symbolizes a casual relationship of less importance than *compromiso*.

The perception of the *compromiso* link in the pueblo is realistic and utilitarian: the supportive acts demanded by the relationship are rarely performed out of affection alone, being more often motivated by a sense of duty, as most people concede. In fact, these acts are sometimes said to involve an annoying personal sacrifice. For example, when questioned as to why they were doing such-and-such a favor for someone, Fuenmayoreños frequently replied, "Because I have *compromiso* with the family and I have to go (*hay que cumplí*) even though it is very sacrificial (*mu' sacrifica'o*)." Thus, while the bond of *compromiso* may be more useful and more secure to the participants, it resembles the superficial and self-serving companionship of the bars in that participants' emotional goals and expectations remain the same. Like the invitations to drinks, each sacrifice called for by *compromiso* involves the clear expectation of a balanced reciprocity; one complies (*cumplir*) only to ensure the equivalency, and everyone admits that self-interest still plays a major role. As one man said, "Who will come to my funeral if I don't comply? Who will help me out when I am sick?" Another man who was encountered on his way to a wake explained his behavior by stating, "I go only to comply, not for the pleasure of it."

If there is a violation of the strict and overriding reciprocity principle, for example, if the friend does not immediately comply when the time arises, this nonfulfillment is often interpreted as a purposeful deceit and the relationship is thenceforth thought to be exploitative by the aggrieved party. The tie is no longer conceived as one of commitment, but a *lio*, (entanglement). A *lio* is a dreaded situation of unbearable tension which must be quickly rectified either through a fulfillment of the obligation, or, if this does not occur, through a termination of the relationship and its replacement by the negative reciprocity (Sahlins 1965: 148) of *nosehablan* (not speaking). The constant danger of precipitating *lios* ensures the symmetry of the bond, for a deceitful man who becomes known as a *lioso* tends to be shunned by his peers and gradually to lose his ability to initiate rewarding relationships. Thus, most people avoid an exploitative calculus in *compromiso* situations.

Fuenmayoreños are aware that the relationship of *compromiso* is a

brittle and pointedly expedient tie which can lead only so far in terms of the emotional gratification an individual can derive from it. People do not become confidants on this basis and there is still a reticence and a vigilance in the behavior of the friends in respect to each other's loyalty and trustworthiness. The residue of doubt in *compromiso* is revealed unmistakably by the fact that the committed friends still fear each other as potential sources of malicious gossip. As one man put it:

Whether you have *compromiso* or not, egoism and self-interest still play a part. People only comply because they are afraid of being alone. Someone with whom you have *compromiso* will still tell (*contar*) the things which you have confided to him. What's to stop him?

Thus, even committed friendship is inadequate to neutralize the underlying agonistic ethos in the pueblo because it lacks a mechanism for obviating gossip and for relieving the fear of gossip. Despite the firm instrumental alliance between the families there is still no haven from gossip and slander and therefore no emotional release for the individual who must still remain bottled up emotionally. In order to achieve that emotional sanctuary still lacking, most people seek to establish a more intimate friendship tie, that of *amistad de confianza*.

Confianza: A Dyadic Tie Leading to Emotional Fulfillment

Confianza literally means confidence or trust. Friends who find themselves emotionally compatible and who decide to share a *confianza* relationship are known as *amigos de confianza* (friends of trust). People state that the bond of *confianza* comes about only in one way: when there is an unqualified "opening" of the heart to a close friend, a voluntary and unreserved surrender of the concealed private sphere of life, or as one man put it, "when the two friends tell each other the secrets and personal things they carry with them." This act of mutual surrender, if successful, creates a kind of personal non-aggression pact, an "inalienable" gossip-proof alliance (Y. Cohen 1961), for neither of the two friends can now divulge secrets without endangering himself. Moreover, because they now share the most intimate aspects of their private lives together and because they have willingly renounced self-interest in their relationship, they now share a single, merged social identity, like the kinsmen who experience the sequestered life of the home together. Consequently, as the people point out when explaining the meaning of "trust," the distinguishing characteristic of the covenanted *amigo de confianza* is his absolute refusal under any circumstances to "tell" on his alter, to betray a confidence. One man explained it this way: "The friend of trust does not tell on his friend no matter what happens. Even if a man came to him and offered him a sum of money for the secret, he would not tell it." Some people, in fact, use the phrases, "friend of trust" and "friend of secrets" interchangeably.

Once the *confianza* relationship has been established through the exchange of secrets, there is an intensification of social interaction and the pre-existing commitment reaches new levels of intimacy. For example, the trusted

friend will not only attend the *velá* in his alter's household, but he will also stay all night and go without sleep. The next day, the trusted friend will not only attend the funeral, but he will also accompany the coffin to the cemetery, acting as a pall-bearer if requested to do so, and will remain for the interment—acts which are otherwise expected only of close kinsmen. Such supportive behavior, however, differs not only in degree from that demanded by *compromiso*, but also in motivation. According to informants none of these acts is perceived as involving a sacrifice. They are performed not reluctantly out of a sense of obligation, but eagerly and without calculations. This support is rendered, it is claimed, not for the "commitment" to the family, nor for the expectation of future returns, but for the "friendship" itself, for the "feelings" from the heart which the two men share as individuals.

Because the relationship of *confianza* is based on affection and is ostensibly devoid of self-interest, the establishment of trust transcends and obviates the need for immediate displays of intentions, for the friends no longer entertain doubts nor operate on a social level where benevolence must be constantly expressed through "transactions" of balanced reciprocity (Barth 1966: 4). Hence, the equivalent interchange of *copitas*, cigarettes, and other objects and symbols ceases when *confianza* is introduced and these low-level exchanges gradually become inconsequential. For example, one informant attempted to illustrate *confianza* by stating, "I can buy my friend two drinks, or three, or four, and he doesn't have to buy me anything in return. That's because we have *confianza*!"

The bond of *confianza* unites the two actors as individuals, not as representatives of a kin group or other polyadic social entity. Although a man may have more than one friend of trust, these relations remain discretely dyadic, and even close kinsmen may be excluded from participating in the relationship by being denied access to the shared secrets. For example, one man related the following story in order to illustrate this particular aspect of *confianza*:

My friend Juan told me a secret about himself. His father came over and tried to get it out of me. But I wouldn't say a word. Well, finally Juan's father got so mad that he threatened to fight with me if I didn't tell, but still I held my tongue. That's *confianza*!⁵

FRIENDSHIP AND THE LIFE CYCLE

The three patterns of friendship we have described are primarily adult male phenomena. Children practice distinctive forms of mainly group fellowship and rarely have close individual friends. Women sometimes have *confidantes* before marriage but rarely retain close friends after marriage when they are encouraged to terminate frivolous activities. Nor do women visit the bars and taverns where most adult friendships are initiated and played out. In later life, in fact, a woman's social ties tend gradually to dwindle to the people in her own family constellation and especially to her own mother and daughters.

On the other hand, the men of the pueblo find that their friendships are

deepening and their social networks expanding in later life rather than narrowing. In fact, the three friendship patterns flow naturally and in many cases sequentially from the masculine life cycle in such a way as to make an extensive and comfortable social network inevitable for most mature males. A brief description of the life cycle will reveal the mechanics of this process.

The first stage of a boy's life is that of *niñez* (childhood), a period which is said to last from birth until the age of six or seven years. While a *niño*, the male child is usually a member of a play group (*grupito*), which forms in his street and in which boys and girls often play together. When the child reaches the age of seven or eight, he becomes a *chico* (boy), and is no longer considered a child. The *grupitos* then begin to separate according to sex. When the boys meet new friends in school, the now entirely male play group may be further changed and expanded by the addition of new members. A little later, in early adolescence, the childhood play group is superseded by the more formal *pandilla* (band). The *pandilla* may include members from all over the pueblo, but it usually retains a neighborhood core and incorporates the *grupito* playmates. It is normally composed of six or seven boys and is almost always segregated sexually.

The *pandilla* persists until middle adolescence at which time the *chico* now becomes a *zagal* (youth). At this point, the *pandilla* begins to serve another purpose which adds momentarily to its value—an instrument for courtship. On Sunday evenings, when the people take to the streets and plazas for their traditional *paseo*, the *pandillas* coalesce and promenade up and down the streets. The boys and girls look each other over collectively and many courtships are begun in this manner.

Finally, in late adolescence, the boys and girls begin to pair off independently and the *pandillas* begin to lose much of their importance for the individual. At about the age of eighteen or nineteen, a boy begins to court a girl seriously and becomes her official *novio* (fiance). At this time, the young people begin going out in *parejas* (pairs), and the *pandillas* are re-activated only on holidays and other special occasions.

The final blow to the masculine *pandilla* is the compulsory military service which begins at age twenty. The boys are conscripted in the Army or Navy and sent to various barracks in different parts of the country. When they return to the pueblo two years later, they have matured and they have new interests and obligations. They are no longer *zagales*, but *hombres*, and they begin to feel the pressure to get married.

After marriage, a man begins to re-establish his neighborhood childhood ties, to make new friends, and to weave from these many relationships a web of mature bonds which will endure for the rest of his life. While his wife is immersing herself in the care of the home and is gradually sloughing off her old ties to friends, the husband begins to integrate himself comfortably into adult masculine society of the neighborhood bar, which he now visits every night. In fact, after marriage, most men spend all their free time in the bars and go home only to eat and to sleep. At first, a man takes up with his former *pandilla*-mates, who as neighbors, also attend the same local

bar or tavern, but soon he is incorporated into the bar's exchange network and is routinely trading *copitas*, cigarettes, and jokes with all of the bar's regulars. In a short time, he becomes a casual good friend to everyone in the bar.

As a young man's family expands and his economic needs escalate, he begins to co-operate more closely with the more compatible and useful of these companions as well as with new friends. Soon a man is sharing a committed relationship with a few of these closer friends, and eventually a bond of "trust" will come about from one or more of these friendships. In many cases, the partners in *amistad de confianza* are former childhood friends who have already established a prior relationship of commitment, or whose fathers were so bound. Thus, in a very real sense, the three friendship patterns form optional steps or stages in a single dynamic process.

THE IDEOLOGY OF FRIENDSHIP

The ability of friendship to insulate a man and his family from social and economic harm is only one aspect of the role of *amistad* in the pueblo society. The word *amistad* refers not only to a concrete social relationship between two or more people, but also to an ethical and behavioral ideal. It is in this more abstract second sense that friendship regulates all routine symmetrical social interaction in the pueblo, even that between acquaintances who patronize different bars, and acts as a mechanism for social control in the public life of the community as a whole.

The people of Fuenmayor think of friendship as the ultimate social good in a basically untrustworthy world, as the one fixed moral point in the amoral flux of life outside the *casa's* walls. Of "true friendship" in general, the people often state that "to have true friends is to be happy." It is not surprising therefore that the *señoritos* have named their private social club *El Casino Amistad* (the Friendship Club), in an attempt to invoke the highest moral value in the society, for this is the one social postulate that the rich and poor share equally.

The veneration and longing for true friendship in the pueblo is reflected in the sanguine image which the people entertain of themselves and their own community. Townsmen, no matter what their class or occupation, think of their pueblo as an inordinately friendly place and of themselves in equal terms. They often dwell upon this imagined characteristic, in fact, more so than upon any other single social or cultural trait.

The importance of friendship and "friendliness" in the moral life of the society is reflected in the conceptualization of the ideal personality. Fuenmayoreños distinguish between two polar types of personality. The first, which is highly admired by everyone, is the "open" (*abierto*) type. The second, which is condemned in equal measure, is "closed" (*cerra'o*). The open personality manifests itself through social extroversion: an open man "gives of himself" continually; he acts openly and frankly, spends most of his time in the bars, and, perhaps most importantly, he enters unreservedly into exchanges of minor commodities such as drinks and cigarettes. The closed man, on the other hand, is secretive and withholds not only himself,

but also his intentions and his money from public inspection. Instead of appearing nightly in the neighborhood bar and generously exchanging conversation and things, he remains secluded indoors. Clearly, it is thought, he has something to hide which this introverted behavior is meant to conceal.

Since a man's personal reputation (*fama*) and by implication his potential to serve as a friend on higher levels depends upon his acceptance by the peer-group as an "open person" (*una persona abierta*), most men who seek peer approval strive to make frequent appearances in the bars, to avoid *lios*, and to act in a generous extroverted manner which conforms to the expectations of the open personality ideal. Thus, most men are inevitably drawn into the exchange systems of the bars and are led subsequently into relationships of intimate friendship involving commitment and trust. The open behavior which wins peer approval not only encourages the formation of concrete friendships and discourages *lios*, but also tends to become internalized as an integral aspect of a man's self-image. In this way, the binary personality framework creates behavioral models in the sense of desirable ideals which encourage the continual enlargement of friendship networks. Each man attempts to win as many friends as possible not only in order to provide security and personal satisfactions, but also because his reputation and his self-esteem depend upon his doing so.

CONCLUSION

Like the other informal microstructures mentioned above, friendship has been characterized as a residual (Barnes 1954: 42-43; Pitt-Rivers 1968: 413), supplementary or interstitial relationship (Wolf 1966: 2), as something which is "left over" when all the other structural components of the society have been analytically removed (Paine 1969: 520). This conception has been questioned by Whitten and Wolfe (1973: 722) and others (Boissevain 1968) who feel that interpersonal networks may also be primary structures. As the data from Fuenmayor show, because friendship may provide the moral and modal basis for many forms of alliance and may extend to many interactive levels, encompassing dyads, family coalitions, and extensive networks, it may represent the focal category of co-operative activity in an atomistic community where other forms of contractual interaction are lacking or insignificant. The residualness of friendship therefore seems to correlate negatively to the degree of organizational and operational denseness of the society, that is, the degree to which social, economic, and psychological resources are provided by the range of alternative groupings traditionally practiced, a correlation implicitly suggested by Wolf (1966: 10) and Barnes (1972: 2). We have seen that in a typically atomistic community in which class hostility eliminates a strategy of seeking patronage and where a lack of emphasis upon fictive kinship negates the alliance potential of *compadrazgo*, friendship is adapted to fill these structural deficits. Indeed, inter-familial co-operation derives almost exclusively from the practice of friendship. In fact, all co-operative and rewarding behavior in Fuenmayor is phrased in a friendship (rather than in a kinship) idiom (Gulliver 1971: 301-2). Thus, to conversely paraphrase Paine (1969: 510), there are societies

which in fact do seem to depend upon friendship for social control and smooth functioning.

Through what social and psychological processes does friendship "mitigate atomism" in the society? Friendship appears to counteract individual isolation in three ways. First, friendship, unlike other voluntary contracts, is a polymorphous all-purpose relationship which the people can use to form coalitions with any number of partners on all levels of communal interaction. On the group level friendship forms a network, on the household level it forms bipolar coalitions, and on the individual level it forms inalienable dyads. On each of these levels, friendship is institutionalized through ritual forms of reciprocal exchange which sustain the co-operative nature of the tie. These ritualized transactions reduce individual anxieties by inducing face-to-face interaction, regularizing values and normative expectations, and thereby eliminating ambiguity in social life (Barth 1966: 14).

Second, friendship, as noted by Reina (1959) and as emphasized recently by Pitt-Rivers (1973: 96) is a unique relationship in that it is neither structurally anchored nor static. Being a changeful state of mind and a cumulative feeling as well as a set of rules and roles, it has none of the constrained equilibrium of more formal role-sets and it often escalates in intensity over time without external stimuli. Thus superficial forms of friendship contain an inherent dynamic which can generate the conditions for their own supersedence. The fact that the three patterns of friendship dovetail to form an easily navigable channel encourages the actors to institutionalize their deepening intimacy by proceeding conventionally from one pattern to the next. This movement of individuals from casual to trusting forms of friendship integrates the society by acting as a kind of dynamic social glue (Foster 1961: 1176) which links the levels of interaction in the community. Moreover, while embarking upon this natural social journey from group to dyadic domains, the friends also bridge the conceptual gap between public and private realms which defines the boundaries of individual secrecy. Thus, many of the psychological sources of atomism—suspicion, distrust, and anxiety—are overcome. At the same time, the friends create overlapping co-operative sets which bind them at all levels to their peers.

Third, because all forms of friendship, even the most utilitarian forms of *compromiso*, contain some affective elements and satisfy some emotional needs, if only the intrinsic need for social contact (Blau 1964: 16-7), friendship is always a prized and rewarding relationship which is practiced for its own sake. It is this combination of affective and expedient properties, this mixture of immediate and conceptual rewards, which has led the people of the community, otherwise isolated, to appreciate and venerate friendship as the highest moral value in their society. The cultural value attached to friendship elevates a simple relationship to the realm of ideology and generates a set of personality ideals which are internalized as aspects of the individual's self-image. Thus, most concrete relationships in the pueblo are guided at least in terms of outward behavior by the friendship model and the friendship ideology acts as a mechanism for social control by restraining

disruptive behavior between social equals in all public contexts and encounters. As a final note, we should caution that this analysis is applicable only to interaction between adult males of the same class who are responsive to peer evaluation; it is valid for the behavior of women only when they are interacting as members of a corporate household. One important area which anthropologists will have more difficulty in researching is the relative paucity of female friendships in atomistic and peasant societies and the consequences of this phenomenon in terms of the total social behavior in such societies.

NOTES

1. Research in Spain took place during a twelve month period from 1972 to 1973 and was supported by NIMH Fellowship #5-FOI-54765, for which support is gratefully acknowledged. I also wish to thank Ruben Reina, Richard Dillon, Margaret Gilmore, M.D., and Cecile Gilmore for their helpful criticism of an earlier draft of this paper.
2. The concept of sociocultural or interaction levels is modified from Steward (1950: 106-114) and Wolf (1967: 300).
3. A pseudonym for a town at 37° 30'N in Seville Province. Farm mechanization and consequent rural exodus have reduced the pueblo's population from a high of 12,000 recorded in 1950 to 7,600 recorded in 1971.
4. Eric Wolf (1966: 10), referring to a paper by Reina (1959), draws a categorical distinction between emotional and instrumental types of friendship. The basic format of this dichotomy is useful here as a guide to the conceptualization of some of the obvious differences between friendship patterns in Fuenmayor, and I borrow the term instrumental to describe *compromiso*. But I also must agree with Paine (1969: 506) who argues that in the final analysis all friendship is "ultimately instrumental," for even *confianza* involves covert expedient elements.
5. Since the original formulation of the dyadic contract concept (Foster 1961) there has been some discussion as to the relevancy of this model to societies in which individualistic ties automatically implicate a group of nuclear kinsmen (Silverman 1965: 177-178; Boissevain 1966: 25; Galt 1974: 200n.) Although this criticism is valid for most of the associations normally labelled dyadic, *confianza* is unambiguous in that it represents a contract which is specifically individual and which explicitly excludes the participation of even nuclear kinsmen.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Banfield, E. 1958. *The Moral Basis of a Backward Society*. Glencoe.
- Barnes, J. A. 1954. Class and Committees in a Norwegian Island Parish. *Human Relations* 7: 39-58.
- 1972. *Social Networks*. Modular Publications in Anthropology, No. 26. Reading.
- Barth, F. 1966. *Models of Social Organization*. London.
- Blau, P. 1964. *Exchange and Power in Social Life*. New York.
- Boissevain, J. 1966. Poverty and Politics in a Sicilian Agro-town: A Preliminary Report. *International Archives of Ethnography* 50: 198-236.
- 1968. The Place of Non-groups in the Social Sciences. *Man* (n.s.) 3: 542-556.
- Cohen, E. 1972. Who Stole the Rabbits? Crime, Dispute, and Social Control in an Italian Village. *Anthropological Quarterly* 45: 1-14.
- Cohen, Y. 1961. Patterns of Friendship. *Social Structure and Personality: A Casebook*, ed. Y. Cohen, pp. 352-382. New York.
- Eisenstadt, S. N. 1956. Ritualized Personal Relations. Blood Brotherhood, Best Friends, Compadre, etc.: Some Comparative Hypotheses and Suggestions. *Man* 56: 90-95.
- Firth, R. 1951. *Elements of Social Organization*. London.

- Foster, G. M. 1960. Interpersonal Relations in Peasant Society. *Human Organization* 19: 169-178.
- . 1961. The Dyadic Contract: A Model for the Social Structure of a Mexican Peasant Village. *American Anthropologist* 63: 1173-1192.
- . 1965. Peasant Society and the Image of the Limited Good. *American Anthropologist* 67: 293-315.
- . 1967. Introduction: What is a Peasant? Peasant Society, A Reader, ed. J. M. Potter, M. N. Diaz, and G. M. Foster, pp. 2-14. Boston.
- Galt, A. H. 1973. Carnival on the Island of Pantelleria: Ritualized Community Solidarity in an Atomistic Society. *Ethnology* 12: 325-339.
- . 1974. Rethinking Patron-client Relationships: The Real System and the Official System in Southern Italy. *Anthropological Quarterly* 47: 182-202.
- Gilmore, D. 1975a. Social Structure and Social Relations in an Andalusian Town. Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, University of Pennsylvania.
- . 1975b. Class, Culture, and Community Size In Spain: The Relevance of Models (in press).
- Gulliver, P. H. 1971. Neighbors and Networks: The Idiom of Kinship in Social Action Among the Ndeudeuli of Tanzania. Berkeley.
- Hammel, E. 1968. Alternative Social Structures and Ritual Relations in the Balkans. Englewood Cliffs.
- Honigman, J. J. 1968. Interpersonal Relations in Atomistic Communities. *Human Organization* 27: 220-229.
- Martínez-Alier, J. 1971. Laborers and Landowners in Southern Spain. London.
- Miller, R. 1974. Are Familists Amoral? A Test of Banfield's Amoral Familism Hypothesis in a South Italian Village. *American Ethnologist* 1: 515-535.
- Mintz, S., and E. Wolf. 1950. An Analysis of Ritual Co-parenthood (Compadrazgo). *Southwestern Journal of Anthropology* 6: 341-368.
- Moss, L., and S. Cappannari. 1960. Patterns of Kinship, Comparaggio and Community in a South Italian Village. *Anthropological Quarterly* 33: 24-32.
- Paine, R. 1969. In Search of Friendship: An Exploratory Analysis in 'Middle-class' Culture. *Man* (n.s.) 4: 505-524.
- Piker, S. 1968. Friendship to the Death in Rural Thai Society. *Human Organization* 27: 200-204.
- Pitt-Rivers, J. A. 1968. Pseudo-Kinship. *International Encyclopedia of the Social Sciences*, ed. D. Sills, Vol. 8: 408-413. New York.
- . 1973. The Kith and the Kin. *The Character of Kinship*, ed. J. Goody, pp. 89-105. Cambridge.
- Reina, R. E. 1959. Two Patterns of Friendship in a Guatemalan Community. *American Anthropologist* 61: 44-50.
- Rubel, A., and H. Kupferer. 1968. Perspectives on the Atomistic-type Society: Introduction. *Human Organization* 27: 189-190.
- Sahlins, M. D. 1965. On the Sociology of Primitive Exchange. *The Relevance of Models for Social Anthropology*, ed. M. Banton, pp. 139-236. London.
- Silverman, S. 1965. Patronage and Community-Nation Relationships in Central Italy. *Ethnology* 4: 172-189.
- Steward, J. H. 1950. *Area Research: Theory and Practice*. New York.
- Whitten, N., and A. Wolfe. 1973. Network Analysis. *Handbook of Social and Cultural Anthropology*, ed. J. Honigman, pp. 717-746. Chicago.
- Wolf, E. 1966. Kinship, Friendship, and Patron-Client Relations in Complex Societies. *The Social Anthropology of Complex Societies*, ed. M. Banton, pp. 1-22. London.
- . 1967. Levels of Communal Relations. *Social Anthropology: Handbook of Middle American Indians*, ed. M. Nash, Vol. 6: 209-316. Austin.