

THE TIMING MECHANISM IN CULTURE LAG REDUCTION:

CHANGING KINSHIP IN A DANISH COMMUNITY

Robert T. Anderson and Gallatin Anderson

Introduction

In general, a positive correlation may be expected to exist between the way a society classifies kin in its terminology of reference and the kind of social classification that is inherent in the patterns of interpersonal interaction between relatives.¹ This correlation was found to hold for European societies over time periods of up to three thousand years, with changes in the social classification showing a consistent association with related changes in the linguistic classification.² Scandinavia, however, provided an exception to this regularity of the correlation of terms and practices in that bifurcate-collateral terms are currently in use even though the associated extended families are now very rare in Sweden and Norway and completely absent in Denmark. In the present paper the kinship system of a Danish community is examined in detail in order to determine with some precision the nature and extent of this functional disharmony.

The community is Dragor, which was a home-port for full-riggers, schooners, and fishing smacks in the 1890's. Its 2000 inhabitants were supported primarily by sailing or fishing, and may be characterized as having been culturally isolated and conservative. The decades of the 20th century witnessed the expansion of the capital city of Copenhagen on a nearby island, and its connection with Dragor by the introduction of modern means of rapid transportation. Concomitantly, Dragor's fishing and sailing industry declined. Under these circumstances, the economic orientations of the village shifted to the city, with the result that its population, augmented by urban immigrants, came to constitute 3500 suburbanites.

Kinship behavior in old Dragor was reconstructed on the basis of interviews held with people between sixty-five and eighty-three years of age. For the modern community the interview technique was supplemented by direct observation. In the last phase of the investigation descriptions of contemporary behavior were submitted to some of the old informants to encourage comments on their views of modern behavior and its differences from that of the nineties³.

In this analysis of the relationship between patterns of kinship interaction and the nomenclature of reference, interest is restricted to the determination of the extent to which terms and behavior patterns agree or disagree in the categorization of kin. Hence it is possible to avoid the difficult problem of describing kinship behavior comprehensively by limiting attention to the single, relatively easily verifiable fact of the presence or absence of the same type of merging in both the linguistic and the social classifications.

Data

The nomenclature of the 19th century included many terms distinguishing kin on the basis of the sex of the connecting relative in the absence of observable differences in behavior towards relatives distinguished in this way⁴. The terms for parents' siblings and siblings' children provide one example (Table 1).

<u>farbror</u>	- FaBr	<u>brorsøn</u>	- BrSo
<u>morbror</u>	- MoBr	<u>brordatter</u>	- BrDa
<u>faster</u>	- FaSi	<u>søstersøn</u>	- SiSo
<u>moster</u>	- MoSi	<u>søsterdatter</u>	- SiDa

Table 1.

In the nineties, onkel referred to the husband of a parent's sister and tante to the wife of a parent's brother. In a few instances, relatively quite rare, onkel was also used to refer to a parent's brother and tante to a parent's sister. This occasional terminological merging, which accurately reflected kinship behavior, became much more common during the 20th century, so that by the middle of the century its frequency of use was approximately equal to that of the terms given in Table 1, the two types of terminology very frequently being used by a single individual with respect to different kinsmen. Although not used in the 19th century and still used but rarely, the 20th century has also seen the introduction of terms merging paternal and maternal relatives of the junior generation, nevø referring to any sibling's son and niece to any sibling's daughter. The terms, onkel, tante, nevø, and niece were borrowed from Copenhageners, who in turn had adapted them from the French, German and English usages. The changes in terminology represent changes towards a perfect correlation of nomenclature and behavior, but to the extent that some older terms of reference are still used and incorporate nonexistent distinctions of behavior the correlation remains imperfect.

Discrepancy between nomenclature and behavior occurred also with respect to parents' parents' siblings and siblings' childrens' children. The terms (Table 2) clearly label paternal and maternal lines both ascending and descending while related behavior indicates no corresponding distinction of roles according to line of ascent or descent⁵.

<u>fars farbror</u>	- FaFaBr	<u>brorsøns søn</u>	- BrSoSo
<u>fars morbror</u>	- FaMoBr	<u>brorsøns datter</u>	- BrSoDa
<u>fars faster</u>	- FaFaSi	<u>brordatters søn</u>	- BrDaSo
<u>fars moster</u>	- FaMoSi	<u>brordatters datter</u>	- BrDaDa
<u>mors farbror</u>	- MoFaBr	<u>søstersøns søn</u>	- SiSoSo
<u>mors morbror</u>	- MoMoBr	<u>søstersøns datter</u>	- SiSoDa
<u>mors faster</u>	- MoFaSi	<u>søsterdatters søn</u>	- SiDaSo
<u>mors moster</u>	- MoMoSi	<u>søsterdatters datter</u>	- SiDaDa

Table 2.

Alternate terms, used less frequently, classified differently for the senior generation (Table 3), but not for the junior generation (Table 4). In merging paternal and maternal relatives the terms of Table 3 agree with the observation that behavior did not differ on this basis. Nevertheless, terminological correlation continues imperfect to the extent that, in the absence of associated differences in behavior, the nomenclature still makes a distinction on the basis of the sex of the connecting relative.

<u>bedstefars</u> <u>bror</u>	- FaFaBr, MoFaBr
<u>bedstefars</u> <u>søster</u>	- FaFaSi, MoFaSi
<u>bedstemors</u> <u>bror</u>	- FaMoBr, MoMoBr
<u>bedstemors</u> <u>søster</u>	- FaMoSi, MoMoSi

Table 3.

<u>brors</u> <u>sønnesøn</u>	- BrSoSo	<u>søsters</u> <u>sønnesøn</u>	- SiSoSo
<u>brors</u> <u>sønnedatter</u>	- BrSoDa	<u>søsters</u> <u>sønnedatter</u>	- SiSoDa
<u>brors</u> <u>dattersøn</u>	- BrDaSo	<u>søsters</u> <u>dattersøn</u>	- SiDaSo
<u>brors</u> <u>datterdatter</u>	- BrDaDa	<u>søsters</u> <u>datterdatter</u>	- SiDaDa

<u>brors</u> <u>barnebarn</u>	- brother's child's child
<u>søsters</u> <u>barnebarn</u>	- sister's child's child

Table 4.

In the 20th century the nomenclature changed. The terms given in Table 5 are now as often used as those of Tables 2 and 3. But since the new terms also distinguish without relational provocation on the basis of the sex of the connecting relative an incongruity remains. No corresponding usage for the junior generation based upon the terms nevø and niece has developed.

<u>fars</u> <u>onkel</u>	- FaFaBr, FaMoBr, FaFaSiHu, FaMoSiHu
<u>fars</u> <u>tante</u>	- FaFaSi, FaMoSi, FaFaBrWi, FaMoBrWi
<u>mors</u> <u>onkel</u>	- MoFaBr, MoMoBr, MoFaSiHu, MoMoSiHu
<u>mors</u> <u>tante</u>	- MoFaSi, MoMoSi, MoFaBrWi, MoMoBrWi

Table 5.

The disparity between the nomenclature and behavior of parents' parents' siblings and siblings' siblings' children, pronounced in the nineties, did not diminish in the new century. No explanation can be given for the fact that Copenhageners and Dragorians borrowed other terms but did not adopt the terms grand-uncle, grand-aunt, grand-nephew, and grand-niece or their equivalents from French or German.

Still another terminological-behavioral discrepancy of the type under discussion concerned parents' parents and childrens' children. In this case the merging nomenclature of the senior generation (Table 6), correlating well with behavior, was reciprocal to terms for the junior generation which distinguished son's offspring from daughter's in the absence of associated differences in social classification. The only evidence for a difference in behavior associated with differences in the sex of the connecting relative was the fact that of these kin only the father's father and the son's son inherited the patronym. In the absence of other observable differences in the relationship, and particularly in view of the rule of inheritance transmitting material possessions equally to both sons and daughters, the behavior is regarded as congruous with the grandparental terms and hence incongruous with the terms for grandchildren. In this case, the

alternate and not uncommon use of the term barnebarn, "child's child," represents a secondary linguistic usage correlating well with the behavioral identity of a son's and a daughter's offspring and thus contrasts with the primary terminology.

<u>bedstefar</u>	- FaFa, MoFa	<u>bedstemor</u>	- FaMo, MoMo
<u>sønnesøn</u>	- SoSo	<u>dattersøn</u>	- DaSo
<u>sønnedatter</u>	- SoDa	<u>datterdatter</u>	- DaDa

Table 6.

In the 20th century no change occurred in the terms for grandchildren, but new terms (Table 7) became very popular for grandparents, equalling the older forms in frequency of use and apparently threatening ultimately to replace them.

<u>farfar</u>	- FaFa
<u>farmor</u>	- FaMo
<u>morfar</u>	- MoFa
<u>mormor</u>	- MoMo

Table 7.

Behaviorally, distinctions between paternal and maternal kin continued unimportant. The lack of a shift in terms for grandchildren to greater use of barnebarn, "child's child", may be interpreted as a reluctance to shift to the primary use of a term merging male and female when the sex of the relative referred to was significant in behavioral interaction. The failure to adopt a French, German, or English type of term such as grandson and granddaughter can only be noted and not explained. But the adoption of new grandparental terms recognizing the sex of the connecting relative, and thus rendering a strong correlation weak, is an apparent anomaly that finds a ready explanation by the Dragorians themselves. Grandparents, especially grandmothers, demand to be referred to and addressed by the new terms (Table 7) on the grounds that the old terms (Table 6) imply old age, and are therefore intolerable in a culture where value has come to rest in youthfulness and its preservation. The new terms of Table 7, which are old Scandinavian forms revived simultaneously in the capital and its suburbs, represent a change in terminology in response to a new type of behavioral relationship between young and old only accidentally associated with terminological recognition of the paternal-maternal distinction.

A final case of imperfect correlation of behavior with terms distinguishing on the basis of the sex of the connecting relative concerns parents' parents' parents and childrens' childrens' children. The terms (Table 8) for the senior generation concur with behavior in making no distinction of this type, whereas those for the junior generation make such distinctions and thus classify relatives into eight categories when behaviorally there were only two, a child's child's son and a child's child's daughter. An alternate term, barnebarns barn, "child's child's child", is notable for correlating with behavior in ignoring differences based upon the sex of the connecting relative but for not correlating in ignoring the sex of the kin subject. No changes occurred in the 20th century with respect to relatives

of this category.

<u>sønnesøns søn</u>	- SoSoSo	<u>dattersøns søn</u>	- DaSoSo
<u>sønnesøns datter</u>	- SoSoDa	<u>dattersøns datter</u>	- DaSoDa
<u>sønne datters søn</u>	- SoDaSo	<u>datter datters søn</u>	- DaDaSo
<u>sønne datters datter</u>	- SoDaDa	<u>datter datters datter</u>	- DaDaDa
<u>oldefar</u>	- FaFaFa, FaMoFa, MoFaFa, MoMoFa		
<u>oldemor</u>	- FaFaMo, FaMoMo, MoFaMo, MoMoMo		

Table 8.

A perfect correlation occurred with respect to parents' parents' parents' parents and childrens' childrens' childrens' children to the extent that neither the terms (Table 9) nor behavioral patterns indicate differences related to different lines of ascent or descent.

<u>tipoldefar</u>	- parent's parent's parent's father
<u>tipoldemor</u>	- parent's parent's parent's mother
<u>barnebarns barnebarn</u>	- child's child's child's child

Table 9.

The nomenclature of the nineties also made distinctions between affinal and consanguineal relatives which were not associated with differences in behavior. This was true, for example, with respect to parents' siblings' spouses and spouses' siblings' children. The terms (Table 10) distinguished these relatives from parents' siblings and siblings' children respectively (Table 1), even though no regular or significant differences in the nature of the relationship distinguished the two categories of kin.

<u>onkel</u> - FaSiHu, MoSiHu	<u>tante</u> - FaBrWi, MoBrWi
<u>mands brorsøn</u> - HuBrSo	<u>kones brorsøn</u> - WiBrSo
<u>mands brordatter</u> - HuBrDa	<u>kones brordatter</u> - WiBrDa
<u>mands søstersøn</u> - HuSiSo	<u>kones søstersøn</u> - WiSiSo
<u>mands søsterdatter</u> - HuSiDa	<u>kones søsterdatter</u> - WiSiDa

Table 10.

Alternate usage of the terms onkel and tante in a few instances to refer equally to parents' siblings and parents' siblings' spouses, and the increased frequency of this usage in the 20th century represents a strong tendency to a perfect correlation between kinship practice and terminology. Similarly, nevø and niece, introduced as occasional alternate terms in the 20th century, are sometimes heard in reference to a niece's husband or a nephew's wife respectively, even though informants stoutly maintained that they properly referred only to consanguineal relatives. To the extent that such a broader application of these terms exists, a change in the direction of a perfect correlation of nomenclature and behavior has been made.

For any one person, the correlation of kinship terminology and behavior could be quite variable. To illustrate, one fisherman reported using the terms of Table 11 in his childhood in the nineties. In this case, no regular difference

FaBr	- <u>farbror</u>
FaBrWi	- <u>tante</u>
FaSi	- <u>faster</u>
FaSiHu	- <u>fastermand</u>
MoBr	- <u>morbror</u>
MoBrWi	- <u>moster</u>
MoSi	- <u>moster</u>
MoSiHu	- <u>onkel</u>

Table 11.

could be discovered in the subject's relationships with these relatives except that based upon the sex of the relative. This fisherman's terminology did not extend the application of the terms onkel and tante to include consanguineal relatives, but the term moster notably merged the consanguineally related mother's sister with the affinally related mother's brother's wife, thus being congruous with the associated lack of behavioral difference in this relationship. His terminological usage, however, is equally notable for including fastermand, which was part of an ancient Danish set of terms (Table 12) already rare and "old fashioned" in Dragor in the 1890's and extinct in subsequent generations. These terms distinguishing affinal relatives from consanguineal ones as well as affinal kin related through the father from those related through the mother, were incongruous with the social classification which made no such distinctions, and their disappearance represents a trend toward a better correlation of nomenclature with behavior. The fisherman's

<u>farbrorkone</u>	- FaBrWi
<u>morbrorkone</u>	- MoBrWi
<u>fastermand</u>	- FaSiHu
<u>mostermand</u>	- MoSiHu

Table 12.

application of the term moster is a loan from southern Sweden just across the sound. The scandinavian Swedish terms (Table 13) were exactly the same as the Dragorian terms given in Table 1, but were used differently, and the Swedish usage was heard sometimes in old Dragor, always referring to a person (usually female) who had married into Dragor from Sweden, an alliance resulting from the contact of Swedish and Danish fishermen in the Sound area. Although not every married-in Swede was referred to in the Swedish way, its occurrence did contrast with primary Dragorian usage in representing a perfect correlation with the behavioral merging of these affinal and consanguineal relatives. Such alliances became rare in the 20th century, and with them the linguistic usage, which perhaps did not become popular because, while merging consanguineal and affinal kin, it distinguished paternal from maternal in contrast to behavior not recognizing such differences. Speculation on the failure

of acceptance of the Swedish terminological usage would also have to take account of the probable role of Copenhagen as a stronger source of cultural influence.

<u>farbror</u>	- FaBr, FaSiHu
<u>morbtor</u>	- MoBr, MoSiHu
<u>moster</u>	- MoSi, MoBrWi
<u>faster</u>	- FaSi, FaBrWi

Table 13.

In sum the situation of an imperfect correlation in the nineties with respect to parents' siblings' spouses and spouses' siblings' children was qualified both by the occasional application of the Swedish usage, which was only invoked in referring to married-in Swedes, and by an extension of the primary application of onkel and tante. The latter practice became quite common in the 20th century and is the major change in the direction of a perfect correlation, the corresponding extension of the terms nevø and niece still being rare. Insofar as the usage of Table 10 is still common there is a survival of the imperfect correlation.

Another example of terminological distinction of affinal and consanguineal relatives in the absence of behavioral differences towards relatives distinguished in this way is found for spouses' parents' siblings and siblings' childrens' spouses, who were distinguished linguistically, but not socially, from parents' siblings and siblings' children respectively (Tables 1, 14).

<u>mands farbror</u>	- HuFaBr	<u>kones farbror</u>	- WiFaBr
<u>mands morbror</u>	- HuMoBr	<u>kones morbror</u>	- WiMoBr
<u>mands faster</u>	- HuFaSi	<u>kones faster</u>	- WiFaSi
<u>mands moster</u>	- HuMoSi	<u>kones moster</u>	- WiMoSi
<u>brorsøns kone</u>	- BrSoWi	<u>brordatters mand</u>	- BrDaHu
<u>søstersøns kone</u>	- SiSoWi	<u>søsterdatters mand</u>	- SiDaHu

Table 14.

Even if alternate terms were used, spouses' parents' siblings were always referred to as a "husband's" or "wife's" relative, but they were addressed exactly as one's own parents' siblings, the terms of reference for the latter also being a term of address, usually joined to the first name of the relative, e.g., farbror Peder, "father's-brother Peter". In address, as in other forms of reciprocal behavior, differences did not exist. Similarly, siblings' childrens' spouses were referred to as a relative's "husband" or "wife". In this instance, forms of address are not a significant indication of behavior since all relatives of the same or lower generation were called by first names without kinship appellations. Unlike the terms for the senior generation, a terminological change occurred insofar as in the 20th century secondary terms nevø and niece were also used at times in referring to a siblings' child's spouse, thus merging the latter with a sibling's child and thereby representing a shift toward a perfect correlation. This usage, however, is still relatively rare.

A discrepancy between nomenclature and behavior was found with respect to spouses' parents' siblings' children and parents' siblings' childrens' spouses who were distinguished terminologically, but not behaviorally, from parents' siblings' children (Table 15).

<u>faetter</u>	- parent's sibling's son
<u>kusine</u>	- parent's sibling's daughter
<u>mands faetter</u>	- husband's parent's sibling's son
<u>mands kusine</u>	- husband's parent's sibling's daughter
<u>kones faetter</u>	- wife's parent's sibling's son
<u>kones kusine</u>	- wife's parent's sibling's daughter
<u>faetters kone</u>	- parent's sibling's son's wife
<u>kusines mand</u>	- parent's sibling's daughter's husband

Table 15.

Although no changes occurred in the 20th century, one frequently heard in the nineties as now a reference to a faetter or kusine when one of these affinal relatives was meant, particularly referring to a faetter og kusine, "male-cousin and female-cousin", when a consanguineal relative and his or her spouse was intended. Thus, to a certain extent, a perfect correlation of terms and roles existed in fact, even though informants maintained that the usage was incorrect.

An imperfect correlation existed and continues to exist with respect to spouses' parents' parents and childrens' childrens' spouses, who are distinguished terminologically, but not behaviorally, from parents' parents and childrens' children respectively (Tables 6, 16).

<u>mands bedstefar</u>	- HuFaFa, HuMoFa
<u>mands bedstemor</u>	- HuFaMo, HuMoMo
<u>kones bedstefar</u>	- WiFaFa, WiMoFa
<u>kones bedstemor</u>	- WiFaMo, WiMoMo
<u>sønnesøns kone</u>	- SoSoWi
<u>dattersøns kone</u>	- DaSoWi
<u>sønnedatters mand</u>	- SoDaHu
<u>datterdatters mand</u>	- DaDaHu

Table 16.

Spouses' parents' parents are and were addressed by the kinship terms appropriate to the parents' parents. In the nineties, the terms of Table 6, which were used in address as well as reference to grandparents, were used in speaking to a spouse's grandparents. In the 20th century the terms of Table 7 were used in address to the growing number of spouses' grandparents referred to by the terms of Table 17. The terms of address thus mirror the identity of behavior between these affinal and consanguineal relations which is not reflected in the terms of reference. Grandchildren and grandchildren's spouses were and are addressed by first names, in conformance with the rule that relatives of the same or of a lower generation are not addressed by kinship terms.

<u>mands farfar</u> - HuFaFa	<u>kones farfar</u> - WiFaFa
<u>mands farmor</u> - HuFaMo	<u>kones farmor</u> - WiFaMo
<u>mands morfar</u> - HuMoFa	<u>kones morfar</u> - WiMoFa
<u>mands mormor</u> - HuMoMo	<u>kones mormor</u> - WiMoMo

Table 17.

(6)

Finally, it should be noted that parents-in-law, children-in-law, and siblings-in-law were distinguished terminologically from parents, children, and siblings, respectively. These are not regarded as cases of imperfect correlation, however, since behavior often differed between these consanguineal relatives and their affinal equivalents even though ideally, and in many cases actually, behavior was indistinguishable.

Having considered imperfect correlations in which the terminology made distinctions not existing in behavior, we turn now to search for imperfect correlations in which behavior differed in ways not reflected in the nomenclature. Five criteria are subjected to examination, the sex of the relative to whom reference is made, the sex of the speaker, age differences within generation, decedence, and wealth ⁷.

Sex was and is a significant factor in every interpersonal relationship in Dragor, not the least in kin relationships. The terms barn, "child," barnebarn, "child's child", barnebarns barn, "child's child's child", brors barnebarn, "brother's child's child", søsters barnebarn, "sister's child's child", søskende, "sibling", and søskendebarn, "cousin" therefore appear to be imperfectly correlated with behavior. These terms, however, were only secondary usages, the latter two, especially, being very rarely heard, and were always used in a context in which sex was an irrelevant consideration and therefore quite consistent. A brother or a sister, for example, was a person, regardless of sex, who lived in the same house, shared the same meals, and attended the same family festivities. Reference to such a person as a "sibling" was always in a context in which this essential identity of male and female was the most relevant factor.

The sex of the speaker was not indicated in the terminology except in some cases, as when referring to a "wife's father's brother" (kones farbror), when the term "wife" always indicated that the subject of the reference was a man, the "husband". This, however, is not regarded as an imperfect correlation since the sex of the subject was, in fact, always known, either because the sex of the speaker could be seen directly, or, if reference was not by the subject in person, the sex of the latter was indicated linguistically by speaking of "his" (hans) or "her" (hendes) relative, or "the relative of so-and-so", the name indicating sex.

Relative age was a factor in determining the roles of offspring and siblings, older children contributing to the support of the household and acting as parental surrogates towards the younger siblings. In contexts, however, where behavior reflected differences in relative age reference was always to an "oldest" (aeldste), "second-oldest" (naestaeldste), or "younger" (yngste) son, daughter, brother, or sister. Terminological usage thus clearly reflected the nature of the relationship.

Whether or not a relative was alive or dead was, to be sure, a significant factor in a relationship. Unlike the occasional English reference to a "late" relative, or the usual custom observed in southern France of adding the adjective "poor" before a relationship term when the relative is deceased (e.g., ma pauvre mère), the Dragorians gave no terminological recognition to decedence. In general, however, it has been concluded that decedence is only of consequence when it is associated with preferential levirate or sororate marriage⁸. Since these forms of preferred marriage were not present in Dragor it may be concluded that decedence was a negligible cultural factor.

Finally, it is notable that wealth, an extremely significant behavioral factor in old Dragor with its class system, was rarely given linguistic recognition, for one only very seldom referred to a "rich" (rig) relative. In this case, one is not surprised to find an absence of terminological recognition of a factor related to differences in behavior, because it would contradict the ideal of social equality among kin.

To summarize, it may be concluded that no significant imperfect correlation existed of the type in which behavior created social distinctions between individuals who were merged in the terminology of reference.

Conclusions

Clear-cut, designatable incongruities existed in Old Dragor between the way kin were classified in the terminology of reference and the social classification inherent in the patterns of interpersonal behavior. In particular, some terms made distinctions not made in associated behavior.

This incongruity may be understood as having its basis in culture lag. As Lowie has pointed out, "One factor that must always be considered is the time element. A recently acquired custom may not yet have developed an appropriate nomenclature, while . . . the nomenclature may survive after the custom has become obsolete"⁹. The terminological distinction of the paternal from the maternal kin, and of the consanguineal from the affinal, are functionally adapted to a form of social structure in which the extended patriarchal family is a basic socio-economic unit. The latter form of social organization existed in Denmark but disappeared long before the period under analysis¹⁰. The terms, nevertheless, still survive.

The dynamic factors fostering culture lag, or influences which conditioned the disparities between terminology and related social classification, may be sought in the culture patterns involved. For, in these, forces for both conservatism and change were simultaneously operative.

Where the patterns of kinship behavior contrast with the kinship nomenclature, i.e., with the terminological pattern, the incongruity presumably exerts an influence on the terminology to adapt to behavior. This propensity, however, would seem somewhat to be offset by the purely linguistic pattern. Murdock has remarked that language was probably an influence in the widespread use of descriptive terms among certain tribes of central Africa¹¹. It is possible that the Dragorian terms which literally describe kinship relations may, similarly, have tended to lag by virtue of a distinctive linguistic structure whose patterning prescribed, for logical interpretation, reference terms clearly describing

the nature of the relationship. Consistent reference to the intermediate primary relationship exerted a force for survival of terms incorporating this distinction.

The divergent, often mutually opposing tendencies of the terminology for congruity with behavior patterns on the one hand and with linguistic patterns on the other were associated, in time, with the borrowing of terms from other societies and in one instance, with the resurrection of antique terms. Neither attempt to meet the problem occurred, however, in every instance in which one or the other method could have been applied to resolve a terminological disparity. Instead, indigenous terms, to a large extent, continued in use. No new terms were invented, nor were indigenous terms redefined to incorporate a different classification of kin.

Between the 1890's and 1957, the half century period of this study, the major bulk of old terms tended to survive in at least partial usage. Only the terms of Table 12 became extinct. Concurrently, a number of new terms were adopted for selected use, although not, in every instance, competitively with older imperfectly correlated terms. Thus, in Dragor, the divergent influences presumed to emanate from opposing culture patterns are correlated positively with the availability of numerous alternate terms. These provide an avenue of harmony through the simultaneous functional adaptation to both linguistic and social patterns. This alleviation is only possible because alternate terms are themselves not in mutual conflict, but co-exist without antagonism.

In the light of this situation, the nature of terminological lag in Dragor may be reassessed. The lag, it appears, is not in the survival of old terms, which is relatable to dynamic factors, but in the limited acceptance of available new terms and the ineffectual terminological impetus to change in those cases where the old terms are incongruous with the social classification. The sources of diffusion for imported terms offered terms applicable precisely to the lag situations. To determine what factors are involved in this terminological reticence, it is necessary to turn from structural considerations of the opposition of patterns to an analysis of the process by which individuals acted in old Dragor to foster change or conservatism.

Emotionally tinged conceptions about the "rightness" of one or another terminological usage, and hence its ethical justification, were apparently not uncommon and many were willing to argue their position. Individuals opposed to these convictions were, conversely, the most positively motivated exponents of new terms.

Active protagonists for the "new" or for the "known" were, however, in the minority. Most were like the fisherman whose terminology is given in Table 11 -- not at all disturbed by the lack of system, nor even cognizant of it. The three systems are mingled in his terminology.

Nor were the motivated individuals manifestly conscious of any need to resolve a functional imbalance between opposing culture patterns. Their defenses might, rather, be termed a kind of socio-psychic rationalization. Advocates of indigenous terms were in favor of "pure", "old", "traditional", "better", or "modern" speech, and the polemics were characterized by emotion rather than reason.

These rationalizations, however, were consistent with opposing attitudes based upon two aspects of the value system. On the one hand, value was placed upon the preservation of traditions; on the other, value attached to "modern" ways.

Danes as a whole valued the uniqueness of their way of life. The inhabitants of Dragor notably published a number of articles and books on local practices, and maintained as well a local museum. A strong sentiment for conserving traditions is also indicated by the fact that much of the 19th century village has been physically preserve, an accomplishment made possible by individual and group endeavor as well as through the enforcement of a building code which forbids major modification of certain old houses and requires that all new constructions be consistent with the traditional architecture.

In contrast, however, value also attaches to technological progress and to urban and foreign ways. In speech habits, personal mannerisms, clothing, household furnishings, means of entertainment and vocational methods, Dragorian styles and tastes are influenced by practices in Copenhagen and abroad. Prestige is inherent in cosmopolitan behavior, and change is valued as a means of maintaining and improving the standard of living.

These opposing values for both traditionalism and modernism acted, it would seem, as a timing mechanism for terminological change in Dragor. Through them the rate of change was controlled to preserve enough continuity in life ways to give the members of the society that sense of security inherent in the possession of well-established patterns of behavior.

These values of traditionalism and modernism were found side by side in Dragor in two senses. First, no one was found who did not voice limits on the amount of general change desirable, nor was anyone uncompromisingly opposed to change within the culture. The individual himself thus seemed to possess an internalized set of regulatory values for the amount of tolerable change or persistence. This mechanism suggests a kind of psychological governor which, in effect, limits the number of new words which may be introduced at any one time. This limitation on change lasted, in the case of Dragor, as long as the new terms were incompletely integrated. Thus, the time for the reduction of culture lag was prolonged by the necessity of changing only a part of the kinship terminology at a time.

Secondly, considering the total societal picture, certain individuals appear to foster retardation through their apparent need for security. Opposingly, desire for innovations on the part of others, unresolved psychological factors and individual historical accidents resulted in variation and increment. There is, thus, a social governor as well in the form of conservatively motivated individuals opposed to progressively motivated ones. So long as the majority are not involved and the opposing individuals are nearly equal in both number and intensity of motivation, it may be expected that the limited number of terms introduced will also be slowly integrated.

Both of these ameliorative devices are expressions of a single force vector, the strength of the motivation for or against change. In the case of Dragorian kinship terms it is held that in the actual process of maintaining cultural conservatism, or implementing change, the dynamic factors are those attitudes arising out of

the value system. Although the opposing values are consistent with opposing factors in the culture patterns of kinship behavior and linguistic structure, they obviously possess a much broader base in the total socio-cultural situation. They have, however, a very low intensity as they specifically involve changes in kinship terminology. This low intensity of motivation would seem to result from the fact that the structural incongruities did not entail any remarkable malfunction. Since they caused very little trouble, very little drive was engendered for change and very few individuals reacted to the motivation.

In sum, although the timing mechanism in culture lag reduction is one of social and psychological governors integrated with the general value system, an intimated relationship nevertheless exists between the effective strength of these values and the amount of cultural conflict in the specific structural factors concerned. This process may perhaps explain the complete absence of imperfect correlations of the type in which behavior creates social distinctions between individuals who were merged in the terminology of reference. It is quite possible that the timing mechanism is faster under these circumstances since apparently a greater amount of culture conflict is felt.

NOTES

1. George P. Murdock, Social Structure, 1949, pp. 107, 113-183.
2. Robert T. Anderson, Changing Kinship in Europe, (mimeo.), Department of Anthropology, University of California, Berkeley, California, 1956.
3. This study of kinship was part of a broader ethnographic investigation of the community conducted during the year ending August 1957. The overall goal was a holistic definition of the social and cultural change involved in the process of urbanization. Financial support was given in the form of a Research Training Fellowship by the Social Science Research Council, to whom grateful acknowledgement is extended.
4. No regular, significant differences in roles with respect to the speaker distinguished the maternal from the paternal relatives of this category. Two facts yield at most a weak indication of a correlation of the terminological distinction of lines of descent with differences in the form of social interaction. First, only the father's brother and the brother's son inherited and transmitted the patronym. While this might conceivably have resulted in a slightly greater feeling of intimacy between these two relatives, it is not regarded as significant behaviorally, especially since material goods were notably not part of this inheritance. Second, parents' siblings, parents' siblings' spouses, and parents' parents were the kin outside of the domestic family most frequently sought out by people in difficulty. Two informants recounted that the help of the mother's brother was solicited on the grounds that this relative was the most kind-hearted or responsive relative, because the affection and sense of responsibility that he felt for his sister was also extended to the latter's children. While it is intriguing to think that this attachment might be a survival from an earlier period when the mother's brother had a unique role, it is not regarded as having been a significant form of behavior in the nineties, because it was not reported by other villagers, who, indeed, turned as frequently to someone other than the mother's brother.
5. A sole exception, once again, was that of the patronym, which, in this category of relationship, was inherited and transmitted only by the father's father's brother and the brother's brother's son.
6. The following terms have not changed in the period under study and are presented here for the sake of completeness.

<u>far</u>	- Fa	<u>mor</u>	- Mo
<u>bror</u>	- Br	<u>søster</u>	- Si
<u>søn</u>	- So	<u>datter</u>	- Da
<u>mand</u>	- Hu	<u>kone</u>	- Wi
<u>svigerfar</u>	- HuFa, WiFa	<u>svigermor</u>	- HuMo, WiMo
<u>svigersøn</u>	- DaHu	<u>svigerdatter</u>	- SoWi
<u>svoger</u>	- WiBr, HuBr, SiHu	<u>svigerinde</u>	- WiSi, HuSi, BrWi

7. A. L. Krober, "Classificatory Systems of Relationship," J.R.A.I., XXXIX (1909).

8. Murdock, op. cit., p. 106
9. Robert H. Lowie, Culture and Ethnology, 1917, p. 173.
10. Anderson, op. cit.
11. Murdock, op. cit., p. 118.

