are unlikely to remain post-birth, meaning that the exterior biological influence on the child will not nurture and "act" as the parent.

- A biological complication does not mean that a child will not feel connected to their parents, an active and loving relationship will constitute a legitimate parent-child affiliation.
- How does this challenge the traditional outline of western kinship, which is based heavily on biological relatedness? Is this viewed as less legitimate or does the lack of biological relatedness even matter? In which case, does this highlight a different outlook of western kinship?

Marshall on the Truk (now known as the Chuuk) of Micronesia

- All sibling relationships – natural or created – involve the height of sharing and "feelings of strong sentimental attachment." … In Trukese kinship, actions speak louder than words; tong must be demonstrated by nurturant acts. Trukese kinship pivots on the fulcrum of nurturance, a fact partially understood by Ruth Goodenough (1970:331) who noted the "intense concentration on problems of nurture – taking care of and being cared for by others" in GTS. Nurture is the nature of Trukese kinship. (Marshall 1977, 656)

Gow on the Piro of Amazonia

- As a child begins to eat real food, and to walk and eventually to talk, its relationship to its parents changes from one in which the parents take care that their physical connection to the body of the child does not harm it, into one in which gifts of food, given out of love for the child, evoke the child's love for its parents and other kin. Older siblings are very important here. From birth, the baby is frequently picked up and held (marcar, "to hold in the arms") by its older brothers and sisters. As it learns to walk and talk, its closest physical ties are with these siblings, for they are its constant companions and they eat and sleep together. Such intimate ties with siblings replace the earlier one with parents as the child grows. (Gow, 1991, 157)

Thomas on the Temanambondro of Madagascar

- Yet just as fathers are not simply made by birth, neither are mothers, and although mothers are not made by "custom" they, like fathers, can make themselves through another type of performatively constituted relation, the giving of "nurture". Relations of ancestry are particularly important in contexts of ritual, inheritance and the defining of marriageability and incest; they are in effect the "structuring structures" (Bourdieu 1977) of social reproduction and intergenerational continuity. Father, mother and children are, however, also performatively related through the giving and receiving of "nurture" (fitezana). Like ancestry, relations of "nurture" do not always coincide with relations by birth; but unlike ancestry, "nurture" is a largely ungendered relation, constituted in contexts of everyday practical existence, in the intimate, familial and familiar world of the household, and in ongoing relations of work and consumption, of feeding and farming. (Thomas 1999, 37)

Storrie on the Hoti of Venezuelan Guiana

- It was my Hoti friends who, through their rejection of my expectations that I would be able to "collect" genealogical information, brought me to the idea that dwelling together and particularly the notions of consumption and ingestion are, for them, fundamental to social identity. Whenever I attempted to discover if there were ideas of genealogical relatedness between kin, I was told that there is nothing that links a parent to their children, or siblings to each other, apart from the bonds of affection and
Human society is unique, he argues, in that we are "working with the same raw material as exists in the animal world, but [we] can conceptualize and categorize it to serve social ends."

These social ends include the socialization of children and the formation of basic economic, political and religious groups.

**Nurture Kinship - Schneider**

- Studies human social relations as measured by the performance of various acts of nurture between individuals.
- The nurturing acts themselves that create social ties between people.
- Stands in contrast to the earlier anthropological concepts of human kinship relations being fundamentally based on "blood ties", some other form of shared substance.
- Biological theory and evidence support the nurture approach more than the blood approach.

**CRITICISMS**

- Anthropology and kinship studies emerged at a time when the understanding of the Human species' comparative place in the world was somewhat different from today's. Evidence that life in stable social groups is not just a feature of humans, but also of many other primates, was yet to emerge and society was considered to be a uniquely human affair. As a result, early kinship theorists saw an apparent need to explain not only the details of how human social groups are constructed, their patterns, meanings and obligations, but also why they are constructed at all. The why explanations thus typically presented the fact of life in social groups (which appeared only unique to humans) as being largely a result of human ideas and values.

John Barnes, Victor Turner, and others, affiliated with Blackman’s Manchester school of anthropology

- Described patterns of actual network relations in communities and fluid situations in urban or migratory context, as with the work of J. Clyde Mitchell (1965, Social Networks in Urban Situations). Yet all these approaches clung to a view of stable functionalism, with kinship as one of the central stable institutions.
- The concept of “system of kinship” tended to dominate anthropological studies of kinship in the early 20th century.

**Barnes**

- "Genitor" or "genetrix" do not necessarily imply actual biological relationships based on consanguinity, but rather refer to the socially held belief that the individual is physically related to the child, derived from culturally held ideas about how biology works.
- Argued that it was necessary to make a further distinction between genitor and genetrix (the supposed biological mother and father of the child), and the actual genetic father and mother of the child.

**Dwight Read**

- Later argued that the way in which kinship categories are defined by individual researchers are substantially inconsistent.