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Introduction

- I have already given background information on the language yesterday, and don’t repeat it today.
- My main purposes in this paper are:
  - To describe the system of kinship terms in Shua
    - To identify terms used in denoting kin, and their denotata
    - To remark on linguistic patterns in the terms and their formation
    - To raise some problems in the identification of kin terms – what is a kin term?
    - To make some observations concerning their usage
  - To make some comments on the kinship system – whatever that might be
Before getting to business, an important caution:

- I experienced a good deal of difficulty in getting kinterms

  - It proved very difficult for speakers to track referents of English possessive formations like *father’s father* in the abstract, and even when contextualised
    - Hopefully this problem will be addressed in the next field trip, now that I know a wider group of people – partly through gathering more extensive genealogies

  - There seemed to be considerable uncertainty amongst even the oldest speakers
    - Even when it appeared that they understood the target referent relation
      - Uncertainties existed even in terms for something as obvious and “concrete” as BW

    » And on the other hand, in the denotata of *matebe* ‘brother-in-law’

- Kinterms appear to be relatively infrequent in use, in the types of text and discourse I recorded
• So what I say today is very tentative
  – I have more questions than answers

• I repeat the caution: there are a number of aspects of Shua phonology that are not yet sorted out, including tones
  – Indicated here only where I am fairly sure of them
Shua kinship terms

• The Shua kinship system is universal in Barnard’s sense, i.e. applies to everyone in the social universe

  – Presumably this means that everyone in the social universe is zã: ‘relatives, family’ – at least in the widest sense of the term

• Basically everyone in the Nata Shua community is integrated into it

• However, there were uncertainties

  – I observed some instances where the interlocutors did not know how they were related – and did not resolve that issue.
• I start by listing the “kinterms”

  – Organised in a table according to generation

    • From G+2 to G-2

  – Then we will look more carefully at the terms generation by generation:

    • Harmonic generations
    • Disharmonic generations
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>G+2</th>
<th>ba:<em>ba:</em></th>
<th>grandfather (FF, MF)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ma:<em>ma:</em></td>
<td>grandmother (FM, MM)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ma:_ma:_ndamahõ</td>
<td>MMB-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ba¯ba¯ngǁe: khoe</td>
<td>MBW</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>G+1</th>
<th>aba:_:</th>
<th>father</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ba:_:</td>
<td>father (alternative term)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>si¯ri¯</td>
<td>mother</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ade(na)</td>
<td>mother (alternative term)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ba¯ba¯</td>
<td>uncle (MB, FB)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>u ba:_:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>tyaba:</td>
<td>FB+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>u ma:_:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>tyama:</td>
<td>MZ+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>hui¯ gǁe:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>hui¯ k’ao</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>hui¯</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>G0</strong></td>
<td>k’a: khoe</td>
<td>husband ('man')</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gǁe: khoe</td>
<td>wife ('woman')</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tya−hu−</td>
<td>older same sex sibling (B+ for ♂, Z+ for ♀); FB+Ch</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>damahō</td>
<td>younger same sex sibling (B- for ♂, Z- for ♀); MZ-Ch</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>k’ũ−k’e−:−</td>
<td>different sex sibling (B+, B- for ♀, Z+, Z- for ♂)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nydja−ra−</td>
<td>cousin, either sex, cross or parallel (MBCh, MZCh, FBCh, FZCh); presumably also 2nd cousins (MMBSS, MMBSD, MMZSS, MMZSD, etc.)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>G-1</strong></th>
<th>k’aro</th>
<th>ōā</th>
<th>son ('boy child')</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>gǁe:</td>
<td>ōā</td>
<td>daughter ('female child')</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ōā gǁe: khoe</td>
<td>SW (of ♀)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ōā k’a: khoe</td>
<td>DH (of ♀)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gǁori−</td>
<td>nephew, niece (ZS, ZD)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gǁori</td>
<td>ōā</td>
<td>ZS, ZD (of ♂)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| **G-2** | |ōā|ōā | grandchild (DS, DD, SS, SD) |
Harmonic generations

Four main expressions were recorded for relatives in G+2:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>G+2</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ba:<em>ba:</em></td>
<td>grandfather (FF, MF)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ma:<em>ma:</em></td>
<td>grandmother (FM, MM)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ma:_ma:_ndamahô</td>
<td>MMB-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ba¬ba¬ng¶: khoe</td>
<td>MBW</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As far as I can tell, *ba:_ba:_* and *ma:_ma:_* can be used of anyone in G+2

- The other two complex forms given appear to be means of more precisely specifying relatives in this generation, by indicating the (G0) relation to the (actual?) grandparent

- They are (unmarked) possessive constructions in form, PR-PM
• If this is correct, in G+2 there is no more than a distinction according to sex of referent

  – Finer distinctions can be made
  – But they are done not by simple monomorphemic kinterms, but by their combination in a possessive construction

• Whether or not this is a compound (and hence a separate lexeme) is a question I cannot answer at present
• There is just one term in G-2:

| G-2 | | | grandchild (DS, DD, SS, SD) |
|---|---|---|

• This involves the lexeme /õã ‘child’, evidently in a possessive construction PR PM – ‘child’s child’

  – A possessive compound?
  – A possessive phraseme?
  – Distinct from additive compounding as in /õã/õã ‘children’?

  • A tonic difference?

  – A kin term?
• G0 is the most lexically diversified of the harmonic generations – as expected:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>G0</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>k’a: khoe</td>
<td>husband (‘man’)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gǁle: khoe</td>
<td>wife (‘woman’)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tya¬hu¬</td>
<td>older same sex sibling (B+ for ♂, Z+ for ♀); FB+Ch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>damahō</td>
<td>younger same sex sibling (B- for ♂, Z- for ♀); MZ-Ch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>k’ʊ˘ɪ˘k’ë˘ːː̮</td>
<td>different sex sibling (B+, B- for ♀, Z+, Z- for ♂)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nydja−ra−</td>
<td>cousin, either sex, cross or parallel (MBCh, MZCh, FBCh, FZCh); presumably also 2nd cousins (MMBSS, MMBSD, MMZSS, MMZSD, etc.)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

• Three terms for siblings

  – Same sex siblings of Ego are distinguished by age
  – Different sex siblings are not – single term
  – Some evidence of borrowing from Setswana, e.g. *wanamme* ‘my B’
• For opposite sex siblings other expressions are possible using the same sex terms, so as to distinguish relative age:

  – ♂ speaker can refer to Z- as *gǁe: damahô tiːː di* (i.e. female younger-same-sex-sibling my)
  – ♀ speaker can refer to B- as *k’aro damahô tiːː di* (i.e. boy younger-same-sex-sibling my)

  – *tyaː huː* can be used in the same expressions for the older different sex siblings

  • *gǁe: tyaː huː* for Z+ of ♂

• This is consistent with the unmarked status of the same sex terms

  – And perhaps relative unmarkedness of the term for younger sibling vis-à-vis older

• It is not clear when these are used instead of the simpler expressions

  – And if they can be used in reference and address
Basic terms for lineal relatives in harmonic generations, for ♂ ego
The picture for ♀ is virtually the same, except in G0 the ♂ and ♀ signs are reversed
• I have given just one term for collateral kin in G0 nydja-ra- ‘cousin’
  – Seems to be used of both cross-cousins and parallel cousins
  – Seems to be used for first and second cousins

• But I did experience considerable difficulty in getting speakers to follow complex expressions denoting MMBDD and the like, so I am not 100% confident
Basic terms for G0 collaterals
• However, there is a twist to the story
• There is evidence that some cousins are/can be referred to as siblings – classificatory siblings:

  – These are parallel cousins, where I have recorded the following:

    • damahô FB-Ch, MZ-Ch
    • tya̍ hu̍ FB+Ch (MZ+Ch?)

    I have no evidence of these terms, or k’ũ T̄k’ē̍?- used for cross-cousins, but one might expect it for close cross-cousins

  – It is not clear whether the Ch has to be the same sex as Ego – one guesses so

  – Given that the same general relative types can also be referred to as nydja̍ ra̍ ‘cousin’, one presumes that there is an interacting principle, such as proximity

    • E.g. it could be that this usage is restricted to children of F’s biological B, M’s biological Z

• This phenomenon is discussed elsewhere under the rubric of “relative age” in classificatory sibling terms (Ono 2011)
• The other two G0 terms are:

  – \textit{k’a: khoe} (male person) H
  – \textit{gǁe: khoe} (female person) W

• Status as kinterms is uncertain – also mean `man’ and `woman’ respectively
  – Vague terms?
  – Polysemous terms?
  – Different homophonous lexemes?

• I tried on a number of occasions to determine whether these terms could be used for spouses of siblings

  • I was unable to get clear-cut statements that they could be used e.g. by a ♂ for BW
  • I was invariably given expressions such as

    – \textit{damahō gǁe: khoe} ‘younger same sex sibling’s W’
    – \textit{damahō k’a: khoe Z-H} (of ♀)

• Ditto for siblings of spouses

  – \textit{gǁe: khoe damahō WZ-}
  – \textit{gǁe: khoe tya”hu” WZ+}
Disharmonic generations

- Considerable terminological diversity exists in the first ascending generation, G+1:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>G+1</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>aba_:</td>
<td>father</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ba_:</td>
<td>father (alternative term)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>si ri</td>
<td>mother</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ade(na)</td>
<td>mother (alternative term)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ŋō_:</td>
<td>parent, guardian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ba ba</td>
<td>uncle (MB, FB)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>u ba_:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tyaba:</td>
<td>FB+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>u ma_:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tyama:</td>
<td>MZ+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>hui g</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>hui k’ao</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>hui</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
• Alternative terms exist for some of the categories:

– meri: ‘my mother’ from mmeri ‘my M’ (Setswana) – also used
– tata: ‘my F’ from ntate ‘my father’ (Setswana)

However, there may be formal differences in terms of the morphological potentials of the lexemes.

A 1sg form of aba:, ba:, and ade seems to be possible with addition of –na, as in aba-na ‘my F’.

The identity of this morpheme (?) is uncertain – e.g. is it the plural marker, or a different morpheme? A connection with the plural marker via respect is not implausible, and thence to ‘my F/M’?

(Also in one instance aba-ma ‘my F’ was recorded – an error in transcription?)
• For siblings of the parents and the spouses of the siblings, the basic system seems to be:

\[ \Delta ba\_ba\_ = \bigcirc lu\_ma\_: \]
\[ \Delta lu\_ma\_: = \Delta ba\_ba\_ \]
\[ \Delta aba\_: = si\_ri\_]  

\[ \bigcirc ba\_ba\_ = \bigcirc ma\_: ma\_: \]
\[ \Delta ma\_: ma\_: = \bigcirc ba\_ba\_]  

\[ \bigcirc nydj\_a\_ra\_ = \bigcirc nydj\_a\_ra\_ \]
\[ \bigcirc nydj\_a\_ra\_ = \bigcirc nydj\_a\_ra\_ \]
\[ \bigcirc k\_u\_k\_e\_: = \bigcirc damah\_o \]
\[ \bigcirc Ego = \bigcirc tya\_hu\_]  

– That is:

• \( ba^\text{-}ba^\text{-} \) for non-parent ♂ in G+1
• \( lu\_ma\_:\_ \) for non-parent ♀ in G+1
• The grandfather and uncle terms are not the same, as per Barnard 1988, 1992
• I checked this carefully on a number of occasions in the field

  – I was specifically told that the terms are not the same.

• Evidence indicates that $ba^{-}ba^{-}$ is the term ‘uncle’, $ba:\_ba:\_ ‘grandfather’$.

  • Note difference in length of vowels, and in tone

• However, I was told that FZ could be called $ma:\_ma:\_$. 

One wonders whether $ba:\_ba:\_ ‘grandfather’$ might be usable as well as $ba^{-}ba^{-}$ for ‘uncle’. Don’t know. 😞
• There are another 3 terms that are used of siblings of parents:

  – |u_ba_:_
  – tyama:
  – tyaba:

• It is not clear what precisely these denote

• But tyama: and tyaba: seem to specify older same sex siblings of F and M respectively

  – Note the relation with tya^-hu^- ‘older same sex sibling’

• |u_ba_:_ does not appear to pair paradigmatically with |u_ma_:_
• The remaining term is /hui/ˈin-law’ – parent of spouse

  – Which can be specified further by adding either
    $g||e$: ♀ or $k’ao$: ♂

• Note in this instance the gender specification follows the N rather than precedes it.

  – Possibly a different type of compound

  – Evidently a reflex of /ˈui/ or /ui/, an affinal term in all Khoe languages according to Barnard (1988: 38)
• Fewer terminological distinctions are maintained in G-1 than in G+1:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>G-1</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>k’aro</td>
<td>ōā</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gǁe:</td>
<td>ōā</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ōā gǁe: khoe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ōā k’a: khoe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gǁori¯</td>
<td>nephew, niece (ZS, ZD)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gǁori</td>
<td>ōā</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

• Most of these are questionable as kinterms

  – Including, as mentioned above, |ōā ‘child’
  – gǁori¯ seems to be the most certain, and probably denotes child of any sibling – i.e. the addition of |ōā ‘child’ in the form for ZS above is probably optional

• Available evidence indicates that it can apply equally to child of a same sex or different sex sibling
• However, the child of a same sex sibling may be regarded as – and referred to as – a S or D, as /õã rather than as gǁori-

– I am aware of actual instances of this type, where the individuals are actual siblings, with same biological parents
– This is consistent with the fact that the offspring of a same sex sibling of a parent may be regarded as a sibling
More distinctions are made in disharmonic than harmonic generations.

More terminological distinctions are made in ascending generations (G+) than the corresponding descending (G-).

The only place where there is evidence of reflexes of PGN markers is in terms for G+

- *ba* for ♂ (modern marker –*ma*, though the stop is found in other KK languages, and in other Shua dialects)
- *ma* for ♀ (modern marker -*fa* – there are reflexes of an *m* in FEM forms in other KK languages)

Another partial formal regularity is the initial *tya* in terms for older siblings (of Ego or parents).
Usage of kinterms

• Kinterms are rare in the corpus – compared to what I am used to in Australian languages
  
  – In reference they seem to be most commonly used for members of close family
    
    • Admittedly this is impressionistic, but other modes of reference appear to predominate for classificatory and distant kin
  
  – In address, especially for showing respect

• We begin with address, then say just a couple of words about reference
• Interesting here are unexpected uses of terms

• $\sigma_1$ (30s) and $\sigma_2$ (80s) are in a cousin relationship

  – $\sigma_1$ sometimes used the term *ta:te* F to show (he said) respect to $\sigma_2$

  – $\sigma_1$ often addressed $\sigma_1$ (40s) as *mme* M – even though they are in a cousin relationship – to show respect

• $\sigma_1$ averred that he would not use this for $\sigma_1$’s Z-, $\sigma_2$ who he maintained a familiar, joking relation to

  – $\sigma_1$ is also recorded as addressing $\sigma_3$ as *mme* M (Setswana) for same reason – though he was unsure of the kin-relation to this woman
• In these examples a parent term is used in addressing an older person, even if they are in a classificatory G0 category with respect to Ego

– Doubtless a reflection of the parent-child relation as an avoidance one (Barnard 1988: 37) – we return to this in a moment
• In one instance a ♀ was recorded who addressed ♂₁ as aba: F, apparently to show respect/deference

• They are related as uncle to niece
  
  – So in disharmonic Gs
  – But at least some uncle-niece relations are joking, hence the term ‘uncle’ is presumably not inherently respectful

• The context was she was apologising for not being able to properly see the colour stimuli we were using in elicitation

• The same ♀ almost immediately afterwards referred to herself as to: g||ori¯ ‘your (respectful) niece’
  
  – Still in context of apologising for inability to do the colour task properly

  • A somewhat different strategy – apparently distancing herself from herself

  – Immediately after, she addresses ♂₁ as tiː:: bəba¯ ‘my uncle’
Reference

• I said that kinterms tend to be used in reference in regard to close family
• If not close relatives of Ego, then of some other propositus

– Thus e.g. $\gamma_1$ referred to $\varphi_1$ as ‘Chi’s M’ when speaking to $\varphi_1$’s Z- – not ‘your Z+’ or ‘my nephew’
– A few seconds later, $\varphi_1$’s Z- refers to $\varphi_1$ as mmaorateng ‘Orateng’s M’ (2nd born of $\varphi_1$, after Chi), rather than as ‘my Z+’ (or ‘your cousin’)
Concluding remarks

- Other instances of alleged respectful usages include (not clear whether just in reference):
  
  – /øã/ for child of sibling, instead of ordinary terms damahõ /øã/ and tyahu /øã/
  – damahõ and tyahu instead of damahõ g/e: khoe B+W and tyahu g/e: khoe B-W of ♀

- It is not clear to me what the basis of this respectful usage is
  
  – Maybe respect is a misnomer? One would expect that these uses would serve to increase familiarity, decrease distance
• Kinterms are sometimes used in expressions of surprise, as expletives

  – *adeto*: ‘my mother’, ‘my god’, ‘shit’

• A general observation: kinterms tend to be used in environments in which interpersonal relationships come to the fore

• As we have seen, in the context of apologising for some inability – distancing from the interlocutor, thus attempting to avoid more intimate interaction

  – An attempt to avoid criticism
Kinship system of Shua

• A couple of words on the Shua system of kinship are in order

  – Recall that it is a “universal” system, embracing everyone in the social universe – at least ideally

• Kinship has other behavioural manifestations than in address and reference

  – Let's look quickly at some of the larger patterns
• Preferred spouse is a *nydja-ra* ‘cousin’

  – Child of a parent’s opposite sex (classificatory?) sibling
  – Not grandchild of a grandparent’s sibling (e.g. not MMBSCh)

• At least, this is what I was told

– This is consistent with the joking relationship that exists between two opposite sex individuals in the *nydja-ra* ‘cousin’ relation

• I have observed good examples of this joking relation in the context of the ‘cousin’ relation

  – E.g. between ♂₁ and ♀₂
– However, the joking relation does not seem to be invariably associated with the nydja−ra− ‘cousin’ relation
– The relation between ♂₁ and ♀₁, the Z+ of ♀₂ was quite different

• It was less extreme in joking behaviour than between ♂₁ and ♀₂
  – There were occasional manifestations of joking behaviour
  – But more often manifestations of respect – recall earlier mention of ♂₁’s respectful use of the term ‘mother’ to ♀₁.

• Why?
  – Perhaps differences in the personalities of ♀₁ and ♀₂
  – Perhaps the closer proximity of ♂₁ and ♀₂ in age compared to the c. 10 years between ♂₁ and ♀₁

• Whatever, it indicates that there is some element of construction or negotiation in the kin relation – that it is not entirely given

The distinction between joking and avoidance categories does not seem as absolute and categorical as suggested by Barnard 1988: 31.
Looks more like a scale with the two poles as extremes.
• To obtain a wife in the past, a man was expected to kill an eland, and give this to his potential in-laws

  – As a sort of bride-price – not expected as a regular or repeated occurrence
  – Might be expected to do jobs for the in-laws

• A person is supposed to show respect to a /hui^- relative – manifested in various forms of avoidance:

  – A ♂ would not speak directly to his WM, but via his W
  – Direct contact between a ♂ and WM avoided, and eye contact was not made
• Barnard 1988: 39 proposes that all Khoe kinship systems exhibit or did exhibit either:

  – Patrilineal local organisation associated with cattle or sheep herding, and a category of respect relative
  – Kindred based band organisation associated with a hunting-gathering economy, and absence of a respect relative category

• Shua were traditionally hunters and gatherers, and show evidence of the importance of respect in the kin terminology

  – This could be a result of adoption of a more sedentary lifestyle
  – I suspect another reason, that respect is one form of avoidance – a form of distancing

  • Just as joking is an instance of proximity
Conclusions

I have discussed the basics of the system of kin terminology in Shua

- Saying something about the range of relation types that the terms express in terms of primitive relations identified in kinship studies (B, W, ...)
- Providing some information on ways in which kin terms are used by speakers

As I have stressed, there are many gaps to fill on both dimensions

- Revealing that the terms are not always used in accordance with the putative system
- And that these unusual uses appear to typically express respect
• The Shua kinship system is basically of the Eskimo type (Morgan 1871)

• In some circumstances – as yet not understood – siblings of parents are treated terminologically as parents, their children as siblings

  – The system begins to look like an Iroquoian one

There are also 3 additional terms for G+1 relatives that are not understood – distinguishing e.g. paternal vs. maternal relatives? Relative age?

The obvious hypothesis is that this happens for the close (actual, biological) kin of the parents, as distinct from their classificatory relatives. This needs to be tested.
• Numerous important questions remain:

– What are the meanings coded by lexemes – their semantic meanings?

– How can these meanings be captured? How apt is description in terms of primitive categories F, M, Z, ...?

– How can we delimit the domain of kinterms? According to what criteria? What are kinterms?

– What sort of grouping do kinterms make anyway? Is it an emic group (making them linguistically significant and interesting) – or is it an etic grouping?

• This is exactly the question that raises in so many other domains – colour, emotion, number...

• I have only recently become aware of Schneider’s (1972) suggestions that the domain of kinship “has no discernible cultural referent in fact” – which seems to be a suggestion that it is not an emic domain. Whether or not this is so, it does not make investigation of the domain any less interesting – and the question of the status of kinterms (and kinship as a system) is a significant one.

• If the groupings are etic, then trying to mount a Whorfian story is fundamentally pointless – they concern not to the language system, but to language use...
What are the non-coded meanings of the kinterms, and how can they be accounted for?

- By pragmatic principles?
- Other cognitive strategies?
- How do non-coded meanings relate to uses of kinterms? Are they the same thing?

What is the connection between the system of kinterms of a language (assuming that this is a viable entity) and the system of kinship of the society?

- Does one “lie behind” the other? Which?
- What is a system of kinship – is it any less problematic than a system of kinterms?
- I find difficulty in separating the two
• There are of course many theories of kinship
• Sahlins 2011 suggests that kinship is about “mutuality of being”

  – And that kinship belongs to “the same ontological regime as magic, gift exchange, sorcery, and witchcraft”

• As I understand it, Sahlins is construing the domain as an interpersonal one

  – Which fits precisely with the linguistic domain of kinship terms
  – But apparently privileges being over doing

• And I think the social over the personal – it seems to me that Sahlins fails to appreciate the extent of the social construction of the person
• My primary interest as a linguist is in the system of lexical items and their usage

  – Though this – i.e. speaking kinship – represents merely one of the ways of doing kinship

    • Which finds many other behavioural manifestations

• Service (1960) is on the right track when he construes kin terms as a strategy for personal reference and address

  – But he is wrong in construing it as a domain of status terms
  – Rather, it is the entire range of linguistic means of referring to and addressing persons that is of interest

    • Not just those that concern “status”
    • Some nice work has been done in this domain by Blythe 2009

  – I think he is also wrong in his evolutionary interpretation – but that’s another story
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