K. Koch

Semantics of kinship terms: The Jalé case

In: Bijdragen tot de Taal-, Land- en Volkenkunde 128 (1972), no: 1, Leiden, 81-98

This PDF-file was downloaded from <http://www.kitlv-journals.nl>

SEMANTICS OF KINSHIP TERMS: THE JALÉ CASE

Recent research on the semantics of kinship terms has added a focus on the logic of native kinship reckoning to the traditional analysis of formal taxonomic or componential properties of classification (Burling 1970, Wallace 1970). This paper contrasts a componential analysis of Jalé kin terms with their own method of deducing the appropriate classification of a relative. I maintain that in the absence of empirical tests designed to compare the ethnographer's construct with the native speaker's cognitive orientation (cf. Romney and D'Andrade 1964 and Wallace 1965), a paradigm of native reckoning statements provides a better basis for linking the categorization of relatives to other behavior systems than a diagram produced by applying conventional, quasi-algebraic reduction techniques and by isolating a set of semantic components.

In a previous article (Koch 1970a) I have presented a description of the kinship terminology of the Jalé, a special Omaha system of the "rank" variety (cf. Romney 1965). That study was an attempt to combine an analysis of the *use* of kin terms with a formal account of categorical principles and the taxonomic variability in the classification of relatives. I demonstrated that this variability not only reflects functional aspects in the use of the terms (speech context) but also specific factors operating within the formal, categorical structure of the system itself. The Jalé people,¹ speakers of a language belonging to the Dani family (cf. Bromley 1967), are settled in compact villages along the valleys of the Jalémó in the Central Mountains of Western New Guinea. This area is roughly delineated by the geographical co-ordinates of 139°15' and 139°30' E longitude and 4° and 4°20' S latitude. The

¹ Fieldwork among the Jalé was done between 1964 and 1966. Research grants were provided by the Social Science Research Council and the Wenner-Gren Foundation for Anthropological Research. John Sodergren read a draft of this paper and made useful suggestions.

northeastern portion of the quadrangle is settled by a people who represent the northwesternmost offshoot of a vast non-Dani speaking population that inhabits the valleys east of the Jalémó on both sides of the Central Range, probably extending to the upper Sobger River in the north and the Star Mountains in the south. To the west and southwest of high ranges bordering the Jalémó live Dani people. On the basis of gross inferential computations, I estimate the size of the Jalé population to be around 10,000. Altitudes of the settled regions vary between 1,200 and 2,000 meters. Jalé economy conforms to a widespread Highland pattern, a shifting horticulture with slash-and-burn, drainage, and fencing techniques. Subsistence is based upon pig raising, and upon cultivation of sweet potato, taro, yams and a variety of greens and supplemented by gathering of forest produce and occasional hunting.

The area was first penetrated by Europeans in 1961 when a Protestant mission began its work. By 1966 many Jalé villages had not yet been contacted although steel tools, first vehicles of Western influence in remote parts of the world, had probably diffused throughout the Jalémó. The national government had not yet brought the area under its administrative control, and warfare was still a common mode of conflict management in many inter-village disputes (see Koch 1970b).

All except the smallest villages are divided into two or more residential compounds or wards. These wards consist of a cluster of family huts, grouped around a men's house which is the permanent domicile of all men and initiated boys. The residents of a men's house constitute the most inclusive political unit in Jalé society. The "big-man" phenomenon reported for other Highland peoples is absent in Jalé society, in which political offices and a formal system of adjudication do not exist. Positions of differential prestige are achieved through the acquisition of expert knowledge to perform rituals, age, and skillful management of pig resources to the benefit of relatives and co-resident members of the men's house. This special competence is most critical, as virtually all changes in status relationships require an exchange of pigs for their validation.

Jalé "society" is divided into named exogamous moieties each of which incorporates a number of named sibs with widely dispersed membership. One men's house may be the home of several lineages belonging to different sibs. Members of co-resident lineages from the same sib recognize a closer kinship among themselves than with a co-resident lineage from a different sib that belongs to the same moiety only. The

Jalé describe a lineage belonging to their own sib with which no links can be traced as a *alem amóroxo*, a stem-by-itself. Sib affiliation and rights of residence are defined by agnatic descent. My haphazard knowledge of Jalé folk-history leads me to assume that the sib organization evolved from localized clans that became scattered over wider areas in consequence of emigrations caused by defeat in war, epidemics, and crop failures. In acknowledging a common affiliation with other lineages of their sib the Jalé always refer to a place of origin rather than to an ancestor.

KINSHIP TERMS AND RANGES

Males and females use different terms to designate male and female members of their own moiety. For male Ego any male person in his moiety is his ARE and for female Ego any female person in her moiety is her EXE. Ego's moiety member of the opposite sex is his (her) EREK. Although these expressions may be used to address or refer to a consanguineal relative of any type of kin, they are not proper kin terms but represent, rather, expressions that separate the sexes into two labelled groups of moiety members. The absence of any quality defining a particular kinship connection is peculiarly evident, for example, in the conventional use of "Nare" as a salutary form of general application, which permits Ego, by some sort of semantic reversal, to greet the husband of his sister, his ÓMPARIK, with "PARIK, Nare!" What is properly a label determining a person's inclusion in a particular population segment is here postposed to a kin term denoting a relative who does not belong to that segment. Below, I explain the use of these expressions in reckoning statements.

In contrast Jalé kinship terms form a nomenclature consisting of a finite set of linguistic forms that are used to define a person's inclusion in a *class of relatives*. The following tables summarize all pertinent data. Table I lists the twelve terms that classify consanguineal kin types. Table II combines affinal kin types that are classified by affinal terms and those for which consanguineal or other terms (EREK, EXE) are used. Table III shows the ranges of consanguineal kin classes.

A set of rules, discovered through the application of conventional reduction techniques (Koch 1970a), completely describes the formal properties of the consanguineal terminology as reflected in the graphic arrangement of Table III for male Ego.

Table I CONSANGUINEAL RELATIVES

Term	Kin Types
1. OE	<i>ebr, esi, efabrso*, efabrda*</i>
2. OT	<i>ybr, ysi, yfabrso*, yfabrda*</i>
3. IKNI	<i>fa, fabr, fafabrso, famosiso</i>
4. ÉSÉNGA	<i>mo</i>
5. ÓAN	<i>fasi, fafabrda, famosida</i>
6. AMÉ	<i>mobr, mofabrso, momosiso, mobrso, mobrsoso</i>
7. ÓMÓM	<i>mosi, mofabrda, momosida, mobrda, mobrsoda</i>
8. AXAVILIE	<i>mosiso, mosida, mofasiso, mofasida, mobrdaso, mobrdada</i>
9. AMLOXO	<i>so, brso, sisso, fabrsoso, fabrdaso, fasiso, fafasiso, mosisoso, mosidaso; soso, daso, brsoso, brdaso, sisoso, sidaso, fasisoso, fasidaso (female Ego)</i>
10. AXALOXO	<i>da, brda, sida, fabrsoda, fabrdada, fasida, fafasida, mosisoda, mosidada</i>
11. ÓMPÓSAK	<i>fafa, fafabr, famobr, mofa, mofabr, momobr, famobrso, momobrso; soso, soda, daso, dada, brsoso, brsoda, brdaso, brdada, sisoso, sisoda, sidaso, sidada, fasisoso, fasisoda, fasidaso, fasidada (male Ego)</i>
12. ÉMPÉANGA	<i>famo, fafasi, famosi, momo, momosi, mofasi, famobrda, momobrda; soda, dada, brsoda, brdada, sisoda, sidada, fasisoda, fasidada (female Ego)</i>

* If two patrilineal parallel cousins are considered to be of the same age, the Jalé substitute the terms ARE, EXE, or EREK.

1. *Skewing Rule*

As linking relatives one's female agnates in his (her) own and ascending generations are equivalent. Reciprocally, as linking relatives one's mother and her male agnates in her own and descending generations are equivalent. [This rule implies that (a) children of the same sex of a person's female agnates in his (her) own and ascending generations are merged, and (b) a person's mother's agnates of the same sex in her own and descending generations are merged.]

Table II

AFFINAL RELATIVES

Term	Kin Types			
	Spouse Linked		Consanguineally Linked	
	Male Ego	Female Ego	Male Ego	Female Ego
AXÓN		hu		
ÓXE	wi			
ANTÉLAXA		co-wife		
ÉAMAL	wifa, wifabr, wimobr, wimobrso	hufa, hufabr, humobr, humobrso	brwifa, sihufa, sowibr, dahu, dahubr, brdahu, sidahu, fasidahu	dahu, sidahu, fasidahu
ÉAMALHE	wimo, wimosi, wimobrda	humo, humosi, humobrda	sowi, brsowi, sisowi, fasisowi	sowi, sisowi, fasisowi
ÓMPARIK	wibr, wisi, wifabrso, wifabrda, wimosiso, wimosida		brwibr, brwisi, sihu, sihubr, sihusi, fabrdahu, mosidahu, sowifa, dahufa	brwibr, sihu, sihubr, fabrdahu, mosidahu
AXARUK		husi, hufabrda, humosida		brwi, brwisi, sihusi, fabrsowi, mosisowi, sowimo, dahumo
ÓMAENG	wifasiso, wifasida, wibrso, wibrda, wisiso, wisida		fasihu, mosihu, mobrdahu	fasihu, mosihu, mobrdahu
EREK	wibrwi	husihu	brwimo, sihumo, sowimo, dahumo	sowifa, dahufa, sowibr, dahubr
EXE		hubrwi		brwimo, sihumo, sowisi, dahusi
IKNI		huebr, ehufabrso, ehumosiso		
ÉSÉNGA	wifasi	hufasi	fabrwi, ebrwi, efabrsowi, emosisowi	fabrwi
ÓAN			mobrwi, mobrsowi	mobrwi, mobrsowi
AXAVILIE	wisihi			
AMLOXO		huybr, yhufabrso, yhumosiso, hufasiso, hubrso, husiso		brdahu
AXALOXO		hufasida, hubrda, husida	ybrwi, yfabrsowi, ymosisowi	brsowi
ÓMPÓSAK			sowisi, dahusi	brwifa, sihufa

Table III

CONSANGUINEAL RELATIVES:
GENERATION, RANGE AND LATERALITY

Circles separate generations (descending toward center)

Numbers refer to Jale kinship terms (male EGO)

— range of terms as limited by given kin types

----- separates male and female relatives denoted by the same term

— separates elder and younger siblings

2. Parallel Cousin Rule

2a. Patrilineal form: As linking relative one's father's brother is structurally equivalent to oneself. [This equivalence implies that a person's patrilineal parallel cousins are merged with his (her) brothers and sisters, respectively.]

2b. Matrilineal form: A relative linking a sibling and his mother's sister are structurally equivalent. [This equivalence implies that a relative's matrilineal parallel cousins are merged with his (her) brothers and sisters, respectively.]

3. *Ambilateral Merging Rule*

One's parent's father or mother is merged with his (her) parents' parent's brothers and sisters, respectively. Reciprocally, male or female Ego's child's child is merged with his or her sibling's child's child.

4. *Special Merging Rules*

4a. Ego's siblings are merged though distinguished by relative age, and as linking relatives they are equivalent to Ego. [This rule implies that the sons and daughters, respectively, of Ego and his (her) siblings are merged.]

4b. The children of Ego's mother's sister are merged and as linking relatives they are equivalent to Ego.

4c. One's father and his brother are merged.

4d. Female Ego's son and her child's son are merged.

As I have described elsewhere (Koch 1970a), the Jálé may use more than one term for a particular relative especially if both affinal and (putative) consanguineal links exist with that relative. However, there is one critical consanguineal link, that between matrilineal parallel cousins, for which two terms are in common use. Although Ego's *mosiso* and *mosida* have a special term, *AXAVILIE*, denoting this genealogical link, these consanguineal relatives are also denoted by the terms used for elder or younger sibling, *OE* or *OT*. Structural sibling equivalence of *AXAVILIE* links is predicted by the matrilineal parallel cousin rule.

SEMANTIC COMPONENTS

The rules do not indicate the semantic features or components that all kin types in a particular class share or which of these features distinguish one class from the other. For the core types or kernels of Jálé consanguineal kin classes I discovered (essentially by a trial-and-error method) that the following seven components suffice to categorize their meaning.

(1) Sex of Ego (E)	E_1 = male
	E_2 = female
(2) Sex of Relative (R)	R_1 = male
	R_2 = female

(3) Moiety (M)	M_1 = Ego's own M_2 = opposite
(4) Degree of Lateral Distance (D)	D_1 = zero D_2 = one D_3 = two
(5) Parent linking relative of two degrees (or more) lateral distance (P) ²	P_1 = father P_2 = mother
(6) Generational Distance (G)	G_1 = second ascending generation G_2 = first ascending generation G_3 = Ego's own generation G_4 = first descending generation G_5 = second descending generation
(7) Relative Age (A)	A_1 = older than Ego A_2 = younger than Ego

Table IV adequately categorizes each kernel by a summation of the components that define its meaning.

SEMANTIC RELATIONS

I doubt that the Jalé share my comprehension of the semantic content of these terms. When a Jalé is asked to explain his denotation of a particular relative, say his mobr, as AMÉ, he does not say "this man is a male member of the other moiety in the first ascending generation at one degree lateral distance." Rather, he says "this man is my mother's EREK." If the relative in question were his mobrso or any other agnate of his mother in his own or descending generations, he would say "he is my mother's AMLOXO". He would make the same statement if the denoted relative were his momosisoso without knowing,

² This component is especially critical if the analysis is to include more distant kin types.

due to prevailing marriage and residence patterns, the exact genealogical linkage involved in this relationship.

A content analysis of reckoning statements collected in the field shows that a Jalé's cognitive orientation in denoting a relative within and outside the central range of core types in Table IV is by deduction from the known denotation of this relative by his father or mother or by deduction from his denotation for this relative's father or mother. Similar deductions apply to the classification of affinal relatives. *Relational analysis rather than class-product logic appears to go on in a Jalé's head* (cf. Wallace 1970).³ However, as the following explication will show, unlike Wallace's scheme the logic of this analysis relates terminological categories rather than genealogical positions.

Although the Jalé include specific kin terms in their explanations or relationships ("this man is my mother's *oe*"), they need and often use only six expressions that describe the deductive classifications for relatives in their own, the first ascending and the first descending generations, excluding own parents, siblings and children. These expressions are, in addition to *IKNI* ("father") and *ÉSÉNGA* ("mother"), *ÓMALIK*, *ARE*, *EREK*, and *EXE*. Reckoning statements for relatives in the second ascending and descending generations always contain the appropriate specific kin terms that explicate the relationship.

The expression *ÓMALIK* means "child", "offspring" or "young". Depending on the context of its use, the term refers to a stage of physical maturity or to the biological relationship. Sex-marking prefixes differentiate *AP-ÓMALIK* ("male child") from *HE-ÓMALIK* ("female

³ Wallace's relational analysis of American kinship terminology is new only as far as his interpretation of the meaning of a term as "a rule reckoning" is concerned. In Romney's study (Romney and D'Andrade 1964), for example, the same relations are expressed by a different set of notational symbols and by writing the transformations in reverse direction. Thus, if

	Wallace:		Romney:
"child of"	= a	=	—a
"sibling of"	= b	=	O a
"parent of"	= c	=	+ a
"spouse of"	= d	=	= a
then:			
"cousin"	= abc	=	+ aOa—a

[In order to demonstrate the structural identity of the two and the initial ("Ego") link in Romney's expression.]

Table IV COMPONENTS OF CONSANGUINEAL TERMS

Component :		E	R	M	D	P	G	A
Term :								
1.	OE	0	0	1	2		3	1
2.	OT	0	0	1	2		3	2
3.	IKNI	0	1	1	1		2	0
4.	ÉSÉNGA	0	2	2	1		2	0
5.	ÓAN	0	2	1	2		2	0
6.	AMÉ	0	1	2	2		2	0
7.	ÓMÓM	0	2	2	2		2	0
8.	AXAVILIE	0	0	1	3	2	3	0
9.	AMLOXO	1	1	1	1		4	0
		2	1	2	1		4	0
		2	1	0	1		5	0
10.	AXALOXO	1	2	1	1		4	0
		2	2	2	1		4	0
11.	ÓMPÓSAK	0	1	0	1		1	0
		1	0	0	1		5	0
12.	ÉMPÉANGA	0	2	0	1		1	0
		2	2	0	1		5	0

child"). The Jalé do not include these prefixes in reckoning statements, and if the relative referred to has reached maturity they commonly use the sex-specific AMLOXO or AXALOXO rather than ÓMALIK. In reckoning statements the term IKNI * and ÉSÉNGA refer to the "parent" through whom a relationship is traced. The asterisk signifies the attribute *jóxon* ("true") that differentiates one's "father" (genitor) from other members of the IKNI class. In their narrower range of application, the terms ARE, EREK, and EXE designate a person's consanguineal relatives in his (her) own moiety and in the same generation ("brothers", "sisters", and "parallel cousins"). Table V summarizes the basic terminological relationships.

A paradigm of reckoning statements need not include the components "moiety membership" and "sex of relative". Subject to certain contingencies, this information is either encoded by the term designating the linked relative or by the term designating the relative of reckoning; see Tables VI and VII.

Table V BASIC RECKONING LINKAGES

Term	Sex of relative of reckoning (A)	Sex of linked relative (B)	Linkages between (A) and (B)
ARE	Male	Male	br, fabrso, mosiso
EREK	Male	Female	si, fabrda, mosida
EREK	Female	Male	br, fabrso, mosiso
EXE	Female	Female	si, fabrda, mosida

Table VI TERMINOLOGICAL COMPONENT: SEX

Component: Sex of Relative*		
Male	Female	Male or Female
IKNI	ÉSÉNGA	OE (e)
AMÉ	ÓAN	OT (y)
AMLOXO	ÓMÓM	AXAVILIE
ÓMPÓSAK (a)	AXALOZO	ÓMPÓSAK (d)
ARE	ÉMPÉANGA	ÓMALIK
EREK (f)	EXE	
	EREK (m)	

* Superscripts specifying contingencies:

- (a) = in ascending generations
- (d) = in descending generations [male Ego]
- (m) = if linked through male relative of reckoning
- (f) = if linked through female relative of reckoning
- (e) = relative age: elder
- (y) = relative age: younger

Table VIII represents a quasi-paradigm of reckoning statements for consanguineal relatives that contains the minimal number of elements needed in relational analyses for the classification of relatives. It reflects cognitive reality more accurately than class definitions derived from componential analysis. Reckoning statements for "cross-cousins" are problematic because the skewing rule logically requires that one's female agnates in ascending generations and, reciprocally, one's mother's male agnates in descending generations are equivalent as relatives of reckoning. Although the Jalé include the specific terms ÓAN and AMÉ in these statements, they often use modified expressions denoting the linking kin types and refer to any patrilineal cross-cousin (AMLOXO or AXOLOXO) as NENEREK (NENEXE) ÓMALIK ["child of our EREK (EXE)"]

Table VII TERMINOLOGICAL COMPONENT: MOIETY

Component: Moiety *	
Same	Opposite
OE	ÉSÉNGA
OT	AMÉ
IKNI	ÓMÓM
ÓAN	AMLOXO (o)
AXAVILIE	AXALOXO (o)
AMLOXO (s)	ÓMPÓSAK (o)
AXALOXO (s)	ÉMPÉANGA (o)
ÓMPÓSAK (s)	
ÉMPÉANGA (s)	
ARE	
EXE	

* Superscripts specifying contingencies:

- (s) = in ascending generation: if male (female) relative of reckoning belongs to the linked relative's own (opposite) moiety;
in own and descending generations: if male (female) relative of reckoning belongs to Ego's own (opposite) moiety.
- (o) = in ascending generation: if male (female) relative of reckoning belongs to the linked relative's opposite (own) moiety;
in own and descending generations: if male (female) relative of reckoning belongs to Ego's opposite (own) moiety.

and to any matrilinear cross-cousin (AMÉ or ÓMÓM) as AMUSI-ANGKE. In this expression AMUSI is the plural form of AMÉ and the suffix (which means "part of", "belonging to") denotes the filial linkage involved in the relationship explained. The reckoning statements for OE and OT included in Table VIII may appear contrived; but they are used, for example, to identify half-siblings and to distinguish siblings and patrilinear parallel cousins from matrilinear parallel cousins who, as indicated above, can all be denoted by these terms.

Like consanguineal terms the terms for affinal relatives themselves or their structural position in reckoning statements encode the components "moiety membership" and "sex of relatives". The only contingency to be specified is "relative Age (A)" between a woman's husband and his "brother" or, reciprocally, between a man and his "brother's" wife.

Table VIII

CONSANGUINEAL RELATIVES: RECKONING STATEMENTS

Term	Sex of Ego	Relative of reckoning (A)	Relationship of (A) with linked relative
OE	m, f	IKNI *	ÓMALIK ^(e)
OT	m, f	IKNI *	ÓMALIK ^(y)
IKNI	m, f	IKNI *	ARE
ÓAN	m, f	IKNI *	EREK
AMÉ	m, f	ÉSÉNGA AMÉ	EREK (ÓMALIK) ÓMALIK
ÓMÓM	m, f	ÉSÉNGA AMÉ	EXE ÓMALIK
AXAVILIE	m, f	ÉSÉNGA or ÓMÓM	ÓMALIK
AMLOXO	m	ARE or EREK (ÓAN)	ÓMALIK
	f	EXE or EREK (ÓAN)	ÓMALIK
		AMLOXO * or AXALOXO *	AMLOXO
AXALOXO	m	ARE or EREK (ÓAN)	ÓMALIK
	f	EXE or EREK (ÓAN)	ÓMALIK
ÓMPÓSAK ^(a)	m, f	IKNI * or ÉSÉNGA	IKNI or AMÉ
ÓMPÓSAK ^(d)	m	AMLOXO * or AXALOXO *	ÓMALIK
ÉMPÉANGA ^(a)	m, f	IKNI * or ÉSÉNGA	ÉSÉNGA or ÓAN or ÓMÓM
ÉMPÉANGA ^(d)	f	AMLOXO * or AXALOXO *	AXALOXO

The superscripts specify the following contingencies:

- * = biological link or *jáxón* relationship
- (e) = relative age: elder
- (y) = relative age: younger
- (a) = in ascending generations
- (d) = in descending generations

There are two structural types of reckoning statements for the classification of affinal relatives. One type, for close affines (Table IX-A), contains either the expression AXÓN ("husband") or ÓXE ("wife") in addition to consanguineal terms. In reckoning statements for distant affines (Table IX-B), in which the relative of reckoning is always Ego's affine, any appropriate term for affinal relatives may occur.

(Distant affines are either consanguineal relatives of the spouse of Ego's own consanguineals or the spouses of a consanguineal relative of Ego's spouse.) The only obvious exceptions are the reckoning statements for ANTÉLAXA ("co-wife") which contains the two basic affinal terms, and AXAVILIE ("wisihu") which also requires two expressions designating affinal relationships. The same logic, however, structures the reckoning statements for "wibrwi" (EREK) and its reciprocal "husihu" and for the self-reciprocal relationship "hubrwi" (EXE), in which consanguineal terms (IKNI/AMLOXO^(A) and ÉSÉNGA/AXALOXO^(A)) designate Ego's affine.

The "cognitive reality" of reckoning statements for affinal relatives designated by other consanguineal terms, especially the expressions EREK and EXE, is problematic, because they do not distinguish these relatives from other members of their sex, generation and moiety. The same consideration applies to affinal terms. My records show that the Jalé designate as ÉAMAL, ÓMPARIK, or AXARUK any member of the same sib and generation to which their particular relatives denoted by these terms belong. Moreover, as forms of address the terms ÓMPARIK and AXARUK are generally used for any member of the speaker's sex and generation who belongs to the opposite moiety regardless of his (her) sib affiliation.

CONCLUSION

The Jalé kinship terminology of consanguineal relatives represents an Omaha-type system. Three main rules and four special merging rules suffice to describe the formal properties of their classification. This classification reflects a differential combination of seven semantic components that give each kin type its distinct analytic meaning. Native cognitive orientation in denoting relatives, however, relies on deductions from known denotations of and by primary consanguineal and affinal relatives.

The separation of a taxonomic analysis (formal model) and an ordered ethnographic report (empirical system) becomes especially critical if one is tempted to infer the existence of native categories from taxonomic equivalence rules as Lounsbury's (1964) discussion of the Fox Indian terminology shows. Like the Jalé the Fox Indians distinguish terminologically the kin types "mother" and "mother's sister". Lounsbury's consistent application of his merging rule obviates this distinction between "lineal mother" and "collateral mother" with

Table IX-A

CLOSE AFFINAL RELATIVES: RECKONING STATEMENTS

Term	Sex of Ego	Relative of reckoning (A)	Relationship of (A) with linked relative
ANTÉLAXA	f	AXÓN	ÓXE
ÉAMAL	m	ÓXE AXALOXO	IKNI or AMÉ AXÓN
	f	AXÓN AXALOXO (o)	IKNI or AMÉ AXÓN
ÉAMALHE	m	ÓXE AMLOXO	ÉSÉNGA or ÓMÓM ÓXE
	f	AXÓN AMLOXO (o)	ÉSÉNGA or ÓMÓM ÓXE
ÓMPARIK	m	ÓXE EREK	EREK or EXE AXÓN
	f	EXE	AXÓN
AXARUK	f	AXÓN EREK	EREK ÓXE
ÓMAENG	m	ÓXE ÓAN or ÓMÓM	AMLOXO or AXALOXO AXÓN
	f	ÓAN or ÓMÓM	AXÓN
IKNI	f	AXÓN	OE
ÉSÉNGA	m	ÓXE IKNI or OE	ÓAN ÓXE
	f	AXÓN IKNI	ÓAN ÓXE
ÓAN	m, f	AMÉ	ÓXE
AMLOXO	f	AXÓN AXALOXO (s)	OT or AMLOXO AXÓN
AXALOXO	m	OT	ÓXE
	f	AXÓN AMLOXO (s)	AXALOXO ÓXE

Table IX-B

DISTANT AFFINAL RELATIVES: RECKONING STATEMENTS

Term	Sex of Ego	Relative of reckoning (A)	Relationship of (A) with linked relative
ÉAMAL	m	ÓMPARIK or ÉSÉNGA/AXALOXO ^(A) ÉAMAL(-HE) ^(d)	IKNI ARE (EREK)
ÓMPARIK	m	ÓMPARIK ÉSÉNGA/AXALOXO ^(A) ÉAMAL(-HE) ^(o, d)	ARE or EREK EREK or EXE IKNI
	f	AXARUK ÓMPARIK	EREK ARE
AXARUK	f	AXARUK ÓMPARIK ÉAMAL(-HE) ^(s, d)	EXE EREK ÉSÉNGA
EREK	m	ÓMPARIK ÓMPARIK or ÉSÉNGA/AXALOXO ^(A) ÉAMAL(-HE) ^(o, d)	ÓXE ÉSÉNGA
	f	AXARUK ÉAMAL(-HE) ^(s, d)	AXÓN IKNI or ARE (EREK)
EXE	f	IKNI/AMLOXO ^(A) AXARUK or ÓMPARIK ÉAMAL(-HE) ^(s, d)	ÓXE ÉSÉNGA EREK (EXE)
AXAVILIE	m	ÓMPARIK	AXÓN
ÓMPÓSAK	m	ÉAMAL(-HE) ^(o, d)	EREK (EXE)
	f	AXARUK or ÓMPARIK	IKNI

the generation of a "more general and hypothetical superclass 'MOTHER'" (1964: 364). Since, furthermore, both "lineal" and "collateral" mother share with "father" the same reciprocals, "son" and "daughter", he postulates the existence of "a still-higher-order superclass ('PARENT')" (1964: 365). I question the *semantic* (not the formal!) validity of these constructs, if I must assume that, in the absence of a "cover term" for these hypothetical superclasses or of a recognizable "bound form, common to the specific terms which label the subclasses", the unlabeled

superclass is "verbalizable (by the native) only with a descriptive circumlocution" (1964: 365).⁴ If pressed hard and long enough a sophisticated Jalé may indeed come up with some "descriptive circumlocution" defining the concept of a taxonomic super-mother hypothesized by the ethnographer. I doubt, however, that this event could vindicate the speculative construct of a formal code generated by reduction analysis.

KLAUS-FRIEDRICH KOCH

REFERENCES

- Bromley, M.
1967 "The Linguistic Relationships of Grand Valley Dani: A Lexico-statistical Classification." *Oceania* 37, 4: 286-308.
- Burling, Robbins
1970 "American Kinship Terms Once More." *Southwestern Journal of Anthropology* 26, 1: 15-24.
- Hammer, Muriel
1966 "Some Comments on Formal Analysis of Grammatical and Semantic Systems." *American Anthropologist* 68, 2 (Part 1): 362-373.
- Koch, Klaus-Friedrich
1970a "Structure and Variability in the Jalé Kinship Terminology: A Formal Analysis." *Ethnology* 9, 3: 263-301.
1970b "Warfare and Anthropophagy in Jalé Society." *Bijdragen tot de Taal-, Land- en Volkenkunde* 126, 1: 37-58.
- Lounsbury, Floyd G.
1964 "A Formal Account of the Crow- and Omaha-type Kinship Terminologies." *Explorations in Cultural Anthropology*, (ed. W. H. Goodenough), pp. 351-393. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Romney, A. Kimball and Roy Goodwin D'Andrade
1964 "Cognitive Aspects of English Kin Terms." *American Anthropologist* 66, 3 (Part 2): 146-170.
- Romney, A. Kimball
1965 "Kalmuk Mongol and the Classification of Lineal Kinship Terminologies." *American Anthropologist* 67, 5 (Part 2): 127-141.
- Wallace, Anthony F. C.
1965 "The Problem of Psychological Validity of Componential Analyses." *American Anthropologist* 67, 5 (Part 2): 229-248.
1970 "A Relational Analysis of American Kinship Terminology". *American Anthropologist* 72, 4: 841-845.

⁴ Lounsbury recognizes this categorical dilemma and reduces it to the formal properties of his taxonomic rules. Cf. Hammer's (1966) discussion of these methodological problems.