

OCEANIA LINGUISTIC MONOGRAPH

NO. 24

THE LANGUAGES OF KINSHIP

IN

ABORIGINAL AUSTRALIA

edited by

Jeffrey Heath
Department of Linguistics
Harvard University

Francesca Merlan
Research Affiliate
Department of Anthropology
University of Sydney

Alan Rumsey
Department of Anthropology
University of Sydney

CONTENTS

Language Locations (map).....	ii
Symbols and Abbreviations.....	iii
<hr/>	
— Introduction, by <i>Jeffrey Heath</i>	1
Dalabon Dual-Subject Prefixes, Kinship Categories, and Generation Skewing, by <i>Barry Alpher</i>	19
The Logic of Damin Kinship Terminology, by <i>Kenneth Hale</i>	31
(Appendix by <i>Ellen Woolford</i>).....	38
— Where Is That (Knee)? : Basic and Supplementary Kin Terms in Dhuwal (Yuulngu/Murngin), by <i>Jeffrey Heath</i>	40
— Kinship Categories in Kaytej Pronouns, by <i>Harold J. Koch</i>	64
Warlpiri Kinship Structure, by <i>Mary Laughren</i>	72
— Neutralisation and Degrees of Respect in Gurindji, by <i>Patrick McConvell</i>	86
Dyadic Kinship Terms, by <i>Francesca Merlan</i> and <i>Jeffrey Heath</i>	107
'Egocentric' and 'Altercentric' Usage of Kin Terms in Maṅarayi, by <i>Francesca Merlan</i>	125
An Etymological Note on Warlpiri <u>kurdungurlu</u> , by <i>David Nash</i>	141
— Gun-Gunma: An Australian Aboriginal Avoidance Language and its Social Functions, by <i>Alan Rumsey</i>	160
— Personal Power, Kin Classification and Speech Etiquette in Aboriginal Australia, by <i>Peter Sutton</i>	182
List of Contributors.....	201

DYADIC KINSHIP TERMS

FRANCESCA MERLAN AND
JEFFREY HEATH0. Introduction.¹

As one part of their overall systems of kinship terminology, many Australian languages (including all which we have studied, covering much of the north-eastern quadrant of the Northern Territory) have a special set of 'dyadic' terms. As we use this term, it does not apply to such expressions as 'my father', although this does specify the relationship between two persons (the propositus, in this case 'me', and alter or referent); let us call such expressions simple or linear kin terms. We also exclude dual forms of these linear kin terms, as in 'my two fathers' (i.e., my true father and one other classificatory 'father' such as my true FaBr).

Instead, by dyadic term we have in mind an expression of the type '(pair of) brothers' or 'father and child', in which the kinship relationship is between the two referents internal to the kin expression. A plural dyadic would be of the type '(three or more) brothers' or 'father(s) and children' in which there are at least three designated referents but in which there are no additional complications in the kinship relationship specified in the corresponding dyadic term.

This definition of dyadic (and plural dyadic) terms will suffice for purposes of initial orientation, but as we will see (and see also the papers by McConvell and Laughren, this volume), dyadic terms are not always easily separable from other kin-term subsystems such as that variously called 'triangular' or 'shared' kin terms. Indeed, as we will see below for the Mara, dyadic kin terms may intrude functionally into the domain of simple (linear) kin terms in interesting ways.

In this paper we present selected data from languages we have worked on, and discuss a number of linguistic and ethnographic issues which these data raise. We hope that this discussion will be helpful to fieldworkers and that the latter will be encouraged to record and publish data on dyadic terms as part of their overall analysis of kin-term systems.

One immediate question to be attacked arises from the fact that in the languages discussed here the dyadic kin terms are monolexemic, each based formally on a single stem which is commonly (though not always) identical to one of the stems found in the linear kin-term subsystem. We can illustrate this point by using the suffix -gija, found in the local creole English used by Aborigines as a dyadic suffix with kin terms (perhaps it is from together). To construct an expression meaning '(pair of) brothers', we add -gija to the stem meaning 'Br'. However, to construct the expression for 'father and son', we cannot be certain in advance whether the stem meaning 'Fa' or that meaning 'So' should be used ('Fa'--gija or 'So'--gija); for each language this is a basic empirical question which must be answered for each non-self-reciprocal pair. It could also be that both forms exist, perhaps with some nuance of meaning changed. On the other hand, some or all of the dyadic terms in a given language could be suppletive (based on special stems which cannot be identified formally with those stems used in linear terms), and this can happen with self-reciprocal as well as non-self-reciprocal pairs.

Second, the affixal morphology of the dyadic terms must be considered vis-à-vis other morphological constructions in the language, especially when there is reason to think that the dyadic terms are merely special instances of a more general construction with additional functions in the language (the dyadic form may be a special subtype of the ordinary dual form, or of a 'having' construction also used with non-kin noun stems).

Third, we must investigate whether the categorial distinctions (leaving aside the forms) in the dyadic system are identical to or predictable from those seen in the linear kin terms, or whether interesting variations occur which might function as evidence for super- or subcategories.

Fourth, the functions of the dyadic construction in syntax and discourse must be discussed. We will see that although dyadic kin terms can function as ordinary noun phrases functioning as arguments (subject, direct object, etc.) in clauses, it is often more typical for them to occur as (nominal) predicates ('they are brothers') and/or as parenthetical or appositional adjuncts ('John and Bill, brothers, went to the river').

The following sections deal with particular languages, and the topics just mentioned are worked into these sections. For each language we highlight certain of its more interesting or distinctive features rather than attempting a complete analysis, hence in each section some of the topics just mentioned are not dealt with.

1. Nunggubuyu.

This language (spoken now mainly at Numbulwar Mission at the mouth of the Rose River, Arnhem Land Aboriginal Reserve, Northern Territory) is still thriving and most of the young speakers are fluent. We will not analyse the kinship system in detail, but we can say that it is a type of Aranda (four-line) system with limited Omaha-type patrilineal skewing down across generations in the Mo's and MoMo's patrilineal lines (hence MoBr = MoBrSo = MoBrSoSo, and MoMoBrSo = MoMoBrSoSo = MoMoBrSoSoSo). The dyadic terms are partially irregular in form; several are suppletive. It is possibly for this reason that the dyadic terms do not seem to be being used very frequently by younger speakers; some informants (under thirty) were able to produce them when asked, but commented that they were used in 'old people language'. (Kin terms from the local English creole are now in fairly common use as alternatives to Nunggubuyu linear kin terms, and the dyadic forms with *-gija* plus a creole kin stem are also coming in.)

We begin by considering dyadic terms in which we discern a stem which is identical to the corresponding linear kin term (if the latter is self-reciprocal) or to one of the corresponding linear kin terms (if non-self-reciprocal). The term *mu:ri* 'FaFa(Si), (Br)SoCh' is a self-reciprocal term. Its dyadic form is *a-muri-j*, based on the linear stem-form used with 2nd or 3rd person propositus (*a-muri* 'your FaFa', *a-muru-yun^g* 'his/her/their FaFa'), with prefix *a-* (actually *an^g-*, allomorph *ran^g-* in other forms). The dyadic suffix here is *-j* (*-yij* or *-n^yij* in other forms). The dyadic form means '(pair consisting of) FaFa(Si) and (Br)SoCh'; that is, it refers jointly to two persons in the same patriline separated by two generations. The plural dyadic form *mi-da-muri-j* (with Pl prefix *mij-*) could designate a pair consisting of one young person and two other persons in his patriline but two generations up (say, his actual FaFa and FaFaSi), or certain other similar groups of three (or more) persons in the *mu:ri* relationship to each other.

Other cases in which we have a self-reciprocal linear kin term and in which the dyadic expression is based on the same stem are those involving (strong) respect-avoidance relationships: *n^ganja^l-yij* 'pair consisting of a person and his/her *n^ganja^l* (MoMoBrSo, i.e., potential WiMoBr)'; *n^gann^galhi-j* 'pair consisting of a person and his/her *n^gann^galha* (actual or intended mother-in-law)'.

For another in-law relationship characterised by a reduced level of respect behaviour, that between same-sex siblings-in-law (WiBr and SiHu, HuSi and BrWi), the dyadic form is ra-n^gun^ymanji. The stem here is difficult to segment and analyse even etymologically, but we appear to have something like *ra(n^g)-n^guj-manji with a distinct dyadic suffix allomorph *-manji and a root related to the 2nd and 3rd person propositus (possessor) forms of the linear term, ra-n^gujbaj 'your WiBr, etc.' and ra-n^gujba-yun^g 'his WiBr, etc.'.

Other self-reciprocal categories show suppletive dyadic forms. For siblings we have dyadic ni-gama-n^yij 'pair of brothers; brother and sister' and n^gari-yama-n^yij 'pair of sisters'; the g/y alternation is regular and the only difference is in the gender-marking derivational prefixes (these are not the same as the regular inflectional noun-class prefixes, which can be prefixed to the above forms). Note that even though the stem here is suppletive (unrelated to stems used in linear terms meaning 'Br' and 'Si', namely muruyun^g 'my Br+ or Si+', mun^yun^yun^g 'my Br- or Si-', and root -lhari- in all forms with 2nd/3rd person propositus), we can still analyse the semantic patterning because of the distribution of the two dyadic forms. The 'M' (masculine) form is used not only for an all-male cast but also for mixed M-F pairs; the 'F' (feminine) form is used only for all-female pairs. This treatment of mixed gender as 'M' is in agreement with the Nunggubuyu treatment of mixed gender in concord and cross-reference; we shall see that in some languages this is not the case.

The other self-reciprocal category is 'Sp' (spouse), 1st person linear term gulgu but suppletive dyadic ali-jij 'husband-and-wife couple'. (Other linear terms are 2nd person ann^ginaj 'your Hu' and ra-n^garinaj 'your Wi', and 3rd person ann^gina-yun^g 'her Hu' and ra-n^garina-yun^g 'his Wi', likewise unrelated to the stem in the dyadic form.)

In the non-self-reciprocal kin categories, if the dyadic form is 'transparent' (not suppletive) we have to find out which of the two logically possible forms occurs (e.g., 'Fa'-gija or 'Ch'-gija in our creole example). If the dyadic form is suppletive we cannot make a formal stem correlation of this type, but we may be able to deduce a structural asymmetry by examining the semantics of the dyadic term carefully.

One of the transparent examples is n^gawu-yij 'pair consisting of FaSi and BrCh', where the stem is the same as that in the 1st person form n^gawuy 'my/our FaSi' and is unrelated to the reciprocal kin terms ni-gi 'my/our BrSo or man's So', n^gari-yi 'my/our BrDa or man's Da'. Note that the sex of the senior relative (FaSi) is specified, while that of the junior relative is not. Other transparent dyadic forms involving non-self-reciprocal pairs are also based on the term for the senior relative and, if the latter is specified for sex, requires that the senior relative be of that sex; the examples involve the categories 'MoFa(Si)', 'Mo', 'MoMo(Br)', and 'FaMoBrCh' (= potential WiFa or WiFaSi)'.

In the other cases of non-self-reciprocal pairs, the use of suppletive stems makes it impossible directly to identify the stem with that of a particular linear kin term. The examples are these: an-n^yij 'Fa and Ch', n^gali-jij 'MoBr and SiCh', and ramu-n^yij 'FaMo(Br) and (Si)SoCh'. Since the latter is based on the reciprocal relationship between mu:mu 'FaMo(Br)' and ga:mbin^yin^y 'SiSoCh, woman's SoCh', with both senior and junior unspecified for sex, there is no possibility of identifying semantic patterns in the dyadic form which would point to asymmetry. (Perhaps etymologically ramu-n^yij is related to mu:mu, cf. the shared syllable -mu-, but the ra- initial has a tap r, not approximant r, and so cannot be identified with 2nd/3rd person prefix ran^g-, which in any event is not used with the paradigm in question.)

In the other two cases, however, the senior relative is specified for sex in the relevant linear kin terms, the 1st person forms being baba 'my/our

Fa' and bibi 'my/our MoBr', respectively. The junior terms are specified for sex of linking relative in the senior generation and also for sex of referent: ni-gi '(man's) So; BrSo', n^gari-yi '(man's) Da; BrDa'; marig '(Si)Ch; (woman's) Ch' (the latter unspecified for sex of referent in 1st person form shown, but specified for sex in the 2nd/3rd person forms such as 2nd person ni-marig 'your (Si)So' and n^gari-marig 'your (Si)Da', with special derivational noun-class prefixes). Even leaving aside the neutralisation of referent sex in the 1st person form marig, the usage of the dyadic forms shows that the senior category is the one which determines the range of possible referent pairs designated by the dyadic term. For example, a form whose semantic range includes the pair 'Fa and So' could, in principle, be extended in either or both of two ways. First, it could be extended to cover the pair 'FaSi and BrSo', since the linear term for '(woman's) BrSo' is identical to that for '(man's) So' (ni-gi). Alternatively, the form could be extended to mean 'Fa and Da', since '(boy's) Fa' and '(girl's) Fa' are called by the same linear term. The third possibility is that both extensions could be applied, so that a single dyadic form could mean 'Fa and So', 'Fa and Da', 'FaSi and BrSo', or 'FaSi and BrDa', representable as 'Fa(Si) and (Br)Ch'. In fact, the second possibility is the one attested in Nunggubuyu: an-n^yij is the dyadic form if and only if the junior relative calls the senior relative baba 'Fa' (cf. n^gawu-yij 'FaSi and BrCh', cited earlier). This shows that the suppletive dyadic form an-n^yij, though not formally identifiable with bala 'Fa' or any of its other linear forms (the 2nd/3rd person forms are based on the stem ni-n^yara-), nonetheless is tied semantically to the (senior) category 'Fa'. The same is true of n^gali-jij 'MoBr and SiCh' (cf. rigi-j 'Mo and Ch').²

We must pause to specify more carefully what we mean by seniority here. We are talking about the unmarked or focal relationship between two reciprocal categories, not the actual relative age or even generation of two individuals in a given case. Thus 'Fa' is senior to '(man's) Ch' in the sense that the most salient relationships designated in this fashion involve an age and generational advantage to 'Fa'. However, because of the way kin terms are extended, a person could have a classificatory 'Fa' who is younger than him or her and who is in a lower generation. In such cases the dyadic term is the same as it is in the unmarked case. Note also that the great majority of dyadic relationships are thus asymmetrical on the senior/junior axis (the Omaha skewing means that cross-cousin is classified as 'Mo' or 'MoBr', and MoMoBrSoCh as 'MoMoBrCh'), so that only relationships between siblings, spouses, and siblings-in-law are intragenerational in terms of the dyadic system.

There is no space to push our analysis of Nunggubuyu any farther, but we can at least hint at the kinds of things which could be done. First, we can subdivide the various dyadic categories on some (perhaps formal) ground and then try to 'map' the subgroups onto the kinship system in some ethnographically meaningful way. We could distinguish suppletive from transparent dyadic terms and try to generalise how they pattern with respect to patriline, respect or familiarity toward various kinsmen, etc. In the case of transparent dyadic terms we could identify those most closely based on 1st person propositus forms ('my/our ...') vs. those based on 2nd/3rd person forms, and again try to account for how these map across the kinship categories. Turning to discourse and syntax, we would point out that the dyadic terms are used sparingly even by older people and that, especially for non-self-reciprocal pairs, it is customary to present both kin terms (in 3rd person form) as they are introduced, so that one or the other of these terms can be repeated later for purposes of referential specification.

2. Maṇarayi.

Our discussion of the linear kin terms can be abbreviated here since further particulars are given elsewhere (Merlan, this volume). In Table 1 we present the full set of dyadic terms with their reduplicated plural forms; the glosses are simplified and merely exemplify the kin categories involved. Some of the affinal categories at the bottom of the table can be considered specially marked subcategories of more general, genealogically defined kin categories listed higher in the table (e.g., gambuṛa is a subcategory of the 'Mo' or 'MoBr' category); we omit details.

The dyadic terms are based on linear kin terms with the addition of suffix -yi (becoming -ji after stops as in yirag-jī). In the non-self-reciprocal pairs in which the two categories are normally in distinct generations, the senior kin term is used in the dyadic expression (seniority is determined as in Nunggubuyu). Thus for 'Fa and Ch' we get baḍa-yi, based on baḍa 'Fa'. The table shows a variant yirag-jī for the same dyadic category. This is based on yirag, which is used in the avoidance (respect) style of speech instead of baḍa, and yirag-jī is thus used for 'Fa and Ch' when one of the two persons referred to is in an avoidance relationship with the speaker or addressee in a given instance.

The sibling terms (linear) are as follows: wawa '(man's) Br+'; yaba '(man's) Br-', (woman's) Si- or Br'; baba '(man's) Si, (woman's) Si+' (see Figure 2 in Merlan's paper on egocentric/altercentric reference, this volume). The semantics are somewhat complex and depend on sex of propositus as indicated by the parenthetical stipulations, but observe that the reference of wawa must be male (i.e., Br) and that of baba must be female (i.e., Si), while yaba is applicable to referents of either sex. The dyadic expressions are shown in Table 1 and reduce the various combinations to just two forms in which relative age (shown by + or - in the glosses just given) is

TABLE 1

Maṇarayi

<u>gloss</u>	<u>dyadic form</u>	<u>plural dyadic form</u>
Fa and Ch (ordinary)	baḍa-yi	baḍaḍa-yi
" " " (avoidance)	yirag-jī	yirirag-jī
FaFa(Si) and (Br)SoCh	muṛi-wa-yi	muṛiṛi-wa-yi
FaSi and BrCh	yilambuṛa-yi	yililambuṛa-yi
Mo and Ch	ṇala-yi	ṇalala-yi or ṇalaṇala-yi
MoFa(Si) and (Br)DaCh	jabjab-jī	jabjabjab-jī
MoBr and SiCh	guṇḡu-yi	guṇḡuṇḡu-yi
MoMo(Br) and (Si)DaCh	gagag-jī	gagagag-jī
cross-cousins	miṇjari-yi	miṇjimiṇjari-yi
Br and Br	wawa-yi	wawawa-yi
Si and Br/Si	baba-yi	bababa-yi
WiFa and DaHu	baraṇali-yi	bararaṇali-yi
Hu and Wi	gaṇbam-yi	gaṇbambam-yi
SpFa and ChSp	mayara-yi	mayaraṛa-yi
SpFaSi and BrChSp	gambuṛa-yi	gambambuṛa-yi
MoMoBrCh and FaSiDaCh	gaṇji-yi	gaṇjaṇji-yi

Note: Dyadic (and linear) forms of the stems mayara and gambuṛa are used infrequently. For non-self-reciprocal relations involving generational differences, the stems used in the dyadic forms above are regularly those representing the senior member.

disregarded: wawa-yi 'Br and Br' and baba-yi 'Si and Br/Si'. Unlike the Nunggubuyu counterparts, here mixed gender is merged with the all-female form (but note that here we are dealing with choice of stem while in Nunggubuyu we are dealing with derivational gender-marking prefixes). The choice of wawa and baba (but not yaba) as bases for the dyadic terms suggests a preference for stems which explicitly mark sex of referents, and of the two (wawa and baba) it appears (from the treatment of mixed-gender forms) that the 'Si' term baba is unmarked. (Note that even as a linear kin term wawa is rather highly marked semantically, requiring male propositus as well as male referent and also requiring that the referent be older than propositus.)

The plural dyadic forms in the table apply, as usual, to groups of three or more persons related to each other in the fashion indicated. Morphologically, plural dyadic terms are formed by reduplication, typically an 'internal' reduplication (as in yirag-ji becoming yirirag-ji). This process is found in other nouns in this language and is not a specific morphological feature of dyadic kin terms; cf. wangij 'child' (not a kin term), reduplicated plural wangangij 'children'.

In this language the dyadic suffix -yi (-ji) is identical with a suffix added to other kinds of nouns creating a 'having X' derivative (where X represents the noun). Thus nugu 'water', derivative nugu-yi 'having water' (hence 'drenched/filled with water', etc.). The sense is that of accompaniment or temporary possession. Such forms can be inflected like other nouns (and can take plural reduplication, for reference to two or more objects), but often are best described as manner adverbs, or as loosely-linked noun-phrase modifiers. Two examples:

- (1) Mayawa nugu-nugu-yi wur-ga-ni Ø-bega-Ø.
 now having water (redup.) 3Du took 3Sg tobacco
 'Now they(Du) were carrying the tobacco, drenched with water.'
- (2) Wirilmayin qir-bu-b qabaranwa baŋgal-yi.
 goanna we hit 3Sg two having egg
 'He and I killed two goannas with (i.e., who had) eggs.'

In (2), dual number is not marked on 'goanna' or 'having egg(s)', or even in the object marker in the verb, since there is an overt numeral 'two'.

The apparent formal identity of dyadic kin terms with these 'having' constructions raises the question whether the dyadic kin terms really ought to be considered just an instance of this more general construction. In its strong form, this would mean that something like baɖa-yi 'Fa and Ch' should be reinterpreted to mean 'having Fa' (i.e., indicating that the referent, here the Ch, is accompanied by or has in his possession his Fa).

This analysis is untenable and can be shown to be false on simple syntactic grounds. If baɖa-yi meant 'having Fa' and were syntactically identical to forms like nugu-yi 'having water', it should be semantically singular (if just one Ch is involved), or semantically dual or plural (if and only if more than one Ch is involved). In fact, however, baɖa-yi refers jointly to the Fa and his Ch in a way not found with forms like nugu-yi, and baɖa-yi is cross-referenced by a dual pronominal form when there is exactly one Fa and one Ch. (It is possible that a case could be found in which baɖa-yi does mean 'having Fa', e.g., to indicate non-orphan status, but if so this is a distinct construction which should not be confused with dyadic kin terms.) An analysis of dyadic terms as 'having' expressions would be more tenable if one could say 'having Ch' when the Fa is the reference point, contrasting with 'having Fa' from the Ch's viewpoint, but in fact the only dyadic expression for this pair is baɖa-yi with the stem for 'Fa'. It is quite possible that dyadic kin terms are etymologically related to or identical with 'having' expressions, but if so they have evolved and become

specialised (syntactically, though not formally) and the two should not be confused synchronically. (See below, however, for the Mara.)

Additional comments on the syntax of Maṇarayi dyadic kin terms are given near the end of this paper.

3. Dhuwal.

This is one of the Yuulngu languages of northeastern Arnhem Land; see Heath (this volume) for a general discussion of the kin-term systems.

The dyadic forms involve a suffix -^yman^yji which is not used in Dhuwal in other senses. (In Ritharngu, a neighboring Yuulngu language, -man^yji is the regular Du suffix for nouns, and a distinct suffix, -ko[?], is used in dyadic kin terms.)

The basic kin terms of Dhuwal are normally non-self-reciprocal, so we must make choices between the two reciprocal linear stems in each dyadic form (there is no suppletion). In this language there is no simple rule for choosing between the two reciprocal linear terms in forming the dyadic term (such as 'use the senior kin term'). The attested forms are shown in Table 2.

Some of the patterns are familiar from our previous sections. The pattern for sibling dyadic terms is like that in Maṇarayi, and in both languages stems (rather than gender-marking affixes) are involved. In the case of sibling dyadic terms, the all-female term is extended to the mixed-gender case, but note that in the case of spouses ('Hu and Wi') the male term 'Hu' is the basis for the dyadic form.

Heath was unable to elicit dyadic terms for 'FaMo' (mu:mu) or 'FaMoBr/MoFa' (n^gathi), but the other grandparental categories are represented in the data. In the linear kin-term system, FaFa (ma:ri or ma:ri-^ymun^gu) is only optionally distinguished from MoMoBr (ma:ri), though there are additional linguistic mechanisms for differentiating them when necessary. In the dyadic system, the two are distinguished by using the senior term ma:ri only for the pair 'FaFa(Si) and (Br)SoCh', and by using the junior reciprocal term guthara 'SiDaCh, (woman's) DaCh' in the dyadic form for 'MoMo(Br) and (Si)DaCh'.

TABLE 2

Dhuwal

<u>gloss</u>	<u>dyadic term</u>	<u>based on (linear term)</u>
FaFa(Si) and (Br)SoCh	ma:ri- ^y man ^y ji	ma:ri 'FaFa(Si)/MoMo(Br)'
MoMo(Br) and (Si)DaCh	guthara- ^y man ^y ji	guthara '(Si)DaCh'
WiMoMoBr and SiDaDaHu	n ^g athiwalkuṛ- ^y man ^y ji	n ^g athiwalkuṛ 'WiMoMoBr'
WiMoMo and DaDaHu	mumalkuṛ- ^y man ^y ji	mumalkuṛ 'WiMoMo'
MoMoBrWiBr and SiHuSiDaCh	garmala- ^y man ^y ji	garmala 'MoMoBrWiBr'
Fa and Ch	ba:pa- ^y man ^y ji	ba:pa 'Fa'
FaSi and BrCh	mu:kul- ^y man ^y ji	mu:kul 'FaSi, WiMo'
MoMoBrSo and FaSiDaCh	maṛalkuṛ- ^y man ^y ji	maṛalkuṛ 'MoMoBrSo'
WiMo and DaHu	gurun ^g - ^y man ^y ji	gurun ^g 'DaHu (=FaSiDaSo)'
Mo and Ch	or mu:kul- ^y man ^y ji	mu:kul 'FaSi, WiMo'
MoBr and SiCh	n ^g a:nḍi- ^y man ^y ji	n ^g a:nḍi 'Mo'
	waku- ^y man ^y ji	waku 'SiCh'
	or gawal- ^y man ^y ji	gawal 'MoBr'
Br and Br	wa:wa- ^y man ^y ji	wa:wa 'Br+'
Si and Br/Si	yapa- ^y man ^y ji	yapa 'Si'
Hu and Wi	dhuway- ^y man ^y ji	dhuway 'Hu'

Note: As usual, terms with spouse or affinal glosses have genealogically as well as affinally determined referents.

A similar opportunistic (disambiguating) use of junior stems is seen in dyadic forms for the categories 'FaSi' and 'WiMo (=MoMoBrDa)', which in the linear system are merged as mu:kul (optionally differentiated by additional adjuncts). The reciprocal of 'FaSi' (a non-avoidance relationship) is ga:thu 'BrCh' (also '(man's) Ch'), while that of 'WiMo' is gurun^g '(woman's) DaHu (=FaSiDaCh)'. In the dyadic system, mu:kul-?man^yji most often means 'FaSi and BrCh' (based on senior term), while gurun^g-?man^yji means 'WiMo and DaHu' (based on junior term). (The distinction between the two dyadic terms is not rigorous, since mu:kul-?man^yji is attested once in the latter sense.)

In the case of 'MoBr and SiCh', both of the forms shown (one based on 'MoBr' and one based on the junior reciprocal 'SiCh') are attested at least twice in texts and both are therefore clearly in use. One feature of this relationship is that 'SiCh' is a kin category which includes referents who can be considered potential WiMoBr to Ego (a crucial relationship since a woman's MoBr plays a major role in bestowing her on a Hu). If a man's SiSo bestows his (SiSo's) SiDa on the man (e.g., as a second or third Wi), he (SiSo) is then functionally the same as maṛalkur 'MoMoBrSo (primary potential WiMoBr)'. In a social sense, then, the senior/junior relationships which we expect between a man and his SiSo may be complicated or reversed, and it is not surprising to find some instability in the dyadic forms.

In the remaining relationships the senior term is the one used in the dyadic form (e.g., 'Fa', 'Mo', 'WiMoMo'). Note also that for 'Br and Br' the form is based on 'Br+' (not 'Br-', yukuyuku). Perhaps the use of 'Hu' rather than 'Wi' in the spouse dyadic form is related to the fact that in traditional times men were normally much older than their wives because of the difference in ages at which men and women were married.

In view of the intricacies of this system, it should be pointed out that some of the more uncommon dyadic terms shown in the table were obtained only in elicitation from one or two informants (though about seven dyadic terms are attested in texts and some others were obtained from several informants). More work on this language (which also has some dialectal variants) and those closely related to it in the Yuulngu group will undoubtedly reveal further complications and variations.

4. Ṇalakan.

This language is now spoken around Roper Valley cattle station, roughly between the Ngalkbon-Dalabon (see Alpher's paper on Dalabon duals, this volume) and the Maṇarayi (already treated); it is not very far from the Nunggubuyu (see above) or from the Mara (see below). The basic kin terms are shown in Figure 1, and the dyadic terms in Table 3.

Examining the dyadic terms, we find that in three out of four combinations for dyads separated by two generations (i.e., grandparent and grandchild) the choice of stem is unproblematic since the linear terms are self-reciprocal. In the fourth case we find that the junior stem (man's DaCh) is used in the dyadic form. This does not seem to involve generation asymmetry in favour of junior categories, though; it is probably just a device for permitting the distinction between memem-go? and wawaya-ko?. If all forms were based on the senior linear term these two would be merged as memem-go?.

When the two members of the dyad differ by one generation, in some cases we find fluctuation between choice of senior and junior terms in the dyadic form. We can see this with 'FaSi and BrCh' (marke-go? or ge-ko?) and with 'MoBr and SiCh' (gayka-go? or ḡamu-ko?). Semantically, the choice corresponds approximately to the difference between 'a woman and her brother's child' and 'a man and his father's sister', for example. That is, marke-go? and ge-ko? are both dual and can be used to denote the same pair of individuals, but achieve this denotation from distinct perspectives, each focusing on one particular member of the dyad and then relating the other member to him or her. Thus, at least in certain categories, Ṇalakan dyadic terms have

FIGURE 1

Nalakan Linear Kin Terms

<u>generation</u>	<u>FaFa's line</u>	<u>MoFa's line</u>	<u>MoMoBr's line</u>	<u>FaMoBr's line</u>
2A	duḍu 'FaFa(Si)'	memem 'MoFa(Si)'	gowko 'MoMo(Br)'	memem 'FaMo(Br)'
1A	{ marke 'FaSi' mokol 'Fa'	manan 'Mo' gayka 'MoBr'	balak 'MoMoBrDa/WiMo' jobal 'MoMoBrSo/WiMoBr'	joy 'WiFa'
0	{ yapa 'ḶSi, qSi+' gaka 'ḶBr-, qBr, qSi-' buypu 'ḶBr+'	giṇḍar 'MoBrCh'	gowko 'MoMoBrSoCh'	jamiñ 'spouse' ṇoy 'Si-in-law' wulukur? 'Br-in-law'
1D	{ ge 'ḶCh, qBrCh' gaya 'ḶBrCh'	manan 'MoBrSoDa' gayka 'MoBrSoSo'	balak 'MoMoBrSoSoDa' jobal 'MoMoBrSoSoSo'	ṇamu 'qCh, ḶSiCh' gaya 'qSiCh'
2D	duḍu 'ḶSoCh, BrSoCh'	wawaya 'ḶDaCh, BrDaCh'	gowko 'qDaCh, SiDaCh'	memem 'qSoCh, SiSoCh'

TABLE 3

Nalakan Dyadic Terms

<u>gloss</u> (simplified)	<u>dyadic form</u>	<u>based on</u> (linear category)
FaFa(Si) and (Br)SoCh	duḍu-ko?	(self-reciprocal)
MoMo(Br) and (Si)DaCh	gowko-go?	(self-reciprocal)
FaMo(Br) and (Si)SoCh	memem-go?	(self-reciprocal)
MoFa(Si) and (Br)DaCh	wawaya-ko?	(Br)DaCh
FaSi and BrCh	marke-go?	FaSi
	or ge-ko?	BrCh
Fa and Ch	mokol-go?	Fa
Mo and Ch	mana-ko?	Mo
MoBr and SiCh	gayka-go?	MoBr
	or ṇamu-ko?	SiCh
person and Ch of same-sex sibling	gaya-ko?	Ch of same-sex sibling
MoMoBrSo and FaSiDaCh	jobal-ko?	MoMoBrSo
MoMoBrDa and FaSiDaCh	balak-o?	MoMoBrDa
Fa-in-law and So-in-law	joy-ko?	Fa-in-law (WiFa)
cross-cousins	giṇḍar-ko?	(self-reciprocal)
woman and BrWi	ṇoy-ko?	Si-in-law
man and SiHu	wulukur?-go?	Br-in-law
Br and Br	buypu-go?	ḶBr+
Si and Br/Si	yapa-go?	ḶSi, qSi+
spouses	jamiñ-go?	(self-reciprocal)

semantic and syntactic possibilities not shared by the other languages, which (with some marginal exceptions in Dhuwal) normally either have suppletive dyadic forms or permit only one choice of kin-term stem for each dyadic relationship.

Sibling dyadic terms follow the pattern seen earlier in Maṇarayi and Dhuwal. The sibling-in-law terms show only slight variations which we will not go into here. Further remarks on syntax are presented in section 6, below.

5. Mara.

This language is spoken on the Gulf coast south of the Nunggubuyu and roughly east of the Maṇarayi (separated from both of them by one or two other linguistic groups). In Mara the study of dyadic terms is not merely an adjunct, rather a central component of, the analysis of 'basic' (linear) kin terms. For in this language some 'basic' kin terms are, in some or all paradigmatic forms, not linear at all; the dyadic forms are the only ones which exist for some categories.

We specify 'in some or all paradigmatic forms' because Mara kin categories are expressed by several stems in either suppletive or derivational relationships to each other. Basically, there is a form for each propositus (1st, 2nd, and 3rd persons), plus a special vocative form. These four basic stem forms can be further elaborated by more or less regular mechanisms to make further specifications of referent gender and number and of propositus gender and number (such propositus categories being expressed by optionally juxtaposed possessive pronouns). We will worry merely about the four basic stem forms. Noun-class/case prefixes, shown here in the absolutive case, are zero for M and n- for F.

An example of a complete paradigm is this set of forms for 'FaSi': vocative baṇaṇa!, REF₁ n-baṇaṇa, REF₂ n-mari-mar, and REF₃ n-mari-ṇanja. In this case the vocative and REF₁ (1st-person-possessor referential form) share a common stem and differ only in the absence of F prefix n- in the vocative (and of course in intonation). The REF₂ and REF₃ forms share a second stem -mari- and are distinguished from each other by special suffixes (used only with kin terms) specifying 2nd person (-mar) or 3rd person (-ṇanja) propositus. This particular split, vocative and REF₁ vs. REF₂/REF₃, is reasonably common but there are some categories where additional splits occur or where the split occurs in a different location. In those cases where a formally dyadic term is used in place of a nonexistent linear term, this replacement may involve all four of these functions (vocative, REF₁, REF₂, REF₃), or it may involve just certain paradigmatic forms.

Before discussing such overlapping between the linear and dyadic systems, let us look at the full set of dyadic terms recorded, all of which can minimally be used to designate pairs of individuals as in the other languages we have considered (Table 4).

In the right-hand column of the table we indicate which linear stem (if any) the dyadic form is based on formally. If the linear forms are unrelated to the stem seen in the dyadic form, the word 'suppletive' appears in the relevant point in this column. On the other hand, if there are gaps in the linear subsystem for a given kin category, so that the 'dyadic' term must also be used to fulfill the functions normally carried out by linear terms, the word 'intrusive' appears in the right-hand column. (We do not specify in this table whether the dyadic form is used in all four linear functions or just some of them.)

In the dyadic subsystem we find a small number of morphologically unanalysable forms (jawula, narjaḷa, mayguḷa, miyangay), but we also find two identifiable constructions. First, there is a fairly transparent formation involving stem-reduplication and addition of suffix -ya; there are five clear examples and a sixth (ḍili-yiliṇa) which lacks the -ya, apparently because

it already has one syllable more than the others. This is formally identical to the 'having' construction, seen in nugu 'water', nugu-nugu-ya 'having (lots of) water'. Of the six dyadic kin terms of this type, two are based on self-reciprocal linear terms, and the other four show the stem for the junior member of the relationship (in three cases this is a grandchild term). In a sense, this violates the generalisation made above for several languages that the term for the senior member is generally used in the dyadic form. However, we could argue that the dyadic form, to the extent that it still functions as a 'having' expression (hence 'having a grandchild' and so forth), is adopting the perspective of the senior member.

Still, these dyadic expressions are treated, semantically and syntactically, as dual nouns. Although the formal connection between these particular dyadic forms and the 'having' construction continues to be quite apparent, we must once again (as with Maqarayi) distinguish the two in a synchronic grammar.

The other analysable construction in Table 4 is not quite so apparent. There are several dyadic forms which end in -ra or -gara. Synchronic segmentation is problematic, but some of the stems occur in nearby languages as linear terms without the -(ga)ra and there is thus reason to believe that this is segmentable as a dyadic suffix at least etymologically.

The distribution of the 'having'-type and -(ga)ra dyadic forms is an obvious issue. We may observe that the former is used a) for all pairs separated by two generations (grandparent/grandchild), and b) in other cases only within patrilineal lines (siblings, FaBr+ and Br-Ch). The -(ga)ra is used in a number of pairs separated by zero or one generation, mostly not within patrilineal lines (the possible exception being wara 'Fa(Si) and (Br)Ch', used most often for actual Fa and Ch, if indeed this is to be segmented as *wa-ra). In general, we can say that the 'having'-type dyadic form is used for relationships which are asymmetrical on the senior/junior axis but involve relatively relaxed or familiar social behaviour. On the other hand, the -(ga)ra and unanalysable (suppletive) types, broadly speaking, involve the more authoritarian parental relationships along with the primary spouse and affinal relationships, which are often characterised

TABLE 4

Mara Dyadic Terms

<u>gloss</u>	<u>dyadic term</u>	<u>based on (linear term)</u>
FaFa(Si) and (Br)SoCh	muṛi-muṛi-ya	(self-reciprocal)
MoFa(Si) and (Br)DaCh	gamb-ambir-ya	(Br)DaCh
MoMo(Br) and (Si)DaCh	gaṅg-aṅguḷ-ya	(Si)DaCh
FaMo(Br) and (Si)SoCh	ḍili-yiliṇa	(Si)SoCh
Fa(Si) and (Br)Ch	wara	suppletive
FaBr+ and Br-Ch	biṇi-wiṇi-ya	(self-reciprocal)
Mo and Ch	gaḷijgara	suppletive
MoBr and SiCh	magara	suppletive
MoMoBrSo and FaSiDaCh	{ jawula	intrusive
	{ narjaḷa	MoMoBrSo
MoMoBrDa and FaSiDaCh	narjaḷa	MoMoBrDa
WiFa and DaHu	ḷambargara	WiFa
spouses	mayguḷa	intrusive
Br-Wi and HuBr+	miyaṅgay	intrusive
HuSi and BrWi	maṅgigara	intrusive
WiBr and SiHu	ṇumbaṇara	elder Br-in-law
siblings	ḍaju-ḍaju-ya	Sb-

by institutionalised patterns of behaviour and sentiment.

The patterns by which the intrusive dyadic forms in Table 4 spill over into the domain of linear kin terms are sensitive to these social factors as well. However, a relatively small number of dyadic terms are used regularly as simple kin terms, and they are limited to spouse and affinal relationships (excluding, for example, parent/child pairs). This can be seen by perusing Table 4,³ noting the presence of the label 'intrusive' in the right-hand column.

The intrusive forms are each used as simple kin terms in at least some of the four basic paradigmatic functions mentioned earlier, for both of the (reciprocal) kin categories involved. For example, maygula 'Hu and Wi' is intrusive since it occurs in forms for 'Hu' as well as in forms for 'Wi'. The dyadic term 'brothers-in-law' ('WiBr and SiHu', the penultimate form in Table 4) is not labeled 'intrusive' in the table since it does not intrude into the basic term domain for both of the reciprocal categories ('elder Br-in-law', 'younger Br-in-law'). As it happens, though, dyadic numbanara does spill over into one of the two basic paradigms, as the REF₃ form for 'elder Br-in-law'. Similarly, lambargara 'WiFa and DaHu' is not labeled 'intrusive' in the table, but the dyadic form is used in most of the basic forms for 'WiFa', and it is not used for '(man's) DaHu' for the simple reason that there is no specific designation for this category (it being normally subsumed under 'MoBr' (= 'MoBrSoSo')). We could therefore elaborate our labels in Table 4 by marking those already labeled there as 'intrusive' as 'doubly intrusive' (intruding into both of the two reciprocal categories), and labeling numbanara and lambargara as 'singly intrusive'. The terminology used is not particularly important; the main point is that the use of dyadic forms in referential functions normally carried out by linear kin terms correlates very strongly with spouse and affinal categories (as usual, we use these terms loosely to include genealogically specified potential spouses and affines).

There is one other category which sometimes uses dyadic terms in this individual referential function. There is a special kin term muñumufu applied to patrilineal cross-cousins (FaSiCh) or father's patrilineal cross-cousins; the term can also be extended downward in a patrilineal line (if a man is your muñumufu, you can also call his children and son's children muñumufu). (Most languages in the area have no equivalent term, combining FaSiCh with MoBrCh as 'cross cousin', and even in Mara the usage of the term is somewhat restricted.) The reciprocal of muñumufu is, in the most salient cases, 'Mo' for female and 'MoBr' for male referent. In REF₂ and REF₃ forms for muñumufu we normally get dyadic magara (ordinarily 'MoBr and SiCh') or galijgara (ordinarily 'Mo and Ch'), since muñumufu itself can apparently be used only in vocative and REF₁ uses.

Given that some 'basic' kin terms are really special uses of dyadic terms, how does the morphology and syntax come to grips with the contradiction between singular referential sense (e.g., 'his Wi') and the fact that the term appears to have an inherent dual reference? Basically, when a dyadic term is used in singular referential function, it occurs as a predicative (i.e., verb-like) expression of the type 'X and Y are ____ to each other'. Like other intransitive verbs or nominal/adjectival predicates, these forms require an intransitive pronominal prefix specifying the pronominal category of the 'subject' of the 'sentence'. The four primary functions (vocative, REF₁, REF₂, and REF₃) of linear kin terms correspond in these predicative dyadic forms to 1st inclusive, 1st exclusive, 2nd, and 3rd person pronominal subject forms (Table 5).

For example, the category '(man's) Br-Wi' (younger Br's Wi) corresponds to no linear kin term, so the dyadic form miyangay must be used in all four basic functions (as well as the true dyadic function). Both the man and the

TABLE 5

Morphology of Mara Dyadic Terms
Used as Simple Kin Terms

<u>prefix</u>	<u>literal sense</u>	<u>practical sense</u>
na-	'you and I are X and Y'	'hey you, (my) X or Y!' (vocative)
qiri-	'he/she and I are X and Y'	'my X or Y' (REF ₁)
quru-	'he/she and you are X and Y'	'your X or Y' (REF ₂)
wur-	'they (Du) are X and Y'	'his/her X or Y' (REF ₃)

Note: X and Y are reciprocal kin categories such as MoBr and SiCh. In an actual instance of referring in this usage, only one (X or Y) is involved.

woman in this relationship address each other as na-miyanḡay, literally a predicative form 'you and I are in the miyanḡay relationship!'. When speaking to a third party, each can refer to the other (in REF₁ function) as qiri-miyanḡay 'he/she and I are in the miyanḡay relationship', and so forth.

In the REF₃ form, the same predicative construction is transparently present when the prefix wur- is used (see Table 5), as in wur-miyanḡay. However, nominal/adjectival predicates in this language often omit the prefixes in the case of third persons, and perhaps as a specific instance of this the REF₃ forms based on dyadic kin terms often omit the wur-. This permits reinterpretation of miyanḡay and other intrusive dyadic stems as not always being truly (or at least overtly) dyadic. Thus, when the practical sense intended is 'his Br-Wi' or 'her HuBr+', the form can show up in the sentence as the overtly dyadic (and predicative) wur-miyanḡay or else in the simpler forms miyanḡay 'her HuBr+' or n-miyanḡay 'his Br-Wi'. These show the regular affixes for Sg human nouns, here M zero and F n- (for absolutive case). Although this option is not available in the vocative, REF₁, or REF₂ functions, its existence in the third person forms suggests a degree of structural ambivalence and instability in the intrusive functions of dyadic terms.

Even when the form itself is unmistakably dyadic (hence nonsingular) and predicative, if the practical sense is individual reference we get singular cross-reference, as in this example:

- (3) qiri-miyanḡay wu-ḡini
 my Br-Wi he/she went
 'My Br-Wi went.'

Here the initial noun is the predicative dyadic form literally glossable as 'she and I are in the miyanḡay relationship', and insofar as this noun acts as the grammatical subject of the following verb form we would expect something like 'she and I are in the miyanḡay relationship, (and) we went'. However, it is not 'we' which functions as the semantic subject of 'go', rather 'she' (my Br-Wi), so the practical meaning of qiri-miyanḡay in this instance is 'my Br-Wi'. In accordance with the semantics, the verb 'to go' is marked for 3Sg (not 1ExPl) subject by the prefix wu-.

In addition to predicative dyadic expressions, there is one other unusual intrusion into the system of simple kin terms. For the category 'younger Br-in-law' (i.e., SiHu or WiBr younger than Ego, with Ego male), the four basic forms are these: vocative mimi-li, REF₁ mimi-di, REF₂ milga+qi-ji, and REF₃ milga+wu-ji. The first two of these are related to the stem seen in mimi 'FaMo(Br)', though the specific surface forms in the two categories are kept distinct by usage of different affixes. (A man's Brs-in-law, actual and

potential, are ordinarily SoSos to men whom Ego calls mimi, so this is a kind of alternate-generation terminological merging, except that the forms are kept distinct by affixes.) The REF₂ and REF₃ forms, on the other hand, look like verb forms rather than nouns. Thus ni- is the regular 2Sg (or transitive 2Sg on 3Sg object) prefix with verbs, and wu- is likewise the 3Sg (or 3Sg on 3Sg) prefix with verbs. The ending -ji is identical to the past punctual form of a common transitive auxiliary verb, which leaves milga in the structural position of a verb-particle (hence we use the + boundary symbol). It is not possible to translate these forms literally, but there is a noun milga 'hip' referring to a body part which is often associated in this part of Australia with the spouse relationship (and can thus be extended fairly naturally to the brother-in-law relationship). We can thus, very crudely, gloss milga+ni-jj as 'you "hipped" him', and milga+wu-jj as 'he "hipped" him', with the practical meanings 'your younger Br-in-law' and 'his younger Br-in-law', respectively.

At any rate, here we have a nondyadic predicative expression (a transitive verb form) functioning as a singular kin term semantically (and syntactically, since it is cross-referenced by a Sg pronominal form). It is now obvious that even the most narrow analysis of 'basic' kin terms must go beyond recording and glossing the usual nonpredicative linear terms by also examining dyadic and verbal forms which spill over functionally into this domain. (In addition, it is necessary to consider all four of the basic vocative and referential functions to see how all of these forms interact.) A considerable amount of interesting semantic patterning emerges, with 'spouse' and 'affinal' categories (even though they also have genealogical referents, such as MoMoBrDaDa equivalent to 'Wi') exhibiting specialised features which set them off from others.

6. Further discussion of syntax.

Leaving aside the special intrusive (singular referential) functions of some of the Mara dyadic forms, we now analyse some major characteristics of dyadic kin terms in the normal sense.

Simple linear kin terms like 'my Fa' can be used either when the kinship relationship itself is focussed on (as in predications, introductions of new noun phrases into the discourse, etc.), or merely as a kind of resumptive or anaphoric index for a referent who has already been introduced in the discourse.

On the other hand, dyadic terms are most often used in contexts where the kinship relationship is focal (foregrounded). Typically, they occur in the form of nominal predicates, which (in most of the languages treated here) means that they take pronominal prefixes like those used with intransitive verbs:

- (4) nuru-wač-jamiñ-go?
 2Du-both-spouse-Dyadic
 'You two are spouses (Hu and Wi).' (Nalakan)

They can take further modifying elements, perhaps specifying the closeness or intensity of the relationship:

- (5) buru-wač-yapa-go?-bindi
 3Du-both-sister-Dyadic-really
 'They are real sisters (i.e., from the same parents).' (Nalakan)

Another usage, actually only slightly different from that seen in the above examples, is appositional. In this construction, a noun phrase (e.g., a 3Du pronoun or an expression like 'two men') is introduced, and is then followed by an explanatory parenthetical aside consisting of a dyadic form which specifies the relationship of the two persons to each other (it thus functions as a predication, though it is not always overtly predicative in form):

- (6) Yiriŋ-juy'-miŋ boŋi, ŋuru-wiŋi-ŋar' marawul-'gun,
 he sent us now you(Pl) poor things die of hunger
 mirpaŋa-gapul, wač-bolo-pira', yirka'-bira' marke-go',
 children both old people we(ExDu) FaSi-Dyadic
 yiri-ŋabo, mu-wapawapa' yiriŋ-ja'-wo'wo.
 we(Pl) went dress he gave us
 'Then he sent us, (saying) "You poor things must be dying of hunger,"
 (along with) all the children. The two old ladies, and we two -
FaSi and BrDa -, we went. Then he gave us some clothes.' (Ŋalakan)

Here marke-go' is in apposition to the person pronoun yirka'-bira'. A more complex example:

- (7) Wuŋa-ya-j, ŋa-ŋayan-ŋan ŋa-baŋam-ŋan wuŋa-ŋi-ŋ, ŋiwa mayawa
 they went at other at camp they sat here now
 ŋala-yag, malga wuŋa-ŋiwiŋdag ŋiŋgi, gari ŋariŋan wuŋa-yiŋi,
 we go then they reached it it there south they went
 ɕayi jaɕ Ø-jaygi-b; baŋam buralaŋ-bu
 not return he did not country (name of subsection)
 gamiraŋ-bu ŋa-yamaŋaŋ-gu ŋa-burala-wu,
 (name of subsection) for correct ones for (name of subsection)
 ŋa-gamira-wu, yamaŋaŋ-garan, wawa-yi, baɕa-yi.
 for (name of subsection) correct(Du) Br-Dyadic Fa-Dyadic
 'They went and sat down in another place (camp). (They said,) "Here
 now, let's go!" Then they reached it (the sea). They went there,
 south. He (kangaroo) did not return. (That) country is for the
 people of the Burala and Gamara (Gamira) subsections - for those
 two appropriate (subsections), Burala and Gamara. (They are) the
 two appropriate ones, brothers of each other, fathers and sons of
each other.' (Maŋarayi)

This is from a myth which, among other things, accounts for the relationship between a particular sacred location and two subsections, which together form a patrilineal descent group (Burala men have Gamara sons and vice versa, so the two alternate across generations in patrilineal lines). The dyadic expressions occur at the end and are intended to explain the relationship between Burala and Gamara. Here 'brothers of each other' indicates the regular kinship relationship of men within a subsection (e.g., Gamara men are brothers to other Gamara men), while 'fathers and sons of each other' describes the relationships among men across the Gamara-Burala division. The net effect of the juxtaposition of the two dyadic expressions is to indicate that an entire patrilineal descent group (equivalent to a patrilineal semi-moiety) is involved.

In such appositional constructions as that in (6), we have a semantically nonsingular dyadic form juxtaposed to another semantically nonsingular noun or pronoun. (In (7) the subsection terms are overtly singular in form but actually refer to collectivities.) This construction differs from that of exhaustive listing. Here we have a nonsingular noun or pronoun which is then more fully specified by listing the individuals it includes. This is a kind of appositional (parenthetical) clarification, but one in which dyadic terms are not normally used:

- (8) Yir-wočwoč-ma-ŋiŋ buligi, yirka' X, ŋayka'.
 we(Du) stole bullock we(Du) (name) I
 'We stole cattle, X (name of a man) and I.' (Ŋalakan)

In the usual appositional construction seen in (6), a dyadic term is appropriate since it indicates the kinship relationship between two (or more) referents, one of whom may already be known (as in (6), where one member of the dyad is the speaker). The exhaustive listing type in (6) is an alternative strategy, most appropriate when the individuals are identified by

personal names or other nonrelational descriptions. It should be noted that in most Australian languages, referring to people by kinship relations (whether using dyadic terms as in (4) or simple linear terms) is extremely common.

In a relatively small percentage of text occurrences, dyadic kin terms function as ordinary nouns, taking up one of the regular case roles in a sentence (e.g., as subject or object of a verb). Examination of Maṇarayi and Ṇalakan data suggests that subject (transitive or intransitive) and genitive-dative (formally a single category) were the most common cases involved. These examples are from Ṇalakan:

- (9) Mokol-go'-yi' ju-go'je jugu-bolo bur-bo'bo.
Fa-Dyadic-Ergative that (FSg) old woman they(Du) hit her
'Fa and So hit that old woman.'
- (10) Mokol-go'-gon ṇu-mu-wakiṛi-wo mungu-may, buru-marawul-me-n
Fa-Dyadic-for I brought it vegetable food they(Du) are hungry
'I brought food for Fa and So, (because) they are hungry.'

In some cases, as in the following Maṇarayi example, the dyadic term is significant semantically since the behaviour in question is abnormal or improper for persons related in the manner indicated:

- (11) Gagag-ji wur-yu-y.
MoMoBr-Dyadic they(Du) slept
'A MoMoBr and his SiDaDa were sleeping (i.e., married).'

Although marriage between MoMoBr and SiDaDa occasionally occurs (chiefly as a second or later marriage), it is officially disapproved of. Here the speaker is pointedly referring to the relationship the man and woman have to each other by using a dyadic term, giving a gossip flavour.

To some extent, use of different dyadic terms with verbs meaning 'to fight' or the like gives the appearance of requiring special verb stems as though there were an 'agreement' system. This is, however, basically a function of the more general rules of linguistic usage (avoidance language and various 'levels' of respect) which are sensitive to kinship relations. The choice of verb meaning 'to fight' thus depends on whether the combatants are in relatively unconstrained relationships to each other (e.g., grandparent and grandchild), in somewhat constrained relationships (siblings), or in avoidance or high-respect relationships (MoMoBrCh and reciprocal). Hence these examples (from Maṇarayi):

- (12) Ja-wur-mamaj-mi-ṇjiyi-n gaṇji-yi.
they fight (avoidance lg.) MoMoBrCh-Dyadic
'Avoidance relatives are fighting.'
- (13) Ja-wur-jaḷ'-mi-ṇjiyi-n baba-yi.
they bump each other siblings
'Siblings are fighting.'
- (14) Gagag-ji ja-wur-bu-yi-n.
MoMo(Br)-Dyadic they fight Recip.
'Grandparent (MoMo or MoMoBr) and grandchild are fighting.'

Here (14) shows the unmarked verb 'to fight' (reciprocal of -bu- 'to hit'), also used in contexts where kinship relations are not specified. (11) shows a special expression used chiefly for siblings fighting each other, while (10) has a verb used specifically for avoidance relationships.

7. Conclusion.

Dyadic terms have typically been neglected both by anthropologists and linguists working on Australian kinship. It may be that in some languages

in other nearby languages. In Merlan's other paper, this volume, on Manarayi egocentric/altercentric modes of reference, Figure 1 presents nañi 'Mo', but the accompanying discussion in the text of the paper points out that just this category has a suppletive form ñala (reduced form -la-) for non-1st person propositus. In the Ngandi language, which is still closer (geographically and genetically) to Nunggubuyu, we find 'Mo' turning up as -ñana-ñ for 1st person and -nele for 2nd/3rd person propositus. (For ñana-ñ cf. perhaps Nalakan manan 'Mo'.) Since 'Mo' and 'MoBr' are closely related categories and since historical semantic shifts from one to the other are attested elsewhere even within Nunggubuyu, it is clear that Nunggubuyu n^gali-jij is based etymologically on the same proto-forms as these Ngandi and Manarayi kin terms (n^g is the same as ñ in different orthographic systems). This is one example of how attention to irregular dyadic forms can lead to reconstructions of kin terms.

The Nunggubuyu dyadic form an-n^yij has a variant awan-n^yij, and in the plural dyadic form we get mij-ban-n^yij or mij-bawan-n^yij (less often mij-gan-n^yij or mij-gawan-n^yij). This suggests a proto-form *bawan- or *baban- for the root and a historical connection with baba 'Fa' seems quite possible. Note that this etymology, like that for n^gali-jij, points to a dyadic form with a stem representing the senior of the two reciprocal categories.

³ A few clarifying comments are in order on the matter of which dyadic terms are intrusive in the sense indicated. In Table 4, the two alternate dyadic forms for 'MoMoBrSo and FaSiDaCh' are jawula and narjala, and only the first of these is listed as intrusive. The second form is also shown in the table for 'MoMoBrDa and FaSiDaCh' but is not listed as intrusive there either. In a sense, however, narjala can be regarded as intrusive. In the sense 'MoMoBrDa', the REF₁ form elicited was n-na-narjala-na, which has the form of a (nonpredicative) noun (hence FSg prefix n-, with meaningless prefix -na- inserted on phonological grounds). Although it is not in the predicative form *ñiri-narjala 'She and I are a narjala pair' parallel to other intrusive dyadic forms for other categories, n-na-narjala-na does appear to be derived from dyadic narjala by adding a 1st person ending -na. The REF₂ form is likewise n-na-narjala-mar with 2nd person ending. (The REF₃ form is suppletive n-wurun.) Although we do not have the same construction seen with other intrusive dyadic forms, there is still an apparently privileged status for the dyadic term on morphological grounds.

Similarly, for 'WiFa and DaHu' the dyadic form lambargara, shown in Table 4 as based on the linear term for 'WiFa', is actually not so clearly in this derivative status. The only simpler form in the vocative and referential functions is lambara, attested as one of two possible vocative forms for 'WiFa' (and classificatory counterparts). However, this is also the usual term for 'WiFa' in local creole, has recently spread into numerous other Aboriginal languages, and in general is strongly suspected of being a recent introduction. The other paradigmatic forms for 'WiFa' are all in predicative form and are based on dyadic lambargara (becoming lambargara-na with 1st person ending in REF₁ function), e.g., nuru-lambargara 'your WiFa' (literally, 'He and you are a lambargara pair').

When these facts are taken into consideration, the association between intrusive functions of dyadic forms and those kinship categories which tend to be thought of as potential spouse and in-law categories becomes even closer than is indicated in Table 4.