

Professional Committee on Linguistic Typology of the China Ethnic Languages Society

Pan Jiarong & Zhuang Junjing

2026-06-14

ChinaRxiv

View the original and related papers at
<https://chinaxiv.org/items/chinaxiv-202606.00235>

Source: ChinaXiv. Machine translation. Verify with the original.

Abstract

A kinship terminology system is defined as a set of lexical items used to refer to or express all culturally recognized kinship relations among individuals in a given society (Read 2015). Kinship terminology systems across languages differ significantly in structure and type. The documentation and analysis of kinship terms in endangered languages can contribute to a deeper understanding of the diversity of human linguistic kinship systems. Based on data collected through fieldwork, this study first systematically organizes and describes the kinship terminology system of Saaroa, and then further examines it from a typological perspective. Overall, the kinship terminology system of Saaroa exhibits mixed characteristics and cannot be classified into any single classical type. This situation suggests to some extent that existing typological frameworks may not yet fully accommodate such marginal cases, and future research may further explore more fine-grained dimensions of analysis on this basis.

Full Text

**Professional Committee on Linguistic Typology of the
China Ethnic Languages Society**

**Ninth Annual Academic Conference and Symposium Mark-
ing the Tenth Anniversary of Its Founding**

**A Typological Investigation of the Kinship-Term
System of the Hla' alua Language**

Pan Jiarong & Zhuang Junjing
Beijing Normal University

Renmin University of China
June 13-14, 2026

Why Are Kinship Terms One of the Core Issues in Typological Research?

Kinship terminology is commonly understood as the systematic linguistic manifestation of social structure. Its formal structure and distribution reflect a society's basic conceptualization of generational relations, relative age differences, and marriage and affinal relations (Leaf & Read 2012).

Why are kinship terms one of the core issues in typological research?

Universality

Kinship terms are universal; every society has such a system. Kinship-term systems in different languages vary in the number of lexical items, the number of kin relations that can be distinguished, and the ways in which terms are organized and interrelated (Read 2015).

Dual attributes

Kinship terms have both linguistic and sociological attributes. On the one hand, they constitute the most highly organized part of the lexical system and are well suited to formal analysis; on the other hand, their referents are interpersonal relationships of central significance in every society (Greenberg 1990).

Contents

- 01 Typological Classification of Kinship Terms
- 02 The Hla' alua Kinship Terminology System
- 03 Typological Positioning of the Kinship Terminology System
- 04 Interpretation and Discussion
- 05 Conclusion

Contents

01 Typological Classification of Kinship Terms

01 Typological Classification of Kinship Terms

- The systematic study of systems of kinship terms can be traced back to Morgan' s (1871) pioneering work in the mid-nineteenth century.
- Morgan held that kinship relations are established primarily through consanguineal and affinal ties, and divided systems of kinship terms into two major types: “descriptive” and “classificatory.”

01 Typological Classification of Kinship Terms

Descriptive Type

Core scope of application: In theory, applies only to the nuclear members of the family.

Basic categories: Includes father, mother, son, daughter, husband, wife, brothers, sisters, etc.

Derived recording mechanism: Other kinship terms must be described through the combination or juxtaposition of these basic terms.

Typical expression: No superfluous substitute terms are introduced; the relationship is described directly.

01 Typological Classification of Kinship Terms

Classificatory Type

Core scope of application: Several different kinship relations are referred to using the same term.

Morgan's (1871) specific definition: Collateral relatives and lineal relatives are designated by the same term—for example, “father” and “father's brother” are referred to using the same term.

Symbolic social function: This often reflects a clan's, or a particular social organization's, understanding of degrees of blood-distance.

Typical expression: The English word “uncle” refers to paternal uncles, maternal uncles, husbands of paternal aunts, husbands of maternal aunts, and so on.

01 Typological Classification of Kinship Terms

- Regarding the traditional dichotomy between “classificatory” and “descriptive” types, Kroeber (1909) pointed out that this division is subjective, because all languages classify kinship relations; the differences lie only in the scope of classification and the completeness of expression.
- Kroeber (1909) held that kinship terminology is essentially a linguistic phenomenon, determined by linguistic psychology, reflecting psychology rather than social structure; he opposed interpreting kinship terms as survivals or reflections of social institutions such as marriage and descent, and argued that they can be used for social inference only with the utmost caution.

01 Typological Classification of Kinship Terms

Kroeber (1909) proposed eight core categories for the analysis of kinship terms:

- Generational distinction
- Lineal vs. collateral distinction
- Age distinction within one generation

- Sex of the relative
- Sex of the speaker
- Sex of the linking relative
- Consanguineal vs. affinal distinction
- Life condition of the linking relative

01 Typological Classification of Kinship Terminology

Murdock (1949), building on the binary typology proposed by Morgan and using the genealogical features shared by Ego's same-generation relatives, further developed this framework and proposed a sixfold classification system.

- Sudanese type (Sudanese) –fully descriptive type
- Hawaiian type (Hawaiian) –generational merging type
- Eskimo type (Eskimo) –nuclear-family-centered type
- Iroquois type (Iroquois) –bifurcate merging type
- Omaha type (Omaha) –patrilineally weighted and cross-generational merging type
- Crow type (Crow) –matrilineally weighted and cross-generational merging type

01 Typological Classification of Kinship Terms

Murdock (1949): Six Kinship-Term Types

Hawaiian Type

- Kin are distinguished by generation and sex.
- Lineal and collateral kin are merged under the same terms.

Maximum merging

Eskimo Type

- At the G+0 level, lineal siblings are distinguished from collateral siblings; all collateral siblings are merged under the same terms.
- At the G+1 level, no distinction is made between the paternal side and the maternal side.

Lineal kin independent; collateral kin merged

Sudanese Type

- Each kin relationship has its own specific term, with no merging.
- There may be up to eight different cousin terms.

Maximum differentiation, no merging

01 Typological Classification of Kinship Terminologies

Murdock (1949): Six Major Types of Kinship Terminology

Crow 克劳型

Within the father's matrilineal descent line, cross-generational merging is practiced. For example, the father and the son of the father's sister are referred to by the same term; the father's sister and the daughter of the father's sister are likewise referred to by the same term.

Patrilateral cross-generational merging

Omaha 奥马哈型

Within the mother's patrilineal descent line, cross-generational merging is practiced. For example, the mother's brother, the son of the mother's brother, and the male descendants on the maternal side in the next generation down are referred to by the same term.

Matrilateral cross-generational merging

Iroquois 易洛魁型

- At the G+1 level, parallel collateral lines and cross collateral lines are distinguished.
- At the G+0 level, parallel cousins are merged with siblings, while cross cousins are distinguished separately.

Parallel/cross cousin contrast

01 Typological Classification of Kinship Terms—Bifurcate-Merging Type

Cross-generational merging (Skewing)

- Crow type
- Omaha type

Bifurcate-merging type (Bifurcate merging)

- Crow type
- Omaha type
- Iroquois type

Bifurcate: distinguishes the paternal side from the maternal side.

Merging: incorporates collateral relatives into lineal relatives.

01 Typological Classification of Kinship Terms

Kroeber (1909) Analytical Framework

Proposed 8 differentiating dimensions (Criteria)

Identifies the parameters by which a terminology system distinguishes kin

Can precisely describe the kinship terminology system of any language

Murdock (1949) Classificatory Framework

Organized 6 major terminology types (Types)

Characterizes the overall profile of a terminology system

Can locate a language within typology.

Integration Strategy

This study adopts a two-level analytical framework: using the differentiating dimensions proposed by Kroeber (1909) as the criteria, it provides a precise, parameter-by-parameter description of the internal structure of the Hla' alua kinship terminology system;

It then takes the six major terminology types summarized and integrated by Murdock (1949) as the framework for typological positioning, placing the Hla' alua system in comparison.

Contents

02 The Hla' alua Kinship Terminology System

Basic Overview of the Hla' alua Language

- **Distribution:** Belongs to the Austronesian language family; the Hla' alua people mainly reside in Taoyuan District and Namasia District, Kaohsiung City.
- **Dialects:** None.
- **(Fluent?) language users:** Around 10? Mostly over 60 years old?
- **Language vitality:** Critically endangered.

Distribution of Austronesian Languages in Taiwan

- SAISIYAT –Saisiyat language

- *PAZEH –Pazeh language
- THAO –Thao language
- TSOU –Tsou language
- *KANAKANAVU –Kanakanavu language
- *SAAROA –Saaroa language
- RUKAI –Rukai language
- PAIWAN –Paiwan language
- ATAYAL –Atayal language
- TRUKU –Truku language
- SEEDIQ –Seediq language
- SAKIZAYA –Sakizaya language
- KAVALAN –Kavalan language
- AMIS –Amis language
- BUNUN –Bunun language
- PUYUMA –Puyuma language
- YAMI –Yami language

02 Hla' alua Kinship Terminology System

Generation	Male	Female
G+2, G+3	<i>tamu tuhluhla</i> (great-grandparents)	<i>tamu tuhluhla</i> (great-grandparents)
G+2, G+3	<i>tamu' u</i> (grandparents)	<i>tamu' u</i> (grandparents)
G+1	<i>ama' a</i> (father)	<i>ina' a</i> (mother)
G+1	<i>tamalungalu</i> (father' s brothers / sisters)	<i>tamalungalu</i> (father' s brothers / sisters)
G+1	<i>tarutaruvunga</i> (mother' s brothers / sisters)	<i>tarutaruvunga</i> (mother' s brothers / sisters)
G+1	<i>usumanu</i> (spouse)	<i>usumanu</i> (spouse)
G+1	<i>ahlalua</i> (older brothers and sisters)	<i>ahlalua</i> (older brothers and sisters)
G+0	<i>hlimilavau</i> (younger brothers and sisters)	<i>hlimilavau</i> (younger brothers and sisters)
G+0	<i>turuua</i> (paternal / maternal cousins)	<i>turuua</i> (paternal / maternal cousins)
G-1	<i>mamaini</i> (child)	<i>mamaini</i> (child)

Generation	Male	Female
G-1	<i>alimu</i> (son-in-law / daughter-in-law)	<i>alimu</i> (son-in-law / daughter-in-law)
G-2, G-3	<i>hlamu' u</i> (grandson / granddaughter)	<i>hlamu' u</i> (grandson / granddaughter)
G-2, G-3	<i>hlamu tuhluhla</i> (great-grandson / great-granddaughter)	<i>hlamu tuhluhla</i> (great-grandson / great-granddaughter)

02 Hla' alua Kinship Terminology System

Kroeber' s Eight Dimensions of Distinction

1. Generational Distinction

- Distinguishes different generations, such as father vs. grandfather, and uncle vs. male cousin.

G+3, G+2, G+1, G+0, G-1, G-2, and G-3 all have specific terms.

G+2 and G+3 are merged (*tamu' u* vs. *tamu tuhluhla*).

G-2 and G-3 are merged (*hlamu' u* vs. *hlamu tuhluhla*).

The phenomenon of generational distinction exists, but some generations are handled through a compound-word strategy rather than by independent lexical items.

02 Hla' alua Kinship Terminology System

Kroeber' s Eight Dimensions of Distinction

2. Distinction Between Lineal and Collateral Lines

- Distinguishes lineal and collateral blood relatives, such as distinguishing father from paternal uncles.

G+1 collateral line: *ama' a* (father) and *tamal ngal* (father' s brothers/sisters)

G+0 collateral line: *ahlahua* (older siblings), *hlimilayau* (younger siblings), and *turuua* (paternal-/maternal-side cousins)

The distinction between lineal and collateral lines appears only in G+1 and G+0.

02 The Hla' alua Kinship Terminology System

Kroeber' s Eight Dimensions of Distinction

3. Age Distinctions Within the Same Generation

- Distinguish elder from younger, such as elder brothers/sisters and younger brothers/sisters.

ahlalua (older brothers and sisters) and *hlimilayau* (younger brothers and sisters) distinguish age.

Age distinctions within the same generation exist only in the G+0 lineal category.

4. Gender Distinctions Among Relatives

In Hla' alua, only *ina' a* (mother) and *ama' a* (father) mark a gender distinction.

Gender distinctions among relatives exist only in the G+1 lineal category.

02 Lha' alua Kinship Terminology System

Kroeber' s Eight Dimensions of Distinction

5. Gender of the Speaker

- Kinship terms differ according to whether the speaker is male or female.
- Lha' alua has no such distinction.

6. Gender of the Linking Relative

- That is, through whom the relationship is established. For example, distinguishing paternal uncles from maternal uncles.

tamalungalu (father' s siblings) differs from *tarutaruvunga* (mother' s siblings).

The gender of the linking relative appears only among collateral relatives in the G+1 generation.

02 Kinship Terminology System of Hla' alua

Kroeber' s Eight Dimensions of Differentiation

7. Distinction Between Consanguines and Affines

- Distinguishes biological blood relations from marital relations.

G+1: *usumanu* (spouse) specifically refers to affinal relations and is separated from the consanguineal terminology system.

G-1: *alimu* (son-in-law/daughter-in-law) specifically refers to affinal relations and is separated from the consanguineal terminology system.

The terminological distinction between consanguines and affines is found only in **G+1** and **G-1**.

8. Continuing Status of the Linking Relative

- Reflects whether the linking relative is alive and whether they are divorced.
Hla' alua has no such distinction.

02 Laruwa Kinship-Term System

Analytical Dimension	Distinction Result
1. Generational differences	Clearly distinguished throughout the entire system
2. Lineal/collateral distinction	Distinguished in G+1 and G+0
3. Age differences	Distinguished only in G+0 lineal relations
4. Sex of relative	Distinguished only in G+1 lineal relations

02 Laruwa-Language Kinship Terminology System

Analytical Dimension	Distinction Result
5. Speaker gender	Not distinguished
6. Gender of the linking relative	Distinguished only for $G + 1$ collateral relatives
7. Consanguineal/affinal kin	Distinguished only for $G + 1$ and $G - 1$
8. Survival status of the linking relative	Not distinguished

02 Hla' alua Kinship Terminology System

1. **Observation 1:** Dimension 1 (*generational difference*) is the only distinction that applies across the entire system.
2. **Observation 2:** $G + 1$ is the level with the highest density.

3. **Observation 3:** Dimension 3 (*age difference*) is distinguished only among lineal kin at $G + 0$.
4. **Observation 4:** Dimension 6 (*sex of the linking relative*) is not transmitted to collateral kin at $G + 0$, resulting in a structural discontinuity.

Contents

03 Typological Positioning of Kinship Terminology Systems

03 Typological Positioning of the Laruwa Kinship Terminology System

Step	Sudanese-type kinship terminology	Laruwa
Step 1	Distinguishes generations.	, generational distinctions run throughout Laruwa.
Step 1	Distinguishes sex.	×, the distinction appears only in the G+1 level.
Step 1	Distinguishes the paternal and maternal sides.	×, the distinction appears only in the G+1 level.
Step 1	Each kin relationship has its own specific term.	×, for example, grandfather and grandmother are merged under the term <i>tamu' u</i> .
Step 1	Among peers, distinguishes elder from younger.	×, the distinction appears only in the G+0 level.

× Exclude the Sudanese type.

03 Typological Positioning of the Hla' alua Kinship Terminology System

Step	Hawaiian-Type Kinship Terminology	Hla' alua
Step 2	Kin are distinguished by generation and sex.	×, sex distinctions occur only at the G+1 level.

Step	Hawaiian-Type Kinship Terminology	Hla' alua
Step 2	Lineal and collateral relatives are merged under the same terms.	×, for example, lineal brothers and sisters are called <i>ahlalua</i> and <i>hlmilayau</i> , whereas collateral brothers and sisters are all called <i>turuuu</i> .

× Exclude the Hawaiian type.

03 Typological Classification of the Hla' alua Kinship Terminology System

Step	Crow-type kinship terminology	Hla' alua
Step 3	Generations are not distinguished.	×; generational distinctions run throughout Hla' alua.
Step 3	Matrilineal relatives on the father' s side are distinguished only by sex; for example, Ego' s father' s sister and the daughter of Ego' s father' s sister are referred to by the same term.	×; for example, the father' s brothers and sisters are all called <i>tamalungalu</i> , and collateral siblings/cousins are all called <i>turuuu</i> .
Step 3	Ego' s father and the son of Ego' s father' s sister are merged under one term.	×; father is called <i>ama' a</i> , while collateral siblings/cousins are all called <i>turuuu</i> .

× Exclude the Crow type.

03 Typological Positioning of the Kinship Terminology System of Laruwa

Step	Omaha-Type Kinship Terms	Laruwa
Step 4	Does not distinguish generations.	×, generational distinctions run throughout Laruwa.
Step 4	Ego' s mother' s brothers and their male descendants all use the same term.	×, for example, the mother' s siblings are all called <i>tartutaruyunga</i> , and collateral siblings are all called <i>turuua</i> .
Step 4	Ego' s father' s siblings and their children use different terms according to sex and age.	×, for example, the father' s siblings are all called <i>tamalutungalu</i> , and collateral siblings are all called <i>turuua</i> .

× Exclude the Omaha type.

03 Typological Positioning of the Hla' alua Kinship Terminology System

	Iroquois-Type Kinship Terms	Hla' alua
Step 5	G+1 level: Ego' s father and Ego' s father' s brothers are merged under one term; Ego' s mother and the mother' s sisters are merged under one term.	×, for example, the father is called <i>ama' a</i> , while the father' s brothers and sisters are all called <i>tamaltungalu</i> . The mother is called <i>ina' a</i> , while the mother' s brothers and sisters are all called <i>tarutaruvunga</i> .
Step 5	G+0 level: parallel cousins are merged with siblings under the same terms. Cross cousins are distinguished separately.	×, for example, lineal brothers and sisters are called <i>ahlalua</i> and <i>hlmilavau</i> , while collateral brothers and sisters are called <i>turuua</i> .

Father' s brothers' children or mother' s sisters' children are “parallel cousins” (Parallel Cousins);

father' s sisters' children or mother' s brothers' children are “cross cousins” (Cross Cousins).

× Exclude the Iroquois type.

03 Typological Positioning of the La' alua Kinship-Term System

Step	Eskimo-type kinship terms	La' alua
Step 6	G+1 level: Does not distinguish the paternal side from the maternal side.	, for example, the father' s brothers and sisters are all called <i>tamal ngal</i> , while the mother' s brothers and sisters are all called <i>tar tar v nga</i> .
Step 6	G+0 level: Distinguishes lineal siblings from collateral siblings. All collateral siblings are merged under one term.	, for example, lineal siblings are called <i>ahlalua</i> and <i>hlimilavat</i> , while collateral siblings are called <i>turuua</i> .

The G+1 level does not conform to the Eskimo type + The G+0 level conforms to the Eskimo type → Exclude.

03 Typological Positioning of the Hla' alua Kinship Terminology System

Typological Positioning

- At the $G + 0$ level, Hla' alua exhibits the characteristics of the Eskimo type of kinship terminology: all collateral siblings are merged under a single term, while being kept distinct from lineal siblings. However, at the $G + 1$ level, the paternal and maternal sides are distinguished, which is inconsistent with the Eskimo-type expectation that the paternal and maternal sides are not differentiated.
- Hla' alua does not fully correspond to any single one of Murdock' s six major types. Instead, it presents a mixed configuration: the $G + 0$ level conforms to the Eskimo type, whereas the $G + 1$ level does not conform to any type.

Table of Contents

04 Interpretation and Discussion

04 Explanation and Discussion

Two-Factor Explanatory Model (Greenberg 1990)

External social structure

(e.g., unilineal descent, residence patterns)

Internal cognitive/linguistic explanation

(e.g., markedness theory, principle of least effort)

Jointly determine → **Kinship terminology system**

04 Explanation and Discussion

I. Marking Theory

Theoretical Origins

Greenberg (1990) introduced Trubetskoy and Jakobson's "marking theory" from phonology and grammar into lexical semantics.

Core Concepts

- **Marked:** represents categories that are more complex, secondary, and lower in frequency of occurrence;
- **Unmarked:** represents categories that are simpler, more basic, and higher in frequency of occurrence.

04 Explanation and Discussion

I. Marking Theory

Markedness Hierarchy (Greenberg 1990)

- **Lineal kin** (*unmarked*) vs **collateral kin** (*marked*): for example, in English, *brother/sister* distinguish gender, whereas *cousin* does not distinguish gender (**unmarked categories have more distinctions than marked categories**).
- **Blood relatives** (*unmarked*) vs **relatives by marriage** (*marked*): in English, affinal kin require the additional expression "in law."
- **Elders / males / older persons** (*unmarked*) vs **juniors / females / younger persons** (*marked*).

- The generations closer to Ego tend more to exhibit unmarked features; the farther from Ego, the more they exhibit marked features. **Marked categories neutralize the distinctions of unmarked categories.**

04 Explanation and Discussion

II. Cognitive Schemas of Social Relations (Schemas of sociality)

- Jones (2004) introduced “Optimality Theory (OT)” into the study of kinship terminology, arguing that cross-linguistic differences in kinship terms are not random, but arise from differences in the “ranking” of constraints in the brain.
- He points out that kinship terminology is governed and generated by innate social cognitive schemas in the brain.

04 Interpretation and Discussion

II. Schemas of Sociality

Schemas of Sociality	Examples of Corresponding Specific Constraints (Associated Constraints)	Explanation
Genealogical Distance	Distinguishing lineal from collateral kin	Requires distinguishing kin at different genealogical distances; more distant kin are increasingly “marked” in cognition.
Social Rank	Distinguishing age within the same generation; distinguishing seniors from juniors	Relatives are classified on the basis of potential social status, power, and seniority.
Group Membership	Distinguishing paternal-line and maternal-line relatives	Relatives are divided into the internal group (Ingroup) and the external group (Outgroup).

Jones (2004:213–214)

04 Explanation and Discussion

III. Causal Analysis of the Hla' alua Kinship-Terminology System

Observation 1: Dimension 1 (generational difference) is the only system-wide distinction.

- In the evolution of human society, different generations usually imply different forms of power and different social roles.
- Generational difference runs throughout the kinship-terminology system. This indicates that the society attaches great importance to generational order, and that both the hierarchical relations of seniority and status formed on the basis of generation and the division of social responsibilities are governed by strict and clearly defined norms.

04 Interpretation and Discussion

III. Analysis of the Causes of the Laaruwa Kinship-Term System

Observation One: Dimension 1 (generational differences) is the only distinction made throughout the entire system.

- The Laaruwa divide a person's life, according to age stage, into four periods: childhood, youth, adulthood, and old age. Different life stages are strictly assigned different social responsibilities and divisions of labor.
- For example, adulthood (approximately ages 15–40) is regarded as the period for undertaking the principal productive activities; among them, men are mainly responsible for hunting, construction, and chopping firewood, while women mainly engage in household affairs, farming, and brewing liquor (Liu Binxiong 1969).

04 Explanation and Discussion

III. Causal Analysis of the Lha' alua Kinship Terminology System

Observation 2: $G + 1$ is the level with the highest density.

The social structure of the Lha' alua people is patrilineal. Their marriage system is patrilineal and, in the vast majority of cases, virilocal, and it maintains a strict monogamous tradition (Liu Binxiong 1969; Pan 2023).

Against this background, distinguishing paternal collateral elders (of the same clan) from maternal collateral elders (of an outside clan) is a rigid requirement

for maintaining the functioning of society.

04 Explanation and Discussion

III. Causal Analysis of the Hla' alua Kinship-Term System

Observation 2: G+1 is the level with the highest density.

High degree of differentiation in G+1: The G+1 level plays the role of core authority in everyday power relations, property inheritance, and marriage decision-making. It is therefore worthwhile for the mind to invest a higher cognitive cost here, precisely distinguishing paternal siblings **tamalngal** from maternal siblings **tartarvnga**.

04 Interpretation and Discussion

III. Analysis of the Causes of the Hla' alua Kinship-Term System

The father' s brothers and sisters are regarded as members within the clan. In daily life, they jointly share territory and property, and maintain clan continuity through cooperation and mutual assistance.

•

The mother' s brothers and sisters belong to an external clan. Their kinship relations are formed mainly through marital ties, and thus constitute affinal relations established on the basis of intermarriage.

→

The clan branch to which an individual belongs has a higher classificatory priority than gender differences.

04 Explanation and Discussion

III. Analysis of the Causes of the Lha' alua Kinship Terminology System

- **G+0 neutralization:** If the G+0 level were further subdivided into categories such as “children of the father' s brothers,” “children of the father' s sisters,” and “children of the mother' s brothers,” the G+0 level would require four to eight additional terms, as in the Sudanese type.
- Here, Lha' alua has adopted the “principle of economy.” Because collateral relatives at the G+0 level belong to a marked category, the brain activates information restriction at this point.

04 Explanation and Discussion

III. Analysis of the Causes of the Hla' alua Kinship-Terminology System

Observation Three: Dimension Three (age difference) is distinguished only among G+0 lineal relatives.

- The elder-younger distinction is made only among G+0 lineal relatives, and is closely related to the inheritance system and family structure of the Hla' alua people. The highest administrative position in a Hla' alua community is inherited hereditarily by the eldest son; at the same time, the eldest son also assumes more responsibilities within the family (Liu Binxiong 1960).
- This means that among lineal relatives of the same generation (G+0), elder-younger status entails substantive differences in social function: the eldest son and his other brothers are not equal in rights, obligations, or status.

04 Interpretation and Discussion

III. Causal Analysis of the Hla' alua Kinship Terminology System

Observation Four: Dimension Six (**gender of the linking relative**) is not transmitted to the G+0 collateral line, resulting in a structural discontinuity.

Typological Commonality	Explanation from Markedness Theory
The terminological features of the G+1 collateral line—such as gender distinctions—often extend directly to the G+0 collateral line (D' Andrade 1971; Hage 2001).	- For Ego, G+1 is the source of collateral branching, whereas G+0 is derived from this bifurcation.- Neutralization of terms occurs at the G+0 level, so that the original gender distinction of the linking relative at the G+1 level is no longer transmitted.

Contents

05 Conclusion

06 Conclusion

- The Lha' alua language is a genuine typological counterexample, demonstrating that Murdock's six-part system cannot exhaust the actual possibilities found in languages.

- Typological analysis of kinship terms should proceed by generational strata, rather than using a single label to characterize the entire system.
- Greenberg's two-factor framework has relatively strong explanatory power.

Selected References:

- Kroeber, Alfred Louis. 1909. Classificatory systems of relationship. *The Journal of the Royal Anthropological Institute of Great Britain and Ireland* 39:77-84.
- Liu, Pin-hsiung. 1969. Shaaluazu de shehui zuzhi [Social structure of the Saalua]. *Taiwan Zhongyanyuan Minzuxue Yanjiusuo Jikan* [Bulletin of the Institute of Ethnology, Taiwan Academia Sinica] 28:67-158.
- Morgan, Lewis Henry. 1871. *Systems of Consanguinity and Affinity in the Human Family*. Washington, DC: Smithsonian Institution.
- Murdock, George Peter. 1949. *Social Structure*. New York: Macmillan.
- Ross, Malcolm and Jeffery C. Marck. 2023. Kinship terms. In Ross, Malcolm, Andrew Pawley and Meredith Osmond (eds.), *The Lexicon of Proto Oceanic: The Culture and Environment of Ancestral Oceanic Society: Vol. 6—People: Society* 47-139. Canberra: The Australian National University.
- Read, Dwight. 2015. Kinship terminology. In James D. Wright (ed.), *International Encyclopedia of the Social & Behavioral Sciences*, 2nd ed., Vol. 13 61-66. Oxford: Elsevier.

Note: Figure translations are in progress. See original paper for figures.

Source: ChinaXiv. Machine translation. Verify with the original.