The study of the kinship in the scientific perspectives is only a century old. A number of studies have appeared in the various branches of social sciences (sociology, anthropology, psychology and linguistics). Many of these studies were disciplinary specific especially in anthropology and sociology with very little importance given to the language of kinship. Even in the terminological aspects, kin terms were used as words to isolate sociological (kinological) and anthropological features. The recent studies of kin terms as words have a long line of precedent studies starting from Morgan (1871) who classified the terms as classificatory and descriptive in the isolation of kinological world families. This classification was further modified by Rivers (1932) as denotative, classificatory and descriptive with correlated features as family, clan and kindred respectively. These models were accepted to be continued for a long time with some modifications (Kroeber, 1909; Lowie, 1929; Davis and Warner, 1932; Murdock, 1949/1960; Ghurye, 1955; Mukherjee, 1980; Kar, 1981; etc.). Some of the studies were concerned with the historical

1. For details refer to in the introductory Chapter (Ch.1).
and etymological aspects (Karse, 1950; 1965; Ghurye, 1955; Gates, 1971 etc.). The current trends in the terminological study of kinship of a correlative nature have shifted from the lexical study to that of an anatomical nature (Bateni, 1973; Thampuran, 1973, Prindle, 1973; Lalitha Bai, 1977; etc.).

This chapter is a thoroughly modified version of the Chapter on same title of the 1977 model. The chapter provides descriptions on the following aspects of the linguistic structure in the sub branch of linguistics - linguistic kinology.

1) The terminological labelling of kinological concepts and also concepts of linguistic kinology as a separate subdiscipline of linguistics,
2) Basic units of analysis of kinship terms,
3) Classification of kin terms with prescribed grouping criteria,
4) Isolation of contrastive structural units of term-phonological/morphological/lexical/syntactic which are helpful in the isolation of extra features of terminological system of kinship as skeletal/kinological/sociological/psychological/biological/historical.
5) The concept of deep structure and surface structure of kin terms,
6) Productive and generative systems of kinship terminology,
7) Evaluation of the fitness of the terminological system and representation by fitness curves of the linguistic structure of kin terms, 
8) Linguistic information content and its relation to the productive and generative systems of kinship terminology, 
9) Diagrametic representation of the various types of kin terms.

10.1. Some basic concepts of linguistic kinology

Kinology is the scientific study about kinship. Linguistic kinology is the scientific study about the correlative nature of terms and aspects of kinship organisations. This branch of social science aims to isolate the kin concepts or parameters in terms of linguistic structural contrast-phonological/tonal, morphological, syntactic, lexical or semantic relations. As a second degree of abstraction, these linguistic units, as isolatable kinological correlative units are also kinological proper, sociological, psychological, ethnological and historical correlative units varying in their nature, types and intensity some times of merging nature. The major concepts are given as follows:

10.1.1. Non-linguistic kinological units

Levi Strauss (1958/1963:34) who pointed out parallelism in linguistic analysis and kinship analysis stated that like phonemes, kinship terms are elements of meaning, like
phonemes they acquire meaning only if they are integrated systems. 'Kinship terms' like phonemic systems are built by the mind on the level of unconscious thought...'. In this section an attempt is made to label some concepts... which are non-linguistic but linguistically expressed within the set up of kinship. The terms coined here are analogous to those used in linguistics in the isolation of phonemes but with the existing differences mentioned in the proper contexts.

10.1.1.1. Kineme:
The minimum kin relational unit is labelled as kineme. The kinemes are limited in number and are universal denoting the eight cardinal kins comprising the four relational and two sex categories respectively. The kinemes are denoted as F, M, H, W, S, D, B, Z. As subtypes of kinemes the following categories are found within and outside the nuclear family.

Allocinemes: Sub varieties of kinemes proper are known as allocinemes. They are of two types, viz., the basic allocinemes, the subvarieties mentioned earlier) and the derived kinemes outside the nuclear family.

The basic allocinemes

The following types are found.

Type: 1. Kinemes which distinguish the filials or sibs in the nuclear family for relative age difference. eg: e5/y5/e8/y8 etc.
Type 2: Kinemes which distinguish the members of polygynous unions or remarital unions. Eg: FW, FS etc.

Type 3: Kinemes which denote the members of the nuclear family whose primary kin is dead (generally husband or wife and who are terminologically expressed). In fact it denotes a shift in status and not the person. Eg: Widow, Widower.

Type 4: Kin term denoting the establishment of a cardinal kin relation. Eg: bridegroom, bride, newly married couple etc.

Kinosophieme: the sociological unit of kinship is labelled as kinosocieme. Eg. status of kin.

Kinopsychieme: the psychological unit of kinship is labelled as kinopsychieme. Eg. emotion

Kinolinqueme: The linguistic unit of kinship is labelled as kinolinqueme. Eg. phonological, morphological, lexical etc.

Kino etyme: The historical unit of kinship. Eg. historical events reflecting on the kin terms such as migration cousin groups overtly or covertly.

10.1.2. Linguistic kinological units

Kinolexeme: A linguistic form indicating any aspect of kinship.

Kino socio lexeme: A linguistic form indicating the sociological aspect of kinship. Eg. /ə:vsu/ 'term for M as

2. Kinolexemes in the broader sense indicate the concept given above but in the narrower sense it indicates the elementary kinship term denoting a non cardinal kin.
status marker of respect.

Kinoetyme: Historical unit (linking path) connected to distant community, caste, region or past and present linguistically.

Kino psycho lexeme: A linguistic form indicating psychological aspect of kinship. eg. /xalal ba:/ 'MZH', ba:/ is a marker of respect (UM). Though the term coined here is lexeme, a word or any other linguistic element can become the unit of analysis of kinship.

10.2. Basic units of linguistic analysis of kinship

The units in connection with the linguistic analysis of kinship are given as follows:

Kine lexeme: The underived linguistic form (kin relationally but linguistically may even be a sentence as a new term denoting a cardinal kin). Generally kine lexemes are minimum linguistic forms, a word, but since kinship is given predominance, in this study, a term which is a syntactic construction, if denotes elementary relation is treated as a kine lexeme in the labelling. Kine lexemes may be more than one for some kinemes as synonyms. -e- in kine of kine - lexeme denotes the term is basic. The following examples will give some kine lexemes in the six communities under study.
Kino lexemes in KG, MR, UM, MN, MK, MM

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>gloss</th>
<th>KG</th>
<th>MR</th>
<th>UM</th>
<th>MN</th>
<th>MK</th>
<th>MM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>/bappa/</td>
<td>/ba:p/</td>
<td>/ba:p/</td>
<td>/acchan/</td>
<td>/ace:/</td>
<td>/ba:ppa/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>/appa/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>/tande:n/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>/amma/</td>
<td>/ma:y/</td>
<td>/amma/</td>
<td>/amma/</td>
<td>/amma/</td>
<td>/amma/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>/a:vsu/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S</td>
<td>/putu/</td>
<td>/no:k/</td>
<td>/be:ta/</td>
<td>/mahan/</td>
<td>/mo:y/</td>
<td>/mo:n/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>/du:v/</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>/bammu:n/</td>
<td>/galla/</td>
<td>/maRa:/ /a:viduttoo:/ /ma:pla/ /ma:pl/</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W</td>
<td>/ba:yl/</td>
<td>/ba:yko/</td>
<td>/jo:Ru/</td>
<td>/agattu/ /lai:/ /penna/ /pennu/ /Annala/</td>
<td>/auRa/</td>
<td>/kattiyoo:/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>/ba:vu/</td>
<td>/bhau/</td>
<td>/bhary/</td>
<td>/a:Ahala/ /appaRanoo:n/</td>
<td>/a:Ahala/</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Kino-Lexeme:** The underived linguistic form denoting a non cardinal kin is labelled as kinolexeme. Examples are given below:

**Kino lexemes in KG, MR, UM, MN, MK, MM**

- KG /de:Ru/, MR /di:Ru/, UM /de:vr/ — 'HB'
- KG /mavna/, MR /mahana/, UM /saila/ — 'WB'
- MR /maccambi/, MM /maccuniyan/ — 'FZS'
- MK /aliyan/ — 'WB'
- MN /apphan/ — 'FYB'
in 'Kino indicates the relation is derived.

Lexi-kineme: The derived linguistic form denoting a cardinal kin is lexi-kineme. 'i- in 'lexi' indicated that the term is derived. Examples are given below:

Lexi kinemes in KG, MR, UM, MN, MK, MM

KG /bayn/, MR /bhayn/, UM /bha:n/ 'Z'
MN /mahal/, MK /mo:li/, MM /mo:li/ 'D'
MK /dapparando:/ 'Z'
MR /ne:k/, UM /be:ti/ 'D'

Lexikinemes can be derived from the cardinal kin terms or a term related to a kin concept.

Eg: /ve:li/ 'W' (ve:li 'marriage')

Allokinemes: Derived kin relational units from the kinemes. It is to be noted that unlike in Linguistics where any sub member of a phoneme can be labelled as a phoneme (though the allophone with wider distribution is given the label generally), Kinemes remain static and basic units and all others are to be taken as allokinemes or the submembers of kinemes. Moreover the formation of these secondary kins by linking the cardinal relations is more ordered characterised by the permutative and combinatory properties.

Kin phonemes: Phonemes denoting kin distinction between two kins or kin concepts terminologically,
**Allokin phonemes**: The phonemes denoting contrast with the basic marker may be treated as allokin phonemes. The contrast may be between two phonemes or a phoneme and a morpheme.

Eg: /ajj/, /ajji/ 'PF/MM'

Here to distinguish the sex category of the respective relation two phonemes stand in contrast. The phoneme /j/ is labelled as basic kin phoneme and the phoneme /i/ is taken as allokin phone. Thus the phonemes are explained in terms of kinship aspects.

**Kin morphemes**: Morphemes, denoting the kin distinction between two kins or kin concepts terminologically.

**Allo kin morphemes**: Morphemes denoting contrast with the basic morphological marker to show kin (concept) distinction may be taken as allokin morphemes.

Eg: KG /ma:ntu/ /ma:və/ 'FeB/FeBW'
UM /sa:di/ /sauhaR/ 'marriage/bridegroom'

Here /-ntu/ in KG and /-di/ in UM are taken as basic morphemes and /və/ and /-haR/ are taken as allokin morphemes for the respective contrast.

Likewise units of lexical, syntactic contrast also can be isolated.
10.3. Criteria for the assignment of linguistic forms as kinship terms

The assignment of linguistic forms as kinship terms is made on the following conditions:

1) For a linguistic form to be a kinship term there should be a kinolinguistic positional contrast (immediately) between two terms, phonologically/morphologically/syntactically/lexically or semantically,

2) There should be a transitional kin (concept),

3) The contrasting linguistic forms (say a modifier) may generally occur with kinship terms only and not with other linguistic forms (nouns),

   Eg: /malgːdːpuːtu/ 'eS' (KG)
   /caːn bhaːy/ 'eB(2)' (UM)

4) Ambiguous terms which are often syntactic constructions are also taken as kinship terms since the surface structure considerably differs from the real relation or deep structure.

   Eg: /annali onn1/ 'eB's)eBW' KG
       /mammaːli məy1/ 'MB's)MBW' KG

5) Generic modifiers occurring with other terms which help to distinguish kins related are treated as kinship terms but with lesser degree of fitness.
When taking into consideration the major kin distinction as fused forms and also used both as reference and address terms specifically, these terms are treated as kinship terms proper.

(i) Linguistic terms of the teknonymous type and of generic description type are excluded from the terminological system.

(ii) Structural absence or prohibition of a specific kin term is also taken as 0 kin term and is given label. For KG address terms are not found for Sp.F, Sp.M, HeBS, H etc. The Nambudiris do not have terms for eZH, FZH, WM etc. A Nambudiri wife is prohibited from referring her husband by the term /ende namburil/ in reference and uses /aviduttoril/. The address terms are prohibited to be used even by the
children for the father in the traditional system. The MM are not accustomed to address the female affinals by kin terms.

10.3.1. Basic member of the contrasting kin terms

Generally basic member of the contrasting terms is selected as the male form, as in the case for the formation of links. But it may be changed according to the nearest relative in the case of non primary kin. For example in the case of UM in the contrastive forms /tə:]/ /tə:y/ (-a/Ø) indicates reduction in the derived relation. In many cases suffixation is the rule.

UM /xa:1ə/ → /xa:1ə1/ (MZ' → MZH)

Here the derivation is from the female term. Similar is the case in MR. /ma:vsə/ → /ma:vsə/ (-1→-a). But in nhavRa/nhavrI the female term is derived from the male form. Hence unlike in the linguistic analysis where structural contrast is given priority over meaning, in linguistic kinology structural contrasts are explained only in terms kin derivation (in some cases).

10.4. Classification of kinship terms

Kinship terms have been technically classified as

1) elementary, 2) derivative, 3) descriptive (Lowie, 1932: 568; Davis & Warner, 1937:303; Murdock, 1960:98)\(^3\). Following this model but with modifications the terms of kinship

\(^3\) Murdock (1960:98).
of the Gowda Saraswath brahmins in Kerala were classified by Lalitha Bai (1977) and analysed. In the 1977 model the terms were classified as:

1. elementary (a) with no derived forms, (b) with linguistically different counterparts, (c) with linguistically similar counterparts.

2. derived terms which included terms which were either distinguished by phonemes, phonemes and morphemes, i.e., complex terms.

3. descriptive (syntactic constructions denoting kin relations ambiguous and non-ambiguous (teknonymous).

In the present study the classification of the kinship terms of the six communities under study fall under the two main categories.

10.4.1. Elementary

The elementary terms are underived terms denoting a kin (+/- cardinal)(primary term). These terms are of the following type:

(a) which do not have a counterpart terminologically.

eg: /de:Ru/ (KG), /di:R/ (MR) 'HyB'
    /be:va/ (UM) 'widow'
    /vigava/ (MN) 'laliyerrV
    /alivon/ (MK) 'WB'
(b) which have different counterparts and hence kinologically both elementary.

eg: /bammunu/ Vs. /ba:yŋ/ (KG) 'H/W'
/dalla/ Vs. /ba:yko/ (MR) ,
/Jo:Ah/ Vs. /maRaj/ (UM) ,
/avidutto:iro/ Vs./agattulla:lo/ (MN) ,
/acchan/ Vs. /amma/ 'F/M'
/annan/ Vs. /akkan/ (MK) 'eB/eZ'

These terms in some cases may have derived terms for other relations.

(c) which have linguistically similar counterparts (either in sex distinction or any other kin concept, or any of the other features described in other chapters) (a) and (b) are called static / dynamic kin terms respectively.

10.4.2 Derived terms

Under this category three sub categories are found.

10.4.2.1 Simplex forms

In the case of simplex terms stems have to be posited for derivation. The following linguistic structural units

---

4. Simplex terms are elementary terms, and also those derived terms by the phonological or morphological affixation.
are employed in the derivation of terms.

Structural units

10.4.2.1.1. Phonological

In this case phonological distinction between two terms distinguishes the two terms and hence the two kin concept relations.

10.4.2.1.2. Phono morphological

In this case distinction between the phoneme and morpheme distinguishes two related terms. The basic contrasting unit may be either phoneme or morpheme. Eg:

KG /-u/, /j/ /ba:v-/ba:v3:/ /ba:vu/ Vs./ba:və:/ə/ 'B/Bw'
MR /-u/, /-n/ /bha-/,/bha-/ /bhau/ Vs./bhayn/ 'B/Z'
UM /-y/, /vəj/ /bha:-/,/bha:/ /bha:y/ Vs./bha:vəj / 'B/BW'
MN /-ən/, /-l/ /amma:/, /amma:/ /amma:man/Vs./amma:mi/ 'MB/ MBw'
MK /-n/, /-tti/ /ce:tta:-/, /ce:tta/ /ce:ttan/ Vs. /ce:ttatti/ 'ZH, Bw'
MM /-n/, /-yi/ /amma:-/, /amma:-/ /amma:man/Vs./amma:yi/'MB/ MBW'

10.4.2.1.3. Morphological

In this case terms are distinguished by morphological markers. Eg:

KG /-ntu/, /-və/ /mə:-/, /mə:-/ /ma:ntu/Vs./ma:və/ 'Feə/Feəw'
MR. There are no typical terms in this category as directly related for other cases

/-ji/, /-bh1/ /bhaunu/, /bha:-/ /bhaunji/ Vs. /bha:bh1/ 'BW/eBW'

UM /-di/, /haR/ /ea:-/, /sa:-/ /s:a:di/ Vs. /sauhaR/ 'marriage'/

Bridegroom/

MN /hali/, /hol/ /a:n-/ /peh-/ /a:nhala/Vs. /pehhal /'B/Z'

/-tta-, /s:da-/ /e:ttan/Vs. /e:datti/'eB/eZ'

MK There is no specific term to indicate this type of contrast

MM /- an/, /-cci/ /maccuniy-/, /maccuni-/ /maccuniyan/Vs.

/maccunicci/ 'FZS/MBS'

10.4.2.1.4. The zero unit of contrast: significant absence of terms or any marker of kin contrast

One of the contrasting units in the terminological distinction may be zero, phonological or morphological. Eg:

/Ø/, /-ly:/ /bappa-/, /bappa/ /bappa/Vs. /bappaly/ 'F/FyB'

MR /Ø/, /-ur/ /ne:k-/ /ne:k-/ /ne:k/Vs. /ne:kup/ 'D/CC'


HeBW'

No specific terms related to this construction are found in

MN, MK and MM.
10.4.3.1 Table showing the contrast between phoneme/phoneme in the distinction of kin terms and relations in KG

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>p/p</th>
<th>stems</th>
<th>terms</th>
<th>gloss</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-r/-1</td>
<td>a:j/-ajj-</td>
<td>a:j/a:jji</td>
<td>'PF/MM'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-r/-u</td>
<td>ce:d/-co:d-</td>
<td>ce:d/co:du</td>
<td>'S/D'(L.C)'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-u/-i</td>
<td>nat-t/-na:t-</td>
<td>nat-tu/nat-ti</td>
<td>'CS/CD'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-u/-j</td>
<td>ba:y/-bay-</td>
<td>ba:yu/bay-y</td>
<td>'B/HeB'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-m/-p-</td>
<td>ausi/-acci</td>
<td>mausi/pacci</td>
<td>'MZ/MZ(U,O)'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-y:/-yi</td>
<td>ma:-/ma:-</td>
<td>ma:y/-ma:yi</td>
<td>'MBW/H/W.M'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-m/-vu</td>
<td>ma:-/ma:-</td>
<td>ma:mu/ma:vu</td>
<td>'MB/H/W.F'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-o/-e:</td>
<td>ag/-ag-</td>
<td>ago/-age:</td>
<td>'(wh/th)'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-e/-a</td>
<td>va:j/-va:j-</td>
<td>vaj:a/vaj-a:</td>
<td>'v'</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

10.4.3.2 Table showing the contrast between phoneme and phoneme in the distinction of kin terms and relations in MR

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>p/p</th>
<th>stems</th>
<th>terms</th>
<th>gloss</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-a/-1</td>
<td>a:j/-ajj-</td>
<td>a:j/a:jji</td>
<td>'MF/MM'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-oo/-e:-</td>
<td>n-k/n-k</td>
<td>no:k/ne:k</td>
<td>'S/D'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-u/-n</td>
<td>bha/-bhay-</td>
<td>bhou/bhay-n</td>
<td>'B/Z'</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 10.4.3.3 Table showing the contrast between phoneme/phoneme in the distinction of kin terms and relations in UM

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>pp</th>
<th>stems</th>
<th>terms</th>
<th>gloss</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-a/-l</td>
<td>kava:si/kava:si</td>
<td>kava:sa/kava:si</td>
<td>'OCS/OCO'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-y/-n</td>
<td>bha:y/bha:n</td>
<td>bha:y/bha:n</td>
<td>'O/B'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-^/-y</td>
<td>ta:y/ta:y</td>
<td>ta:y/ta:y</td>
<td>'FeB/FeBW'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-Ø/-\O</td>
<td>du:la/dulha-</td>
<td>du:la/dulhan</td>
<td>'bride/groom/bride'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-æ/-i#/</td>
<td>pa:ccha/pa:ccha</td>
<td>pa:ccha bha:y/</td>
<td>'HeB/'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-æ/-\a</td>
<td>phuphu/phupha</td>
<td>phuphu/phupha</td>
<td>'FZ/FZH'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-æ/-ai(y)</td>
<td>xa:la/xala-</td>
<td>xa:la/xala1</td>
<td>'MZ/MZH'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-Ø/-\a</td>
<td>bha:n/bh\a:n</td>
<td>bha:n/b\a:na</td>
<td>'Z/ygst.Z'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-\P/-n</td>
<td>samdh\i/samdh\i-</td>
<td>samdh\i/samdh\i</td>
<td>'C.Sp.F/M'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-a:-/-i-</td>
<td>c-cca/c-cca</td>
<td>ca:cca/cicca</td>
<td>'FyB'</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 10.4.3.4 Table showing the contrast between phoneme/phoneme in the distinction of terms and relations in MN,MK,MM

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>cm.</th>
<th>p/p</th>
<th>stems</th>
<th>terms</th>
<th>gloss</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MN.</td>
<td>-n/-i</td>
<td>saho:\gar/-</td>
<td>saho:\garan/</td>
<td>'B/Z'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MK</td>
<td>-\O/-l</td>
<td>se:sa:R/-se:saR-</td>
<td>se:sa:Rse:sa:Ri</td>
<td>'ZS/WBD'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MM</td>
<td>-n/-i</td>
<td>elacc-/elacc-</td>
<td>elaccan/elacc1</td>
<td>'HyB/HyBW'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p/mr</td>
<td>stems</td>
<td>terms</td>
<td>gloss</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-u/-ni</td>
<td>ba:v/-b y-</td>
<td>ba:vu/bayni</td>
<td>'B/Z'</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-u/-j∅</td>
<td>ba:v/-ba:v∅-</td>
<td>ba:vu/ba:va:j∅</td>
<td>'B/BW'</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-u/ji</td>
<td>ba:v/-ba:va-</td>
<td>ba:vu/ba:va:ji</td>
<td>'B/EZH'</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-a/-mu</td>
<td>amm/-ma:-</td>
<td>amma/mamu</td>
<td>'M/MB'</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-a/-si</td>
<td>amm/-mau-</td>
<td>amma/mausi</td>
<td>'M/MZ'</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-u/-lɔ</td>
<td>ma:m/-mau-</td>
<td>ma:mu/maulɔ</td>
<td>'(MB/MB(re.:))'</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-∅/-ni</td>
<td>maul/-ma:val-</td>
<td>maulɔ/ma:valni</td>
<td>'MB/MBW'</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-∅/lyɔ</td>
<td>bappa/bappa-</td>
<td>bappa/bappalyɔ</td>
<td>'F/FyB'</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-a/ulɔ</td>
<td>bapp/-bapp-</td>
<td>bappa/bappulɔ:su</td>
<td>'F/F(re.:)'</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-u/-nyɔ</td>
<td>put/-put-</td>
<td>putu/putnyɔ</td>
<td>'S/B/Z/S'</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-∅/lu:vE</td>
<td>bal/-bal-</td>
<td>bal:/ba:lu:vE</td>
<td>'S/obstinacy'</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-∅/-nti</td>
<td>bal/-ba:la-</td>
<td>ba:la:nti</td>
<td>'S/woman in con-'</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ø/-R</td>
<td>ba:la:nti/</td>
<td>ba:la:nti/</td>
<td>'delivery'</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ø/-R</td>
<td>ba:la:nti/</td>
<td>ba:la:nti/</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ø/-R</td>
<td>ba:la:nti/</td>
<td>ba:la:nti/</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ø/-R</td>
<td>ba:la:nti/</td>
<td>ba:la:nti/</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>∅/∅</td>
<td>putu/nat-</td>
<td>putu/nattu</td>
<td>'S/CS'</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-u/-R∅</td>
<td>natt/-nat-</td>
<td>nattu/natR∅</td>
<td>'C.children'</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-∅/-di</td>
<td>du:v/-duv-</td>
<td>du:v:duvdi</td>
<td>'D/B/Z/D'</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-∅/-ai1</td>
<td>a:y/- yai-</td>
<td>aiy/ yeip in</td>
<td>'PM(woman)/wifehood'</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-u/-p</td>
<td>coRdu/-coRdu-</td>
<td>coRdu/coRdu p∅</td>
<td>'C/youth'</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-∅/-1:k∅</td>
<td>soyR/-sovr-</td>
<td>soyR/soyr:k∅</td>
<td>'affinal kin'/</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>proposal'</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
10.4.4.2. Table showing the contrast between phoneme/morpheme in the distinction of kin terms and relations in MR

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>p/mr</th>
<th>stems</th>
<th>terms</th>
<th>gloss</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ø/-ji</td>
<td>bhaubhau-</td>
<td>bhaubhauj/</td>
<td>'B/Bw'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ø/-ur</td>
<td>ne:k/ne:k-</td>
<td>ne:k/ne:k/</td>
<td>'D/child'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-u/-bhi</td>
<td>bha-/bha-</td>
<td>bhaubha:hi/</td>
<td>'B/eBw'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-u/-vya</td>
<td>bha-/bha-</td>
<td>bhaubha:vya/</td>
<td>'H/HeB'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-u/-nd</td>
<td>na:t/na:ta-</td>
<td>na:tu/na:ta:nd/</td>
<td>'CC/CCC'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-a/-la</td>
<td>ma:m-/mha:v-</td>
<td>ma:ma/mha:v/</td>
<td>'MB/MB'</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

10.4.4.3. Table showing the contrast between phoneme/morpheme in the distinction of kin terms and relations in UM

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>p/mr</th>
<th>stems/terms</th>
<th>terms</th>
<th>gloss</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-a/-ji</td>
<td>abb-/abba:</td>
<td>abba/abba:ji</td>
<td>'F/F'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-a/-mu</td>
<td>amm-/ma:-</td>
<td>amma/ma:mu</td>
<td>'M/MB'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-u/-ni</td>
<td>ma:m-/ mumma:-</td>
<td>ma:mu/mumma:ni</td>
<td>'MB/MBW'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ø/ve:le</td>
<td>a:Raz/a:raz-</td>
<td>a:Raz/a:Razve:le</td>
<td>'bride/bride's party'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-a/-ni</td>
<td>cicca/-cicca:-</td>
<td>cicca/cicca:ni</td>
<td>'FY8/Fy8BW'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ø/-ni</td>
<td>je:th/je:tha:-</td>
<td>je:th/je:tha:ni</td>
<td>'FY9/FyeBW'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ø/-ja</td>
<td>bha:n/bha:n-</td>
<td>bha:n/bha:nja</td>
<td>'Z/ZS'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-y/-va:j</td>
<td>bha:-/bha:v</td>
<td>bha:y/bha:v:j</td>
<td>'B/8W'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-y/-ja</td>
<td>bha:-/bha:ti:-</td>
<td>bha:y/bha:ti:ja</td>
<td>'B/BS'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-y/-bi</td>
<td>bha:-/bha:-</td>
<td>bha:y/bha:bi</td>
<td>'B/e8W'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-i/-ya</td>
<td>samdh/-samdh-</td>
<td>samdh/samdhya</td>
<td>'C.Sp.F/affinal kins'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-/va:da</td>
<td>samdh/-sammandh-</td>
<td>samdh/sammandh-</td>
<td>'C.Sp.F/affinal kins'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ø/-yi</td>
<td>nanand/nananda:-</td>
<td>nanand/nanandayi</td>
<td>'HZ/HZH'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-I#/en#/</td>
<td>payl-/paul-</td>
<td>payl:jorU/</td>
<td>'W(1)'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-a/-pan</td>
<td>baac/-bac-</td>
<td>baac/bacpan</td>
<td>'child/childhood'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-u/-ba</td>
<td>ma:m/maul-</td>
<td>ma:mu/maula</td>
<td>'MB/MB'</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

10.4.4.4. Table showing the distinction between phoneme/morpheme in the distinction of kin terms and the relations in MN

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>p/mr, stems</th>
<th>terms</th>
<th>gloss</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-n/-tći</td>
<td>aniya/-aniya-</td>
<td>aniyan/aniyatti</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-a/-o:l</td>
<td>o:pp/-o:pp-</td>
<td>o:ppa/o:ppo:l</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-a/-an</td>
<td>amma/-amma:m-</td>
<td>amma/amma:man</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-an/-i</td>
<td>amma:m/amma:m</td>
<td>amma:man/amma:mi</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table showing the contrast between phoneme/morpheme in the distinction of kin terms and relations in MK

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>p/mr</th>
<th>stems</th>
<th>terms</th>
<th>gloss</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-n/\tt</td>
<td>aniya-/aniya-</td>
<td>aniyân/aniyattî</td>
<td>'yB/yZ'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-y/-lɔ</td>
<td>mo:/-mo:</td>
<td>mo:y/mo:lɔ</td>
<td>'S/D'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-Ø/-cci</td>
<td>amma/amma-</td>
<td>amma/ammacci</td>
<td>'M/M(+-h)'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-j/-tti</td>
<td>penn-/pend-</td>
<td>pennâ/penda:tti</td>
<td>'woman/W'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-y/-kkalɔ</td>
<td>mo:/-ma:-</td>
<td>mo:y/makkalɔ</td>
<td>'S/C(affe.)'</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table showing the contrast between phoneme/morpheme in the distinction of kin terms and relations in MM

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>p/mr</th>
<th>stems</th>
<th>terms</th>
<th>gloss</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-n/\sa:\nka</td>
<td>ammo:-/ammo:-</td>
<td>ammō:n/ammo:sa:nka</td>
<td>'MB/Sp.F'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-a/-o:n</td>
<td>amm:-/amm-</td>
<td>amma/ammo:n</td>
<td>'M/MB'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-n/\lɔ</td>
<td>marumo:-/marumo:-</td>
<td>marumō:n/marumo:lɔ</td>
<td>'OH/SW'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-n/-yi</td>
<td>amma:-/amma:-</td>
<td>ammō:n/amma:yî</td>
<td>'MB/MBW'</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| -an/-i | va:lyakka:r/-va:lyaka:ran/-va:lys:kka:r- | va:lyakka:ran/ | 'young man/
young woman' |
| -Ø/-ka:ran | pa:\ngett:/ | pennetâ:/ | 'alliance/
alliance broken' |
10.4.5. Table showing the contrast between morpheme/morpheme in the distinction of kin terms and relations in KG.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>cm</th>
<th>mr/mr</th>
<th>stems</th>
<th>terms</th>
<th>gloss</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>KG</td>
<td>-mu/-yi</td>
<td>ma:-/ma:-</td>
<td>ma:mu/ma:yi</td>
<td>'MB/MBW'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-di:k/-n</td>
<td>vaR/-vo:R</td>
<td>vaRdi:k/-vo:R:n</td>
<td>'marriage/bridegroom party'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-di:k/-tu</td>
<td>vaR/-vo:re:-</td>
<td>vaRdi:k/-vo:re:tu</td>
<td>marriage/bridegroom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-tu/-l</td>
<td>va:re:-/vo:k:-vo:re:tu/vokk:</td>
<td>bridegroom/bride'</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MR</td>
<td>Ø</td>
<td>Ø</td>
<td>Ø</td>
<td>Ø</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| UM | -Ra/-a:l | sa:s/-sasur- | sa:sRa/sasuRa:l | 'HF/H's house' |
|    | -di/-haR | sa:-/-sa- | saidi/sauhaR | 'marriage/H' |
|    | pɔ:/-ko:- | tɔra/tɔra | pɔ:tɔra/ko:tɔra | 'SS/SCS' |
|    | na:-/ka- | va:sa/-va:sa | nava:sa/kava:sa | 'DS/DCS' |

5. Since there are limited number of structural units in this category all are given in a single table. Analysis is not strictly followed as in the descriptive analysis. Most of the sandhi elements are taken with the stems. Since the aim is to show structural contrast with differing kin relations same term may be treated with a suffix in some cases and in some cases they are taken as words and hence the contrasting structural unit as Ø. The zero contrast unit - absence of term is not taken as a unit into counting in the tables.
### Table showing the contrastive linguistic units in the distinction of kin terms and relations in the six communities under study

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Community</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>KG</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MR</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UM</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MN</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MK</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MM</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**10.4.6.1. Discussion on units of contrast in the distinction of terms and relations based on their frequency.**

Regarding the general frequency of contrastive linguistic units, MR, MN, MK and MM exhibit a poor picture. For MR, this is largely due to the distinctive terms which
Similar.

donot have counterparts and also due to the same units being utilised in the kin distinction. This is also true for MN, MK and MM. Moreover the terms are few in these communities when compared to KG and UM. All the communities have more frequency in the category of p/mr of contrastive units UM which have a considerably higher number of terms than other communities but have frequency of contrastive units lesser than KG in the category of simplex terms. For structural productivity and generative productivity of kin term refer to section (10.9).

10.5. Complex terms

These are of the type of kin terms where a modifier is affixed (prefixed/suffixed/infixed) with the kin terms forming the complex kin terms. The following types are found.

10.5.1. M + K (M+K) where M=modifier and K=kin term

\[ M_1 + K \]

where the modifier occurs with kin terms only.

Eg: KG. /malg .:da bai:vu/ 'eB'

MR. /holli bhayn/ 'eZ'

UM. /maindaR bha:y/ 'step B'

MK. /cittappE/ 'St.B'

In MN and MM similar terms are not found.

10.5.2. M_2 + K where the modifier may occur with other linguistic forms.

Eg: KG. /lii pu:lu/ 'eS'

MR. /svand bhau/ 'uterine B'

UM. /bada be:ta/ 'eS'
The modifier in the reduced form combines with the kinship term. The kinship term is also reduced forming a fused construction. Eg:

KG /pun:j: <— porn + ajj > 'old PF' (PPF)
MR /thollayi <— thorla + ayyi 'big/fat M (FeBW)'
UM /nauṣo <— naya + sauhaR 'new bride groom (eZH)'
MN /ele:mburu:ri <— elaya + namburu:ri 'younger Namburi' (HyB)
MK /pudiya:pla/ <— pudiya + ma:pla 'new husband' (bridegroom)
MM /elaccan/ <— elaya + accan 'new father' (HyB)

10.5.4. M₄ + K where a kinship term functions as a modifier

KG Ø
MR /sautaR bar:p/ 'St.F (saut-cowife)'
UM /da:da bhaiy/ 'eB (da:da - FF)'
MN /mutta:siyamma/ 'PM (amma-mother an honorific modifier)
MK /magan mo:j:y/ 'Step.S (magan-son as a modifier in the duplicate term)

6. In isolation is not found in MM.
10.5.5. $M_5 + K$

Oblique reflexive form of first person (in this study occurs with kinship terms. Similar terms are termed as inalienably possessed kin terms in Dravidian, by Emeneau (1967). These terms are found in NKG only, borrowed from Kannada or Tamil.

Eg: KG $t\text{-}ngi \rightarrow tam + akka \rightleftharpoons tanga \rightleftharpoons tangi 'yZ$

$\text{tamma} \rightleftharpoons \text{tam} + \text{anna} \rightarrow \text{tammanna} \rightarrow \text{tamma} \rightarrow \text{tamma} 'yZ$

10.5.6. $M_6 + K$ where $M = N/N_1/N_2$

$N$ is the personal name of a male kin, $N_1$ that of a female kin, before marriage of the respective kin, $N_2$ the personal name of the female kin after marriage of the respective kin. These distinctions are found in KG only and also in MN for non-elders but elder kins (sib). Eg:

KG $/N\text{appa}/$ 'FyB/MyZH'  
$/N_1 \text{pacci}/$ 'MyZ'  
$/N_1 \text{akka}/$ 'eZ-eldest/FZ' (even after marriage for ego)  
$/N_2 \text{pacci}/$ 'FyBW'  
MN. $/N\text{e\text{-}datti}/$ 'FBD, FZD, MBD, MZD'

10.5.7. $K + M_7$ where $M = a\text{ noun}$

KG $/\text{pontRu mu\text{-}kh}/$ 'CCC-face' (seeing the face of a CCS, rare luck among the KG)  
MR $/\text{ba\text{-}vu bang}/$ 'B-rotation' (sibling's)
10.5.8. $M_1 + M_2 + K$ where two modifiers are used to combine with the kin term.

KG ø
MR ø
UM ø

MN /muđu muttassa/ 'PPF (muđu+iutta +assan/accan)'

MK ø

MM /muṭṭaḍa:ppa/ 'Fyā (1)'

10.5.9. K + pl.m. where pl.m indicates plural marker for a single kin as an honorific marker.

This term is found only in MM and MN /aṭṭa:ma:ra/ 'W'

MM /pennuḥhala/ 'W' (penn+ woman)

Actually kinologically this term may be taken as an elementary term but structurally this is derived in MM.

10.5.10. *K + pl.m + sq. where pl.m indicates plural marker after the kin term which does not occur in isolation as a kin term (*) but can be taken historically as a kin term. The term is formed finally and synchronically by suffixing the singular marker to denote the respective kin.
Eg: a1ality +ya+n --> aiyana 'WB'
-ya is a plural marker found in some of the dialects of Malayalam especially in the extreme north and south of Kerala. This term is also available in Toda language as /piliya/ (Emeneau, 1967).

10.5.11. M + N + K

Eg: MK. mu:ttan+kudi+ma:pla 'elder (first) marriage + husband (husband by first marriage).

10.6. Multiple structural analysis of kin terms

A single term may be included in more than one category as in the case of simplex terms where layering may be allowed. Thus /da:da/ which is an elementary term can be used as a modifier. Similarly /ma:pla/ in /mu:ttan-kudi ma:pla/ can be taken as a single term or as K, since it has already achieved a terminological status.

10.7. Compound kin terms

Kinship terms conjoining more than one kin term and also other modifier in some cases giving rise to other kin terms come under this category.

10.7.1. Compound terms: type 1 - non-collective type

10.7.1.1. K1 + K2 where two different terms combine to form a new kin term

7. Does not occur in isolation.
Except in KG all terms are ambiguous.

10.7.1.2. $K_1 + K_1$, where the same term is duplicated to form a new kin term

KG. /bapp ma/ $\Longleftrightarrow$ bappa + amma 'FM'
MR. /Ra:n mund/ $\Longleftrightarrow$ Randi + munda 'widow'
UM. /xa:la amma/ $\Longleftrightarrow$ xa:la + amma 'MeZ'
MN. /opp:1 amma/ $\Longleftrightarrow$ opp:1 + amma 'FeBW'
UM /amma:yi amma/ $\Longleftrightarrow$ amma:yi + umma 'Sp.M'

10.7.1.3. $K_1 + K_2 + K_3$

KG. /mavl) bacci soyri:k)/ 'cross cousin alliance' (MB-ZD Proposal)

The construction is ambiguous since in the surface structure it indicates uncle niece marriage.

10.7.1.4. $M_1+K_1+K_2$

KG. /p:nja:bu/ $\Longleftrightarrow$ p:n + ajj + a:bu 'PF'
UM. $\emptyset$

UM. /nau' ha:yi/ $\Longleftrightarrow$ (naya+sauhaR+bha:y) 'eZH'
MN. /mutt:essi+yamma/ $\Longleftrightarrow$ (mut:ta+essi+amma) 'PM'
MK. $\emptyset$
In this case a form which occurs as a modifier but which dates back to an old term outside India conjoins with another term forming a fused term in KG. Eg:

\[ /'sent\overset{\cdot}{s}/ \leftarrow (sentis+pu:tu) \]

In 1977 this term was reconstructed as \( \text{\`se} + \text{porn} + \text{pu:tu} \) where \( \text{\`se} \) = 'hundred', \( \text{porn} \) = 'old' and \( \text{pu:tu} \) as 'son'. Later this etymology was found to be incorrect which was based on superficial similarity. In Lithuanian 'grand father's father' is found (Ghurye, 1965) and the KG term is apparently derived from this term.

10.7.2. Collective term

These are terms of the apositional type. They are of lesser significance, are characteristic of reduplicative and echotype structure.
10.7.2.1. \(K_1 + K_2\) (apositional reduplicative)

KG /jav-javv/ 'wives of brothers'
MR /ja:vu-ja:vu/ 
UM /bha:ya:-bha:ya:/ 'brother'

10.7.2.2. \(K_1 + K_2\) (nonreduplicative type)

KG /cordu balle/ 'children'
MR /dalla baiyko/ 'H & W'
UM /devRa:ni-jeti:tha:ni/ 'wives of brothers'

10.7.2.3. \(K_1 + K\) (echo type)

\(K\) is an echo term without any meaning occurring oppositionally with the basic kin term but meaning the opposite kin in the deep structure.

MR /mhe:vne-dha:vne/ 'brothers in law'
/dalla- balle/ 'H&W'

Similar terms are not available in other five communities.
10.7.2.4. \( K_1 - K_2 \)

MK /magan mo:y/ 'St. S'

Where \( K_1 \) is only a repetitive form of the term /mo:y/ to indicate step kinship.

10.7.2.5. \( K_1 - K_2 \)

Where \( K_1 \) as a collective term is not common in MN (where this term is available) and \( K_2 \) is also not available in the general pattern of language.

MN /makkal: + mahale:ra/'children'. Here /mahale:ra/ in the plural form the plural form is not common to Malayalam. But in Tulu /amme:ra/ for father and /-e:ra/ as an honorific suffix available for father. 8

10.8. **Syntactic kinship terms**

Syntactic terms of the taknonymous type are excluded from this study. Syntactic kinship terms involve fused or contracted sentences as kin terms or conjoined with kin terms and also sentences which have a deep structure for the superficially exhibited structure are taken into consideration.

1. \( S + K \) where \( S \) is an affirmative single response sentence fused with a kin term to form a new term.

KG /va:i ge:/ (vocative term, honorific (va:i + age:))

/va:i go:/ , informal (va:i + age:)

8. From the information collected from a Tulu speaker.
/vali re:/'vocative term, informal (male) (vai+are:)

/valvo:/'

',

male honorific.' (vai +avo: (ago)

1,2,4 are derived from the same term /age:/ and /vali/ 'yes'

Structure of /vali age:/ KG

S

\[ /\text{vai} /\]

\[ /\text{age}/ /\]

\[ /\text{valage}/ (honorific vocative - female) \]

Similar diagrams can be given for other terms.

10.8.2. S + K where S is an interrogative sentence.

MR /kayge:/ 'hey' (what + age)

Structure of /kayge:/ MR

S

\[ /\text{kay}/ /\]

\[ /\text{age}/ /\]

10.8.3.5v(K) where 'S' is quotative conjoiner used generally in the language but in the kinship context used as an honorific vocative especially for the husband in MK.

/enne:/ 'honorable vocative term for the husband'
This term is derived from the conjunctive /enne/.
This term is a familiar term of honorific vocative in the Paraya dialect of Poovar also (Lalitha Bai, 1976).

10.8.4. Conjugated terms

Kinship terms as conjugated nouns are also found in the communities under study. In this case the terms underlie a sentence which in the deep structure posit a relative clause construction finally emerges out as a conjugated noun. K(S_CN) where the notation S_CN indicates the kin term is a sentence(s) transformed into the conjugated noun (CN).

KG /lek ṭā:li/ 'relatives'
/viyeve:li baṁyl̃/ 'widow'

10.8.4.1. Structure of /letā:li/ 'kin' KG
Construction (1) indicates the basic structure., statement type (2) indicates relativisation transformation and (3) NP deletion which ultimately gives the conjugated noun /lektɔːli/. 

10.8.4.2. Structure of /vidava:li ba:y1:/ KG

Sentence (1) in the deeper most structure is the statement type, (2) interchange of N of NP and VP (N of NP of VP), (3) interchange of the position or positional transformation of NP(N) and V of VP, (4) relativisation transformation and finally the transformed conjugated construction emerges as the conjugated noun.
10.8.4.3. Structure of /dappeRanno:n/ (MN & MK)

Transformation rules from deeper levels:

1. --- statement type of two compound sentences by the insertion of an additional subject ego (nā:n), also by the insertion of an adjectival ore: ablative marker ninnu.

2. --- shifting of the major subject avan in the NP to the VP after V

3. --- deletion of the adjectival

4. --- deletion of the ablative

5. --- relative clause transformation
6 — ego subject deletion
7 — conjoining of the NP and VP of the major VP as a conjugated noun as in the surface structure.

/MM. /kettiyo:n/ 'H'

10.8.4.4. Structure of /kettiyo:n/ (MM)

\[
\begin{align*}
S & \quad \text{VP} \\
\text{NP} & \quad /\text{avan}/ \quad /\text{ketti}/ \\
\emptyset & \quad /\text{ketti avan}/ \quad /\text{kettiya avan}/ \\
\end{align*}
\]

Transformational rules

1 — statement type simple sentence
2 — transformation of the major subject to VP after V
3 — relativisation transformation
4 — conjugated noun as a kin term in the surface structure.

PL + S + N where PL is the place noun + locative case suffix or post position S is a relative clause construction and N a noun. eg:

KG. ∅
M?. ∅
UM. ∅
MN. /agattullaːlɔ/ 'W'
/kunnəːtːoːlɔ/ 'a Nambudiri maiden'

10.8.4.5. Structure of /agattullaːlɔ/ (MN)

Transformational rules

1. --- statement type simple sentence with a splitting of NP as N and case suffix and VP

2. --- relativisation transformation

3. --- positional shifting of the NPa and VP of the V

4. --- conjugated kin term in the surface structure.

10.8.4.6. Structure of /kunnəːtːoːlɔ/ (MN)

This is compound sentence.
The derivation of embedded sentence is already described. In this context only excessive contraction of phonological elements takes place as /agattulla:lə/ → /atə:1/ by the lower castes. /kunə/ indicates the unmarried status of person.

10.8.5. PLS + K + PP where PLS denotes the place noun, LS relative clause used as locative case suffix in fusion with relative clause and P the pronoun used as an honorific marker.

10.8.7. Structure of /atte:maːɾ / (MN)
Transformational rules

1. --- statement type simple sentence with an insertion of verb
2. --- Positional transformation of NP and V of VP
3. --- relativisation transformation
4. --- deletion of the relativisation morpheme
5. --- shifting P; relativisation of the case suffix by changing the final phoneme u → e
6. --- conjugated noun as a kin term by the necessary phonological contractions

10.8.6. $K_1 + X + PC + K_2$ Where PC indicates possessive case marker. In this case no trace of verbs are superficially found. Hence in this case the two terms are considered as two compound sentences conjoined by the case suffix.

10.8.6.1. Structure of /anna:li onni/

$S$ —

\[
\begin{align*}
S & \quad N_P & \quad V_P \\
\text{t} / \text{ain atә}/ & \quad \text{/ti batyla atә}/ & \quad (1) \\
/\text{mige:li/} & \quad /\text{ti: onni/ atә}/ & \quad (2) \\
/\text{anna:li/} & \quad /\text{ti: onni/ atә}/ & \quad (3) \\
& \quad /\text{anna:li onni/} & \quad (4)
\end{align*}
\]
Transformational rules

1 --- statement type splitting or the compound sentence into two with necessary verbs and demonstratives

2 --- Simultaneous transformation of the N in the first and second sentences since the relation is changed (in transformational rules simultaneous transformations are not allowed but in the kinological analysis a transformation in the first sentence should follow a corresponding simultaneous transformation in the second sentence also).

3 --- replacing the former NP in the first sentence by another NP

4 --- deletion of the demonstratives

5 --- the final conjoining of the two sentences into one.

In this case the possessive case (*) marker act as a dummy element synchronically. /-re/ is a possessive post position or case suffix occurring with the first and second person pronouns but not with the other nouns. The informant also told me that it is not a possessive marker. Hence in the deep structure only the case marker is posited and thus the examples bear analogy with the example in the previous example in the KG, but with some semantic or kinological differences. eg: KG /cicce:re bha:y/ 'Fy8S'.
10.8.6.2. Structure of /čičča ra bhaːy/*

Transformational rules

1 -- statement type splitting of the compound sentences into two simple sentences

2 -- simultaneous conversion of the first and second sentences as in the previous case

3 -- further transformation of the N of the second sentence by the deletion of the adjective -ulta 'cross' since this is the real kinship as a cross cousin they have where in the terminal string it conveys the impression of a parallel cousin.

4 -- replacing the former NP in the first sentence

5 -- deletion of demonstratives

6 -- final conjoining of the two sentences into one.

9. Same structure is available in MR /sautaR baːp/ 'St.F' where -aR is possesive case, -a with -thj
In the hafi dialect this post position is replaced by an adjectival post position with the same meaning as /cicca sa:sRa/ 'Sp.HyB'.

10.9 Productive and generative system in the kinship terminology

Productivity and generative capacity are the two opposing aspects of kinship terminology. A terminological system of kinship is said to be productive if each kin relation is designated by a distinctive and separate kinship term. To this extent no society can have a full fledged system of terminology. A kinship system is said to be terminologically generative if more linguistically related terms are derived from the previous ones. All kinship systems to some extent are generative in terminology. If more structures are employed in the derivation of terms they are said to be generatively productive as in the case of konkani. Konkani tops above all the communities in the structural diversity with more number of elementary terms (50) and also have more structural units in the contrast for the distinction of kin terms. MR with a limited number of total terms however have many terms as elementary (36). UM have a number of elementary terms, structural contrasting units but compared with the total high frequency contributed by the generative capacity its fitness is delimited. The fitness of terminological system of MR cannot be delimited since it has 36 elementary terms. MN, MK and MM have a low frequency of
elementary terms (21, 20, 14) and also contrasting structural units, though some of the structural units are distinctive for their nature especially in the syntactic category especially for MN.

In some systems both these mechanisms do not work. On the other hand the generative tendency is envisaged in the domain of semantics where a few terms generate many terms of classificatory nature which is the case in MK and MM. Hence the types which categorise the kinship system on the basis of productivity and generative capacity are:

1. Individually productive (no community have such a full fledged system),
2. descriptive and generatively productive (of classificatorily productive nature),
3. classificatorily generative
4. classificatorily or semantically productive

No community individually holds solely any of these types. However its relative measure identifies a kinship system as ideal or proper terminologically. Productivity which is always given predominance over generative capacity has relative score of fitness. This can be hierarchically ordered on the basis of structure as follows:

1. Separate term for each kin or more number of elementary terms,
2. complex types - contrast by morpheme/morpheme
3. "", morpheme/phoneme
4. "", phoneme/phoneme
5. M + K
6. compound terms
7. syntactic terms.

Syntactic terms if ambiguous deserve attention, however as terms words are always preferred over sentences and in the evolutionary course of kin terms they are beginners of formation of new terms.

10.9.1. More on generative nature of kin terms

10.9.1.1. Classificatorily generative

This is analogous to what Morgan (1871) said about the linguistic structure of kinship terms. The terms which have been popularly labelled as classificatory are semantically descriptive and underlie a number of deep structures may be either kinologically significant like /onni/ 'eB, HeZ, C.Sp.M' in KG. indicating cross cousin marriage, or a simplification process as /amma/ 'M, HM(MN) or random simplification of the classificatory nature as /ikka:kka/ 'eB, MB, etc. In the Nair and Exhava speech /ce:tta:n/ indicates 'eB, HeB, H, EZH, 11/cousin etc.

10. For details refer to structural evolution of kin terms in the historical component.
10.9.1.2. Descriptively classificatory

The immediate basic term may be denotative but a regular pattern of generation is found as in UM.

eg: UM /tə:yə:rə bha:y/ 'FaBS'
     /maule:rə sa:sRa/ 'Sp.MB'

10.9.1.3. Structurally generative

If more structures are employed in the generation of terms such terms are said to be structurally generative. KG and UM for the case communities in this respect.

10.9.1.4. Lexically generative:

These form the core of first degree fitness eligible group. KG, MR and UM belong to this group.

10.9.1.5. Descriptively and classificatorily generative

Sometimes both processes may be operative and the probability of higher number of terms is predicted which is the case in UM.

10.10. The terminological fitness curve of kinship: Graphical inference on the productivity, generative nature and numerical predominance of kin terms

10.10.1. Methodology and procedure

To decide the fitness of terminological system of kinship of the six communities under study the following mea-
asures and procedures are undertaken. The frequency of elementary terms (E.T) (kinlexemes + kinolexemes), total frequency of static kin terms (underived elementary terms (S.E.T) and the total individual communal frequency based on the criteria suggested earlier (vide 10.3). These frequencies are then converted into percentages of S.E.T/E.T X100, E.T/n X100 and n/N x 100 where S.E.T indicate static elementary terms, E.T. elementary terms, n—the total number of kin terms in individual communities, and N—the total frequency of all kin terms in all the six communities under study. The average percentage frequency was found to be 27.8, 33.0 and 16.7.

The frequency table of contrastive linguistic units (10.4.6) in the distinction of kin terms for the category of simplex terms is converted in percentage frequency table (19.10.4). The average percentage curve was taken as 16.7, the average of 100/6 as the minimum or standard fitness curve frequency. These two percentage tables when graphically represented give a clear picture of the terminological nature of kin terms. For graphical inference compound terms and syntactic terms are not taken into consideration since they are a combination of these elementary terms and above that in the total frequency they also come into picture.
10.10.2. Table showing the frequency of elementary terms, static elementary terms and total terms of kinship in KG, MR, UM, MN, MK and MM

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>cm./fr.</th>
<th>E.T.</th>
<th>G.E.T</th>
<th>n(total fr.cm)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>KG</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>154</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MR</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UM</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>187</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MN</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MK</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MM</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>184</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>591</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

10.10.3. Table showing the percentage frequency of S.E.T/E.T., E.T/n and n/N in the KG, MR, UM, MN, MK, MM and together with the average percentage frequency

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>cm./fr.%</th>
<th>S.E.T/E.T.%</th>
<th>E.T/n%</th>
<th>n/N%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>KG</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>32.5</td>
<td>26.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MR</td>
<td>38.9</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>12.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UM</td>
<td>16.3</td>
<td>22.9</td>
<td>31.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MN</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>32.3</td>
<td>11.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MK</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>10.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MM</td>
<td>21.4</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>8.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Av.fr.%</td>
<td>27.8</td>
<td>33.0</td>
<td>16.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table showing the percentage frequency of p/p, p/mr, mr/mr in the KG, MR, UM, MN, MK and MM and also the average percentage frequency

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>cm./fr.%</th>
<th>p/p</th>
<th>p/mr.</th>
<th>mr/mr</th>
<th>Av.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>KG</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>32.8</td>
<td>36.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MR</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UM</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>26.6</td>
<td>36.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MN</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10.9</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MK</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7.8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MM</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9.4</td>
<td>18.2</td>
<td>16.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>total</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

10.10.7. The terminological fitness curves in the six communities under study. Discussion on the percentage frequencies and relative fitness of terminological system of kinship

The percentage frequencies of the S.E.T./E.T for the six communities under study reveals that KG tops above all indicating larger % number of S.E.T (42%) that is more number of individually distinctive terms. MR comes next (38.9%) and

11. '/' indicate contrast in this case and not division as symbolised in the previous tables.

Numerical value in the tabular form is already represented in the section (10.4.6).
10.10.5. Graph showing the terminological fitness curves of kinship in KG, MR, UM, MN, MK and MM, and the average frequency curve for values of $\frac{SET}{ET}$, $\frac{ET}{n}$ and $\frac{n}{N}$.
Graph showing the terminological fitness curves of kinship in KG, MR, UM, MN, MK and MM and the average percentage curve for values of $P/p$, $P/m$, and $m^2/m$. 

**AVC** - Average percentage curve.
UM comes last except MK. This means that in UM and MK most of the terms are derived. In the second category E.T/n, % MR tops above all with a relatively high percentage for elementary terms and KG and MK comes next, UM comes next and last comes UM. This need not be led to a conclusive inference since the total frequency of communally individual terms in MR, MN and MK are lower than KG or UM. When taken into consideration \( \frac{n}{N} \) of the communities the previous status falls down considerably for MR, MN and MK (where UM tops above all and KG comes next but others with a lower percentage (MR-12.7%, MN-11.0%, MK-10.2%) \( \times \frac{\%}{\%} \).

In the percentage frequencies for the contrastive units of simplex terms, the picture is still more vivid. For p/p contrast %, UM tops above all (40%), KG comes next (36%), others and especially the Malayalam speaking communities fall back. For p/mr. contrast % KG tops above all (32.8%) and UM comes next (26.6%) and others fall back. For mr/mr the contrast percentage for both KG and UM tops above all and MM comes next (however the general frequency in this category is very low for all the communities as per dissection of terms. Thus regarding the higher value feature for various categories the following marking by a '+' sign is given as follows which reveal the actual situation.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>KG</th>
<th>MR</th>
<th>UM</th>
<th>MN</th>
<th>MK</th>
<th>MM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>S.E.T</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E.T</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p/p</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p/mr</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mr/mr</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Hence the highest number of values is shared by the KG and next comes UM. MR and MN deserve attention for the higher number of elementary and static terms, MK for higher number of elementary terms. The only feature where MM have a + value cannot come into much affect due to the general lower frequency in the respective category. The fitness of these factors is revealed by the percentage curves which lie above (+ fitness) or below (- fitness) the normal minimum fitness curve - the average percentage curve in the graphs (10,10.5) and (10,10.6).

10.11. Linguistic information content and its relation to the generative nature of kinship terms

Linguistic information content of kinship is a measure of the competence of the native speaker in realising the roles and naming them. The more the terms employed or in other words a powerful descriptive generative system is a clear and abundant information source for a hearer as a non-native speaker.
A classificatory system is helpful to a native speaker only and presents a least powerful source of information content. In other words the classificatory terms which do not reflect any non linguistic such as social or a anthropological clearly in the surface structure present simple kinship system specifically in cases of a economy type system. This economy system may further indicate a weakening kinship system. The branch of study content-analysis influenced by the developments in the information theory, deals with the study of the messages that are communicated. Apart from studying the current trends of various aspects in the newspapers it also takes into consideration other aspects such as political campaign, personal traits etc. (Siromony & Siromony, 1979: 192-3). It is high time that how linguist can utilise the 'native speakers oral news in the evaluation of the information content especially in the ethnological data which speak on their opinions and values of their community and how productive and informative are oral languages. No part of language presents such an effective and explicit information profile on all non-linguistic aspects such as sociological, psychological and historical and group concepts, behaviour patterns via the terms as the language of kinship reflecting the past present and also future of the community.
10.12. Diagramatic representation of kinship terms

10.12.1. Elementary terms having no derived terms

Elementary terms which do not have terms derived can be represented by segmental line where one end point (the vertex) is taken as the nod for ego and the second end point as the underived kin term.

10.12.1.1. Diagram of static kin term in KG

```
   /po:Ru/ 'S'
```

Similarly /tæ:ta/ 'FF' (MR), /sa:jhu/ 'WZH' (UM), /ap:pan/ 'FyB' (MN), /aɾiyan/ 'WB' (MK), /ca:kko:latti/ 'cowife' (MM) can be diagramatically represented.

10.12.2. Dissimilar counter terms

Terms which have linguistically dissimilar counter parts can be represented by a branching diagram and the two terms remaining disjoined.

10.12.2.1. Diagram of dissimilar counters terms in KG

```
   /pu:tu/ .......... /du:w/'
```

Parallel examples in the other communities are: /dalla/, /ba:yo/ 'H/W' (MR), maRa/djo:Ru 'H/W (UM)', acchan/amma 'F/M' (MN), acra/amma 'F/M' (MK), ba:μα/amma 'F/M (MM).
The dotted line indicate linguistic dissimilarity but kin connection.

10.12.3 Triangle of kinship terms

Those of the first degree order derived terms can be represented by the triangle diagram. The principal node in all the diagrams is the ego to which we can allot one or more kin terms as per nature of the diagram which always remains in the deep structure. The triangular diagrams represent the simplex terms generally.

10.12.3.1 Structure of simplex terms in contrast

\[ \begin{array}{c}
  \text{E} \\
  /\text{bappa}/ \\
  /\text{bappaly}/ \\
\end{array} \]

Similar terms in the other communities are bheu/bhaui 'B/BW' (MR), bha:y/bha:y:a 'B/BW' (UM), aniyan/aniyattu 'yB/yZ (MN & MK) ansan/ansattu 'yB/yZ (MM).

10.12.4 Diagonally represented terms

In the case of diagonally represented kin terms two diagonals of a square represent the conjoining terms and the resultant term to ego respectively.
Similar structure as found above in the structure is not found in other communities under study except in MN. In case where they occur are honorific markers as /ammaci/, /ta:yba:/

In a pyramid of kin terms more than one kin term of the simplex type can be derived (elementary term diverted to many directions).
10.12.5.1. Pyramid of kin terms /bappa/, /bappaly/ and /N bappa/ in KG

10.12.6. Prism of kin terms

This may be taken as an analogous situation as in the previous case. This axis of centre is formed by the ego and the elementary term ego being at the vertex and basic kin terms centre of the base.

10.12.6.1. Diagram of prism of terms derived from amma in KG
10.12.7. Derivational circle

Certain terms represent the aspects of kinship of an individual. Etymologically and process wise the derivation differ, linguistically they are derived from the same word and sometimes exhibit equal importance. For example in KG the terms /va\Rdi\k\y\j/vo\re\t\u/,/vo\R\a\n\j/,/vokk\a\l\j/,/vo\R\j/ are derived from the same word /va\R/ 'to marry' (Skt.). But they are equally significant or have a more or less equal status and can be plotted on the periphery of a circle with ego as centre.

10.13. Conclusion

The anatomical study of the terminology of kinship has brought to light how contrastive units can be utilised in the isolation of meanings of kinship in correlation with other nonlinguistic aspects as kinological, sociological, psychological, etc (the disciplinary specific features are already dis-
cussed under other chapters. In this chapter only structural units are isolated which may be correlated with nonlinguistic parameters. The contrastive units also reveal how communities differ and agree each other in number and nature in the distinction of kin terms. The quantitative analysis of the elementary terms (kine lexemes + kinolexemes) inclusive of static elementary terms exhibit the conceptualisation ability of the individuals in the discrimination process. Communities with relatively lower number of terms may have a higher number of elementary terms. When the total frequency of the terms is below the prescribed norms the higher value of the elementary terms of the case communities is delimited, in significance, to some extent. A community with good number of elementary terms with a good number of S.E.T and a large number of contrastive units for the simplex terms presents equally a good productive and generative terminological system in the kinship which is the case in KG. A community with the highest frequency and fairly good frequency of E.T but a lower frequency in S.E.T presents a generatively ideal terminological system with a good number of contrastive units of simplex system presents perhaps an almost equally ideal terminological system of the language concerned which is the case in UM. The Malayalam speaking communities fall back in total frequency but to some extent the MN and MK are
notable for a good number of elementary terms. MM presents terminologically a poor picture in the surface structure with the lowest total frequency (50) and also for other parametric considerations of anatomical analysis.