

WHERE DO COMPLEX KINTERMS COME FROM?

ALAN DENCH

1. INTRODUCTION¹

Australian languages have become quite renowned for the complexity of their kin referencing systems, the most often cited examples being sets of derived kinterms used to refer to pairs and groups of kin. However, while there have been a number of discussions of the logic underlying such systems of kinship reference (see especially the papers collected together in Heath, Merlan and Rumsey (1982)), there has been little detailed discussion of the morphology used in deriving the terms.

This paper explores the possible origins of the morphology used to code various kin relations in a group of Australian languages spoken in the Pilbara region of Western Australia.² I show that morphemes used within restricted paradigms to indicate particular kin relationships have cognates outside these paradigms and that there are recurrent patterns of semantic connection. The paper does not attempt to provide a definitive account of the semantics underlying kin reference terminology, but is intended as an exploration of the grammaticalised metaphors that may underlie reference to kin relationships in Australian languages.

In developing the argument, I make the methodological assumption that the presence of similar forms used to mark particular categories is indicative of some connection between these categories. That is, I choose to disregard the possibility of accidental homophony. An example will make this point more clearly. In the Mantharta languages (Austin 1993b) a suffix, *-panti*, marks plural kinterms. In the same languages a case suffix, *-panti*, marks ablative and causal categories. My initial assumption is that this is not an accidental relationship.

The approach I am taking blurs the line between synchronic and diachronic analysis and so raises the question of polysemy. Assuming a connection can be made, is the Mantharta homophony the result of some distant historical connection with subsequent semantic

¹ I am grateful to Marie-Eve Ritz for comments on this paper, and to Peter Austin for his comments on an earlier draft, for providing additional crucial examples, and for making available to me his draft grammars of Kanyara and Mantharta languages. He should not be held responsible for any errors of interpretation which I may have made of these data. I am also indebted to the following people who have helped me learn about the languages of the Pilbara: the late Percy Tucker and Herbert Parker (Panyjima), the late Algy Paterson (Martuthunira), Alexander Brown (Ngarla) and the late Daisy Williams (Nyamal). Research on Nyamal and Ngarla, and comparative work on the Pilbara languages, is funded by the Australian Research Council (grant numbers A59131653, A59532829).

² The languages in the sample include Ngarla, Nyamal, Ngarluma, Panyjima, Yindjibarndi, Kurrama and Martuthunira (of the Ngayarda group), Jiwarli and Warriangka (of the Mantharta group), and Thalanyji and Payungu (Kanyara group). Sources are cited throughout the paper.

divergence, or is there a synchronically valid semantic connection? I will return to this question in the conclusion, but my method of exploration addresses it indirectly. Having assumed a relationship between seemingly divergent categories I consider the broader semantic field surrounding each of the categories. In this way I hope to find points where the fields overlap. Such successive overlapping fields will ideally themselves be identified by sets of morphemes and will thus strengthen the case for a real semantic connection between seemingly disparate categories.

The paper proceeds as follows: in §2, I describe a range of morphological devices employed in Pilbara languages for encoding specific kin relationships, including the morphology of 'dyadic' and 'group' kinterms and suffixes to pronouns and nominals; §3 describes the range of forms and functions of ablative/causal suffixes across the group of languages; §4 then draws together this discussion by returning to a consideration of a selection of six specific suffix forms. Finally, I make some concluding remarks in §5.

2. KIN RELATIONS

In this section I will explore a number of different morphological systems which allow reference to kin relations. To begin with, I need to make a few general remarks about the semantics of kinship terms.

Singular, linear kinterms are inherently relational. The word 'father' can be used to refer explicitly to a single individual, but that reference necessarily involves the existence of another individual for whom the referent stands in the relation 'father-of'. Thus we can view the kin relation as a two-place predicate:

father-of (x, y)

Languages have different means for denoting the kin relation and the arguments of that predicate. In Panyjima, there are two simple means of describing a kin relationship, one involving a possessive noun phrase (1), the other involving the use of a kinterm as a predicate taking the possessor as an accusative complement (2) (see Laughren (1982) for some discussion of the logic of similar expressions in Warlpiri).³

³ Abbreviations used in glosses are as follows:

ABL	ablative	EFF	effector
ACC	accusative	EMPH	emphatic
ACT	activity	ERG	ergative
BELONG	belonging	EXC	exclusive
Bro	brother	Fa	father
CAUS	causative	FUT	future
Ch	child	GEN	genitive
COLL	collective	HABIT	habitual
CONCSS	concessive	HYPTH	hypothetically
CTEMP	contemporaneous	ID	identification
Da	daughter	IGNOR	ignorantly
DAT	dative	IMP	imperative
DEF	definite	IMPERFss	imperfective same subject
DEIC	deictic	INC	inclusive
DU	dual	INCAUS	indirect cause
DWELL	dweller	INCH	inchoative
DY	dyad	LOC	locative

- (1) *Ngunha marlpa ngatharntu mama.*
 that man 1SG.GEN father
 That man is my father.
- (2) *Ngunha marlpa mama ngaju.*
 that man father 1SG.ACC
 That man is father to me.

All of the Pilbara languages have constructions like (1) in which the regular means for marking (alienable) nominal possession is also used to indicate the existence of a kin relation. However, a range of other means of encoding kin relationships is found among the Pilbara languages.

Firstly, kin possessive relations involving kinterms need not be expressed periphrastically. Like many other Australian languages, those of the Pilbara region have collections of dyadic and group kinterms which identify sets of two or more people on the basis of the particular kin relations existing among members of the set. The first detailed description of such systems is to be found in O'Grady and Mooney's (1973) analysis of some Nyangumarta terms. My concern here will be with the morphology of these derived terms.

Secondly, some of the Pilbara languages have sets of possessive suffixes which may be attached to kinterms to indicate the person and number of the possessor. Similar use of pronominal affixes occurs in a range of Australian languages and a number of examples are to be found in the descriptions collected together in Heath, Merlan and Rumsey (1982). The forms of these possessive suffixes in the Pilbara languages do not coincide with those of other categories to be discussed here, and so I will not deal with them further (a description of the Martuthunira system can be found in Dench (1995)).

Thirdly, as we shall see below most of the Pilbara languages make use of suffixes to free pronoun stems which specify particular kin relationships. That is, the pronoun stem specifies the possessor while the suffix specifies the kin relation—typically a parent-child relation. In some cases the suffixes involved have functions beyond the specification of kin relationships.

Beyond this, a number of the Pilbara languages have special pronoun forms which are used with particular classes of kin. As in many other Australian languages, the primary

MAT	maternal	PRIV	privative
MATRI	matrilineal	PrREL	present relative
Mo	mother	PURP	purposive
NFUT	nonfuture	PURPs=0	purposive subject = object
NOM	nominative	PURPss	purposive same subject
NPST	nonpast	QUOT	quotative
NV	not visible	REAL	realis future
OBL	oblique	REFL	reflexive
PASS	passive	SCE	source
PASSP	passive perfective	SEMBL	semblative
PAT	paternal	SG	singular
PATRI	patrilineal	Si	sister
PL	plural	So	son
PNM	proper noun marker	TOP	topic
POSS	possessive	USIT	usitative
PPERF	passive perfective	YK	'You know'
PRES	present		

organising principle here involves the notion of alternate generation sets (see Dench 1982). Similarly, this principle underlies a particular use of the 'collective' verbal derivational suffix to mark kin relationships in the Ngayarda group (Dench 1987). Finally, most communities in the Pilbara make some use of a marked 'avoidance' vocabulary. Since the use of the avoidance style is, normatively, mandatory between certain kin, it also serves to indicate the existence of particular kin relationships (for a brief description of the Panyjima avoidance style, see Dench (1991)).

My concern here is not with the interaction between these various referential systems, most of which have been described elsewhere, but with the sources of selected morphological forms involved in these systems. In the following sections, then, I will first discuss the formation of 'dyadic' and 'group' kinterms, and then secondly the forms and functions of kin relation suffixes attached to pronouns and other nominals.

2.1 DYADIC KINTERMS

All languages of the area have derived kinterms indicating groups of two ('dyadic' terms) or more ('group' terms) kin. These terms may specify both kin relationships which exist within the referent set of the term, and relationships between the speaker and/or addressee and referents of the term. For example in Panyjima, a pair of brothers who are in the same patrimoiety as the speaker will always be referred to as *kurtarra*, whereas a pair of brothers who are in the opposite patrimoiety will be referred to as *partangarra*, if in the same alternating generation set as the speaker, but as *yirtangkarra* if in the opposite generation set (Dench 1982).

In all of the languages there are dyadic terms which involve the addition of a suffix descended from the form **-karra*, with a typical set of allomorphs as follows:

<i>-karra</i>	following a consonant
<i>-yarra</i>	following <i>i</i>
<i>-warra</i>	following <i>u</i>
<i>-rra</i>	following <i>a</i>

Some examples of dyadic terms from Panyjima are given below.

<i>kurta</i>	brother	<i>kurtarra</i>	pair of brothers
<i>nyupa</i>	spouse	<i>nyuparra</i>	married couple
<i>kumpali</i>	cousin	<i>kumpaliyarra</i>	pair of cousins

In each of these cases the relationship between the referents of the dyadic term is symmetrical. Thus, each of a pair of brothers is brother to the other. However, dyadic terms are also used to refer to non-symmetrical relationships. For example:

<i>thurtu</i>	elder sister	<i>thurtuwarra</i>	sisters
<i>mimi</i>	mother's brother	<i>mimiyarra</i>	MoBro+SiCh

The mother's brother in the second example will be called *mimi* by his sister's child, but will in turn call that child either *manyka* 'son/nephew' or *ngarraya* 'niece'. In the case of asymmetrical relationships, one of the two reference points is chosen as the basis for the dyadic term referring to the two relatives. Most analyses of dyadic paradigms (see Merlan & Heath 1982, for example) suggest a logic for the choice of linear term stem—very often this involves choosing as a stem the term referring to the most senior member of the pair, or to

put it another way, choosing the point of view of the junior member of the pair. However, this logic will not always explain particular uses of a term.

Notice that the dyadic kinterms do not specify some independently identifiable possessor of the kin relation. Instead, the possessor of the relation is *included* within the reference set of the dyadic term. This is the case whether or not the kin relation is symmetrical. In some sense, the dyadic formative serves to abstract the essence of a particular kin relation away from individuals who may stand in the particular relationship named by the linear stem. Under this view, there is no need to suggest a reference point for the choice of stem.

The use of some terms must be understood as generalisations from a prototypical relationship of some kind. For example in Panyjima, two people who are in the same matrimoiety but in different alternate generation sets may be referred to and addressed by the term *kurmtalkarra*, based on *kurmtal* 'daughter'. The term is appropriate to a pair of men who stand in the necessary relationship and so need not involve two people one of whom calls the other 'daughter'. Yet, at the same time, the use of a term based on the stem *kurmtal* 'daughter' presumably calls to mind the prototypical mother/daughter matrilineal relation.⁴

O'Grady and Mooney (1973) describe a range of dyadic terms in Nyangumarta, most (but not all) of which involve the *-karra* suffix.⁵ Here (pp.9–10), they mention the cognate term *kurmtalkarra* in cautioning against assuming that dyadic terms (dual terms in their terminology) always denote two people:

[A]lthough dual terms in spontaneous utterances generally seem to denote two people, *kurmtal-karra*...has in one instance been defined as a woman (singular) 'after she has had a child'...Perhaps, then, the dual-plural terminology may in the case of some or all of the terms, or in the case of certain contexts, denote unity rather than duality or plurality: a single individual with the property of possessing certain kin, or of being in company with certain kin.

Clearly, to treat the *-karra* formative as a dual number marker would be an oversimplification of its semantics.

The *-karra* suffix appears to be quite widely distributed. It occurs, in various manifestations as a dyadic kinterm formative in most languages of the Western Desert, as well as in the Pilbara, and may have functions outside this restricted paradigm. In Yankunytjatjara for example, a nominal bearing the 'pair' suffix *-(ra)rra/-kirra* denotes "a pair consisting of a thing or person...together with its natural counterpart" (Goddard 1985:72). Thus in addition to its use on kinterms, the suffix may appear on stems which refer to plants or animals and in these cases "the other element of the pair is understood to be a similar animal or plant" (Goddard 1985:72).

In Dyrirbal, the *-garra* suffix occurs on kinterms but is clearly not a dyadic term formative. Dixon (1972:230) notes that the suffix "is most commonly used with proper names and indicates that the person referred to is one of two people involved in a general set of events".

Both Panyjima (Dench 1991:152) and Nyamal (Dench fieldnotes 1993) have a *-karra* nominal suffix distinct from the dyadic kinterm formative (it is not subject to the same

⁴ Such metaphorical extension is not restricted to dyadic terms by any means. For a detailed example of the metaphorical extension of kinterms see Rumsey (1981).

⁵ Other Nyangumarta dyadic terms involve a suffix *-(ra)ngu* alternating with *-ngartu*. Like the *-karra* suffix, the *-(ra)ngu* suffix has probable cognates in related languages (*-rlangu* in Warlpiri (Laughren 1982), *-langi* in Gooniyandi (McGregor pers. comm.), for example).

allomorphic variation). In Nyamal, the suffix serves to produce an expression denoting the defining characteristic of a situation. For example:

Warrkamu paru-karra
work spinifex-ACT
spinifex-work (collecting seed)

Warrkamu wangka-karra
work language-ACT
language-work (linguistic elicitation)

and is the usual marker of direct objects in a particular kind of relative clause.

In Warlpiri, a *-karra* suffix functions as the complementiser for subordinate clauses describing simultaneous action and controlled by the matrix subject, and can also be attached to nominals functioning in what Hale (1982) calls an autonomous predicate function. For example:

- (3) *Wati ka nyina-mi karli-karra.*
man PRES sit-NPST boomerang-CONCSS
The man sits involved with a boomerang.

Same subject imperfective relative clauses in Thalanyji and Payungu (Austin 1993a) and contemporaneous relative clauses in Martuthunira (Dench 1995), involve reflexes of a verbal inflection of the form **-CM-karra*. Finally, in the Kimberley languages Walmatjari (Hudson 1978), Gooniyandi (McGregor 1990) and Djaru (Tsunoda 1981) a *-karra* suffix forms manner adverbs when attached to nominal or verbal stems.

This is not the place to explore the semantics of these seemingly related suffixes in detail, but this brief survey does suggest that the notion of 'duality' may not be fundamental to the *-karra* dyadic formative. As O'Grady and Mooney suggest, the apparent number specification is most likely an artefact of the primary semantics of the suffix, rather than a defining feature.

2.2 GROUP KINTERMS

In addition to the dyadic terms, terms for larger groups can be derived in each of the languages. There are essentially two methods of deriving such group terms. In most of the languages, a 'group' formative stands in paradigmatic contrast to the *-karra* dyadic formative. So for example in Jiwari, group terms involve the addition of the suffix *-parnti* to a singular kinterm (Austin 1993b):

Linear		Dyadic	Group	
<i>kunyjan</i>	elder sister	<i>kunyjankarra</i>	<i>kunyjanparnti</i>	sisters
<i>kantharri</i>	MoMo	<i>kantharriyarra</i>	<i>kantharriparnti</i>	MoMo/DaDa
<i>yakan</i>	spouse	<i>yakankarra</i>	<i>yakanparnti</i>	spouses

However in Panyjima, and for some of the Nyangumarta terms the group terms are derived from the dyadic terms by the addition of an augmenting suffix. In Panyjima the augmenting suffix is *-ngara*:

<i>kurta</i>	brother	<i>kurtarra</i>	<i>kurtarra-ngara</i>	brothers
<i>nyupa</i>	spouse	<i>nyuparra</i>	<i>nyuparra-ngara</i>	married people
<i>kumpali</i>	cousin	<i>kumpaliyarra</i>	<i>kumpaliyarra-ngara</i>	cousins

In all cases, the group terms refer to a collection of relatives who have in their midst a relationship which is characterised by the linear stem on which the group term is based. Unlike dyads, which always involve a single (albeit occasionally asymmetrical) relationship, sets of people referred to by the group terms can involve a number of qualitatively different kin relationships.

The Panyjima group term *kumpaliyarra-ngara* ‘cousins’ provides a good example here. The *kumpaliyarra* dyadic term is most appropriately used of two men who are cross-cousins—the relationship is symmetrical. As soon as the gathering expands to include another man of the same generation set (a necessary condition if this group term is to be used), then he must logically be a brother to one or other of the two cousins. However, the *kumpali* relation remains the most marked within the set and determines the choice of the particular group term. An analysis of the principles determining the choice of the Panyjima group terms is presented in Dench (1982).

In some sense then, the other relationships which might exist within the reference set of a group term are subordinate to that which determines the use of the term. The group’s identity is dependent on only one of the relationships which it manifests and the group as a whole is characterised as an extension of that relation. It is the recognition of this relationship of extension which allows us to ultimately connect particular nominal suffixes with the group term formative.

Table 1 presents a list of the group term formative suffixes found across languages in the sample:

TABLE 1: ‘GROUP’ KINTERM SUFFIXES

Ngarla	- <i>malingka</i>
Nyamal	- <i>malingka</i>
Panyjima	DY- <i>ngara</i>
Kurrama	- <i>warnti</i>
Martuthunira	- <i>warnti</i>
Jiwarli	- <i>parnti</i>

In §4, I will consider the *-ngara* and *-parnti/-warnti* suffixes in this set. The *-malingka* suffix is common to Ngarla, Nyamal and also Nyangumarta, but so far I have been unable to find cognates and cannot suggest a source for this.

2.3 KIN RELATION SUFFIXES

In this section I will describe the morphology of kin relation suffixes attached primarily to pronouns (denoting the possessor of the relation) as these occur in selected languages.

Martuthunira has two very restricted suffixes which will serve to introduce the phenomenon here. The two suffixes are attached to pronouns or ‘definite demonstratives’ and denote particular kin relationships. These are:

- ngulham* (-PATRI) own father('s sibling)
-wula (-MATRI) own mother('s sibling)

For example:

- kartu-ngulham* your (2SG) own father
ngalii-ngulham our (1DU.INC) own father
nhuwanaa-wula your (2PL) own mother

The pronoun (or demonstrative) stem provides the person and number features of the possessor of a kin relation, while it is the suffix which specifies the kin relation. Examples (4) and (5) illustrate further:

- (4) *Ngayu nhuura-ma-rnu jurti-wula-lu, pipi-ngku*
 1SG.NOM know-CAUS-PASSP 1SG.POSS-MATRI-EFF mother-EFF
nganaju-wu-lu.
 1SG.OBL-GEN-EFF
 I was taught by my own mother's people, by my mother.
- (5) *ngumula-ngulham Pirrjilingu*
 that.DEF-PATRI name
 Pirrjilingu's own father

Ngarla appears to have somewhat similar pronoun constructions, though the data is not really extensive enough to allow a confident characterisation of the suffixes involved. (Conclusions are based on forms in the Brown & Geytenbeek (1991) dictionary and my own 1993 fieldnotes.)

Firstly, the *-rrumara* suffix is used to denote the father of the referent of the pronoun stem. The examples so far elicited all involve addition of the suffix to the suppletive dative stem of the singular pronoun:

- nganu-rrumara* my father (1SG.DAT)
nyinu-rrumara your father (2SG.DAT)
parnu-rrumara his father (3SG.DAT)

Secondly, a pronoun bearing the *-ngkarangu* suffix is used to refer to child(ren) of one of the members of the reference set of the pronoun. It appears that the referents of the pronoun stem must themselves be in the same alternating generation set, and are typically siblings or a married couple. The terms may be used in reference or address (example (6) illustrates).

- ngaliya-ngkarangu* our (1DU.EXC) child(ren)
nganyjarra-ngkarangu our (1PL.INC) child(ren)
nganarna-ngkarangu our (1PL.EXC) child(ren)
piya-ngkarangu their (3DU) child(ren)
- (6) *Nyini-yanta nganarna jamurlu kanyjarri-malingka. Kanyi-yirnta*
 sit-USIT 1PL.EXC MoFa MoMo-GROUP look.after-USIT
nganarnanya piya-ngkarangu-lu, ngaliyanga-ngku karna-ngku.
 1PL.EXC.ACC 3DU-KIN-ERG 1DU.EXC.DAT-ERG uncle-ERG
 We (two boys) were there, our mother's father and our mother's mother (we boys and our MoMo making a group of *kanyjarri*). Their son was looking after all of us, our (dual) uncle.

One exception to this pattern is a form apparently based on the ISG.DAT stem *nganu* with the addition of a syllable *wa*, and involving the *-ngkarangu* formative:

nganu-wa-ngkarangu 'mother'

The expected sense is 'my child(ren)', but here there is apparent reference to the converse relation—'my mother'.

In both Martuthunira and Ngarla, there are suffixes which are more like regular genitive suffixes in their distribution but which also have conventionalised kin relation uses. Firstly, Martuthunira has two suffixes which are attached to pronouns and demonstratives but also to common nominals. These are:

-ngura/-wura/-kura 'Belonging'
-nguwaya/-waya 'Owner'

(where the *-ngu* form is selected by proper names and some pronouns—the details are not relevant here (see Dench 1995)).

These suffixes have conventionalised meanings as markers of kin relations: expressions involving the *-wura* 'Belonging' suffix are used to refer to the children of the referent of the nominal bearing the suffix, while those involving the *-waya* 'Owner' suffix refer to the parents of the referent of the nominal bearing the suffix.

- (7) ...*ngayala-tharra ngurnulangu, ngurnulangu-wura*
 nephew-DU that.DEF.GEN that.DEF.GEN-BELONG
mari-wura pawulu-tharra.
 young.sister-BELONG child-DU
 ...his two nephews, his younger sister's two children.

- (8) *Ngayu puni-lha ngurnu nhawu-lu, ngunhu-lwa*
 ISG.NOM go-PAST that.ACC see-PURPss that.NOM-ID
ngurnula-waya mayiili-ngu-waya.
 that.DEF-OWNER SoSo+1POSS-OBL-OWNER
 I went to see that fellow, that one who is the father of that grandchild of mine.

The following examples show the suffixes attached to common nominals. Here the 'child-of' and 'parent-of' relations are still clear.

- (9) *Ngurnu-ngura parnparn-kura kupiyaji ngularla waruu*
 that.OBL-BELONG budgerigar-BELONG little.PL there.NV still
jalyuru-la nyina-marri-nguru parnparn-ngara.
 hole-LOC sit-COLL-PRES budgerigar-PL
 Those little ones belonging to that budgerigar are still all together in a hole there somewhere.
- (10) *Ngayu nhuwa-lalha ngurnu tharnta-a wal.yu-way-a.*
 ISG.NOM spear-PAST that.ACC euro-ACC joey-OWNER-ACC
 I speared a euro that had a joey.

Nominals marked with either of the *-wura* or *-waya* suffixes often occur as the head of a noun phrase and then simply denote either the 'belongings' or 'owner' of the stem. Example (11) illustrates this use of the *-wura* suffix. Notice that no kin relation is involved here, yet the spider is clearly the source of origin of the web.

- (11) *Ngunhaa kanparr-wura, wantha-rru kanparr-u, mir.ta nhawu-ngu-layi*
 that.NOM spider-BELONG put-PASSP spider-EFF not see-PASS-FUT
yantharmarta-ngara-lu, nganyjali kuyil.
 woman-PL-EFF proscribed bad
 That thing of the spider's (a web), built by the spider, shouldn't be seen by
 women, it's bad, proscribed.

In (12), the *-wura* suffix marks the cultural source of origin of a name (and see (27) and (28) below).

- (12) *Warruwa-ngara-wura Walter. Kanyara-wura Karlinpangu.*
 European-PL-BELONG Walter Aboriginal-BELONG Karlinpangu
 His European [name] is Walter. His Aboriginal one is *Karlinpangu*.

While the *-wura* suffix is conventionally used to refer to children, there are exceptions. The following extended example includes a number of instances of the suffix.

- (13) *Ngana-ngura ngunhu, punga pangkira, jal.yu wanarra?*
 who-BELONG that.NOM guts bulging neck long
 Whose (child) is that one, with the potbelly and long neck?

Ah, Nganaju-wura-nu.

Ah 1SG.ACC-BELONG-QUOT

Ah, one of mine.

Yarta ngarti-rru-wurtu. Mirtiwul-yu ngunhaa ngangka
 other again-NOW-HYPH all-ACC that.NOM mother

ngumu-ngara-a. Wangka-ngu-rra ngunhaa jurtingura-nu
 that.OBL-PL-ACC say-PASS-CTEMP that.NOM own.mother-QUOT

ngunhaa.

that.NOM

Another one. For all of them, she was the mother. Apparently she was called *jurtingura*, 'own mother' (by all of them).

This example includes an apparently frozen form of the suffix on the 1SG.POSS pronoun *jurti*.⁶ Here, however, the derived form means 'own mother' rather than 'my child'. On another occasion, Algy Paterson, gave the form with the meaning 'own aunt (for a man or woman)' and the form *jurti-wula* (1SG.POSS-MATRI) for 'own mother' (see (4) above). Yet on still another occasion, *jurtingura* was described as a term a mother might use of her own children. This suggests some use of this term, at least, for either side of the 'mother-of'/'child-of' converse relation pair. The reader will recall a similar 'confusion' in the sense of the Ngarla term *nganuwa-ngkarangu* 'mother'.

There is evidence of the *-paya/-waya* 'Owner' suffix in Kurrama (Dench fieldnotes 1990) also, though this has not been investigated in detail. An example is:

⁶ Martuthunira, apparently alone among the Pilbara languages, has a special possessive form of the first person singular pronoun specifically used for marking kin relationships (though *jurti* is the regular 1SG.GEN/DAT in Thalanyji). Notice that, because of its restricted distribution, the pronoun does more than indicate simple person and number features of a possessor—it indicates the existence of a kin relation. The specific kin-relation is then elaborated by some other means.

- (14) *Ngunhaat-paya-yu* *Corrine-waya*, *walarnaatpa-mpa*.
 that.one-OWNER-EMPH name-OWNER, this.one-TOP
 That one's father, Corrine's father, that's who it is.

I have also recorded examples of a Panyjima pronoun form, *ngaju-paja* (where *ngaju* is 1SG.OBL), as in example (15). I do not know how general the suffix is.

- (15) *Ngatha* *wiya-ma* *ngajupaja-ku* *mimi-ngu*.
 1SG.NOM see-PAST 1SG.POSS-ACC MoBro-ACC
 I have seen my uncle.

Ngarla and Nyamal have a pair of morphologically conditioned suffixes with equivalent functions to the Martuthunira *-wura* suffix; *-kapu* (on nouns) and *-ngara* (on pronouns). While the two suffixes are not cognate, they are quite clearly paradigmatically related in the modern languages. The following examples illustrate the use of the Nyamal *-kapu* suffix as a marker of the 'child-of' relation. (The suffix is glossed as 'Source' for reasons which will become clearer in the next section.)

- (16) *Nyanya-lapa ngaja* *jananya...*
 see-PRIV 1SG.NOM 3PL.ACC
Marrpari-nya-kapu-ku *jilya-yu* *parnunga-ku*.
 Marrpari-PNM-SCE-DAT child-DAT 3SG.GEN-DAT
 I don't see them...(I never see) Marrpari's boys, his boys.
- (17) *Ngarti piyanga* *yikamarta*. *Ngarti-kapu* *piyalu* *yikamarta-kapu*.
 mother 3DU.DAT one mother-SCE 3DU.NOM one-SCE
 They have the one mother. They are from the one mother.

As in Martuthunira, the suffixes mark apparent possessive relationships that do not involve kin relations.

- (18) *Juntiya-larta ngaja* *janala* *wangka jurtu-kapu*.
 tell-PURP 1SG.NOM 3PL.LOC word sister-SCE
Jurtu, *juntiya-larta ngaja* *wangka nyunangara*.
 sister tell-PURP 1SG.NOM word 2SG.SCE
 I will tell them (my) sister's words. Sister, I'll tell them your words.

Jiwarli (Austin pers. comm.) also has two suffixes with quite similar functions to the Martuthunira *-wura* and *-waya* suffixes. The two Jiwarli suffixes refer specifically to the possession of paternal and maternal kin relationships—the sex of the speaker is crucial:

- wari* own child (father speaking)
-kara own child (mother speaking)

There are two main patterns of occurrence. Firstly, the suffixes can be attached to place-names to form personal names. Here the personal name is used to refer to someone who has inherited rights to the place through their father or mother respectively. So, for example:

- Pirtuthuni-wari* person whose father's country was Pirtuthuni
Jalyily-kara person whose mother's country was Jalyily

Austin (1993b) notes that this use of the *-wari* suffix, at least, has been extended beyond this:

With the arrival of white settlers and their possessions, the *-wari* suffix seems to have been extended in function. Jack Butler's step-father was referred to as *yawartawari*, based on his own father's name *yawarta* 'horse' (it seems he was kicked by a horse). Here *-wari* is added to a common noun, not a toponym.

Secondly, the suffixes can be added to genitive pronoun stems to indicate that the speaker or addressee is the father or mother of the referent of a co-occurring kinterm nominal. Austin (1993b) provides the following examples:

- (19) *Nganaju-wari ngunha kurmtal-pa.*
1SG.DAT-PAT that daughter-CLITIC
That is my daughter. (father speaking)
- (20) *ngali-ju-ngu-wari mura*
1DU-EXC-DAT-PAT son
our son (two brothers speaking)
- (21) *ngali-ju-ngu-kara mura*
1DU-EXC-DAT-MAT son
our son (two sisters speaking)

Austin (pers. comm.) notes that the pronoun may be used without the specifying kinterm. So for the following Payungu examples we find (24) and (25) in contrast to (22) and (23):

- (22) *ngatha-ngu-kara kurmtal*
1SG-DAT-MAT daughter
my daughter (mother speaking)
- (23) *ngatha-ngu-kara mura*
1SG-DAT-MAT son
my son (mother speaking)
- (24) *ngatha-ngu-kara nyanyjil*
1SG-DAT-MAT woman
my daughter (mother speaking)
- (25) *ngatha-ngu-kara kanyara*
1SG-DAT-MAT man
my daughter's husband (mother speaking)

What remains unclear here is the significance of the contrast in kin relation encoded by (25) as opposed to (23)—why does (25) not refer to “My son”? Austin (pers. comm. 2/12/93) notes that “examples from Payungu suggest that when the referent is the same sex as the speaker then own child is intended; when the sex is different then a close kin in the child's generation is referred to”.

Austin has also provided me with an example of the Payungu *-wari* suffix recorded by O'Grady. I have given an alternative translation, more easily reconciled with the present discussion of the suffix, in parentheses.

- (26) *Yinha-mpa-ya wuparni-nmayi pala-ma-wari-nha mama-ngku.*
this-DEIC-EMPH kiss-NFUT he-DAT-PAT-ACC father-ERG
This one's own father kissed him. (As for this one, father kissed his own son.)

Example (26) shows that the marked pronoun forms may stand alone as expressions of the kin relation: *palama-wari* might be glossed as ‘his own son’. Recall that where the suffix is attached to a placename, the resulting expression stands alone as a personal name.

While we have no direct elicitation of forms from other southern Pilbara languages, Algy Paterson noted that the Martuthunira *jurtingura* form of the 1SG.POSS pronoun (see above) has a Thalanyji equivalent, *juritikara* (a form of the 1SG.DAT/GEN *jurit*), used by mothers speaking of their children.

Austin describes three additional functions of the *-wari* suffix in Jiwarli. Firstly, the suffix may be used to indicate the cultural source of origin of a name. Recall that the same pattern occurs in Martuthunira with the *-wura* suffix.

(27) *Warri-rru nyuja-wari-thu yini yajina kumpa-ja ngunha-purra.*
 not-NOW white.man-PAT-DEF name sweet.food be-PAST that-TIME
 Those were sweets that time without white man’s names.

(28) *Yini ngunha mantharta-wari.*
 name that man-PAT
 That is his Aboriginal name.

Secondly, Austin (1993b) notes that when added to a human noun, the suffix derives a nominal expression which indicates “the person who gave an object to someone else”. Here the suffix quite transparently indicates the source of origin of some given object. Austin gives the following contrasting examples and explains that while in (29), which involves the regular dative/genitive suffix, the stick belongs to the old woman, in (30) the stick belongs to the speaker and was given to him by the old woman:

(29) *Jamtira-wu-lu wuru-ngku puthi-rminyja.*
 old.woman-DAT-ERG stick-ERG hit-PAST
 (I) hit (them) with the old woman’s stick.

(30) *Jamtira-wari-lu wuru-ngku puthi-rminyja.*
 old.woman-PAT-ERG stick-ERG hit-PAST
 (I) hit (them) with the old woman’s stick.

Thirdly, the suffix may be used to mark direct cause. This overlap in function is discussed in §3.4 (see especially (46)).

Table 2 summarises the forms discussed in this section. I have chosen to represent the suffixes by the kin relations they are used to mark, even though this is obviously not a complete description of their semantics.

TABLE 2: KIN RELATION SUFFIXES

	'Parent-of'	'Mother-of'	'Father-of'
Ngarla			<i>-rrumarnu</i>
Nyamal			
Kurrama	<i>-paya/-waya</i>		
Martuthunira	<i>-waya</i>	<i>-wula</i>	<i>-ngulharn</i>
Jiwarli			
Payungu			

	'Child-of'	'Child-of (fem)'	'Child-of (m)'
Ngarla	<i>-kapu/-ngara</i> <i>-ngkarangu</i>		
Nyamal	<i>-kapu/-ngara</i>		
Kurrama			
Martuthunira	<i>-kura/-ngura</i>		
Jiwarli		<i>-kara</i>	<i>-wari</i>
Payungu		<i>-kara</i>	<i>-wari</i>

A number of questions remain in relation to the categories and forms represented in this table. Firstly, we would ideally like to have a more definitive statement of the kin categories for which the suffixes are appropriate. For example, I noted earlier that the Ngarla *-ngkarangu* suffix can be attached to a non-singular pronoun stem, in which case it appears that the members of the referent set of the pronoun must be in the same alternating generation set. Similarly, in describing the uses of the Jiwarli *-wari* 'paternal' suffix on non-singular pronoun stems, Austin (pers. comm.) notes that "it may be that this is only possible when the non-singular refers to a same patriline pair—the data are not sufficient to decide". I noted above that the Payungu examples (23) and (25) present a puzzle in that the *-kara* 'maternal' suffix can be used in reference to both a son (23) and son-in-law (25) suggesting, on the other hand, that reference can be made to someone who is outside the speaker's matriline.

Similar questions arise concerning the flexibility of reference of some of the inflected pronoun forms. I noted above that the Martuthunira term *juritungura* 'own child', used to refer to one's mother or aunt, and the Ngarla term *nganuwa-ngkarangu*, given the gloss 'mother' but with an expected gloss 'my own child(ren)', suggest that some terms may be used for either side of the otherwise asymmetrical 'mother-child' relation. There is a clear parallel here with the use of dyadic terms based on a particular linear term to refer to either of the two kin standing in the relation (see §5).

Further questions arise in Martuthunira concerning the semantic differences between the 'parent of' relation indicated by the *-waya* suffix, and the specific 'mother of' and 'father of' relations. Similarly, it is not clear how the 'child of' relation marked by *-ngkarangu* in Ngarla differs from the 'child of' relation marked by the more general *-ngara* and *-kapu* suffixes. Given the many parameters by which kin relations can be reckoned, there exists the possibility of a range of subtle contrasts in these systems. More detailed information on these patterns of reference would allow a more confident appraisal of the differences among the

(possibly partial) systems represented in Table 2. For some of these languages this data can now never be obtained.

Secondly, we might hope to establish some cognate relationships among the suffix forms presented in Table 2. For example, given a certain similarity in form we might imagine some relationship to hold between the Ngarla *-ngkarangu* 'child of' suffix and the Jiwarli and Payungu *-kara* 'child of (female speaking)' suffix, and perhaps between the Nyamal and Ngarla *-ngara* suffix to pronouns and the Jiwarli and Payungu *-kara* suffix.

The clear overlap in functions of the Martuthunira *-ngural/-wura* suffix and the Jiwarli *-wari* 'paternal' suffix also might suggest that the forms are cognate. However, here there is no principled reason to expect such a high degree of variation in vowel quality. It is at least as plausible that the Martuthunira suffix forms are related to the *-kara* 'maternal' suffix.

Without a clearer picture of the semantic relations which exist among these categories, and a more extensive picture of possible cognate categories, it is difficult to assess the likelihood of cognacy among many of the forms in Table 2. However, there are apparent cognate relationships to forms outside this paradigm, as we shall see in §4.

3. ABLATIVE AND CAUSAL

As noted in the introduction, the *-parnti* suffix used to mark group kinterms in the Mantharta languages is identical in form to the ablative/causal suffix in these languages. In this section I present a survey of ablative/causal categories more generally among the Pilbara languages.

Most Australian languages have case suffixes marking ablative (locative source) and causal (reason) categories (see Dixon 1980:295–299). Some languages have distinct ablative and causal morphemes, at least for some nominal classes, others make use of a single morpheme with both ablative and causal functions. The ablative/causal nexus may be further elaborated by temporal uses of the ablative (to mark temporal precedence) and what might be described as spatial uses of the causal, to mark place of ultimate origin or habitual dwelling place.

Table 3 gives a rough characterisation of the semantic domain over which various ablative/causal suffixes in the Pilbara languages may range. The different functions are then briefly discussed in turn.

TABLE 3: SEMANTIC DOMAIN OF ABLATIVE/CAUSAL SUFFIXES

a.	source of motion	X moves from place Y
b.	temporal precedence	X dates from Y/ is after Y
c.	source of origin/ habitual dwelling place	X is from Y X habitually dwells at Y
d.	direct cause	X results from Y
e.	indirect cause	situation X is because of Y

3.1 SOURCE OF MOTION

The prototypical ablative marks some place as the source of motion or point of recent origin. The following Martuthunira examples illustrate this:

- (31) *Ngayu manku-lha parla-a-rru pariingku-layi ngurnaa*
 1SG.NOM get-PAST rock-ACC-NOW hit-FUT that.ACC
mirntirimarta-a parna-a, punga-waa-rru kalyaran-ta-nguru.
 goanna-ACC head-ACC fall-PURPs=o-NOW tree-LOC-ABL
 I grabbed a rock and hit that goanna in the head so it would fall from the tree.
- (32) *Ngunhaa manku-lha-nguru wii panga-a kujawari-la-nguru-u,*
 that.NOM catch-PAST-ABL if itch-ACC whale-LOC-ABL-ACC
puni-layi yurra-l.yarra.
 go-FUT scratch-CTEMP
 If he has caught that itch that comes from a whale, he'll be going along scratching.

As these examples show, the Martuthunira ablative suffix *-nguru* is attached to a locative stem. By contrast, the common Kanyara and Mantharta ablative suffix *-parnti* does not require a locative stem.

3.2 TEMPORAL PRECEDENCE

The ablative suffix often has clear temporal functions: it may simply mark a point in time preceding the temporal reference point, or may fix the starting point of some persisting state or continuing process or action. The following Martuthunira examples illustrate the first of these patterns. The temporal use of the *-nguru* ablative does not require that the suffix be attached to a locative stem (compare (33) and (34) with (31) and (32) above).

- (33) *Nhartu-u wii warnan-ku yirla kuliya-rminyji parnta-mura-a.*
 something-ACC or rain-ACC only hear-FUT rain-PrREL-ACC
Ngurnu-nguru-wa karlwa-lha.
 that.OBL-ABL-YK get.up-PAST
 All I heard was the rain or whatever falling. After that I got up.
- (34) *Nhartu-ma-rmu-lwa-rru ngula kanyara-nguru, warruwa-nguru?*
 what-CAUS-PASSP-ID-NOW IGNOR person-ABL devil-ABL
 What became of them after the time they were people, devils?

The Mantharta *-parnti* ablative/causal also has temporal functions. Austin (1993b) gives the following example of a temporal use of the Jiwari suffix:

- (35) *Nhaanha yulu wantha-rminyja nyirnta ngarri-ngka kajalpu-parnti-nha?*
 what this.ERG put-PAST here ashes-LOC emu-CAUS-ACC
 What has he put here in the ashes after the emu?

The suffix also serves as the 'different-subject' complementiser following the past tense inflection in Jiwari perfective relative clauses (Austin 1993b).

3.3 SOURCE OF ORIGIN AND HABITUAL DWELLING PLACE

Source of origin and habitual dwelling place are typically not distinguished, both being marked by suffixes glossed variously as 'Dweller' or 'Provenience'. The derived term describes a place which is at once the source of ultimate origin for some person or thing, but with which that person or thing has an abiding qualitative association. The source of origin is a defining characteristic of that person or thing. The Martuthunira 'Dweller' suffix *-nyungu* is illustrated in (36) and (37).

- (36) *Nhiyu martawulyu, palyarri-nyungu, ngunhaa panyu jami.*
 this gum.type plant.species-DWELL that.NOM good medicine
 This *martawulyu* gum, which comes from the *palyarri* tree, it is good medicine.
- (37) *Ngunhu-ngara yinka-lwayara Kawuyu-nyungu-ngara-a yinka-lwayara*
 that.NOM-PL carve-HABIT name-DWELL-PL-ACC carve-HABIT
thawu-rminyji Wirrawanti-mulyarra.
 send-FUT name-ALL
 They used to carve the ones that came from *Kawuyu* and send them to *Wirrawanti*.

In Nyamal, source of origin is marked by the use of the *-kapu* suffix, (38) and (39), described as a marker of kin relations in the preceding section.

- (38) *Wurrangkura-kapu makuya juwa-lkura.*
 tree.type-SCE grub chop-FUT
 (We) will chop the *makuyu* grub that comes from the *wurrangkura* tree.
- (39) *Nyunta wuluyu-kapu, Karrkara-kapu.*
 2SG.NOM south-SCE Perth-SCE
 You are from the south, from Perth.

Panyjima shares the *-nyungu* suffix with Martuthunira, Yindjibarndi and Kurrama. However, in Panyjima (at least) the general ablative suffix *-nguru* can be used to mark the *material* source of manufactured implements. Notice that here, as with temporal uses of the suffix, *-nguru* is attached to a bare nominal stem.

- (40) *Nyiya kurrjarta warama-maanu wintamarra-nguru.*
 this spear make-PPERF mulga-ABL
 This spear is made out of mulga wood.

3.4 DIRECT CAUSE

Panyjima has a suffix *-mari* used specifically to mark the direct cause of some situation or state. For example:

- (41) *Nharnu-pati-la pilingkarra parmma-kaji karla-mari.*
 sand-PRIV-LOC flat.rock explode-REAL fire-CAUS
 If/When it's without sand, the flat rock will explode from the fire.
- (42) *Wilinpi-ma-pula kartukarra paja-mari.*
 shake-PAST-REFL head anger-CAUS
 (He's) shaking his head in anger.

Examples (43) and (44) illustrate the Nyamal use of the *-kapu* 'Source' suffix to mark direct cause:

- (43) *Ngarlu punpalpa ngaja, papa-kapu.*
 guts sick 1SG.NOM water-SCE
 My guts are sick, from water.
- (44) *Winyja nguluma-ka, kama-lapa-lu. Punpal-ngarri-mpa-la*
 unwanted leave-IMP cook-PRIV-ERG sick-INCH-FUT-1PL.INC
puka-kapu.
 rotten-CAUS
 Leave it there, discarded, without cooking it. We'd get sick from the rotten thing.

In the Kanyara and Mantharta languages, the *-parnti* ablative suffix is used to mark the cause of some state or situation. A Jiwarli example (Austin 1993b) is:

- (45) *Ngatha kulypi-nha kari-parnti.*
 1SG.NOM be.ill-PRES grog-ABL
 I am sick from grog.

In addition, Austin (1993b) gives a Jiwarli example in which the kin relation suffix *-wari*, 'paternal', is used to mark direct cause. Only this single example occurs in the data:

- (46) *Pali-ngu-rru kumpa-ja ngunha wartawarta-rru-rru*
 vomit-IMPERF_{ss}-NOW sit-PAST that shake-INCH-IMPERF_{ss}-NOW
kala-rru thinthal-wari-kunti-rru.
 like.that-NOW poison-PAT-SEMBL-NOW
 He vomited and shook like that as if from poison.

In Martuthunira, direct causals of this kind are also marked using the kin relation suffix *-wura*, described in §2.3.

- (47) *Ngayu punga pangkira-mpa-nguru kayulu-wura.*
 1SG.NOM guts swollen-INCH-PRES water-BELONG
 My guts are swelling up from water.

3.5 INDIRECT CAUSE

The Ngayarda languages have a special suffix marking the indirect cause of some situation. The Panyjima suffix *-ngarala* and the Martuthunira suffix *-ngalyarnta* are illustrated in examples (48) and (49) respectively. A possible source for these suffixes is suggested in §4.4.

- (48) *Pantharra-kutha pinyarri-ku palya-ngarala.*
 jealous-DU fight-PRES woman-INCAUS
 Those two jealous men are fighting over the woman.
- (49) *Yimpala-rru-wa, muyi-i ngurmu pawulu-tharra thani-lalha*
 like.that-NOW-YK dog-ACC that.ACC child-DU hit-PAST
murla-ngalyarnta.
 meat-INCAUS
 It was like that, two kids were hitting that dog over meat.

3.6 SUMMARY OF FORMS

Table 4 sets out the forms of suffixes used to cover the various functions illustrated in §3.1–§3.5.

TABLE 4: ABLATIVE/CAUSAL SUFFIX FORMS (L = LOCATIVE)

	Source	Precedence	Dweller	Cause	Ind.Cause
Ngarla	<i>nguru</i>	<i>nguru</i>	<i>kapu/kurangu</i>	<i>kapu</i>	
Nyamal	L+ <i>kulyara</i>	<i>kulyara</i>	<i>kapu</i>	<i>kapu</i>	
Ngarluma	L+ <i>nguru</i>	<i>nguru</i>		<i>kapu</i>	
Panyjima	L+ <i>nguru</i>	<i>nguru</i>	<i>nyungu</i>	<i>mari</i>	<i>ngarala</i>
Yindjibarndi	L+ <i>ngu</i>	<i>ngu</i>	<i>nyungu/wartu</i>		<i>ngaala</i>
Kurrama	L+ <i>ngu(u)</i>	<i>ngu(u)</i>	<i>nyungu/wartu</i>		<i>ngaala</i>
Martuthunira	L+ <i>nguru</i>	<i>nguru</i>	<i>nyungu</i>	<i>wura</i>	<i>ngalyarnta</i>
Jiwarli	L+ <i>nguru</i>	<i>parnti</i>	<i>nyungu</i>	<i>parnti/wari</i>	
Warriyangka	<i>parnti</i>		<i>nyungu</i>	<i>parnti</i>	
Thalanyji	<i>parnti</i>	<i>parnti</i>			
Payungu	<i>parnti</i>	<i>parnti</i>			

Clearly, there are sets of cognate morphemes amongst these languages. We can summarise the patterns as follows:

1. *-nguru* is restricted to the marking of spatial and temporal source and in the former instance typically selects a locative stem (the Ngarla distribution remains unclear). In Yindjibarndi and Kurrama the suffix descends as *-ngu(u)* by regular phonological changes (O'Grady 1966). This ablative suffix conforms to Dixon's (1980:312) reconstruction of Proto Australian ablative as LOC+*ngu(ru)*.
2. *-parnti*, unlike *-nguru*, does not select a locative stem as an ablative, and in addition to both spatial and temporal source, marks direct cause.
3. *-nyungu* marks habitual dwelling place and source of origin. In Yindjibarndi and Kurrama, the suffix is restricted to common nouns; proper nouns take a *-wartu* suffix.
4. *-kapu* marks dwelling place in Nyamal and Ngarla and also direct cause in these two languages and in Ngarluma (Simpson 1980).
5. *-ngarala* marks indirect cause in Panyjima and in Yindjibarndi and Kurrama (**ngarala* > *ngaala* by regular sound changes). The Martuthunira suffix *-ngalyarnta* is not cognate.

Brown and Geytenbeek (1991) list a suffix *-kurangu* in their Ngarla dictionary which they gloss as 'Dweller'; thus, *wula-kurangu* 'one always found in/near water'. This form may be related to the Martuthunira *-wura/-kura* suffix (see §4.2).

Beyond this, there are suffix forms which occur in individual languages and in isolated functions. The Nyamal ablative suffix *-kulyara* will not be considered further here. The Martuthunira direct causal *-wura* will feature more prominently in the next section.

4. COMPARISONS

The reader will by now have noticed some similarities in the forms used to mark the ablative/causal categories discussed in §3, and forms used in making reference to kin relations in §2. I can now summarise these and discuss the general patterns. Consider the following table.

TABLE 5: CATEGORIES AND SUFFIX FORMS

	<i>kapu</i>	<i>wari</i>	<i>*kura</i>	<i>*ngulham</i>	<i>ngara</i>	<i>parnti</i>
a. source						*
b. origin/dweller	*		(*)			
c. direct cause	*	*	*			*
d. indirect cause				(*)	*	
e. kin relation	*	*	*	*	*	
f. group kinterm					*	*

	f	d	e	b	c	a
<i>kapu</i>			*	*	*	
<i>*kura</i>			*	(*)	*	
<i>wari</i>			*		*	
<i>*ngulham</i>		(*)	*			
<i>ngara</i>	*	*	*			
<i>parnti</i>	*				*	*

Table 5 is organised into two parts. Firstly, a selection of suffix forms is presented against the categories discussed in §2 and §3. The second part of the table is a reorganisation in which categories are mapped against the suffixes.

In the sections which follow, I will discuss each of these six suffixes in more detail, presenting a summary of the functions listed in Table 5. Some of these suffixes have additional functions to those listed in Table 5 and I will describe these also.

4.1 *-kapu*

- source of origin/habitual dwelling place (Nyamal, Ngarla)
- direct cause (Nyamal, Ngarla, Ngarluma)
- 'child-of' kin relation (Nyamal, Ngarla)

The connection between the three categories can be made clear if we assume that the primary sense is source of origin/dwelling place. In describing this category in §3.3 I noted that the source or dwelling place was typically taken to be a defining characteristic of the person or thing originating from that place. In the same way, we can see the use of the suffix to describe an originating or persisting cause of some state or situation as a defining characteristic of that state or situation.

Finally, the kin relation uses of the suffix can be connected with the notion of originating source—children have their parents, particularly their mother, as a source of origin. What is

more, their matrilineal (and patrilineal) affiliation remains with them as an important 'defining characteristic' in their adult social life.

In Nyamal, Ngarla, and apparently also Ngarluma (the data are suggestive but not extensive, see Simpson 1980:97), the *-kapu* suffix is also used as an associating case marking the arguments of predicates in certain types of subordinate clauses. While this function is historically connected to the 'source of origin' function, I will not explore this here.

4.2 **-kura*

- 'child-of' kin relation (Martuthunira)
- direct cause (Martuthunira)
- (- *-kurangu* 'Dweller' in Ngarla)

A connection between the three categories was established in the preceding section and this allows the possibility that the *-kurangu* suffix in Ngarla may be connected to the Martuthunira suffix (< **-kura+ngu*). However, without a more detailed internal reconstruction of Ngarla nominal morphology this remains entirely speculative.

4.3 *-wari*

- 'child-of (father speaking)' (Jiwarli, Payungu)
- original owner (Jiwarli)
- direct cause (Jiwarli)
- proprietive (Ngarluma, Yindjibarndi, Kurrama)

The connection between the causal relation and the 'child-of' relation is shared with both *-kapu* and **-kura*, though it must be remembered that only one example of the causal function of *-wari* occurs in the Jiwarli data. The more common construction involves the *-parnti* ablative/causal. On the other hand, the Jiwarli suffix appears to be cognate with the 'proprietive' or 'having' suffix in three of the Ngayarda languages.

Although I have not explored it in this paper, a connection between the proprietive and the marking of kin relations is found elsewhere among the languages of the area. Firstly, some special pronoun forms involve the proprietive suffix: the special Panyjima 2DU pronoun *nyinku+ngarni* (used where the two addressees are in the same matrimoiety but different generations) involves the productive proprietive *-ngarni* added to the 2SG oblique stem *nyinku*. Similarly, the 1DU(disharmonic) pronoun in Martuthunira is *nganaju+marta*, quite transparently involving the 1SG.OBL stem plus the regular proprietive *-marta*.⁷ Further afield, Merlan and Heath (1982) describe the relationship between dyadic kin terms and 'having' constructions in Mangarayi and Mara. I discuss this further in §5.

Since I have so far been unable to find clear cognates for the specifically paternal kin relation suffixes in Ngarla and Martuthunira, there is no contributing pressure towards either the causal or the proprietive as a source for the kin relation uses of *-wari*. Either seems a reasonable source on the basis of current evidence.

⁷ Incidentally, the form *-marta* is one of three augmenting suffixes to dyadic kinterms in Nyangumarta (O'Grady & Mooney 1973:11).

4.4 *-ngara*

- 'child-of' kin relation (Nyamal and Ngarla)
- augment on dyadic kinterms (Panyjima)
- indirect causal *-ngarala* (in Panyjima)
- nominal plural (Martuthunira)

As noted in §2.3, the *-ngara* suffix stands in a paradigmatic relation to the *-kapu* suffix in Nyamal and Ngarla. In these languages, the two suffixes can be considered morphologically conditioned allomorphs; *-ngara* occurs on pronouns, *-kapu* occurs on other nominals. Of course, there are differences in the distribution of the two suffixes given that pronouns and common nominals do not occur in exactly the same distribution. For example, the *-ngara* suffix does not occur as a marker of *direct* cause in Ngarla and Nyamal. However, in all contexts in which there is the possibility of occurrence the two suffixes pattern in a similar fashion. I would ultimately expect to be able to provide historically distinct sources for the two suffixes.

It remains to connect the 'augmenting' use of the *-ngara* suffix in forming Panyjima group kinterms with the kin relation uses in Nyamal and Ngarla. In the discussion of group terms in §2.2, I showed that particular terms referred to groups of kin among whom existed a range of kin relation types, many of which did not coincide with the kin relation defined by the stem of the derived term. The group's identity is dependent on a particular relation and the whole group is characterised as an extension from that important relation. In a metaphorical sense, the larger group has a smaller group, the group instantiating the important relation, as its *source* relation. Its character is determined by the persistence of that relation.

Thus, although the *-ngara* suffix is not used to mark a clear source or cause relation in the languages described here, I suggest that the essential notion of 'characterising source of origin' lies at the basis of the use of this suffix to mark both kin relations and group kin terms.

Note also that *-ngara* is the productive plural suffix on nominals in Martuthunira. This might argue against my assumption of a connection between the *-ngara* group kinterm augment and the kin relation uses of a *-ngara* suffix, and in favour of an analysis of the kinterm augment as a simple plural number marker. However, to take the opposite point of view, it is conceivable that the plural in Martuthunira is semantically closer to the notion of an augmenting suffix. That is, the suffix marks an *extension* of the properties defined by the stem to a group of objects. The semantics of number marking in these languages is a topic for further study.

Finally, I have suggested that the Panyjima indirect causal suffix *-ngarala* involves the *-ngara* suffix. The connection between the 'child-of' kin relation and direct cause has been established through the *-kapu*, *-wari* and **-kura* suffixes discussed above. Here, I am relying on the validity of this connection to suggest that a similar relationship holds between the kin relation uses of *-ngara* and the indirect causal. To make the connection, I would suggest that *-ngarala* be analysed (at some level) as **-ngara-la*, where *-la* is originally the locative suffix.

4.5 *-ngulharn/-ngalyarn+ta*

- *-ngulharn* 'own father' (Martuthunira)
- *-ngalyarn+ta* indirect cause (Martuthunira)

If the connection between *-ngara* and the indirect causal in Panyjima is valid, it suggests a similar analysis of the Martuthunira indirect causal suffix *-ngalyarn+ta*. This might be analysed as involving, originally, the regular locative suffix *-rta*; thus **-ngalyarn-rta*. It may then be possible to connect *-ngalyarn* with the Martuthunira kin relation suffix *-ngulharn* 'own father'.

While it may be possible to construct almost plausible interpretations of the locative marked indirect causal expressions (as second predications of some (perhaps) mediated source of origin on the unmarked subject), I am unable to present a convincing argument.

4.6 *-parnti*

- ablative (Mantharta languages)
- causal (Mantharta languages)
- group kinterms (Martuthunira, Kurrama, Mantharta languages)

The connection between ablative and causal is clear and uncontested. The important connection to be established here is that between the group kinterm formative and the ablative/causal uses of the *-parnti* suffix. Once again, I appeal here to the notion that the group kinterms are extensions from a particular named kin relation and that in this sense, the use of a causal to mark the relation is appropriate. What is missing for *-parnti* is the set of connecting categories between causal and group kinterm. However, the connections between causal and kin relation, and between kin relation and group kinterm are established by the range of functions of other suffixes.

5. CONCLUSIONS

My aim in this paper has been to investigate possible semantic connections between the complex morphological marking of kin relations and other, less specialised, categories. In the simplest of terms I have asked, "Where does kin marking morphology come from?"

In asking the question I am making the assumption that the morphology must have some external source, and does not arise from within the paradigm. Of course this need not be the case. Thus for example, O'Grady and Mooney (1973:11) list an instance of derivation by reduplication—the Nyangumarta group term *kurntal-kurntal* corresponds to the dyadic term *kurntal-karra* cited in §2.1. Having accepted the assumption of external source, the problem then involves first identifying possible sources for the morphology, and then constructing some believable tale about how this morphology came to have specialised uses.

I noted in the introduction that there has been virtually no discussion of the origins of kin-marking morphology in the literature. One exception to this is Merlan and Heath's (1982) survey of dyadic kinship terms. Here (p.108) they emphasise the importance of considering the structure of such complex terms:

The affixal morphology of the dyadic terms must be considered vis-à-vis other morphological constructions in the language, especially when there is reason to

think that the dyadic terms are merely special instances of a more general construction with additional functions in the language.

In the course of their survey they note a number of connections between dyadic formatives and other morphological categories. For example, they point out (p.113) that the dyadic terms in Dhuwal involve what is the productive dual suffix in Ritharngu.

They also point out a connection between the 'having' affix and dyadic formatives in Mara⁸ and Mangarayi. In Mangarayi in particular, the dyadic terms are formally identical to 'having' expressions. Thus, Merlan and Heath note that the term *barda-yi* 'father and child' might be analysed as 'having father', where *-yi* is the 'having' suffix. However, they cite syntactic evidence to show that this analysis is synchronically untenable, and further suggest (p.112) that:

An analysis of dyadic terms as 'having' expressions would be more tenable if one could say 'having Ch' when the Fa is the reference point, contrasting with 'having Fa' from the Ch's viewpoint, but in fact the only dyadic expression for this pair is [*barda-yi*] with the stem for 'Fa'.

They go on to state (pp.112-113) that:

It is quite possible that dyadic kin terms are etymologically related to or identical with 'having' expressions, but if so they have evolved and become specialised...and the two should not be confused synchronically.

Merlan and Heath do not elaborate on the possible diachronic connection or investigate the semantic link between dyadic terms and 'having' constructions any further than this. Their intention is to provide a general survey and a spur to others to subject dyadic terms to detailed synchronic analysis, and so such etymological analysis is well beyond the scope of their paper.

However, their discussion does show quite clearly the direction of the change. Presumably certain 'having' expressions have been extended so that rather than indicating a particular individual's property of being in some association (whatever the comitative or possessive properties of the 'having' suffix) with a particular named kinsman, such expressions can be used more generally to mark two people whose relationship is characterised by the fact that one may say of one of them, that they 'have' the other. Thus the change involves some metaphorical extension of the 'having' relation as well as the choice of a particular relation to stand as the basis for the dyad.

I have not been especially concerned with the logic determining the particular choice of stem (see §2.1), and have implied that what is more important is the fact that one relation is chosen as prototypical of that holding between the pair of kin. While there may be a logic to this choice, ultimately the dyadic term involves a metaphorical extension from a particular kin relationship to the abstract dyadic relationship which holds between two kin.

My main concern has been with the metaphorical extension involved in the use of particular nominal suffixes to mark kin relations. As I suggested in the introduction, an argument for a diachronic relationship between suffixes with seemingly divergent semantics raises the question of a possible persisting semantic connection. If a connection can be

⁸ In Mara, some other terms involve a suffix *-(ga)rra*, "segmentable as a dyadic suffix at least etymologically" (Merlan & Heath 1982:117). The authors do not suggest sources for this suffix.

demonstrated, then we may learn something more about the way in which kin relations and related notions are conceptualised.

To take another example, in an earlier description of the use of a verbal derivational suffix to mark certain kin categories (Dench 1987) I argued that the innovated use of the 'collective' suffix depended on a perception that the prototypical relationship among members of these categories could be characterised as 'collective activity'. The morphology reveals an important underlying principle in the conceptualisation of particular kin relations. Wierzbicka (1986, 1992) argues strongly for this approach in proposing an account of the meaning of alternating generations in Australian languages.

In this paper I have explored the connection between the categories of 'source of origin' and 'causal' in the marking of certain kin relations. Two patterns in particular have emerged: the use of source/causal morphology on nominals to mark the 'child-of' relation, and the use of similar morphology on linear and dyadic kinterms to derive group kinterms.

The first of these patterns involves the quite straightforward notion that children have their parents, and in particular their mother, as a source of origin, and their matrilineal and patrilineal affiliation as a persisting characteristic. This explains the range of uses of *-kapu* (§4.1) and **-kura* (§4.2) especially. The link between the kin relation uses of *-wari* (§4.3) and *-ngulham* (§4.5) and the source/causal categories is not as clear.

The second pattern involves a further level of abstraction. I have argued that dyadic and group kinterms depend primarily on the generalisation from a specific kin relation involving a particular linear term to some abstraction of that relation. This abstraction is as much a part of the dyadic terms as it is part of the group terms.

There are differences in the way in which the group terms are formed (see Table 1). In Panyjima (and for some Nyangumarta terms) on the one hand, the group term involves the addition of an augmenting suffix to the dyadic term. In Kurrama, Martuthunira and Jiwarli on the other hand, the group term formative stands in paradigmatic contrast to the dyadic formative. Since the primary abstraction from the linear term occurs for dyadic and group terms in both cases, we can reconcile the differences by suggesting that the dyadic term formed by the *-karra* suffix denotes the minimal set for which the kin relation is appropriate, through some notion of 'essential complement'. In Panyjima, the *-ngara* suffix appended to dyadic terms (§4.4) augments this minimal set. In the other languages, the *-parnti* suffix (§4.6) does not depend on the notion of minimal set, but is attached directly to the (abstracted) linear term.

I have argued that in both cases the group term involves an extension from a primary kin relation which, by its presence, serves to characterise the whole group in the same way as an individual may be characterised by his or her 'source of origin'. It is this quite abstract connection which allows me to identify the Jiwarli ablative suffix *-parnti* with the Jiwarli group term formative *-parnti*.

REFERENCES

- Austin, Peter K., 1993a, A reference grammar of the Kanyara languages. MS, La Trobe University.
 1993b, A reference grammar of the Mantharta languages. MS, La Trobe University.
 Brown, Alexander and Brian Geytenbeek, 1991, *Ngarla-English dictionary* (2nd interim edn). Port Hedland, WA: Wangka Maya, Pilbara Aboriginal Language Centre.

- Dench, Alan**, 1982, Kin terms and pronouns of the Panyjima language of northwest Western Australia. *Anthropological Forum* 5/1:105–120.
- 1987, Kinship and collective activity in the Ngayarda languages of northwest Western Australia. *Language in Society* 16:321–339.
- 1991, Panyjima. In R.M.W. Dixon and Barry J. Blake, eds *Handbook of Australian languages*, vol.4: *The Aboriginal language of Melbourne and other grammatical sketches*, 124–243. Melbourne: Oxford University Press.
- 1995, *Martuthunira: a language of the Pilbara region of Western Australia*. PL, C–125.
- Dixon, R.M.W.**, 1972, *The Dyirbal language of North Queensland*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- 1980, *The languages of Australia*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Goddard, Cliff**, 1985, *A grammar of Yankunytjatjara*. Alice Springs, NT: Institute for Aboriginal Development.
- Hale, Kenneth**, 1982, Some essential features of Warlpiri verbal clauses. In Steven Swartz, ed. *Papers in memory of Lothar Jagst*, 217–315. Darwin: Summer Institute of Linguistics.
- Heath, Jeffrey, Francesca Merlan and Alan Rumsey**, eds, 1982, *Languages of kinship in Aboriginal Australia*. Oceania Linguistic Monographs 24.
- Hudson, Joyce**, 1978, *The core of Walmatjari grammar*. Canberra: Australian Institute of Aboriginal Studies.
- Loughren, Mary**, 1982, Warlpiri kinship structure. In Heath, Merlan and Rumsey, eds 1982:72–85.
- McGregor, William**, 1990, *A functional grammar of Gooniyandi*. Amsterdam: Benjamins.
- Merlan, Francesca and Jeffrey Heath**, 1982, Dyadic kinship terms. In Heath, Merlan and Rumsey, eds 1982:107–124.
- O'Grady, Geoffrey N.**, 1966, Proto-Ngayarda phonology. *Oceanic Linguistics* 5/2:71–130.
- O'Grady, Geoffrey N. and Kathleen A. Mooney**, 1973, Nyangumarda kinship terminology. *Anthropological Linguistics* 15:1–23.
- Rumsey, Alan**, 1981, Kinship and context among the Ngarinyin. *Oceania* 51:181–192.
- Simpson, Jane**, 1980, Ngarluma as a W* language. MS, MIT.
- Tsunoda, Tasaku**, 1981, *The Djaru language of Kimberley, Western Australia*. PL, B–78.
- Wierzbicka, Anna**, 1986, Semantics and the interpretation of cultures: the meaning of 'alternate generations' devices in Australian languages. *Man* 21:34–49.
- 1992, *Semantics, culture, and cognition*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.