8. THE TANGUT KINSHIP SYSTEM IN QIANGIC PERSPECTIVE

Guillaume Jacques (CNRS, CRLAO)

Tangut has been a dead language since the sixteenth century. In spite of its complex logographic script, it is relatively well understood. Its basic kinship system has been described in relative detail by Kepping (1986, 1990, 1991), relying data from a collection of short Tangut stories illustrating family virtues (such as filial piety).

In this paper, after a quick introduction to general issues about kinship terminology, we describe the kinship system of a language closely related to Tangut, Rgyalrong. Then, we analyze the Tangut kinship system, on the basis of Tangut texts and insights taken from the modern Rgyalrong system.

KINSHIP TERMINOLOGY

In order to simplify the analysis of kinship terminology, ethnologists usually use a set of standard abbreviations to represent kinship relations. Since the present paper is primarily addressed to Sino-Tibetan linguists and Tangut philologists, it is necessary to introduce these conventions.

The anthropologists' metalanguage is based on the first letter of the basic term in English, except for 'sister' which is represented by the letter Z to avoid ambiguity with 'son'. In this system, more complex relationships are represented by combining these terms with one another. For instance, 'maternal uncle younger than the mother' would be MyB (mother's brother), the English term 'brother-in-law' could be either HB (husband's brother) or WB (wife's brother), etc. Although this metalanguage does not encode several distinctions relevant in some kinship systems, it will be more than enough for the present work. It is usual to present kinship systems in Tables, where males are indicated with a triangle, female with a circle (a square is used when sex is not relevant). This kind of scheme will be used several times in the present article (see for instance Table 8.5).

---

I am indebted to Alexis Michaud, Katia Chirkova, Niê Hôngyên 蒼鴻音, Vyacheslav Zaytsev and an anonymous reviewer for comments on earlier versions of this article. I remain responsible for any remaining error and inconsistency.

1 Tangut forms use Gong Hwangchung's reconstruction (Li 1997).

2 This text has been subsequently edited and translated into French (Jacques 2007).
The terms ‘man speaking’ and ‘woman speaking’ are extremely misleading. They do not really reflect the sex of the speaker, but reflect instead the sex of the person linked to the kin in question. For instance, in Japhug (see section 3), the term -sonom ‘sister (man speaking)’ (ZMS) is used in the following sentence because the ‘possessor’ (the demon) is male, even though the narrator of the story was a female:

(1) ŋdut yu u-sonom tshu kru-ndrum pyi-ru
demon gen 3sg.poss-sister road imphe-hold[3] mihmmp-be
The demon’s sister was guarding the road (Gesar 241)

The sex of the speaker is only relevant when the given kinship term has a first person possessive affix or possessive pronoun (depending on the language). For instance, the form u-sonom ‘my sister’ (again with the noun ZMS) with a first person singular possessive prefix, can only be uttered by a male in Japhug. We will keep the terms MS and PS in the present paper, as they are widely used by linguists and anthropologists, but the reader should bear in mind that this terminology is problematic.

Kinship systems are classified into six major categories (Morgan 1880) based on their terminologies for uncle and aunts, as presented in Table 8.1.1. The Crow and Omaha systems have a so-called ‘skewing’ rule according to which a member EGO’s generation is called by the same term as a member of EGO’s parent’s generation. In Omaha systems, which are usually associated with patrilinear societies, the cross-cousin in the mother’s side (MBS) ‘ascends’ one generation, as he is called by the same term as his father (MB). Now, we have to bear in mind that in all kinship systems, kinship terms like ‘uncle’ have a reciprocal term ‘nephew’, MB vs. ZS for instance. If MB and MBS are equated, this means that by this rule of reciprocity, ZS and FZS will be equated too. Therefore, the ‘ascending’ skewing rule MB=MBS always comes along with the descending one ZS=FZS according to which a cross-cousin is called using the term for ‘nephew’.

Crow systems are the exact inverse of Omaha systems: FZD is equated with FZ (and FZS with FZH), and similarly, MBS=BS. Here, the matrilineal cross-cousin MBS ‘descends’ one generation.

In the Sino-Tibetan family, various terminologies are found, including Iroquois, Sudanese and Omaha (Benedict 1941). In the present paper, we will show that in the Qiangic subbranch, both Omaha and Iroquois terminology are attested. As for the Tangut kinship system, the available evidence
is ambiguous as to exactly which type it belongs to, but we will try to propose several plausible solutions.

The study of kinship from the point of view of terminology is only partial and reductionist; it is well-known among anthropologists that kinship terminology categories do not necessarily correlate with marriage rules and prohibitions. This is especially true of the Omaha systems, which interest us particularly since Tangut possibly had Omaha skewing elements.

In the original Omaha society (whose members used to speak a language which belongs to the Siouan family), marriage prohibitions were fairly widespread and complex. First-degree cousins were banned from marriage, and males from the same patrilineage of succeeding generation could not take wives from the same group (see for instance Barnes 1984: 157), that is, father and son could not marry women from the same clan. Various theoreticians of anthropology have tried to account for Crow/Omaha kinship systems using functional explanations. McKinley (1971) in particular, has argued that skewing systems serve to disperse affinal alliance.

However, in other societies with Omaha kinship terminologies, a considerable variety of marriage practices has been documented (Barnes 1976: 386), including cross-cousin marriage. Similarly, McConvell and Alper have mentioned that “Omaha skewing and matrilineal cousin marriage may go together, not because they have a logical connection with each other, but because they both function in similar ways in expanding systems” (2002: 174). Therefore, there is no a priori obstacle in having a society with both Omaha kinship terminology and cross-cousin marriage.

This fact is important for the present article, as we will propose the hypothesis that Tangut kinship terminology had an Omaha skewing rule while it is well-known, as will be explained in section 3, that cross-cousin marriage was widely practiced in Tangut society. Before analyzing Tangut data, we will describe attested kinship systems of modern Qiangic languages closely related to Tangut: Rgyalrong and Pumi.

The Rgyalrong languages⁴ belong to the Sino-Tibetan family,⁵ but their precise affiliation within the family is the object of a controversy. Although these languages are only very remotely related to Tibetan, their speakers are officially considered by both the PRC government and Tibetan intellectuals to belong to the ‘Tibetan’ nationality (Chinese: zàngzú 藏族, Tibetan: bod-rigs). The considerable influence of Tibetan on these languages (see the study of Tibetan loanwords in Japhug in Jacques 2004: 83-200), lead to the mistaken idea that the Rgyalrongic languages are Tibetan dialects. Although speakers of Rgyalrong are deeply influenced by Tibetan culture, they maintain distinct characteristics, in particular in their kinship system, which is entirely different from those found in Tibetan dialects.

In the present study, only kinship terms will be presented. A comprehensive study of kinship among the Rgyalrong would have to include an analysis of preferential marriages and genealogies, but these issues remain for future research. Despite the limitations of this work, we believe that substantial information on the history of kinship can be drawn by analyzing the use of terminology alone.

### Consanguines in the Japhug kinship system

All Japhug kinship terms except for the siblings (see below) can be summarized in the following table (Jacques 2008: 42). All kinship terms must appear with a possessive prefix or the neutral tu- / tv- prefix,⁶ and they are here indicated with the first person singular a- prefix (meaning ‘my father’, ‘my brother’ etc.). Among these terms, no Tibetan loanword can be

---

⁴ This term was coined by Sun (2000). There are at least seven Rgyalrongic languages: Eastern Rgyalrong, Japhug (Chabao), Thsobdun (Caodeng), Zbu (Shuwu, Ribu), Lavrug, Rtau (Daofu) and Shangzhai. These languages are spoken in the Ngaba (Aba) and Bakarmdzes (Ganzi) districts of Sichuan. Only Japhug data will be presented in this paper.

⁵ We do not believe that a ‘Tibeto-Burman’ clade exists within the Sino-Tibetan family, as no phonological or morphological innovation common to these languages all has been discovered up to now.

⁶ All the kinship terms can appear with the prefix tu-, and it is in this form that they were recorded in Jacques (2008). However, tu- is here a reflexive possessive prefix, not the neutral (absolute prefix). For instance, tv-rpa means ‘a/the uncle’, whereas tu-rpa means ‘one’s uncle’. This distinction was overlooked in my former work.
detected, which shows that Tibetan influence on Rgyalrong kinship must have been weak.\footnote{There are also three honorific terms \textit{ur-pa} ‘father’, \textit{ur-ma} ‘mother’ and \textit{ur-ja} ‘elder sibling’, used mostly in traditional stories. \textit{ur-ma} could be argued to come from Tibetan, but not the other two; \textit{ur-pa}, if a loanword from Tibetan \textit{pba}, would have aspirated initial.}

In this system, the maternal uncle is designated by the same term as his son \textit{tr-rpu} (MB = MBS = MBSS). Symmetrically, the sister’s children have the same name \textit{tr-fsa} as the father’s sister’s children (\textit{zs} = FZS = ZD = FZD). This skewing rule is the defining feature of Omaha kinship systems (see Table 5). This rule is illustrated in more detail in Table 6. The terms \textit{tr-fsa} and \textit{tr-rpu} are in a symmetrical relationship one to another. As we have mentioned in part 1, wherever I call \textit{a-fsa} will call me \textit{a-rpu} in return, and whoever calls me \textit{a-fsa}, will be called \textit{a-rpu} by me.

The \textit{tr-fsa} / \textit{tr-rpu} opposition appears in two types of kinship relations: MBS/FZS and MB/ZS. These two sets of opposed relations are symmetrical (I am a MBS to my FZS, as FZS to my MBS, a ZS to my MB and a MB to my ZS), but not reciprocal (I am not a MB to my MB etc.). In Table 7, we present for the terms that would be used by each person in Table 6 to call Ego and the term used by Ego to call each of them.

In the Japhug system, the MBS (2) ‘ascends’ to G\(^1\), while the FZS ‘descends’ to G\(^1\). This is the defining characteristics of a Omaha kinship system. This system is said to be widespread among languages of western Sichuan. During a recent consultation with Nan Kejin, a speaker of Northern Qiang from Heishui (Khro-chu), I was able to ascertain the presence of the same skewing rule MBS = MB.

Another conspicuous characteristic of Japhug kinship is that two distinct systems are used to designate siblings. In the first system (the one included in Table 8.3), only relative age between Ego and his siblings is coded: \textit{ta-sri} means younger brother or sister, while \textit{tr-pi} is used for siblings older than Ego. In the second system (the one included in Table 8.3), four terms are employed, relative age is not coded, but the sex of Ego and his sibling’s are coded:\footnote{The word \textit{tr-wrmu} was incorrectly transcribed as *\textit{wrmu} in some of my former publications.}

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Brother</th>
<th>Sister</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Man speaking</td>
<td>\textit{tr-xtrg}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woman speaking</td>
<td>\textit{tr-wrmu}</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 8.3: The second system for siblings in Japhug.

The terms in Table 8.3 can only be used with true siblings, whereas \textit{ta-sri} and \textit{tr-pi} have a much wider range of meanings (see below).

It should be noted that the terminology for siblings in other Qiangic languages is derivable from the one found in Rgyalrong. In Pumi, as described by Ding (2008), we find the following system:\footnote{The forms given here are from the present author’s own fieldwork in 永宁 Yongning, Yunnan (Muqiqing 木底箐 dialect), very similar to Ding’s data.}

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mudiqing</th>
<th>Cognate Japhug form</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pumi</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B(^{\text{ws}})</td>
<td>ms(^3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Z(^{\text{ms}})</td>
<td>hnyè(^1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>eB(^{\text{ms}}), eL(^{\text{ws}})</td>
<td>pei(^3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>yB(^{\text{ms}}), yZ(^{\text{ws}})</td>
<td>kuè(^3)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 8.4: Pumi and Japhug sibling terms.

As pointed out by Ding, in Pumi cross-siblings \textit{B\(^{\text{ws}}\)} and \textit{Z\(^{\text{ms}}\)} distinguish the sex of the sibling but not his/her relative age, whereas siblings of the same sex as the speaker are distinguished according to their relative age, not their sex. The Pumi system basically looks like a conflation of the two sibling systems found in Japhug: we can obtain the Pumi system by suppressing the special terms for \textit{B\(^{\text{ws}}\)} and \textit{Z\(^{\text{ms}}\)} found in Japhug, keeping only four terms instead of six. With the loss of special terms for siblings of the same sex, the only terms left to call those sibling is by using the generic sibling terms that distinguish relative age. Japhug and Pumi sibling terms in Table 8.4 are probably cognate, except perhaps for kuè\(^3\) / \textit{ta-sri}.

For cousins, the situation is quite complex. The mother’s brother’s children (MBCh), as indicated above, are called by the same terms \textit{tr-rpu} and \textit{tr-las} as their parents, and belong to the ascending generation. The father’s brother’s children (FBCh) are designated by the terms \textit{ta-si} and \textit{tr-pi} as siblings—however, they cannot be called by the terms in Table 8.3. The father’s sister’s children (FZCh) are called \textit{tr-fsa} as the nephews (sister’s children). Finally, the mother’s sister’s children (MZCh) have a special name, \textit{tr-mvtsa}, which must be etymologically analyzed as \textit{mu-} + \textit{-fsta}, literally ‘mother’s nephews (sister’s children).’

At G\(^1\), there are six different terms as in a Sudanese system. (F \(\neq\) FB \(\neq\) MB and M \(\neq\) MZ \(\neq\) FZ) Parents have special names distinct from uncles and aunts (\textit{tr-wa} ‘father’, \textit{tr-mu} ‘mother’), and siblings of the father and
the mothers are all distinguished. However, only the father’s sister (FZ) ty-nil has no other usages, the other terms ty-\(\beta\)-yo and ty-lar can be used for various affines (respectively FZH, MZH and FBW, MBW). At G\(^2\), the terminology is limited; ty-wu and ty-wi are uniformly used for all persons belonging to this generation.

Apart for the terms for siblings in Table 8.3, the sex of Ego is not relevant in the kinship system of Japhug.

**Affines and the extended use of kinship terms**

As mentioned previously, there are no special terms for affines in the Japhug kinship system. For the son’s wife and the daughter’s husband, the compound terms tua-me-nmar and ty-tewu-za\(\beta\) (respectively daughter + husband and son + wife) can be used respectively, but it is also possible to call them as if they were one’s real children. For affines belonging to Ego’s generation, that is the husbands of sisters, and wifes of brothers, the terms tua-wi and ty-pi are used, although if the brother’s wife is significantly older than Ego, she can also be called ty-lar (MZ).

---

**Table 8.6: An Omaha skewing rule in the Japhug kinship system.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Opposition</th>
<th>Kinship relation</th>
<th>Kinship term</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4 to Ego</td>
<td>MBS</td>
<td>ty-(\beta)-sa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ego to 4</td>
<td>FZS</td>
<td>ty-(\beta)-sa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ego to 2</td>
<td>MBS</td>
<td>ty-rpu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 to Ego</td>
<td>FZS</td>
<td>ty-(\beta)-sa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 to Ego</td>
<td>MB</td>
<td>ty-(\beta)-sa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ego to 5</td>
<td>ZS</td>
<td>ty-(\beta)-sa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ego to 1</td>
<td>MB</td>
<td>ty-(\beta)-sa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 to Ego</td>
<td>ZS</td>
<td>ty-(\beta)-sa</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 8.7: MBS / FZS and MB / ZS in the Japhug kinship system.**

At G\(^1\), ty-\(\beta\)-yo and ty-lar are used for the uncles and aunts’ wives and husbands (MZ = MBW = FBW and FB = FZH = MZH). As for the members of Ego’s spouse’s family, they are usually addressed by Ego by the same term as the one used by his or her spouse, as if they were his own family.
The six terms tr-pi (eB = eZ), ta-ki (yB = yZ), tr-fyo (FB), tr-lar (MZ), tr-wu (MF = FF) and tr-wi (FM = MM) can be applied to people outside the family, as generic calling terms. Conversely, tr-pi (FZ), tr-rpu (MB), tr-mu (M), tr-wa (F) and the terms for siblings in Table 8.3 are never applied to strangers.

**TANGUT**

The Tangut language was a close relative of the modern Rgyalrong languages, and its kinship system presents many similarities with the Rgyalrong one. In this section, we shall attempt at ‘filling’ the gaps left by previous researchers such as Kychanov (1987), Kepping (1990, 1991) and Shi et al. (2000) in their analysis of the Tangut kinship system, especially the terms designating cousins and nephews, and link our analysis of the kinship system with the marriage rules of the Tangut society.

This study was based on the same body of data as Kepping, and a new translation of the Tangut legal documents pertaining to the kinship system, a chapter on the ‘Degrees of Mourning’, is provided as an addendum to this paper. To facilitate the reader comparison of our translation to Kepping’s, we reproduced the same rule numbering as she. This numbering is also used in our discussion to cite examples for the chapter in question.

**The Tangut kinship system according to Kepping**

As stated in the introduction, Kepping’s seminal work on the Tangut kinship system (1990, 1991) was based on her analysis of the Tangut text ‘Newly gathered notes on Maternal Love and Filial Piety’ on the Tangut Legal text 天盛律令 Tānhèng lǜlíng, as well as several excerpts from the encyclopaedia 立義海 Shènglǐ yìhǎi.

She managed to determine with certainty the meaning of the following kinship terms (taking here only consanguines into account):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tangut term</th>
<th>Meaning</th>
<th>Japhug cognate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>wja³</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>tr-wa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mjå¹</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>tr-mu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ljo²</td>
<td>eB³⁻⁰</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tjo²</td>
<td>yB³⁻⁰</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nio¹</td>
<td>ZŠ⁻¹</td>
<td>tv-snöm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mij¹</td>
<td>BWS</td>
<td>tv-wynnau</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kie³</td>
<td>ZWS</td>
<td>tv-sgyyj</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>wjj²</td>
<td>FB</td>
<td>tv-fyo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nji¹</td>
<td>FZ</td>
<td>tv-jí</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>jyi¹</td>
<td>MB</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>la²</td>
<td>MZ</td>
<td>tv-lar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nji²</td>
<td>BS³⁻⁰</td>
<td>tv-mdyu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>zji¹</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mjj¹</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>tū-me</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>wjja o¹</td>
<td>FF</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>maje wjja¹</td>
<td>FM</td>
<td>tv-wi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lhjji¹</td>
<td>SS</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>zjwi¹</td>
<td>BSWS, ZŠ³⁻⁰</td>
<td>(tv-fsα ?)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 8.8: Tangut kinship terms and Japhug cognates.

Her identification of the terms presented in the table above is correct and almost all Tangut scholars agree on them. However, given the fact that Tangut is a dead and imperfectly known language, it is inevitable that her analysis did not account for all possible kinship relationships and that some of her conclusions might require revision. Rather than proposing here a complete reanalysis of the whole kinship system, it seemed more interesting to select a series of topics worthy of discussion and propose new interpretations that sometimes differ from Kepping and Kychanov’s work on the Tangut kinship system.

A very well attested marriage institution in Tangut society was cross-cousin marriage; even though the purpose of this article is to reconstruct Tangut kinship terminology, not analyzing marriage institutions, this fact cannot be eluded. The compound 諾諾 yi³-zi⁴ ‘marriage, to get married’, was coined from two syllables that are homonymous and probably etymologically identical to 諾 yi³ ‘mother’s brother’ and 諾 zi⁴ ‘sister’s son’ (ZŠ³⁻⁰). Likewise, the term for ‘mother-in-law’, 諾 mi³ wji¹, has a first
syllable homonymous with 聳 nji₂ FZ. In the case of matrilineal cross-cousin marriage (MBD with FZS), the identity of the terms ‘mother-in-law’ with FZ present the point of view of the bride, who marries the son of her FZ; therefore, her FZ actually becomes her mother-in-law after marriage.

It is not entirely sure that patrilineal cross-cousin marriage was also possible in Tangut society. The following sentence found in Kychanov (1974: 102 [134], 172) could be understood to imply this:

(2) 難 nji₁ tēhja nji₁ nji₁ dzu₂
near on near FZ sit

However, it is not entirely clear how this proverb ought to be translated, as it is not a full sentence with a conjugated verb. One possible translation would be: ‘The kin (has to marry) with the kin, the nephew’s BSₙ₉ bride (is) on the paternal aunt’s FZₙ₉ seat’. However, we will see that other interpretation of this proverb are possible.

The following three topics will be discussed in this section: the terms for siblings, for mother’s sister and a detailed analysis of terms for cousins and nephews. The analysis of other problematic terms is left for future investigations.

**Siblings**

As is obvious from Table 8.8, many Tangut kinship terms have Japhug cognates that are conform to the basic phonetic correspondences presented in Jacques (2006), and these are not Chinese or Tibetan loanwords.¹³

¹³ relationship between the son-in-law and his father-in-law. There are no evidence that 聳 zjwi₁ meant ‘bride’, as suggested by Kepping (1990: 136).

¹¹ The names for father and mother are probably recreated in both languages and are not direct descendants from proto-Qiangic. The relationship between 聳 nio₁ and tr-snom Z₉ might not be obvious. However, the correspondences are almost perfect: japhug -om (proto-Japhug *-am) corresponds to Tangut -o, the dot underneath the vowel marks a tense vowel that indicates the presence of a preinitial consonant in proto-Tangut corresponding to the s- preinitial in Japhug. The reconstruction diwò given in Li (1997) is inconsistent with the ūŋqū of this character in the dictionary Wénhái. Borrowings from the Chinese terms for

Moreover, the functions of these terms as indicated in the table are almost identical in both languages, at least when limited to consanguines:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tangut</th>
<th>Japhug</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B₉ⁿ</td>
<td>ts'ımju₁</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Z₉ⁿ</td>
<td>tćej₁</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B₉</td>
<td>tje₂</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Z₉</td>
<td>nio₁</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 8.9: Sibling terms in Japhug and Tangut.

Only the term for ‘brother’ (man speaking) is probably not related between Japhug and Tangut, as we found no other instance of a Tangut -o corresponding to Japhug -γγ.

This is a remarkable fact, in particular regarding the terms for siblings that probably can be considered a common innovation of Tangut and Rgyalrong (Jacques 2007: 7), as no such system is found elsewhere in Sino-Tibetan, it is unlikely to have arisen independently and is certainly not a retention from proto-Sino-Tibetan preserved only in Tangut and Rgyalrong. Among the four names of the siblings in Table 8.3, only the sister (man speaking) tr-snom has cognates in non-Qiangic languages (Burmes e hna-ma₁ etc.). Other Qiangic languages such as Pumi, whose kinship system can be derived from the Japhug one, also share this innovation.

**Mother’s sister**

The term 聳 la₂ MZ appears many times in the chapter Degrees of Mourning. However, the compound form 聳 thar mja₁ jji₁ kjej₁, literally “mother’s sister”, also appears in rule [52]. In Kepping’s translation, 聳 la₂ in rules [10], [23], [34] and [36] and 聳 thar mja₁ jji₁ kjej₁ in rule [52] are both translated as MZ, but a serious contradiction arises: in rule [10], it is stated that the 聳 la₂ has to be mourned for one year, while the 聳 thar mja₁ jji₁ kjej₁ only deserves a five-months mourning: it cannot refer to the same person.

siblings āgə 阿哥 and ājiē 阿姐, however, also exist in Tangut (Kepping 1990: 135).
Another interesting fact is that 面 la2 is included among the 面 ma3 relatives in rule [36], i.e. relatives from the father’s side: it cannot be question of a parallel aunt on the maternal side. A straightforward explanation offers itself: since 面 la2 always appears after 面 wjjii FB in all four rules, it is logical to assume that the intended meaning is not MZ, but FBW. In Rgyalrong, the cognate of 面 la2, รก-รก, means both MZ and FBW, and such equivalence would be expected in the kinship system of Tangut too. The authors of the Tangut Law code used the compound form 面 รก รก mja1 jii1 kie1 precisely to avoid a misunderstanding between MZ and FBW. If the analogy with the Rgyalrong kinship system is valid, we would expect 面 la2 to be used also for the MBW, also this is mere speculation.14

Cousins and nephews

The terms for parallel/cross cousins15 and nephews are only imperfectly understood. Without them we have no way to know whether the Tangut kinship system was closer to the Rgyalrong one or the Pumi one.

Kepping (1990: 120) proposed that parallel cousins (FBCh and MZCh) were called like brothers and sisters, and that cross-cousins (MBCh13 and FZCh15) were called by the same term 面 zjj1 as cross-nephews. To prove her point, she drew an example from the Tiānshēng jílìng (see appendix, 6A.2, rule 34):

(3) 面 面 面 面 面 面 面 面 面 面 面 面 面 面
5305 4 3894 3361 355 2134 724 1139
wjjii la nji kie1 mju zjj1 nji jii
2.32 2.14 1.30 1.60 1.03 1.67 2.28 1.36
FB MZ FZ ZWS BWS ZS etc. Dat

In this example, Kepping proposes that of the six terms enumerated, the last three would not be the brothers, the sisters and the cross-nephews,16 but the

14 Rather than the term for FZ, 面 nji1 for instance. If this hypothesis is true, then it implies that 面 wjjii FB was used for MZH and FZH.
15 Cross-cousins are the children of one’s father’s sister or one’s maternal uncle (FZCh, MBCh). Parallel cousins are the children of one’s father’s brother or one’s mother’s sister (FBCh, MZCh).
16 Cross-nephews are children of one’s sibling of the other sex (sister’s children for a male, brother’s children for a female).

children of the three former parents, that is, parallel cousins and cross-cousins. The terms for brother and sister 面 kie1 and 面 mju1 would also be used for parallel cousins, while 面 zjj1 would mean both cross-nephews and cross-cousins (MBChMS and FZChFS). She translates this passage in the following way (Kepping 1991: 53):

(Nine-months mourning should be observed by) married daughters for brothers of father, mother’s sisters, father’s sisters (and their children, respectively), brothers and cross-cousins.

This interpretation is not without difficulty, although it is not entirely impossible. We will now analyze her claims about parallel cousins and cross-cousins separately.

Parallel cousins

Let us first discuss the first aspect of Kepping’s argument: her claim that the terms for siblings could be used for parallel cousins. We should bear in mind first that even in Kepping’s translation of the Degrees of mourning, the MZS, parallel cousin on the mother’s side, is treated in rule [52] where it is stated that he deserves a five-months mourning duration, a much shorter one than the duration prescribed in rule [34]. Therefore, even granted that terms for siblings could be used for parallel cousins, it is clear that in rule [34], the term 面 mju1 is certainly not intended to mean MZS, it could mean only B or FBS.

Is FBS treated anywhere else in the text? This all depends on the interpretation of a very peculiar term: 面 wjjii zjj1 ljo5. This term first appears in rule [24], line 5B.6:

(4) 面 面 面 面 面 面 面 面 面 面 面 面 面 面
5305 1085 2447 4444 2019 1139
wjjii zjj ljo ljj thja jii
2.32 1.11 2.44 1.69 1.20 1.36
FB S eBWS and this GEN
面 面 面 面
549 5689 5399 3099
njo ya khju dzjj
1.71 1.17 1.03 1.39
Zms home under live
interested in. We have extracted here the relevant sentences from lines 5A6-8 of the text.\textsuperscript{18} We reproduce Kepping’s translation (1991: 51):

\begin{verbatim}
(6)  
\begin{tabular}{cccccc}
2447 & 605 & 5305 & 4 & 1561 & 1543 \\
\text{ljø} & \text{tjø} & \text{wjĳ} & \text{la} & \text{njĩ} & \text{mjo̱r} \\
2.44 & 2.64 & 2.32 & 2.14 & 2.60 & 1.90 \\
\text{cB} & \text{yB} & \text{FB} & \text{MZ} & \text{BCh} & \text{own} \\
\end{tabular}
\end{verbatim}

(One-year mourning should be observed) [09] for all brothers (including the sons of one’s father’s brother) [10] for father’s brothers and mother’s sisters,\textsuperscript{19} [11] for clan nephews.

\begin{verbatim}
(7)  
\begin{tabular}{cccccc}
3894 & 549 & 5689 & 5399 & 3099 \\
\text{njĩ} & \text{niq} & \text{ya} & \text{khju} & \text{dzjjj} \\
1.30 & 1.71 & 1.17 & 1.03 & 1.39 \\
\text{F} & \text{Z} & \text{Z} & \text{home} & \text{under} & \text{live} \\
\end{tabular}
\end{verbatim}

\textsuperscript{13}for father’s sisters and sisters living at home.

As expected, the term for FB, MZ and FZ are found in both in the section on one-year mourning (applied to men and unmarried women) and in the section on the nine-months mourning (sentence 3). The terms for sibling are different for the simple reason that rules [9] to [11] normally apply to men, whereas rule [34] only applies to women. Since, as previously noticed, the terms for siblings distinguish the sex of both members of the relationship (male’s brother vs. female’s brother, etc.), this is the expected situation. Basically, the only real difference is the term \textit{zjwī} which only appears in rule [34] (in fact, the only occurrence of this character in the whole chapter), and \textit{njĩ}, which does not appear in rule [34]. The logical conclusion of this is therefore that these two terms should also be equated: \textit{zjwī} is the ‘female speaking’ equivalent of \textit{njĩ2}, BS, and can only be translated here as “brother’s son”, not as “cross-cousin”.

In fact, a complete reading of the chapter reveals that MBS and FZS are actually much lower on the mourning scale: they only deserve a three-

\textsuperscript{18}The reader who wants to verify our claim can check the fully-analyzed Tangut text of this chapter in the addendum.

\textsuperscript{19}The correct translation of this term in this context will be presented in section 3.3, but let us provisionally keep a translation closer to Kepping’s.
month mourning duration (rule [75] and [76]); it would be somewhat a paradox if the cross-cousins were treated in two different places in the same text. Even if we wanted to play the devil’s advocate and argue that rules [75] and [76] only applied to a male, not to a female, this would still not be a valid explanation, as (married) female always have a shorter mourning duration than male, never a larger, but such a claim would imply the opposite: a nine-months mourning duration for married female to their cross-cousin, but only a three-months one for males.

Now, let us examine this issue from the point of view of the structure of the system. The word 騁 zjwì¹ certainly means ‘cross-nephew’ BS MS / ZS MS, as it is explicitly defined this way in the Tangut dictionary Wèneål:

(8) 騁 jwì¹ tja¹ nju¹ niò¹ jii¹ tji gii²
    TOP B MS Z MS GEN boy

A zjwì¹ is the son of one’s brother (for a female) or of one’s sister (for a male).

騁 zjwì¹ forms a dyadic relationship with the terms 姊 yij¹ “mother’s brother” on the one hand and with 姊 niì¹ “father’s sister” on the other hand. Therefore, whoever I call 騁 zjwì¹ should call me 騁 yij¹ if I am a male and 騁 niì¹ if I am a female. Now, this implicates that if 騁 zjwì¹ truly meant MBC MS and FZC MS as Kepping claims, by the rule of reciprocity explained in section 1, 騁 yij¹ should also be applied not only to MB, but also to FZ and niì¹ not only to FZ, but also to MB.

In Kepping’s reconstruction, the Tangut system had a mix of Omaha and Crow skewing features. Although this kind of system is not unthinkable altogether, it might be valuable to try to account for Tangut data in a simpler way. Besides, Kepping’s solution involves several problems in view of Tangut social structure.

First, if one called his MBD (the preferential marriage partner) 騁 zjwì¹, the same way as his sister’s daughter, this should indicate that marriage with one’s ZD should be as important an institution in Tangut society as cross-cousin marriage. This kind of marriage, though not impossible in principle, is not documented in any source on Tangut society at my disposition.

Second, two pieces of evidence not mentioned by Kepping may lead to propose different solutions. However, these evidence are contradictory; the

---

30 Marriage with (zZD), the elder sister’s daughter (when the daughter is younger than EGO) is common in some societies, for instance Tamil (Good 2006).

first piece would lead to reconstruct an Omaha skewing system, while the second suggests the existence of a Crow one. Therefore, rather than proposing one solution to the problem investigated here, we prefer to propose competing ideas and wait until additional data from Tangut texts becomes available before giving a definite reconstruction.

**Omaha skewing**

Although Kepping’s solution may require revision, we believe that there is some degree of truth in her insight that the term 騁 zjwì¹ could be used to designate cross-cousins. However, we disagree on which cross-cousins. In the Shènqí yìhái (p. 66. line 6–7, Kychanov 1997: 150; 264), we read the following account about paternal aunt and sister’s sons:

(9) 姊 yij¹ nji gii niö zji tjo kiej .we
      1.30 2.10 1.71 1.11 2.64 1.60 2.07
  FZ son Z MS boy yB MS Z PS place

The son of the father’s sister and the boy of a sister (for a male) are close like brothers (for a male) or sisters (for a female). They enjoy a high prestige.

鯾 鯵 鯾 鯷 鯯 鯥
3229 4508 981 1332 2412 5993
nyao tji .war deej dzjo kha
1.31 1.67 2.73 1.37 2.44 1.17
chanting food goods transmit poem in
鯿 鯲 鯳 鯳 鯴
5612 3894 1567 549 1085
tshijt nji gii niö zji
1.39 1.30 2.10 1.71 1.11
say[1] FZ son Z MS boy
One shares food and possessions with them. According to a poem: “Sons of father’s sisters and boys of sisters

| 981 | 5346 | 5346 |
| .war | .ju | .ju |
| 2.73 | 2.02 | 2.02 |

always look for presents, just as sheep bleat and yaks moo for grass.”

This passage implies that the relationship of a male to his sister’s son and to his father’s sister’s son is of the same kind. Interestingly, if we now turn back to the Tangut law code, we observe that according to rules [51] and [76], both FZS and ZS have the same mourning duration of three months. These two pieces of evidence strongly suggest that FZS and ZS had the same status in the Tangut kinship system, and this could indicate that they were called by the same term jzwj. If this is true, then it entails that by reciprocity both MB and MBS were called by the same term jji. This does not tell us how the MBD was called, though it could suggest that a G+1 term would be used to designate her (probably jji FZ).

We would then obtain an Omaha skewing system almost exactly like the one described for Japhug in Table 8.5 and Table 8.6, just by replacing a-fsa and a-rpu by jzwj and jji respectively. The resulting system is the exact opposite of Kepping’s reconstruction (she thought that MBS, not FZS was called jzwj). In view of this hypothesis, the sentence 8 could be interpreted not as a clue that one can marry the FZD, but that the preferred bride MBD is called by the same term as the FZ, jji.

These data seem therefore to indicate that Tangut, like Rgya’r lung and Qiang, had an Omaha-type skewing system, although the exact structure of these systems may differ, especially as far as female relatives are taken into account. We have no way of knowing if a similar rule existed for female, as the term jzwj is always applied to males in Tangut texts.

---

We wish to emphasize that the reconstruction proposed in this section is tentative, as we only have indirect clues of the existence of the skewing rule proposed here.

### Crow Skewing?

In the previous section, we have discussed the terms for cross-nephews in Tangut, and have proposed that Tangut kinship had an Omaha skewing system. If this hypothesis is true, then the term for MB jji was also applied to MBS, as in Rgya’r lung.

Incidentally, an entirely different piece of evidence suggests that a skewing system existed in Tangut. In the bilingual dictionary *Pearl in the Palm* (番漢合時掌中珠 緬-漢 Hēshì Zhǎngzhōngzhū), line 204 (Li 1994: 64), we find the following glosses:

(10) jzwj jzwj jzwj jzwj jzwj

597 3443 2134 2254 5305 4 3894 355

jji po jzwj mo wjii la nji mu

1.29 1.49 1.67 2.42 2.32 2.14 1.30 1.03

阿 舅 外 舅 叔 姨 姑 妹

MB MB ZS ZS FyB MZ FZ MB

We see that the character jzwj unexpectedly corresponds to Chinese 舅 ‘MB’. This contradicts the normal use of jzwj in Tangut texts, where no other meaning than 舅 is attested. Given the care with which Gūlè Māocái (骨勒茂才), the author of *Zhāngzhōngzhū*, wrote this dictionary, it is unlikely that this is an error. It is also impossible to argue that he chose the character 舅 ‘MB’ because the characters for ‘brother’ and ‘brother’ had already been used to gloss jzwj eB and jzwj tji on line 203: there was clearly no constraint against using the same Chinese (or Tangut) gloss several times in a row. For instance, we clearly see in example (10) that 舅 ‘MB’ is used two times to gloss two distinct Tangut characters. Therefore, this gloss is to be taken seriously in any study of the Tangut kinship system.

However, if we take this sentence at face value, we have to suppose the existence of a Crow-type skewing rule. The fact that female call their MB as jzwj ‘brother’ would imply the equation MB = B. By extension, jzwj would designate both MBS and BS. In other words, it would equate the fathers of the parents whom she calls by the same term jzwj.

---

21 The reduplication of the verb here indicates either iterative or intensive meaning.
Another logical consequence would be that since $MB^{WS} = B^{WS}$ then $ZD^{WS} = Z^{WS}$, in other word a male would call his cross-niece a 'sister'.

In this theory, female would have a Crow skewing system. This could be reconciled with the Omaha skewing system postulated in the previous section by assuming Crow-rule for female speakers and Omaha rule for male speakers, a solution that involves the same intrinsic problem as Kepping’s, though in a different way.

However, concerning the Tangut expression for $ZD^{WS}$, however, we should point out that Xu (2009) has proposed to interpret the term 乳娘 $\bar{n}jo^3$ which appears in rule [78] precisely as $ZD^{WS}$. Previous research on the text of Tiansheng luoling have either left this term untranslated, or as Sun and Song (1999), proposed that it meant 乳女 ‘wet nurse’, based on the correspondence with Chinese legal texts. Nevertheless, as Xu pointed out, another term for ‘wet nurse’ is already attested in the Shengli yihai: 乳娘 $\bar{n}ju^3mja^1$, making Sun and Song’s idea less probable. Xu’s idea, however, is only a conjecture too, and the available Tangut texts do not seem to allow a definite solution to the question of how $ZD^{WS}$ was called.

We will not try to give any definite explanation for example (10), and leave it to future investigations on the Tangut kinship system.

**CONCLUSION**

In this paper, we have presented a description of the kinship system of Japhug Rgyalrong, a modern Qiangic language, and attempted to go further in the reconstruction of the Tangut kinship terminology. We have shown that Rgyalrong and Tangut share a strikingly similar terminological system for siblings. Besides, we have suggested the existence of traces of an Omaha-type skewing rule in Tangut, similar to the one observed in Rgyalrong.

Nevertheless, although Tangut data on kinship are abundant, they are also extremely ambiguous and have the strong problem of being male-centered, so that many aspects of the kinship system on the female side are difficult to ascertain. In this article, we have tried to set out facts clearly, but have encountered apparently insurmountable contradictions in Tangut data. Only more research on Tangut texts can reveal data that can allow us to answer these questions.
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APPENDIX: DEGREES OF MOURNING

4B.5 葬 龍 鬘 4739 5689
    213 njij tsewr ya
    1.36 1.87 1.17

Degrees of kinship.

4B.6 葬 龍 鬘 鬘 鬘 鬘 鬘 鬘 鬘 鬘 鬘 5285 2888 1965 4027 5932 213 4739 3791 1890
    lji ma dzij njii ma njij tsewr bji bjj
    1.29 2.25 1.42 1.32 2.25 1.36 1.87 2.10 2.33

There are five different ways of wearing mourning clothes, depending on the relative proximity of the kin, and whether he or she belongs to one’s paternal, or maternal lineage.

4B.7 葬 龍 鬘 鬘 鬘 鬘 鬘 4342 3576 749 2019 5993 243 2541
    dja sjwij phji thja kha sji dzjwo
    2.17 1.36 1.11 1.20 1.17 2.10 2.44

D1 明 使 1 此 中 W
Having explained this, (we should add that) a wife wears mourning clothes the same way as her husband does.

One has to wear mourning clothes for three years (in the following cases):

[01] A son to his father or mother, [02] a wife to her husband

[03] The eldest grandson to his grand-father or grand-mother if his father had already passed away.

[04] An adopted son to his adopted father or mother. [05] A son to his father's wife (嫡母).

[06] (The same applies to) unmarried non-adopted and adopted daughters who live at home.
5A.5 艮 嘉 鑄 鑄 輯
d 5981 3305 28 4906 1274
. a kjw hjuu giwi wo
0 1.45 1.07 2.10 2.42
一 年 喪 葬 1 應

One has to wear mourning clothes for one year (in the following cases):

5A.6 應 嘉 嘉 嘉 嘉 嘉 嘉
5049 154 92 4893 2447 605
wja o mja wji ljo tji
1.19 1.49 1.20 1.29 2.44 2.64
FF FM EBM yBM

5A.7 艮 嘉 嘉 嘉 嘉 嘉 嘉
d 5049 92 960 1085 1139
wja mja njij zji jji
1.19 1.20 1.61 1.11 1.36
F M D S DAT

5A.8 艮 嘉 嘉 嘉 嘉 嘉 嘉
d 960 1561 1543 5689 5399 3099
mjjj njj njor ya khju dżijj
1.61 2.60 1.90 1.17 1.03 1.39
BD M W DAT

5A.9 艮 嘉 嘉 嘉 嘉 嘉 嘉
d 5049 769 92 2904 1139 5049 154
wja ljiw jja jjar jji jji wja o
1.19 1.36 1.20 2.74 1.29 1.36 1.19 1.49
F M M 婦 往 2 DAT FF

[12] Father or mother to their son or daughter. [13] To one’s father’s sister or one’s sister (for a male) who still live at home.

[07] To one’s grandfather or [08] grandmother, [09] to one’s elder or younger brother (for a male), [10] to one’s father’s brother or his wife, [11] to one’s brother’s non-adopted son (for a male).

[07] To one’s brother’s non-adopted daughter still living at home (for a male).


[16] (A son) to his mother if his father died and she remarried. [17] A grandfather to his eldest grandchild if his eldest child has already passed away.

---

22 It is better to translate here 拉 by “father’s brother’s wife” rather than by “mother’s sister”. Our translation differs here from Keppin (1990: 51). Mourning for mother’s sister is treated in 6B.9.
5B.1 父 父 母 姐 姐 妹 妹
5049 92 147 1085 1139 147 1085 1139
wja mja sji jji sji jji sji jji
1.19 1.20 2.32 1.11 1.36 2.32 1.11 1.36
F M 請 S DAT 請 S DAT

胞 姊 姐 姐 姐 姐 姐 姐
2104 5746 5645 5049 92 1139
sji gjwi jji wja mja jji
1.10 1.30 2.60 1.19 1.20 1.36
先 割 處 F M DAT

[18] A father or a mother to their adopted son, [19] an adopted son to his original father and mother.

5B.2 貝 貝 貝 貝 貝 貝 貝 貝
5049 769 2983 4 2904 4481
wja ljwij u la jar shi
1.19 1.36 2.01 2.14 2.74 1.29
F 亡 中 MZ 嫁 往 2

龍 龍 龍 龍 龍 龍
1897 1567 4481 1139
pha gji sji jji
1.17 2.10 1.29 1.36
随 S 往 2 DAT

[20] A wife remarried after her first husband's death to her children if they have followed her (in her new husband's home).

5B.3 貝 貝 貝 貝 貝 貝 貝 貝
92 2904 4481 2104 3126
mja jar sji sji dji jji
1.20 2.74 1.29 1.10 2.32
M 嫁 往 2 先 有 1

5B.4 父 父 姊 姊 姐 姐 姐 姐
1794 5447 1326 2537 1567 1139
o do kji rji gji jji
1.49 2.42 1.30 2.72 2.10 1.36
主 DAT PRF 遺 S DAT

[21] A remarried mother to her son whom she has left at her former's husband's home.

5B.5 貝 貝 貝 貝 貝 貝 貝 貝
3113 3281 3749 0028 4906 1274
ghji lhih plow lhuu gji gi wo
1.32 2.60 1.54 1.07 2.10 2.42
九 月 月 喪 着 1 應

One has to wear mourning clothes for nine months (in the following cases):
[23] To one’s father’s male parallel cousins and their wives of the first degree, [24] to one’s father’s brother’s son and his sister (father’s brother’s daughter) if she still lives at her parent’s home.

5B.7

1085 239 960 239 5689 5399
zji 1.11 1.30 1.61 1.30 1.17 1.03
GrS 3894 960 2904 4481

[25] To one’s grandson or [26] granddaughter if she still lives at her parent’s home, [27] to one’s married father’s sister or one’s married sister21 (for a male).

5B.8

960 1561 2904 4581 147 1085
mjij 1.61 2.60 2.74 1.29 2.32 1.11
BD 3894 960 2904 4481

[28] To one’s married brother’s daughter. [29] An adopted son to his father’s sister, his sister and brother from his original home.

5B.9

1561 1139 2455 2129 2447 1561 724
nji 1.36 1.36 2.10 2.33 2.44 2.60 2.28
BS Gen W 2904 4481

[30] To one’s brother’s son’s wife, [31] to brothers or brother’s children who were adopted in another home.

6A.1

92 2104 4945 2455 4950 2590
mja 1.20 1.10 1.27 2.10 2.72 2.27
M 3894 960 2904 4481

[32] A mother who divorced from her former husband to her daughter who lives (at her father’s home).

---

21 The parallelism of this passage with the one in 5A.7 indicates that translating “one’s sister” rather than “one’s sister’s daughter” is preferable, though the word 非 mjjj is left unaccounted for.
[35] To one’s great-grandfather and great-grandmother and [36] to one’s father’s male parallel cousins and their wives 24 and sister of the second degree.

6A.6

5049 154 1139 2447 549 4444
wjia o jji ljo nio lji
1.19 1.49 1.36 2.44 1.71 1.69
GrF GEN eBMS ZMS 及

2455 2129 2447 1139 239
gji bjij ljo jjj lhji
2.10 2.33 2.44 1.36 1.30
W eBMS GEN GrCh

[37] To one’s grandfather’s brothers, sisters and wives, 25 [38] to brother’s grandsons,

6A.7

5305 1085 1561 4027 4739 5305 1085 2447 549
wjij zji nji nji tsewr wjjj zji ljo nio
2.32 1.11 2.60 1.32 1.87 2.32 1.11 2.44 1.71
FB S BCh L節 FB S eBMS ZMS

[39] To one’s father’s brother’s grandchildren, 26 [40] to one’s father’s brother’s children of the second degree.

6A.8

5305 1085 549 2904 4481
wjij zji nio jar sjj
2.32 1.11 1.71 2.74 1.29
FB S ZMS 嫁 往 2

24 It would be illogical here to translate 莫 by “mother’s sister” (cf. 6B.9). We suggest that, as in Rgyalrong, MZ = FBW (equivalence between parallel affines and consanguines). Although, as Kepping (1990: 23-4) proposes, this may be related to a rule of sororate or sororal polygyny, this need not be the case either.

25 Probably the grandfather’s brothers’ wives.

26 One’s nephews from the parallel paternal line.
[41] To one's married father's daughter. [42] To one's married granddaughter. [43] To one's great-grandson.

6A.9

6B.1

[44] To one's brother's wife.

6B.2

[45] An adopted son to his married father's sister and his married sister from his original home.

6B.3

[46] A grandfather or a grandmother to their eldest son's wife if they son passed away.

6B.4

[47] A married girl to her brothers and brother's sons if they have been adopted in another home.

6B.5

and to her brothers and (brother's) sons' wives.
6B.6 西 西 西 西 西 西 西 西 西 西 西 西 西 西 西 西 西 西
2904 4481 960 5305 1085 355 1139
jj 4j1 mjj wjj zj mju jij
2.74 1.29 1.61 2.32 1.11 1.03 1.36
嫁 往 D FB S B^{ws} DAT

[48] A married girl to her father's brother's son.

6B.7 透 透
1965 213
dzjij njij
1.42 1.36
姆 近
Kin from the mother's lineage.

6B.8 西 西 西 西 西 西 西 西 西 西 西 西 西 西 西 西 西 西
92 1139 5049 92 597 549 1139 1567
mja jj wja mja yji niq jij gji
1.20 1.36 1.19 1.20 1.29 1.71 1.36 2.10
M Dat F M MB Z^{ms} GEN S

[49] To one's mother's father or mother, [50] to one's mother's brother and [51] to one's sister's son (for a male).

6B.9 西 西 西 西 西 西 西 西 西 西 西 西 西 西 西 西 西 西
0092 1139 3361 4444 1906 1567
mja jj kiey lji nioow gji
1.20 1.36 1.60 1.69 1.57 2.10
M GEN Z^{ms} 及 后 S

[52] To one's mother's sisters\(^2\) and their sons.

7A.1 西 西 西 西 西 西 西 西 西 西 西 西 西 西 西 西 西 西
92 3370 5049 1918 3370 857 549
mja gu wja mji gu mo niq
1.20 2.01 1.19 1.11 2.01 2.25 1.71
M 共 F 不 共 Z^{ms}

7A.2 西 西 西 西 西 西 西 西 西 西 西 西 西 西 西 西 西 西
2983 4 1139 5049 92 355 3361
.4 la jij wja mja mju kiej
2.01 2.14 1.36 1.19 1.20 1.03 1.60
中 MZ DAT F M B^{ws} Z^{ws}

[54] To one's father’s wife’s father, mother, brother or sister.

7A.3 西 西 西 西 西 西 西 西 西 西 西 西 西 西 西 西 西 西
5865 2814 3749 28 4906 1274
so lhij phow lhjiu giwio wo
1.70 2.60 1.54 1.07 2.10 2.42
三 月 月 喪 着 1 應
One has to wear mourning clothes for three months (in the following cases):

7A.4 西 西 西 西 西 西 西 西 西 西 西 西 西 西 西 西 西 西
2888 213
mo njij
2.25 1.36
族 近
Kin from the father's lineage.

7A.5 西 西 西 西 西 西 西 西 西 西 西 西 西 西 西 西 西 西
2099 263 5049 92 5865 4739 5305 4444 3894
no tjw wja mja so tserv wjij jij nji
2.42 2.52 1.19 1.20 1.70 1.87 2.32 1.69 1.30
太 Gr F M 三 節 FB 及 FZ

[55] To one’s great-great grandfather or grandmother, [56] to one’s father’s parallel cousin of the third degree.

7A.6 西 西 西 西 西 西 西 西 西 西 西 西 西 西 西 西 西 西
263 1139 549 4444 2447 1906 2455 2129
tjw jij niq lji jio nioow gi bijj
2.52 1.36 1.71 1.69 2.44 1.57 2.10 2.33
Gr DAT Z^{ms} 及 eB^{ms} 後 W

[57] To one’s great grandfather’s sister, brother and brother’s wife.

\(^2\) The term used for mother's sister is the explicit form 西 西 西 rather than 西 西, which is ambiguous, as it also means FBW (cf. 5A.6).
7A.7 酮 駱 龍 濒 濒 濒 濒
5865 4739 5305 1085 2447 549
sp tsewr 'wjij zji ljo nio
1.70 1.87 2.32 1.11 2.44 1.71
三 節 FB S eB<sup>MS</sup> Z<sup>MS</sup>

織 織 鑼
2447 1139 2859
ljo jij lhiq
2.44 1.36 2.63
eB<sup>MS</sup> DAT GrGrCh

[58] To one’s father’s brother’s son or daughter (parallel cousin on the paternal line) of the third degree. [59] To one’s brother’s great-grandchild.

7A.8 酪 酴 酴 酴 酴 酴 酴
5049 154 1139 5305 1085 2447 4444
'wjia 'o jij 'wjij zji ljo li
1.19 1.49 1.36 2.32 1.11 2.44 1.69
FF GEN FB S eB<sup>MS</sup> 及

織 織 織 織
2455 2129 1906 549
gij bjj hij nioow nio
2.10 2.33 1.57 1.71
W 後 Z<sup>MS</sup>

[60] To one’s grandfather’s father’s brother’s sons and their wives, as well as their sisters.

7A.9 酴 酴 酴 酴 酴 酴 酴
5305 1085 2447 1139 239
'wjij zji ljo jij lhji
2.32 1.11 2.44 1.36 1.30
FB S eB<sup>MS</sup> GEN GrS

[61] To one’s father’s brother’s great grandsons.

7B.1 窠 酴 酴 酴 酴 酴 酴 酴
4027 4739 5305 1085 1561 4444 960 1064
njj tsewr 'wjij zji njj lij mjij mjij
1.32 1.87 2.32 1.11 2.60 1.69 1.61 2.33
二 節 FB S BCh 及 D 未

隔 隔 隔 隔 嫁
2904 4469 5689 5399 3099
jar 'ji ya khju dzijij
2.74 2.09 1.17 1.03 1.39
嫁 往 1 門 下 住

[62] To one’s father’s brother’s grandsons of the second degree, as well as unmarried granddaughters.

7B.2 窠 酴 酴 酴 酴 酴 酴 酴
5948 5305 1085 960 1561 2904 4481
lijwjj 'wjij zji mjij njj jar 'jj
2.54 2.32 1.11 1.61 2.60 2.74 1.29
GrGrGrCh FB S GrCh 嫁 往 2

[63] To one’s great-great-great grandson and [64] to one’s father’s brother’s married daughter.

7B.3 窠 酴 酴 酴 酴 酴 酴 酴
2447 1139 960 239 2904 4481
ljo jjij mjij lhji jar 'ji
2.44 1.36 1.61 1.30 2.74 1.29
eB<sup>MS</sup> Gen GrS 嫁 往 2

[65] To one’s brother’s married granddaughter.

7B.4 窠 酴 酴 酴 窠 酴 酴 酴
960 2904 4481 5049 154 1139 5305
mjij 'jar 'ji 'wjia 'o jjij 'wjij
1.61 2.74 1.29 1.19 1.49 1.36 2.32
D 嫁 往 2 GrF GEN FB
[66] A married woman to her grandfather's father's brother's son,²⁸ to their wives and to her grandfather's father's brother's daughter.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1085</th>
<th>2447</th>
<th>2455</th>
<th>2129</th>
<th>1906</th>
<th>549</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>zji</td>
<td>ljo</td>
<td>gji</td>
<td>bjji</td>
<td>nioow</td>
<td>nio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.11</td>
<td>2.44</td>
<td>2.10</td>
<td>2.33</td>
<td>1.57</td>
<td>1.71</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
S eB<sub>MS</sub> W 后 Z<sup>WS</sup>

[67] To one's grandson's wife, [68] to one's father's brother's son's wife.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>239</th>
<th>1894</th>
<th>5305</th>
<th>1085</th>
<th>2447</th>
<th>1139</th>
<th>2455</th>
<th>2129</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>lhji</td>
<td>jar</td>
<td>wjjj</td>
<td>zji</td>
<td>ljo</td>
<td>jjjj</td>
<td>gji</td>
<td>bjji</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.30</td>
<td>1.82</td>
<td>2.32</td>
<td>1.11</td>
<td>2.44</td>
<td>1.36</td>
<td>2.10</td>
<td>2.33</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
GrS SW FB S eB<sub>MS</sub> GEN W

[69] To one's father's brother's grandson's wife. [70] A married woman to her brother's grandson.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2447</th>
<th>1139</th>
<th>239</th>
<th>2455</th>
<th>2129</th>
<th>2904</th>
<th>4481</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ljo</td>
<td>jjj</td>
<td>ljjj</td>
<td>gij</td>
<td>bjji</td>
<td>jar</td>
<td>šji</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.44</td>
<td>1.36</td>
<td>1.30</td>
<td>2.10</td>
<td>2.33</td>
<td>2.74</td>
<td>1.29</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
eB<sub>MS</sub> Gen GrS W 嫁 往 2

[71] A married woman to her father's brother's grandson.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>7B.8</th>
<th>92</th>
<th>1906</th>
<th>4507</th>
<th>1567</th>
<th>2503</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>mja</td>
<td>nioow</td>
<td>šio</td>
<td>gji</td>
<td>šu</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.20</td>
<td>1.57</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>2.10</td>
<td>1.55</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
M 後 發 S 後

[TANGLOUT KINSHIP]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>5049</th>
<th>4950</th>
<th>5689</th>
<th>3601</th>
<th>1608</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>wja</td>
<td>rjir</td>
<td>ya</td>
<td>khew</td>
<td>law</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.19</td>
<td>2.72</td>
<td>1.17</td>
<td>2.38</td>
<td>2.38</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
F Com 函 口 同

[72] A remarried mother's son (from the first marriage) is like other members of his stepfather's home.

[7B.9] 嫁 迩

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1965</th>
<th>213</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>dzjj</td>
<td>njj</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.42</td>
<td>1.36</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

嫁 近

Kin from the mother's lineage.

[8A.1] 嫁 迩 嫁 迩 嫁 迩 嫁 迩

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>960</th>
<th>1139</th>
<th>1567</th>
<th>3361</th>
<th>724</th>
<th>3212</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>mjjj</td>
<td>jjj</td>
<td>gji</td>
<td>kiej</td>
<td>njj</td>
<td>tji</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.61</td>
<td>1.36</td>
<td>2.10</td>
<td>1.60</td>
<td>2.28</td>
<td>1.69</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
D GEN S Z<sup>WS</sup> 等 童

²⁸ Here the masculine form 程 ljo<sup>2</sup> is used, as he is the grandfather's cousin; his relationship to the woman is indirect, so the feminine form 程 mju<sup>2</sup> cannot be used.
8A.2 ATALA LAI LUTI LUTI
3894 1139 1567 2455 2129 1139
nji jij gi gi bijj jij
1.30 1.36 2.10 2.10 2.33 1.36
FZ GEN S W GEN

8A.3 ATALA LAI LUTI LUTI
960 3212 1567 1139 2455 2129
mjj tji gi gi jij gi bijj
1.61 1.69 2.10 1.36 2.10 2.33
D 童 S GEN W

[79] To one's daughter's son's wife, [80] to one's sister's son's wife (for a male),

8A.4 ATALA LAI LUTI LUTI
4820 3361 1567 1139 2455 2129
mà kiej gi gi jij gi bijj
1.63 1.60 2.10 1.36 2.10 2.33
DH ZWS S GEN W

[81] To one's daughter's husband and [82] to one's sister's son's wife (for a female).

---

29 The exact meaning of 陆陆 陆陆 is not clear with certainty. Sun and Song (1999), based on Chinese legal texts, argue that it corresponds to 乳娘 'wet nurse', while Xu (2009) translates it as 'ZD (MS)'.
Figure 8.2: Siblings and first degree cousins.

Figure 8.3: Patrilineage.