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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Relationship</th>
<th>Kinship Terms</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>haʔn̓ih</td>
<td>father</td>
<td>F, FB, FMSs, FFBs, FMBs, FFSs, FFFBss, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hakhnóʔsēh</td>
<td>uncle</td>
<td>MB, MMSs, MFBs, MMBs, MFSs, MMMSds, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>noʔyēh</td>
<td>mother</td>
<td>M, MS, MMSd, MFBd, MMBd, MFSd, MMMSdd, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>akeːhak</td>
<td>aunt</td>
<td>FS, FMSd, FFBd, FMBd, FFSd, FFFBsd, etc.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These are all $\text{GEN}^{-1}$ kinship types. We can hypothesize that all four words have the feature $\text{GEN}^{-1}$. But what **distinguishes** them?
hatsi? my elder B, MSs, FBs, MMSds, FFBss, MFBds, brother FMSss, MMBds, etc. (older)
akyáː?seːʔ my cousin MB(s/d), FS(s/d), MMSs(s/d), FFBd(s/d), MFBs(s/d), FMSd(s/d), MMBs(s/d)

These are all $\text{GEN}^0$ kinship types. We can hypothesize that all both words have the feature $\text{GEN}^0$. But what feature distinguishes them (contrastiveness principle)? Note: It’s not the feature Male or the feature being older than ego. For example, the word akyáː?seːʔ is used for a MBs even though he is male and older than ego.
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A non solution

haʔninh
father

hatsiʔ
eld. brother

hakhnóʔsēh
uncle

akyāʔseʔ
cousin
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Violating the subset principle

1. Look at the features for haʔnih in the proposed solution.

\[ [\text{MALE}] \cap [\text{DIRECT}] \cap [\text{GEN}^{-1}] = \{F\} \]

So these features do NOT capture [haʔnih]:

\[ [\text{haʔnih}] \neq [\text{MALE}] \cap [\text{DIRECT}] \cap [\text{GEN}^{-1}] \]

2. The problem is the LIN feature:

\[ [\text{haʔnih}] \not\subset [\text{DIRECT}] \]

There are only two DIRECT GEN\(^{-1}\) kinship types: M, F. But many of the kinship types listed under haʔnih are NOT DIRECT: FB, FMSs, FFBs, FMBs, FFSs, FFFBss

3. The problem is that [haʔnih] is neither a subset of [DIRECT] NOR a subset of [COLLAT]. The feature LIN plays no role in the conceptual system of Seneca kinship!
Non-solution 2: Capturing disjointness

akyáʔseʔ
cousin

hatsi?
eld. brother

\[
\begin{bmatrix}
\text{LIN} & \text{COLLAT} \\
\text{SEX} & \text{MALE} \\
\text{GEN} & 0
\end{bmatrix}
\quad \begin{bmatrix}
\text{LIN} & \text{DIRECT OR COLLAT} \\
\text{SEX} & \text{MALE} \\
\text{GEN} & 0 \\
\text{AGE} & +
\end{bmatrix}
\]

The problem is that hatsi? and akyáʔseʔ don’t just have different extensions; they have **disjoint** extensions. No relative can be both a hatsi? and a akyáʔseʔ. So there needs to be at least one feature that assigns them distinct disjoint values. No feature here does that. What should I say for a MMBss who is older than me? He is male, collateral, and older than me, so both feature sets are true of this relative. But in fact for a Seneca speaker, he is a cousin, not an elder brother.
Looking for the contrasting feature

hatsiʔ my elder brother B, MSs, FBs, MMSds, FFBss, MFBds, FMSss, MMBds, etc. (older)
akyāʔ?seʔ my cousin MB(s/d), FS(s/d), MMSs(s/d), FFBd(s/d), MFBs(s/d), FMSd(s/d), MMBs(s/d)

Consider case of an elder male cousin. What would distinguish such a relative from an elder brother? Compare most similar kinship types belonging to each word.