INDO-EUROPEAN KINSHIP TERMINOLOGIES IN EUROPE:

TRAJECTORIES OF CHANGE

ROBERT PARKIN

**Introduction**

This is a study of kin terms and kinship terminologies in Indo-European (IE) languages. There is, of course, no shortage of such studies already (e.g. Delbrück 1889, Hocart 1928, Galton 1957, Friedrich 1966, Szemerényi 1977, Kullanda 2002), which go back to the nineteenth century. By and large, however, most of them are concerned with reconstructing terms historically, right back to proto-IE, and/or studying specific terminologies or groups of terminologies either synchronically or diachronically or both. Rather less attention has been given to changes in IE languages in Europe generally following the break-up of IE into its component families, which for this article means Baltic, Slavonic, Greek, Latin/Romance and Germanic. The present article seeks to develop understanding of this topic. More specifically, I hypothesise that there has been a trend – starting over two thousand years ago in some cases, but only happening now in others, and not made at all in yet others– for IE terminologies in Europe to shift from a zero-equation pattern (i.e. with separate terms for most kin types) to a cognatic one (in Rodney Needham's sense of the term, i.e. involving a broad distinction between lineal and collateral relatives, but not among the latter in any generation).[1]

In 1998 I published a chapter in a volume devoted to the differences between the Dravidian and Iroquois variants of kinship terminology in many parts of the world and possible transformations between them.[2] While the Dravidian type has been well known from south India since the nineteenth century, and indeed takes its name from the language family

---

[1] We owe the term 'zero-equation' to N.J. Allen (e.g. 1989). Needham's term 'cognatic' is equivalent to Robert Lowie's 'lineal', but it expresses better the fact that Lowie's 'lineal' terminologies do not mark out descent lines the way his term suggests. The paradigm case is the English terminology, in which, although there are distinctions between lineal and lateral relatives, the latter are not further distinguished into patrilateral and matrilateral, nor into cross and parallel. Needham does use the term 'lineal' for certain types of terminology, basically those that do, by contrast, sort categories into descent lines, and therefore including what Needham calls 'prescriptive' terminologies or those expressing regular cross-cousin marriage, which typically do not have lineal equations between adjacent generations, as well as Crow-Omaha ones, which do (Needham disliked the term 'Crow-Omaha', NB). These uses are very different from Lowie's 'lineal' or Needham's 'cognatic'.

[2] By these terms, I am referring to the formal typology, not any actual Dravidian or Iroquois terminology. The distinction also corresponds to Trautmann and Barnes' Type A and Type B crossness (1998), which they prefer as avoiding ethnically specific labels for terminological patterns of wide cross-cultural relevance.

that predominates in this area (though similar terminologies are found worldwide), firm recognition that the Iroquois type was different had to await a study by Floyd Lounsbury in 1964 (1964a) showing that the cross-parallel distinction worked differently in such cases for kin beyond first-cousin range. My own chapter in that volume (Parkin 1998) identified an Iroquois-type terminology in South Asia (the non-IE Burusho terminology of northern Pakistan). However, my chapter also went on to describe certain features of the very different kinship terminology of Hindi, an IE language of north India, pointing out its tendency to have a separate term for each kin type, a pattern that has been described as 'zero equation' (Allen 1989), though it is also represented by Murdock's 'Sudanese' (1949: 224, 238-9). Much more recently (2012), I have suggested that zero-equation terminologies are likely to emerge from bifurcate collateral ones: for example, in the +1 pattern for male referents, $F \neq FB = MZH$[3] becomes $F \neq FB \neq MZH$, and $MB = FZH$ becomes $MB \neq FZH$. In fact, in principle any terminology with characteristic equations (prescriptive, bifurcate merging, bifurcate collateral, Crow-Omaha) might break down those equations to produce a zero-equation pattern, whether through separate terms or relative product-type phrases (i.e. descriptive phrases). Many African terminologies have this kind of pattern, as does Arabic. However, it is not claimed that the pattern necessarily occurs throughout a terminology, and indeed the Hindi terminology is only partially of this type.

Nonetheless, very broadly speaking we have zero-equation terminologies, at least partially, in the east of the IE speech area and cognatic ones in the west, with intermediate or mixed patterns in between. Since this is a single language family with a substantially common linguistic inheritance, it is reasonable to assume that changes have taken place historically that can mostly be contained within that inheritance, that is, they involve little or no borrowing from non-IE language families. It is the aim of this article to try and trace at least some of these changes, without seeking to account for them linguistically or sociologically apart from some very brief comments where relevant.

To return to the second of my articles just mentioned (Parkin 2012), this is a general theoretical article setting out the most likely trends in changes in kinship terminologies, though, barring the occasional brief comment, it presents typological sequences rather than strictly historical ones. It argues inter alia that, while zero-equation terminologies by

---

[3] Abbreviations for kin types are as follows: F father, M mother, P parent, B brother, Z sister, G sibling, H husband, W wife, E spouse, S son, D daughter, C child. Senior generations to ego's are marked with a plus sign, junior ones with a minus sign; the accompanying numbers increase with longitudinal distance: thus +2 is the grandparents' generation, -3 that of ego's great-grandchildren. Occasionally I also use ms or 'man speaking' (term used by males) and ws or 'woman speaking' (term used by females).

definition lack terminological equations between kin types or only have a few of them, terminologies affected by this principle would have to reintroduce equations in changing to a cognatic terminology. What was lacking at the time of writing the earlier article on Burusho and Hindi (Parkin 1998) was hard evidence of this happening: Hindi is related linguistically to other Indo-European languages in Europe, but there was no obvious way of tracing the change from the Hindi zero-equation kinship terminology to a cognatic terminology like English in the absence of intermediate patterns. This situation has now changed following a closer examination of the varying patterns of IE terminologies in modern Europe. Sources for this exercise include dictionaries, though these rarely give enough detail on their own, and, where available, previous studies of kin terms in languages such as Greek, French and Catalan.[4] However, in the case of the Slavonic and Baltic branches especially, but also Norwegian, I have also drawn on oral communications from a number of students and colleagues who are mother-tongue speakers of some of these languages, as well as my own field enquiries some years ago in Poland (see Parkin 1995).[5] While this informant base is, of course, extremely small, and while many of the written sources have limitations of their own, I am confident I have enough material to make a reasonably sound assessment of the variations in these terminological patterns and possible pathways of change between them.

**Lexical universalism/evolutionism**

An important inspiration for this and other such studies is the work of the so-called 'lexical universalists', especially the famous and at times controversial study of the growth of colour terminologies by Brent Berlin and Paul Kay (1969). The major claim in this approach is that, largely but not entirely, the order in which certain colour terms emerge historically can be predicted. Thus, starting with terms for white, black and red – the latter the only so-called 'hue' colour in this initial paradigm – either yellow or 'grue' (green/blue) emerges next as a separate term, then the other one of this pair, then 'grue' separates into green and blue, and so on. As a result, as Allen has pointed out (1984), this makes these scholars 'lexical evolutionists' as much as 'lexical universalists'. The methods they use are based on a scrutiny

---

[4] Where I am silent about sources, the reader should assume that I have used dictionaries for want of anything more appropriate.

[5] Specifically, I am grateful to the following, who are all mother-tongue speakers of the languages that follow their names (listed in order of appearance in the article): Rasa Račiūnaitė-Paužuolienė for Lithuanian; Ieva Raubisko for Latvian; Ana Ranitović for Serbian; Yulia Savikovskaya for Russian; Ina Zharkevitch for Russian and Bielorussian; Iliyana Angelova for Bulgarian; Johana Musalkova for Czech; and Rosa Krogh for Norwegian. At certain points in the text below their information is referenced using their initials and 'p.c.' for 'personal communication'.

of a large number of ethnographic texts drawn from around the world. The results are more a typological sequence than a truly verifiable historical one, but there are some exceptions where there is evidence for change, such as the introduction of English 'orange' from Arabic *naranja* (both fruit and colour), this possibly having been defined as a shade of yellow or red earlier. Regarding how colour categories change, Edwin Ardener showed how the Welsh colour terminology, once very different in its distribution of categories across the colour spectrum than the English one, has converged with the latter in modern times (1971: xxi).

Similar studies were made in the lexical universalist camp of how life-form terms emerge (Brown 1984) and on developmental sequences in kin categories (Witowski, his unpublished thesis, 1971, but also 1972). In the case of life-form terms, thanks to the biological sciences, the inventory of terms is constantly and apparently endlessly expanding as more and more discoveries are made. The same might be said of colour terms, expansion of separate terms for different shades only being limited by the imagination of paint manufacturers and their marketing specialists. However, these are now shades rather than colours: another of Berlin and Kay's observations is that certain colours – primarily those that emerge as separate at the earlier stages of the sequence – can be considered 'focal' because they reflect more directly the physiology of the eye, implying that terminological expansion cannot go on indefinitely in the case of colour terms.

This is even more the case with kin terms, as the number of theoretically discriminable kin types is limited by the facts of kinship, and so, therefore, are the paradigms into which kin terms can be ordered by equating or distinguishing kin types in different ways. For example, there are only so many ways of ordering terms for +1 male kin (F = FB = MB; F ≠ FB ≠ MB; F = FB ≠ MB; F ≠ FB = MB), and not all of those are found, or likely to be found, in reality (in this example, F = MB ≠ FB). We therefore already have a limit on variation within this particular semantic domain, i.e. kinship terminologies. One more point to be made here, following Witowski, is that the presence of a particular pattern in one part of a terminology may imply its presence in another part, but not vice versa. For example, Hawaiianization is often present in ego's generational level but not the +1 level. Its presence in +1 thus normally suggests it will be present in ego's level as well, but not necessarily vice versa. Similarly, prescriptive equations expressing the operation of repeated cross-cousin marriage suggests cross/parallel distinctions but not vice versa, given the appearance of the latter in non-prescriptive Iroquois and Crow-Omaha terminologies as well. This principle can therefore be used to explain and even predict terminological change, much as Berlin and Kay argued for

colour terms. Finding historical evidence for change, however, is less easy, and is the real challenge for work in this area.[6]

I now turn to discuss separately the situation in each branch of Indo-European languages in Europe apart from Celtic and Albanian, for which I have no or insufficient data.[7]

**Baltic**

A study trip I made to Latvia and Lithuania in the spring of 2013 indicated that the Latvian and Lithuanian terminologies may represent a kind of missing link, both typologically and historically, between IE languages of India like Hindi and the European branches of IE. Lexically the links between them are recognized to be close, though in fact many of them are reflexes of Proto-IE. As already indicated, however, systemically there is more of an affinity. In particular, the patterns of the historical Lithuanian and possibly also Latvian terminologies have a close though not identical similarity to Hindi, while the present-day terminologies in these two languages appear to be undergoing or to have undergone developments similar to those already made centuries ago by West Germanic (English, Dutch, German) and Romance (French, Italian, Catalan, Spanish, Portuguese). In this sense they are changing in parallel with North Germanic or Scandinavian languages (Swedish, Norwegian, Danish, Icelandic), though there are also differences between the latter and the Baltic group.

The Baltic languages of interest here are Lithuanian, Latvian and Old Prussian, the latter no longer a living language. Published sources for Lithuanian are primarily Buivydienė 1997 (in Lithuanian, but with an English summary),[8] and for Old Prussian Mažiulis 1988 etc., but for Latvian I have had to rely on dictionaries and personal enquiries. Mažiulis provides some cognates of common Baltic terms and etymologies, but nothing of structural significance except for a now redundant Latvian term (see below). There are frequent lexical similarities with Slavonic languages, representing direct loans in some cases, but indicating a common

---

[6] Kryukov (1998) has usefully listed the types of evidence one might have to resort to in order to assess whether terminological changes have actually taken place. I return to these and related issues, more from the point of view of marriage systems, in another paper (Parkin forthcoming).

[7] In this article I am more concerned with changes in terminological patterns than with exact transcriptions of the terms themselves in relation to Greek and Slavonic languages using Cyrillic, where I have generally followed my main sources in this regard. I have included diacritics elsewhere, however, including for Proto-Indo-European forms (in the latter case, ḥ and ṛ have been used for h and r with subscript circles, as the proper characters are not in Unicode). Also, while I do list and cite the necessary sources, I do not give an exact reference for every detail of what is inevitably a series of quite dense descriptions of words and their meanings. As already noted, some data come from checking in dictionaries, which are rarely anthropologically aware and usually need supplementary information from native informants; I have not given details of these works. As is conventional in linguistics, an asterix indicates unattested reconstructions or hypothetical forms.

[8] This work also comments usefully on terms in other IE languages in Europe.

heritage in others, reflecting the hypothesis that both branches formed a single branch of IE in the past.

We start with **Lithuanian**, which has clearly become increasingly cognatic over time, historically being more zero equation in pattern. PP terms now are *senelis* PF, *senelė* PM (from a root for 'old'; cf. Latin), though formerly the latter appeared as *močiutė*.[9] Note also *prosenelis* PPF, *prosenelė, promočiutė* PPM, *proprosenelis* PPPF, *propromočiutė* PPPM. Descending reciprocals include *dukraitė* or *vaikaitė* CD, but *vaikaitis* or a loan from Slavonic, *anūkas*, are used for CS. The latter reappears in both male and female forms in -3: *proanūkas* for CCS, *proanūkė* for CCD, with *provaikaitis* and *provaikaitė* as alternatives respectively. Collaterals in +2 include *dėdė* PPB (also 'uncle'; very similar to forms in Russian). The prefix *pro-* is clearly cognate with *pra-* etc. in Polish and other Slavonic languages.

In +1 *tėvas* is F, *motina* or *móčia* M. FB and MB are both now *dėdė* (cf. PPB above), though MB was formerly *avynas*, MBW *avà, avýnienė*.[10] Terms for PZ also seem to have changed: today both FZ and MZ are *teta* (cf. PPZ, above) or *dėdienė* (grammatically a feminine form of *dėdė*), but in the past FZ was *dėdina*, MZ *móša* (cf. Hindi *mausī*). The resemblance of *dėdė* and *teta* to old Russian forms (see Friedrich 1964) indicates that the PG area of the Lithuanian terminology may have become cognatic through their borrowing. Also recorded historically are *tet(ul)ėnas* PZH and *dėdienė* PBW.[11] In -1 *sūnus* is S, *duktė* D. There seems to have been a similar re-sorting of GC terms as of PG terms: today GS is *sūnėnas*, GD *dukterėčia*, obviously derived from the terms for S and D. However, formerly there were four terms, *brolėnas* or *brolaitis* BS, *brolaitė* BD, *seserėnas* ZS and *seserėčia* ZD, the two pairs derived from the terms for B and Z respectively. *Seserėnas* and *seserėčia* are also given as PGC, the only cousin terms recorded apart from *tetulėnas* (lit. 'aunt's children'; but cf. the PZH term above). Thus these areas of the Lithuanian terminology have clearly moved from a zero-equation or bifurcate collateral pattern to a cognatic one.

There are similar derivations for HBS, *dieverėnas* or *dieveráitis*, and HBD, *dieverėčia*; and WGS, *svainėnas*, WGD, *svainienė*, derived respectively from a now redundant *dieveris* HB and a still current *sváinė* WZ. SW is *marti*, DH *žéntas*, terms also formerly covering BW, ZH respectively, i.e. they link the adjacent 0 and -1 generations (a feature also widely found

---

[9] Mallory and Adams (2006: 216) give *senmotė* as PM, from PIE *$seno\text{-}meh_at\acute{e}r$, suggesting 'old mother'.

[10] Mallory and Adams (2006: 214) give Old Lithuanian *strūjus* FB, clearly reminiscent of Slavonic forms, though it is a regular development of PIE *$ph_atr\bar{o}us$, and therefore cognate with Latin *patruus*.

[11] In fact *-ėnas* (masc.) and *–ienė* (fem.) can be used to indicate the spouses of consanguines in general, e.g. *anūkienė* CSW.

in IE languages in India, NB). In +1, terms for EP are also undergoing a change similar to that in the consanguineal +1 terminology: EF is now *úošvis*, EM *úošvė*, though formerly these were WP terms only, HF being *šešuras*, HM *anýta*. The only terms recorded for CEP categories are *svōtas* CEF and *svočià* CEM, dialect words from the east and south Aukstaičiai regions of Lithuania, and very similar to Slavonic forms.

In ego's level, B is *brolis*, Z *sesuo*, W *motė*, *žmonà* or *pati*, H *výras* (also redundant *diedynas, pats*). The affinal terminology of ego's level again shows a change from a zero-equation pattern to a cognatic one. Formerly there were separate terms for all specifications, but many have now become obsolete. Apart from *brólienė*, all those that follow immediately have now fallen out of use in the meanings given, if not absolutely: *marti* (cf. SW, above) or *brólienė* BW; *žéntas*, ZH (cf. DH, above); *láigonas* WB; *láigonienė* WBW; *dieveris* HB; *jentė* HBW; *móša* HZ (cf. MZ, above); and *mošénas* HZH. Now the terms originally confined to WZ, *sváinė*, and WZH, *sváinis*, are used for all these specifications, according to gender.[12]

The affinal terminology in ego's level in Lithuanian thus indicates a historical pattern similar to present-day Hindi etc., with separate terms for each kin type in this field. Subsequently there has been a change to just two of these terms being used for all these kin types, according to gender. As Buivydienė points out, this means that descriptive terms now have to be used to specify these kin types more precisely. In fact, most of the terminology has made similar changes, making Lithuanian a link (at least typologically) between Indic languages and IE languages in Europe, as well as between the zero-equation and cognatic patterns.

The **Latvian** KT appears to represent an intermediate position between these two patterns, as very many kin types, especially for consanguines, are designated by compound terms based on the primary set one would find in the nuclear family: *tēvs* F, *mate* M, *brālis* B, *māsa* Z, *vīrs* H, *sieva* W, *dēls* S, *meita* D. In +2 PP terms are generally *vectēvs* PF, *vecāmāte* PM, combining parent terms with *vecs* 'old'; similarly, -2 terms are *mazdēls* CS, *mazmeita* CD, incorporating *maz* 'little' (also *mazberns* CC). However, compounds are recorded alongside these in some cases, e.g. *meitadēls* DS, but not **dēlsdēls* SS. In +1, PG terms are compounds, apart from *tēvocis* alongside *tēvabrālis* for FB. However, the term *krusttēvs*,

---

[12] Buivydienė also gives *žaláusis* as WZ (also *žila ausis*, R.R.-P.), used in Lithuanian-speaking communities in western Belarus and derived from Bielorussian (R.R.-P.). As for the origin of the contemporary terms *sváinė* and *sváinis*. Buivydienė gives a number of historical terms for ego's-level affines in *sv-*, indicating a Slavonic origin for this group. These changes were already underway by the 17th and 18th centuries, when *sváinis* is recorded as a synonym of *žéntas* ZH. The contemporary terms are linked to a root meaning 'own'; cf. Polish *swoje*.

literally 'cross-father' or 'step-father', does not mean FB or 'uncle' in the modern language.[13] In addition, the loan term *onkulis* (a loan ultimately from French *oncle*, perhaps introduced via German *Onkel*) is now being used for PB and PZH. Similarly *tante* has evidently been borrowed from French or German for PZ, PBW, alongside traditional compounds. Conversely, no terms corresponding lexically to 'nephew', 'niece' or 'cousin' have been borrowed: the former two are essentially covered by modified compound terms, while cousin terms are similarly derived from those for siblings, according to gender, viz. *brālens* PGS and *māsīca* PGD. In the -1 affinal field, SW is *vedekla*, DH *znots* (cf. Lith. *žéntas*) alongside the compound *meitasvīrs*. Only compounds are recorded for EP terms.

As in contemporary Lithuanian, just two terms cover the affinal field in ego's level, according to gender, namely *svainis* (masc.) and *svaine* (fem.).[14] Compound terms are also recorded in this area, but assuming the terminology has evolved in a similar way to Lithuanian, these would appear to have followed, not preceded, the reduction to just two primary terms in this field, being used genealogically to specify relationships more precisely rather than as primary terms in their own right; they thus resemble the descriptive phrases mentioned by Buivydienė for Lithuanian. In Lithuanian, the process has clearly gone from i) a zero-equation pattern consisting of primary terms for each kin type, to ii) a concentration of all these kin types on two gendered terms, to iii) compounding as a reaction to ii), adopted in order to describe relationships more clearly as a subsidiary feature (genealogical rather than categorical). It is at least likely that Latvian has undergone similar changes, and indeed Buivydienė records some obsolete zero equation-type terms for that language too, viz. *ietere* HBW (cf. Lith. *jentė*), *dievelis*, *dievainis* HB, *dievainītis*, 'das Schwägerlein', *dieverene* HBD.[15] Similarly, Mažiulis gives *mārša* as BW in Latvian (cf. Lithuanian *marti*, above). Finally, Buivydienė also records older Latvian *māsēns* MZS, from *māsa*, MZ (cf. older Lithuanian *moša*, above; cf. Hindi *mausī*).

However, In Latvian there has been another process in other parts of the terminology (especially for consanguines), of compounds becoming separate words in their own right. This resembles the opposite direction of change, one that can be identified for Scandinavian and indeed Germanic generally, namely that composite terms for collaterals precede rather

---

[13] Indeed, no term in *krust-* means anything but 'step-' in modern Latvian, although it regularly appears for collateral kin in dictionaries (I.R. p.c.).

[14] Again they can be linked to roots meaning 'own', e.g. *savinieks* 'one who belongs, relative', possibly also represented in English 'swain'.

[15] On the latter, see the explanation in note 11 for Lithuanian. Buivydienė (1997) speculates that these and cognate terms may derive from *dev* 'god, etc.

than succeed the introduction of primary terms – usually through borrowing, e.g. of *onkel* and *tante* – arranged in a cognatic pattern. In Latvian but apparently not Lithuanian, this latter process is represented by the contemporary introduction of the loans *onkulis* and *tante* for PG specifications to replace earlier compounds for this part of the terminology. The Latvian process could therefore have been similar to Lithuanian as regards ego's-level affines, but was reversed in other parts of the terminology such as the PG field.

**Slavonic KT**

As in the case of the Baltic branch of IE, terminologies in Slavonic languages are generally intermediate between zero equation forms and the cognatic pattern. However, there is considerable variation in this interesting group, examination of which demonstrates some of the changes I argue are taking place.

Some years ago I published an article on changes in **Polish** KT (1995), which I shall use as a default in discussing other Slavonic terminologies here. I start with Serbo-Croat, for which Hammel 1968 is the leading published source. Since the break-up of Yugoslavia, what was formerly Serbo-Croat has become divided into separate Serbian, Croatian and Bosnian national languages for political reasons, though linguistically they remain essentially dialects of the same language. Any important variants will be noted as we proceed, but I shall continue to use the term 'Serbo-Croat' where data apply to both these languages, with or without Bosnian.

In fact, most of the Serbo-Croat terms are recognizably Slavonic and clearly cognate with Polish. In the main I shall only mention instances where the two terminologies diverge. In Serbo-Croat the prefix *pra-* is not reduplicated for +/-4 levels and beyond, as it is in Polish, but restricted to +/-2 and +/-3; *čukun-* is used for +/-4. The PGE field is a little different from Polish, though lexically some terms are similar: thus *tetka* is FZ and MZ, *teča* PZH, while *stric, strina* mean FB, FBW, *ujak, ujna* MB, MBW. By contrast, the pattern in Polish was formerly *stryj* FB, FZH, *stryjna* FZ, FBW; *wuj*, MB, MZH, *ciotka* MZ, MBW, though there was also evidence of the last two terms taking over the whole field in a cognatic pattern. In Serbo-Croat this is so far only happening for *tetka*, now effectively meaning 'aunt' (consanguineal only, though, not affinal).[16] Polish *teść* EF and *teściowa* EM are represented in Serbian as *tast, tašta*, but only as WP; HF, HM are respectively *svekar, svekrva*, clearly from Germanic, though via which route is unclear.

---

[16] Barić's report (1967: 11) from western Croatia that *stric* is being extended to cover MB as well as FB is not confirmed by other sources, including A.R., p.c.

Cousin terms, in both ego's level and +1, are essentially descriptive in a manner similar but not identical to Polish. However, affinal terms in ego's level are quite different. Whereas in Polish there is a tendency to consolidate this field around just two gender-differentiated terms borrowed probably from German, namely *szwagier* and *szwagierka*, Serbian retains separate terms for most referents in this field, viz.: *zaova* HZ, *svastika* or *svastica* WZ, *d(j)ever* HB, *šurak* WB, *zet* ZH (also DH; also HZH in Hammel; cf. Polish *zięć*, DH only), *snaha* or *snaja* BW, SW (Polish *bratowa, synowa* respectively) and *jetrva* HBW. A Turkish loan, *pašenog*, is used for WZH, probably related to *pašanac*, an alternative term for BW, SW, though Buivydiene (1997: 180) gives *svak* for WZH. There are also separate terms for CEP, namely *prijatelj* CEF (also 'friend') and *prija* CEM (in Polish these are *szwagier* and *szwagierka*).[17]

Apart from the inter-generational mergers of BW and SW, and of ZH and DH, Serbo-Croat does not diverge very much from Polish in -1 or -2. *Svastić* WZS and *svastićina* WZD are recorded, clearly based on *svastica* WZ. Hammel (1968: 27) gives *bratanac* as BS ws, the ms term being *sinovac*, this relative-sex pattern, which is very unusual in a European language, also applying to BD (*bratanica* ws vs. *sinovica* ms). Also odd is the fact that, while the former term is based on *brat*, B, the latter is based on *sin*, 'son'. Hammel attributes the relative-sex feature here to the fact that, in the traditional *zadruga* or extended family, BC would have been co-resident, ZC not. ZS and ZD are therefore respectively *sestrić, sestričina*, i.e. display an absolute-sex pattern in both Serbian and Croatian. Apart from the relative-sex terms above, this pattern is very like Polish, and even Hammel adds the information (1968: 29 n. 24) that 'in urban Serbia, the term *sinovac* is losing currency'. However, alongside these divided terms Hammel (ibid.) also lists combined terms for nephew and niece, respectively *nećak* and *nećakinja*, although, writing in the 1960s, he says they are heard 'more rarely and usually among more educated persons; they are sometimes regarded as affected'. Further, he says that, 'In Kotor, with its heavy Italian influence, one hears *neput* and *neputa*, nephew and niece'. These last two pieces of information indicate that is some areas the GC part of the Serbo-Croat terminology has a cognatic pattern either alongside or in

---

[17] Information on Serbian in this paragraph from A.R., p.c., unless otherwise stated. According to Hammel (1968: 27-8), *snaja* were women not senior to ego married into the *zadruga* or extended family cooperating economically, while *jetrva* is the term they used for one another (i.e. HBW). As for the terms for WZH, Hammel confirms that these are Turkish loans, namely *pašenog* or *pašanac* in Serbian, or *badžanak* in Bosnia and western Macedonia, the latter probably being borrowed in the fourteenth century or later, *pašanac* 'very early' (1968: 30 n. 26, after Filipović). Hammel (ibid., n. 25) also mentions *svak* as 'an occasional term' for HZH, as well as *svojak* as a possibly literary term for 'relative', but also meaning WZH, ZH ws, and derived from *svoj*, 'own' (cf. Polish *swoje*).

place of an older zero-equation pattern, the latter being strongly represented in the terminology more generally.[18]

There is also considerable zero-equation patterning in the **Bulgarian** terminology, though we start with its cognatic aspects. *Dyado* and *baba* are respectively PF and PM, circumlocutions being resorted to in order to specify side (*po bashtina linia,* 'from the father's side'; *po maichina linia,* 'from the mother's side'). The familiar *pra-* prefix is added to these terms for +3 kin, and to uncle and aunt terms to provide the terms for great-uncle and great-aunt. The standard Slavonic roots *vnuk, vnuchka* are used for CS, CD. Great-niblings may use the term for -1 niblings, *plemennik* GS, *plemennichka* or *plemennitsa* GD (also in Russian, from which they might have been borrowed), though this is not entirely clear.

F is *bashta*, there being no reflex of Polish *ojciec* etc. here; M is *maika*. PZ is *lelya*, but the PB field is split between *chicho* FB and *vuycho* MB, the latter recalling Polish *wuj* etc. Both aunt's husbands are *svako*, reflecting the situation for 'aunt', but the split between FB and MB is replicated with their wives, MBW being *vuyna* (clearly related to *vuycho*), FBW *strinka*, clearly related to Polish *stryj* FB, *stryj(e)nka* FBW, FZ, etc. WP have separate terms from HP, viz. *tast, tashta,* vs. *svekar, svekarva* (cf. Serbo-Croat).

The standard Slavonic roots for siblings occur, viz. *brat* B, *sestra* Z. Male cousin is *bratovched*, female cousin is *bratovchedka*, with the circumlocutions given above for side of family being added where necessary. H and W are *saprug, sapruga* respectively, though *maj*, literally 'man', and *jena*, literally 'woman' may be used as well. Sibling-in-law kin types mostly have individual terms, with familiar equations with -1 referents. Thus *snaha* is BW and SW, as well as being one possible term for HZ; *zet* is ZH and DH, as well as HZH. WB is *shurei*, WBW *shurenaika*, WZ *baldàza*, WZH *badjanak*. HB is *dever*, a familiar IE root for

---

18 Here I offer a few remarks on marriage options in traditional Serbia, based on Hammel (1968: 31ff.). Agnatic relations were avoided far more in marriage than matrilateral relations, which were especially pursued by Muslims, despite approval of FBD marriage, which hardly occurs here. Hammel also reports the practices of brideprice, levirate and sororate in the past, the rationale for the levirate being the 'preservation and accumulation of land' (1968: 33), as well as privileged though canonically sinful sexual relations with brothers' wives and sons' wives on the part of co-resident men within the *zadruga*. Although sister exchange was disliked, it did occasionally occur, according to Hammel, having formerly been 'long common among Bosnian Roman Catholics [i.e. Catholic Croats in Bosnia?] and is now found among Serbs as well', while 'Coon (1950) notes preferential direct exchange in Albania' (Hammel ibid.: 35). However, Hammel reported unilateral marriages between a group of brothers and a group of sisters or between two agnatically related male cousins and two agnatically related female cousins (NB: not marriage between individuals who are themselves cousins). Hammel attributes these details to the fact that 'peasants think of families and even wider agnatic groups as playing unitary roles in marriage and sexual relationships [and] that there is some sense of corporacy and substitutability in the exercise of the roles...', though also 'a tendency toward unilaterality and a distaste for direct exchange' (ibid.). The intensity of intermarriages between groups of siblings is found in other parts of the world, but it is rarely reported in Europe.

this kin type, HBW *etarva* (cf. Russian *jatrov*, Serbian *jetrva)*. As well as *snaha* for HZ, this kin type is also *zalva* (cf. Serbian *zaova)*. The only remaining -1 terms to note are *sin* S and *dashterya* D, both common Slavonic roots. Thus Bulgarian too retains some zero equation features in key parts of its terminology, with some cognatic features in the PG field.

The main published source for **Russian** is Friedrich (1964), who considers both history and the present-day terminology. While he does not do much to identify possibly obsolete kin terms, he does state: 'By 1700, Russian terms for the avuncular and nepotic relationships were no longer bifurcate collateral and the kinship system had become technically lineal [sc. cognatic], lumping the parents' brothers together as against the father, and so forth' (ibid.: 141). As far as the latter are concerned, Friedrich was anticipated by P.A. Lavrovski, a nineteenth-century Russian philologist, who not only identified such changes but traced them back even further, to the twelfth to fourteenth centuries. Earlier, terms for uncle distinguished FB as *stryi* or *stroi* from MB as *(w)ui*, before giving way to *dyadya* for both, coupled with *tyotka* for FZ and MZ, the latter attested as far back as 1178, possibly as a loan from Polish (Kryukov 1998: 301, who adds FBW and MBW to the specifications). Lavrovski saw this as constituting a simplification of the terminology consonant with the shift away from collective forms of social organization (the 'clan') to the nuclear family.[19]

Friedrich also mentions that BS and BD (*bratánich, bratánna*, from an older *bratán* B) were formerly distinguished from ZC (ZD term not given, but ZS is *sestrich*, from *sestra* Z),[20] though both are now *plemjannik/-itsa*. It is clear from the table he gives (p. 140) that the present-day terminology is entirely cognatic as far as consanguines are concerned: grandparents,[21] uncles, aunts, nephews and nieces are now distinguished by gender but not side, *pra-* (cf. Polish) is used as a marker for more distant lineals (ascending and descending), and cousin terms are descriptive ones based on *brat* and *sestra* in a similar fashion to other Slavonic languages, though, possibly under French influence, *kusin, kusina*, though rare, can be found as far back as the nineteenth century (Y.S., p.c.). Otherwise first cousins are literally

---

[19] Not having access to Lavrovski's original, nor being able to read Russian, I am relying here on Kryukov's summary (1998: 295-6). However, Kryukov appears to have switched the meanings of the two pairs of terms *stryi, stroi*, and *wui, ui*, giving them respectively as MB and FB, whereas, where they do appear elsewhere (e.g. Polish, Serbo-Croat, and vestigially Bulgarian), the meanings are reversed. My suspicion of error here is supported by the information that *stryi* is derived from PIE *\*pḫₐtrōus*, making it cognate with *patruus*, the Latin term for FB (Mallory and Adams 2006: 214; see also n. 10 above). Also, Buivydienė (1997: 162) gives *yŭ* as MB in older Russian. In pointing out this apparent mistake I am, of course, mindful that Kryukov is himself a Russian speaker.

[20] These terms are now apparently redundant, except that *bratán* still exists as a very informal word for male friend, e.g. 'mate' (YS, p.c.).

[21] Friedrich's *baba* for PM is now said to be rather disparaging, *dadushka* being more acceptable (Y.S., p.c.).

'second brothers/sisters', second cousins 'third brothers/sisters', etc. (ibid.). Alongside *djádja* PB, PZH, in the north one found *djadina* PBW,[22] though this is also *tjótja*, otherwise PZ (pp. 144-5). The PB term seems to be based on *ded*, PF. As we have seen, cognates of Polish *stryj* FB, *wuj* MB, are not found here at the present day, but Buivydienė (1997: 162) gives *yŭ* as MB in earlier Russian, indicating a past bifurcation of MB and FB.

The affinal terms listed by Friedrich (p. 144) have a more zero-equation pattern, at least in part. Though he does not make it clear whether these terms represent present-day or historical usage, merely saying that 'the affinal terminology has been collated from the available documents' rather than fieldwork, this same pattern is indicated by more contemporary data (Y.S., p.c.). In Friedrich's account, HP (*svjókor, svekróv*) are distinguished from WP (*test', tjóshcha*), as in Serbo-Croat but not in Polish, where cognates of the latter pair stand for all EP. In ego's level, HZ, WB and WZ all have separate terms (respectively *zolóvka, shúrin or shur'já*,[23] and *svojáchenitsa* or in dialect *sves'*). BW has a separate term *bratanikha*, but can also be *nevéstka*, a term also meaning SW (ws), HBW. A third term for BW, *játrov'*, is also EBW, though it is apparently the preferred term for HBW, in preference to WBW, and indeed had that meaning solely before about 1700 (Friedrich ibid.: 163 n. 10). However, more recent information (Y.S., p.c.) does not recognize *bratanikha* or *játrov'*, WBW in this paradigm being *nevéstka*. Both sources have *snokhá* as SW (ms); thus Russian has one example of a relative-sex pair, unusual for IE, though Friedrich also adds (ibid.: 155), first that a woman's HM might use it of her too in some districts (i.e. it is ws too), and secondly that an absolute-sex term, *synóvka*, also exists or existed (cf. Polish). For Friedrich, DH is covered by *zjat'* or *zja'já* only, which also means ZH and HZH. However, there is an alternative term for the latter pair, *svójak*, also meaning WZH predominantly (only WZH for Y.S. p.c.). HZH is evidently also a subsidiary meaning of *déver'* or *dever'já* (cf. Hindi), otherwise HB. *Svat* or *svatov'já* and *svát'ja* complete this field as CEF, CEM. Again, more recent information (Y.S., p.c.) did not recognize some of these terms as current, namely *zja'já, dever'já* and *svatov'já*. However, deleting these unrecognized terms mainly means simply removing alternative vocabulary from Friedrich's list and does nothing in itself to dilute the zero-equation pattern of this part of the Russian terminology.

Nonetheless the recent changes in usage (i.e. 1960s or earlier) that Friedrich discusses briefly in a footnote (ibid.: 164, n. 11) indicate that there may have been some reduction of

---

[22] Not recognized as current by Y.S., p.c.

[23] Latter term not recognized as current by Y.S., p.c.

terms: 'By 1963 most young, urban Russians…had forgotten the specific meanings of *svat, svát'ja*, had altogether lost *játrov'*, were using *svoják* for most close male affines, were using purely descriptive terms for all siblings-in-law, and were limiting the reference of *zjat'* and *nevéstka* to children-in-law.' Taken together with the information above, this suggests that terms for female affines of ego's generation seem to have been less affected; but nonetheless this suggests a tendency to simplify this area of the terminology by moving towards more global terms, backed up by the use of descriptive terms and phrases when a relationship needs to be specified more narrowly, even if the process has been less complete here than in other cases. There are indications that this situation has been perpetuated into the following generations – that is, that descriptive terms are beginning to replace primary ones in this field – possibly alongside many of these older terms, which at present are also surviving (I.Z., p.c.; Y.S., p.c.).

One other contemporary change in Russian is the gradual abandonment of *otets* for F, *mat'* for M, *ded* for PF and *baba* for PM, all now being seen as excessively formal and even derogatory. Instead, what were originally the more affectionate address terms are becoming standard, i.e. respectively *papa, mama, dedushka, babushka* Y.S., p.c.).

**Bielorussian**, unsurprisingly, has a closely similar terminology to Russian in both structure and vocabulary. Although like Russian Bielorussian has no cognate of Polish *stryj* FB, unlike Russian it does retain *stryechny brat, stryechnaya siastra* for FBS, FBD; reflexes of Polish *wuj* are also lacking, however. While terms for HB and HZ are recognizably similar to those in Russian, the terms for WB and WZ are respectively *shvager* and *shvagerka* or *svayachka*, recalling Polish forms but presumably originally from German *Schwager* etc.

Both Hammel (for Yugoslavia) and Friedrich (for Russia) suggest that the changes from zero-equation to cognatic reflect in part the decline and/or disappearance in these regions of traditional extended families like the Yugoslav *zadruga*, with concomitant modern changes like the collectivization of agriculture and urbanization in these socialist societies (though potentially they apply to other sorts of society too). Thus a social system based on exogamous patrilineal extended families linked by marriage may well encourage co-resident paternal uncles to be terminologically distinguished from maternal uncles residing elsewhere. However, this becomes much less necessary with a shift to an urban environment based on the nuclear family having neither as resident, whereby both kin types eventually fall into the same category of 'uncle'. One consequence of this is the progressive reduction in the circle of people recognized, or simply inter-acted with, as kin in modern conditions. The process from zero-equation to cognatic terminologies certainly requires the deletion of terms from the

terminology. This goes against the usual assumption that classifications expand in size and complexity rather than decrease, though, to return for a moment to the lexical universalists, we do have reduction in the example of the loss of terms for flora and fauna in urban conditions that are more divorced from everyday contact with nature (cf. Brown 1984).

The **Czech** terminology has many similarities to Polish, both lexically and systemically, but it is more definitely cognatic in form than any other terminology discussed thus far in the article. Interestingly PB is *strýc*, PZ *teta*, comparable to Polish *stryj, ciotka*, but without any cognate of Polish *stryjna* (FBW, FZ), *wuj* (MB, MZH) or *wujna* (MBW). WP = HP, the prefix *pra-*, usually reserved elsewhere for the remoter than +2, -2 generations, being added to these two terms for CEF, CEM (*pratchán, pratchyné*). Cousin terms are non-descriptive, unlike in other Slavonic, but they resemble the GC area of the latter in using terms based on *bratr* B and *sestra* Z, namely *bratanec* and *sestřenice* (cf. Polish *bratanek* BS, *siostrzenica* ZD). The term for H, *manžel*, recalls Polish *mąż*, but W is preferably a derived form, *manželka*, though *žena* 'woman' can also be used for this kin type (cf. Polish *żona*). Affines in ego's level all have a single term, depending on gender: male *švagr*, female *švagrová*, as in many cases with such words probably from German. BS = ZS (*synovec*; cf. Polish *synowa*, SW), BD = ZD (*neteř*). The cognatic nature of the Czech terminology may reflect the long and intense Germanization of Bohemia in particular, which, unlike the case of Polish, severely restricted the use of Czech in the region and nearly drove it out of existence. More generally, taking the Czech example into account indicates that the Slavonic branch of IE spans the full range from something resembling broadly the Hindi zero-equation form to the west European cognatic form.

**Ancient and Modern Greek**

This section describes changes in Greek kin terms from antiquity to the modern period, as well as within antiquity itself. Sources for antiquity are Hocart 1928, Miller 1953 and Szemerényi 1977; for the modern period, Andromedas 1957, Friedl 1962: 70ff., Herzfeld 1983 and Just 2000: Ch. 4.

We start with **Ancient Greek** terms. In +1 the terms given by Hocart are *patēr* F, *mētēr* M, *tēt(h)is* PZ (Szemerenyi: linked with *tethe* PM) and *mētrōs* MB, the latter Homeric according to Szemerényi. Mallory and Adams (2006: 216) state that this is the sole derivative in the daughter languages of PIE *$méh_a$trōus*. It can be compared with the alternative (?) PIE root *$meh_a$truh$_{a\sim}$*, yielding Gk *metruia*, 'step-mother'. The Homeric term for FB was *patrokasignētos*, later giving way to *patrádelphos* and *pátrōs*, the latter linked to Sk. *patṛvya*

according to Hocart. From the time of Euripides the term *theîos* appears for both MB and FB. According to Szemerényi, *theia* 'aunt' followed in the 1st cent. AD, presumably replacing *tēt(h)is*. In due course *theîos* and *theia* were borrowed by all the major western Romance languages except French and Romanian.

The term for 'brother' also changed in the ancient Greek period itself. Originally *phrātēr*, representing the standard IE root, this term came to be used for 'clan brother' alone in ancient times. Hocart says that it was first linked in a single phrase to *adelphos*, originally meaning 'of the same womb (*delphos*)', thus qualifying *phrātēr* as 'own brother'; later *phrātēr* dropped out of this expression, leaving *adelphos* alone with the changed meaning of 'brother' and yielding a feminine form, *adelphē*, as 'sister'. Szemerényi also gives *sor* for the latter, from IE *\*swesōr*. Hocart gives *kasignētos* and *kasignētai* as the Homeric terms for male and female cousins, though strictly they meant uterine siblings (cf. *patrokasignētos* FB, above; also FBS according to Wallis. Hocart mentions one other cousin term, *anepsiōs*, FBS and FZS in Herodotos, and even DH and ZH, as well as ZS; later it was transferred wholly to the -1 level as GS, its meaning in modern Greek. According to Mallory and Adams (2006: 211), this is a regular development of PIE *\*népōts*, with CS as the most likely reconstructed meaning.

Ancient Greek terms in -1 include *paîs* C, which Szemerényi derives from a root for 'small'. Hocart also lists *huiós* S (a regular development of PIE *\*suh$_x$nús*) and *thugatēr* D (Szemerényi *dugater*; Mycenean Greek *tukate*). Alongside *anepsiōs*, discussed above, Hocart also gives *adelphidéos* as nephew (ZS in Herodotos), while Wallis has *adelphide* for niece. Szemerényi gives *anepsia* as GD and says that it and *anepsiōs* mean 'cousin' in Ancient Greek, GC in modern Greek (see above).

Ancient Greek terms in +2 also changed within the period of antiquity, from composite terms to terms derived from baby-speak. Thus Homer gives *mētropátor* MF, as well as Pindaric *patropatōr* FF and *mētromētōr* MM; Hocart also mentions *patromētōr* FM as a later term. These gave way to *páppos* PF and *tēthē*, later *mámmē*, PM. In -2 *huiōnos* is CS (Szemerényi: possibly SS, because of derivation from *huiós*), but Hocart gives no term for CD. Szemerényi gives *annis* for PM as well as *tēthē*.

Affinal terms in Ancient Greek include *gambrós*, primarily DH but also ZH (Homer), EF, as well as WB according to Wallis. However, Miller and Wallis also give *pentheros* for WF,

ZH and DH,[24] indicating flux in this area. Other terms are *daēr* HB (linked to *dever* etc. in other IE languages), *gálōs* HZ (Wallis adds BW to this term), *aélioi* WZH, *núos* SW (from PIE *snusós*), *hekurós* EF (from PIE *swekuros*) and *hekurá* EM, the latter two apparently older than *pentheros*. Szemerenyi also gives *enater* HBW, presumably the same as the Homeric *einateres* recorded by Wallis.

Many of the above terms can be identified in those given by Andromedas for **Modern Greek**, i.e. *patéras* F, *mitéra* M, *adherfós* B, *adherfí* Z, *yos* S, *papús* PF, *thios* PB, *thia* PZ, *anepsyós* GS, *anepsyá* GD, and *ghambrós* DH, ZH (also 'groom'). New consanguineal terms in Modern Greek are *yáya* PM, *kóri* D, *pedhí* C, *ángonas* CS, *angóna* CD, *(e)xádherfos* PGS and *(e)xadhérfi* PGD. It is the affinal terms that show the greatest change lexically from ancient Greek: *nífi* SW, BW (also 'bride'), *batzanákis* WZH, *sinifádha* HBW (lit. 'co-bride'), *pentherós* EF, *pentherá* EM, *kunyádhos* EB, *kunyádha* EZ, *simpétheros* (CEF) and *simpethéra* (CEM). Herzfeld (n. 1) notes that in western Crete *kunyádhos* is also ZH, ZHB, *kunyádha* also BW, BWZ, while Andromedes points out that both terms were borrowed from Romance (cf. Iberian languages). Just (Ch. 4) does not discuss consanguineal terms very much, but gives a full set of affinal terms in agreement with Andromedas, though with variant spellings. He also adds the information that cousin terms extend to the spouses of cousins and the cousins of spouses, and that *simpétheros, simpethéra* are also used for CEG, GEB, GEP, GCEPG, i.e. any affine lacking a specific term listed above.

Andromedas also draws attention to the fact that some Greek terms are loans (1957: 1088). These include Ancient Greek *theíos* and *anepsiós* from unspecified non-IE languages, as well as the element *delphýs* 'womb' ('of uncertain origin') in *adelphós/-ē*. As just noted, *kunyádhos/-a* is from Iberian IE, and *yáya* also has (unspecified) Romance origins, while *batzanákis* is from Turkish.[25] None of these loans or the other changes identified through a comparison between ancient and modern Greek sources has much in the way of structural significance, and they mostly just represent vocabulary replacement over time. Modern cousin terms are clearly derived from sibling terms, almost indicating a Hawaiianization of ego's level, whereas in Ancient Greek they tended to be linked semantically with GC categories. In essence, though, the ascending part of the Greek terminology has been cognatic in type since the replacement of composite terms for +2 categories by baby terms and the

[24] Mallory and Adams (2006: 216) link this term with Indic *bandhu*, 'relative', especially affinal, from PIE *bhendṛros*.

[25] According to Just (2000: 109 n. 9), *kunyádhos* and *badzanakis* are not very familiar to young middle-class Greeks. In a passage more concerned with Turkish loans in Serbo-Croat, Hammel mentions *badzanakis, badzanakia* as Modern Greek terms for WZH and HBW respectively, both being of Turkish origin (1968: 30).

introduction of *theîos* for both MB and FB in the post-Homeric period; similarly, the GC area appears to have been cognatic throughout most of recorded history. However, the sibling-in-law part of the terminology retains a largely zero-equation pattern, despite lexical replacement, and despite the consolidation of EB and EZ through Romance loans.

## Latin and the Romance Languages

Sources for this branch include Wallis 1918, Hocart 1928,; Miranda 1974 on French; Iszaevich 1981 and Llobera 1997 on Catalan; and Callier-Boisvert 1968 on Portuguese.

The **Latin** terminology has been much studied, and it is recognized that it is far from having had a cognatic pattern. In +1, *pater* F and *patruus* FB are etymologically linked in opposition to *avunculus* MB ('little *avus'*), though without sharing terms exactly, i.e. without entirely being bifurcate merging. Similar remarks apply to *mater* M and *matertera* MZ in opposition to *amita* FZ. In ego's level, *frater germanus* B is distinguished from *frater patruelis* FBS (later just *patruelis* according to Hocart), *soror* Z from both *soror patruelis* FBD and *consobrinus/-a* MZC. However, Wallis says that FBC and MZC are *sobrinius/-a* to one another, while MBC and FZC are *amitinus/-a*, so that cross cousins and parallel cousins are distinguished in a way that is unusual in IE. Given also *avus* PF (*avia* PM) alongside *avunculus* MB, one can see why previous scholars (e.g. Lounsbury 1964b, Friedrich 1966) have thought they found Omaha features in this terminology. There is also the conflation of GC and CC under the terms *nepos*, *neptis*, retained in Italian and Romanian, but not the more western Romance languages. Hocart says that *nepos* originally meant CC, becoming GC after Augustus. The main remaining consanguines are *filius/-a* S, D. Latin affinal terms are *levir* HB, *glos* HZ, *socer* EF, *socrus* EM, *gener* DH and *nurus* SW. Wallis adds *janitrices* HBW, *fratria* BW and *enater* ZH (where Z is deceased; possibly a loan of Greek *enater* HBW).

The daughter languages of Latin, on the other hand, have become basically cognatic. I concentrate first on **Italian, Catalan, Spanish** and **Portuguese** (on the last three, some details here are from Entwhistle 1962: 64-5). All these terminologies have cognatic patterns for +1 kin, with Italian *zio/-a*, Spanish and Portuguese *tio/-a* for uncle and aunt (borrowed from Greek; cf. Catalan *oncle* and *tia*), alongside parent terms. Portuguese illustrates the pattern in ego's level, with *irmão* B and *irmã* Z (Spanish *hermano/-a*; Catalan *germá/-ano*) being distinguished from *primo irmão/hermano* PGS and *prima irmã/hermana* PGD in Portuguese and Spanish (descending cousins being just *primo/-a*), though Catalan has *cosí, cosine*, either from Latin or loaned from French. Thus the Latin terms for siblings were replaced in all three Iberian languages, and those for cousin in Spanish and Portuguese. By

contrast Italian *fratello, sorella*, for B and Z, are clearly derived direct from Latin, like French *fils, fille*, which Miranda regards as exceptionally stable terms that emerged early in the development of French. Portuguese GC and GCC are *sobrinho/-a* (Spanish *sobrino/-a*), CC and CCC *neto-/-a* (Spanish *nieto/-a*). The Catalan equivalent of the latter is *nét/-a*, and all three forms are derived from Latin *nepos, nepta*. However, in Catalan GC are *nebot, neboda*.

Portuguese *cunhado* is used of WB and ZH, *cunhada* of BW (also not derived from Latin); *sogro/-a* are EP, *genro* DH, *nora* SW (all derived from Latin; cf. Spanish *suegro/-a*). In Catalan, all cousins are *cosí* or *cosine*, DH *gendre* (are these French loans?) and SW *nora*. Thus these languages separate GC and CC categories (though the Catalan terms might have the same origin), while Italian retains the late Latin conflation of them in *nipote*.[26] GC terms in French (*neveu, nièce*) also represent the Latin originals.

Miranda (1974) is a useful source for the history of the **French** terminology. In +1, French distinguishes *oncle* PB and *tante* PZ from parent terms; the former is derived from Latin *avunculus*, the latter from *amita* (both have been borrowed by a number of Germanic languages). French *cousin(e)*, Italian *cugino/-a* PGC are also distinguished from sibling terms; like the Catalan terms, they are clearly derived from Latin *consobrinus/-a*. Grandparent terms also differ among these languages, with Iberian terminologies deriving from Latin, Italian *nonno/-a* apparently being derived from baby language, and French *grandpère, grand'mère* being new developments (reflecting German influence? Cf. *Grossvater, Grossmutter*). French *petit-fils* and *petite-fille* for CC date from the fourteenth century, having replaced nibling terms in this field (*petit/-e* is a marker of distance here, like *arrière*, which expresses even greater distance). Until the sixteenth century, *grandpère* faced competition from *aïeule* in French ('*grand*' connotes 'old' here).

French shows considerable deviation from other Romance languages in its affinal terminology. It retains *gendre* for DH but for SW discarded any reflex of Latin *nurus* and borrowed *bru* from Old High German, where it meant CE, later 'bride' (Modern German *Braut*).[27] +1 and 0 level terms in *beau-, belle-* competed with Latin-derived terms from about the fifteenth century, which in most cases they replaced, only *gendre* surviving with difficulty. *Beau-père* and *belle-mère* originally applied to step-P as well as EP; both entered Dutch in loan translation in the sixteenth century (*schoonvater, schoonmoeder*). In essence, some of the remaining Latin terms that did not fit a cognatic pattern (*avunculus, amita,*

---

[26] This term applies to both male and female referents, though it is marked grammatically for gender in taking other words, e.g. the definite article.

[27] *Bru* specifically from OHG *brūþ*, via Old French *bruz, brut* (Ewert 1943: 291).

*consobrinus*) have expanded their semantic fields and supplanted others (*patruus, matertera*, other cousin terms) to produce such a pattern in French. In the case of *avunculus* and *amita*, at any rate, it is significant that they, the cross-uncle and cross-aunt, have survived to mark the new contrast with parental terms and that their parallel equivalents have disappeared. While it is not as clear with Latin as in the case of Greek that these changes were made in antiquity, they had certainly taken effect by the time the daughter languages had reached the modern era. However, it is clear that the various new coinings, loans and the peculiar development of the French terminology within the Romance group are not linked to any of these structural changes, which appear to have taken place before the daughter languages of Latin had clearly become distinct.[28]

**Germanic**

We have sufficient historical information on Germanic kin terms to be able to say quite a lot about changes from a zero-equation pattern to a cognatic one – indeed, the published sources are too numerous to discuss in any detail here, though Bjerke's comparison of Old German and Old Norse should be mentioned (1969). However, these changes have only fully taken place in German, Dutch and English, and only to a limited extent in the Scandinavian languages, though there are indications that here too this development is underway.

In fact, Scandinavian languages are still partly zero-equation and have obviously been more so in history. **Swedish, Norwegian** and **Danish** are very similar in this regard. Thus Swedish has the primary 'nuclear family' terms *far (fader)* F, *mor (moder)* M, *bror (broder)* B, *syster* Z, *son* S and *dotter* D, simply combining them to produce PP, PG, GC and CC terms, e.g. *morbror* MB. However, Norwegian and Danish also have *onkel* and *tante* (also Swedish *tant, onkel*; Barlau 1981: 199) as cognatic-pattern terms for PG, as well as *nevø*, *niese* (Nw.; R.K., p.c.), *niece* (Dan.) for GC. In all three languages cousin terms also follow a cognatic pattern, viz. Swedish *kusin* PGC, Nw., Dan. *kusine* PGD; Nw. *fetter*, Dan. *fætter* PGS.[29] All these terms are clearly loans from French, possibly through German or English, except the last, which is also found in older German (*Vetter*), but not French.

---

[28] Although located in the Balkans, the remaining major Romance language, Romanian, resembles Italian most closely in its kin terms, with similar GC/CC equivalence (*nepot, nepoată*) and two single gendered terms for siblings-in-law (*cumnat, cumnată*). SW is *noră*, DH *ginere*, EF *socru*, EM *soacră*, etc. However, reflexes of *tio/-a* etc. are lacking for PG (information drawn from standard dictionaries). There is no evidence that either Turkish or the surrounding Slavonic languages have had any influence over the Romanian terminology, either systemically or lexically; like other major modern Romance languages, it has a cognatic pattern today.

[29] Mallory and Adams (2006: 216) give *swiri* MZS in Old Swedish, a regular development of PIE *\*swesr(iy)ós* ZS, while the similar looking Old Norse *svili* WZH is from a separate PIE root, *\*sweliyon* id.

In Norwegian *onkel, tante* (both also used for PGE), *nevø* and *niese*, are also compounded with *grand-*, which can only come from French or English, for great-uncle, -aunt, -nephew and -niece, though the old compounds are still used for the four grandparents and grandchildren, the latter alongside *barnebarn* (lit. child's child). R.K. adds the terms *oldefar, oldemor* for PPP, *oldebarn* for CCC. *Barn* is ubiquitous for 'child' in Scandinavian languages (also borrowed by the Scots dialect of English).

Affinal terms also tend to follow the compounding principle, e.g. Nw. *systermann* as ZH. W is *kone* (Nw., Dan.), *fru* (Sw.; cf. German *Frau*); H is *mann* (Nw.), *mand* (Dan.; cf. German *Mann*), *hustru* (Nw., Sw.). In Swedish there is a whole series of related terms, viz. *svåger* EB, *svägerska* EZ, *svärfar* EF, *svärmor* EM, *svärson* DH, the latter alongside an alternative term of uncertain derivation, *måg* DH.[30] Bjerke gives Old Norwegian variants or predecessor terms, thus *mágr* ZH (cf. Sw. *måg*, above) and *versyster* HZ, *ver-* being a bound morpheme for 'husband', or perhaps 'spouse' or even affines in general. Also conforming to the compounding principle was *bróðurkona* BW. At one period *púsa*, from Fr. *épouse*, was used for 'wife', later replaced by *húspreya*; H was *(hús)bóndi*.

More recent information (R.L., p.c.) indicates that the Old Norwegian bound affinal morpheme *ver-* (see above) reappears in *varsyster* BW and *verbror* ZH. However, there are also blanket terms for all sisters-in-law (i.e. BW, EBW, EZ) and brothers-in-law (i.e. ZH, EB, EZH), respectively *svigersøster* or *svigerinne*, and *svigerbror* or *svoger*. *Sviger-* and *svoger* are clearly Germanic in origin (cf. German *Schwager*), but due to their absence from Bjerke's list of Old Norse terms it is unclear whether they are loans or cognates. They also appear in other levels, thus *svigerfar, svigermor* for EP, *svigerdatter* SW. Given the record of an alternative *systermann* for ZH, a clearly descriptive compound, we might speculate that any such terms isolating individual affines of ego's generation is giving way to two blanket terms (with alternatives) distinguished only by gender, indicating a cognatic direction of change. This new information on Norwegian may provide a model for what is happening in Nordic languages generally, that is, the replacement of zero-equation terms with extensive loans in a cognatic pattern.

**Icelandic** kin terms have been studied much more extensively that those in other Scandinavian languages − perhaps because they have been taken as being more conservative − and have given rise to a degree of controversy. A useful summary is Merrill (1964). Fundamentally another zero-equation terminology, the main differences are in the affinal

---

[30] Probably related to Anglo-Saxon *mæg*, a general word for kinsman given by Lorraine Lancaster (1958). Szemerényi (1977: 192) gives Old Norse *mágr* as DH, EF and brother-in-law.

terminology. Thus *mágur* (cf. *måg, mágr* above) is EB, ZH, *mágkona* EZ, BW. These terms were previously used for all in-laws according to Merrill, but in +1 and -1 they have now been replaced by consanguineal terms prefixed by *tengda-*, from *tengja*, 'tie together' (e.g. *tengdasonur* DH). Another source, Rich (1976) also applies this prefix to affines of ego's level as alternatives to *mágur* and *mágkona*, viz. *tengđabróđir, tengđasystir*; he also indicates that descriptive terms exist as alternatives for all affines, including s*vili* EZH and *svilkona* EBW. Nonetheless these affinal terms do not distinguish wife's from husband's kin, so are not as zero-equation as they could be. The cousin terminology also differs from other Scandinavian, formerly having a zero-equation pattern for parallel cousins (*bræđrungur/-a* FBC, *systrungur/-a* MZC),[31] cross cousins apparently having only descriptive terms. However, Rich (1980: 476-7) indicates that these older terms are now giving way to two synonyms referring to all cousins (i.e. as glossing English 'cousin), namely *tvímenningur* and *frændsystkini*. Similarly (ibid.: 477), he gives *frændi* as a term equating FB and MB, *frænka* as the female equivalent for FZ and MZ, stating that on occasion these are used of PGE referents too. In both these cases, therefore, a switch from a zero-equation to a cognatic pattern (what Rich calls a 'centrifugal' process) is indicated in part of the Icelandic terminology too, countering Barlau's argument (1981: 199) that this is not happening in Icelandic and that it is therefore different from other Scandinavian terminologies. In the PP area of the terminology, *afi* PF and *amma* PM now exist alongside the older compound terms, which they may be replacing; Rich (1976) says they only came into common use in the nineteenth century, the former derived from Latin *avus*, the latter possibly from the Latin root *am-*, as in *amita*. Informally, in address, the loanwords *pabbi* and *mamma* are used instead of *fađir* and *móđir* (F, M). H is *mađur*, W *kona*, often prefixed by *eigen-*, from *eiga*, 'to own' (cf. German *eigen*).[32]

There are many sources for changes in **German**, but here I use mainly Mitterauer (2000). In about the tenth century there were zero-equation terms for PG, namely *Vetter* FB, *Base* FZ, *Muhme* MZ and *Oheim* MB (the latter cognate with Latin *avunculus* according to Priebsch and Collinson 1948: 27). Earlier, FB had been *fatureo*, derived from or cognate with Latin *patruus* according to Wallis (1918). By about 1550 the former four terms were also being

---

[31] Although Merrill treats these as part of the modern terminology, Rich's informants denied that they were still in use. In fact, they appear to have given way to descriptive terms, making the earlier distinction between cross and parallel cousins less significant.

[32] The historical and contemporary situations in Icelandic are actually quite complicated, with extensive debates and disagreements between earlier authors, deserving of separate treatment. In addition to the references already cited, see also Pinson 1979, Rich 1980, Barlau 1981.

used for their respective children, depending on the gender of these cousins. By the end of the nineteenth century these older terms were existing alongside the French loans *Onkel*, *Tante* and *Cousin*(e), which have now replaced them apart from *Vetter* for male cousins (itself possibly now redundant, except in dialect). By the end of the nineteenth century also, only *Muhme* of the older terms was found in both -1 and ego's level: *Oheim* was confined to the latter, *Vetter* and *Base* to the former. By this time these terms had lost their zero-equation characteristics and were applied more to respective PG and PGE referents according to absolute sex: thus *Oheim* was PB, PZH, *Muhme* PZ, while *Tante* at this time was PBW. In -1 German has also adopted *Neffe, Nichte* as terms for GC, these being recorded as far back as Old High German (*nevo, nift*).[33] Similar terms already occurred in Old English (*nefa, nift*) and Old Frisian (*neva, nift*). In fact it is clear from Naroll (1958) that the set *Vetter, Oheim, Base* and *Muome*, as well as OHG, MHG *neve, nift(el)*, were variously used of collaterals in all five medial levels of the terminology. Ultimately, while the latter have survived as GC terms, the former have been replaced by *Onkel*, *Tante*, for +1, except possibly in dialect (Naroll worked in the Austrian Tyrol). Naroll also records descriptive terms for cousins in MHG, now all consolidated under the French loans *Cousin* and *Cousine*.

Lancaster's list of **Anglo-Saxon** terms (1958) indicates a system of separate terms for all +1 cognates, with *swor* or *geswiria* for all first cousin specifications (with the possibility of descriptive phrases for them individually), and *nefa* (masc.) and *nefna, nift, genefa* (fem.) for all descending lineals and collaterals, i.e. GC, CC etc. (also with descriptive phrases as alternatives and *geswiria* as a synonym for ZD). The modern cognatic terminology has clearly evolved from the Anglo-Saxon one. The modern English terms for GC, however, represent not a development of the Germanic terms, but borrowings of their French originals directly into Middle English. 'Niece' may originally also have meant CD, while 'cousin' was borrowed from Old French, like 'aunt' and 'uncle' (see below). Thus English has borrowed *cousin, nephew* and *niece* from French, having become the archetypal cognatic terminology with their aid. Old English is, unsurprisingly, closer to Common Germanic, with *sweor* EF and *modrige* MZ.

According to Barlau (1981), whereas *Onkel* first appears in German in the late 18th cent., *ante* and *uncle* entered English from French in the 13th cent. – obviously the French influence was much stronger there for political reasons connected with the Norman Conquest. Affinal terms in Anglo-Saxon given by Lancaster are *tacor* for HB, *aðum* WB, ZH and DH, *snoru*

---

[33] According to Priebsch and Collinson (1948: 123), *Nichte* derives from Middle High German *niftel* through a more general change of *ft* to *ht* dating back to Old High German (ca. late tenth century AD).

SW, *sweor* EF and *sweger* EM; now, of course, all these terms have been replaced by consanguineal terms plus 'in-law'. Husband already appears in the form *(hus)bonda*, recalling an Old Nw. form (see above). German affinal terms are today characterized by the word *Schwieger-* prefixed to terms for consanguines. An alternative to *Schwiegerbruder* for brother-in-law is *Schwager*, originally also EF and DH. Wallis (1918) gives older *zeihhur* HB, *snura* SW.

Dutch (cf. Barnard and Good 1984: 56-7) has also become cognatic, though *neef* GS and *nicht* GD also mean CS, CD, and 'cousin', the only term in the language uniting -2 and -1 with ego's level (any cognate or loan of 'cousin' appears to be absent here). Dutch has retained *oom* (cf. German *Oheim*; also Old English *ēam* PB) as both FB and MB rather than borrowing *oncle* from French. This is interesting because Dutch has borrowed *tante* PZ, and also apparently taken over a number of loan translations from French, e.g. *grootvader* (PF), *grootmoeder* (PM) from *grand-père, grand-mère* (unless these are Germanic: cf. German Großvater, Großmutter), *kleinkind* (CC; cf. Fr. *petit-enfant*), as well as a whole series of affinal terms consisting of consanguineals prefixed by *schoon-*, 'beautiful', e.g. *schoonvader* EF (cf. French *beau-père*; a construction not found with the German cognate *schön*). One exception is *zwager* EB, ZH, cognate with German *Schwager*.

**Conclusion**

The present article has basically been concerned to trace a development in IE kinship terminologies in Europe from the zero-equation pattern associated with Hindi and other north Indian languages to the cognatic pattern represented by English. It can be seen from the foregoing that it is the Latin or Romance branch of IE that has made this shift most comprehensively, the zero-equation features of Latin having evolved into the cognatic pattern of the daughter languages. A similar development has taken place in the Germanic branch, but only partially, namely in English, German and Dutch (the West Germanic branch), though at least some Scandinavian languages (the North Germanic branch) show signs of similar development. Similarly the Slavonic branch has one basically cognatic terminology in Czech, while the other terminologies discussed here (Polish, Russian, Serbo-Croat and Bulgarian) have at least some zero-equation features, especially Serbo-Croat and Bulgarian, with Russian and Polish occupying a more intermediate position between the two patterns. There are indications of similar processes underway in Greek and more particularly in the Baltic branch, though the terminologies of the latter's two living languages differ in detail.

These processes may not have been completed, but the changes they do indicate are also reflections of the relationships between IE branches more generally: thus Slavonic and Baltic, which both show indications of these changes, are generally closer linguistically to Hindi and other Indo-Aryan languages than are either Germanic or Romance languages at the present day, as were also, however, the respective ancestors of Germanic and Romance, namely Common Germanic and Latin. Examination of Old Church Slavonic, a similar ancestor for modern Slavonic languages, might also reveal significant data about such developments in terminology, but this has yet to be undertaken.

The significance of loans from other branches of IE should also be highlighted, e.g. the number of terminologies that have borrowed *oncle* and *tante*, or *neveu* and *nièce* (I give the French forms as the most likely direct or indirect source) as a way of deleting lateral distinctions in the PG and GC fields. This is an alternative to one existing lateral term taking over from the other of the pair, as appears to be happening in Polish, where *wuj* may be taking over from *stryj* (i.e. *wuj* MB + *stryj* FB >>> *wuj* 'uncle'). Among other changes, especially prominent is the consolidation of a zero-equation affinal pattern in ego's level to just two gendered terms, whether loans, formerly existing affinal terms or other vocabulary drawn from the same language. This is strikingly evident in Lithuanian, thanks to Buivydienė's careful historical study of that language, but it may also be happening in Latvian, Serbo-Croat, Russian, and possibly Scandinavian. The material discussed in this article therefore indicates that terms can be deleted from terminologies (i.e. fall out of use) as well as be added to them through loans or new coinings. Indeed, the reduction of many ego-level affinal terminologies to just two gendered terms entails mass deletions of this sort. One other possibility is the lexical evolution of terms going along with a semantic shift, e.g. from Latin *avunculus* (MB; zero equation) to French *oncle* (cognatic) and similarly Latin *amita* (FZ) to French *tante*. This process also entailed the deletion of terms, namely *patruus* FB and *matertera* MZ, as they gradually fell out of use with the development of French from Latin.

What are the reasons for such changes? A persistent argument refers to the change from forms of collective family organization such as the Yugoslav *zadruga* to the increasing predominance of the nuclear family in Europe, in which it less important to distinguish, e.g., side of family or other kin individually, especially as descriptive terms or other circumlocutions can always been brought in for reasons of greater precision. However, this is probably a local explanation at best, and is in any case likely to be only part of the reason for change. In particular, cognatic terminologies are by no means confined to western Europe, as

is indicated by the alternative term 'Eskimo' for them in the older literature.[34] Indeed, in the Arctic there are definite indications that such terminologies may derive directly or indirectly from the very different symmetric prescriptive type of terminology that expresses repeated cross-cousin marriage (Ives 1998). Perhaps all we can say in general is to remind ourselves that particular terminological patterns reoccur in different parts of the world and in different societies that do not otherwise share much in common. In addition, societies are known to make changes to their ideas and practices concerning kinship, which may take very different forms: the more limited resources of the terminologies, i.e. the domain of classification, are at the service of these changes, but they have to be fitted to them according to local circumstances. Whether we view things synchronically or diachronically, therefore, we should not always expect similarities in terminological pattern between different societies to reflect or be reflected in other ethnographic facts. Clarification of this question can only be produced, if at all, through the collection and examination of much more data.

## References

Allen, N.J. 1984. Review of Brown 1984, *JASO* 15/2, 169-72.

— 1989.The evolution of kinship terminologies, *Lingua* 77, 173-85.

Andromedas, John 1957. Greek kinship terms in everyday use, *American Anthropologist* 59/6, 1086-8.

Ardener, Edwin 1971. Introductory essay, in Edwin Ardener (ed.), *Social anthropology and language*, London etc.: Tavistock Publications.

Barić, Lorraine (née Lancaster) 1967. Levels of change in Yugoslav kinship, in Maurice Freedman (ed.), *Social organization: essays presented to Raymond Firth*, London: Frank Cass.

Barlau 1981. Old Icelandic kinship terminology: an anomaly, *Ethnology* 20, 191-202.

Barnard, Alan, and Anthony Good 1984. *Research practices in the study of kinship*, London etc.: Academic Press.

Berlin, Brent, and Paul Kay 1969. *Basic color terms: their universality and evolution*, Berkeley: University of California Press.

Bjerke, Robert 1969. *A contrastive study of Old German and Old Norwegian kinship terms*, Baltimore: Waverly Press, for Indiana University (*International Journal of American*

---

[34] However, at least some Inuit terminologies have classificatory equations in +2, as Gertrude Dole pointed out many years ago. I am grateful to N.J. Allen for reminding me of this point, as well as for other useful comments on an earlier draft of this article.

*Linguistics* Memoir 22, published as supplement to *International Journal of American Linguistics* 35/1).

Brown, Cecil 1984. *Language and living things: uniformities in folk classification and naming*, New Brunswick: Rutgers University Press.

Buivydienė, Rūta 1997. *Lietuvių kalbos: vedybų giminystės pavadinimai* [Affinal kin terms in the Lithuanian language], Vilnius: Mokslo ir enciklopedijų leidybos institutas. [Research and Encyclopaedia Publications Institute]

Callier-Boisvert, Colette 1968. Remarques sur le systeme de parenté et sur la famille au Portugal, *L'Homme* 8/2, 87-103.

Delbrück, B. 1889. *Die indogermanischen Verwandtschaftsnamen: Ein Beitrag zur vergleichenden Altertumskunde*, Leipzig: Abhandlungen der Königlichen Sächsischen Gesellschaft der Wissenscheaften 11/v, 380-606.

Entwhistle, W.J. 1962. *The Spanish language* (2nd edn.), London: Faber & Faber.

Ewart, Alfred 1943. *The French language* (2nd edn.), London: Faber & Faber.

Friedl, Ernestine 1962. *Vasilika: a village in modern Greece*, New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.

Friedrich, Paul 1964. Semantic structure and social structure: an instance from Russian, in Ward H. Goodenough (ed.), *Explorations in cultural anthropology: essays in honor of George Peter Murdock*, New York etc.: McGraw-Hill Book Company.

— 1966. Proto-Indo-European kinship, *Ethnology* 5/1, 1-36.

Galton, Herbert 1957. The Indo-European kinship terminology, *Zeitschrift für Ethnologie* 82/1, 121-38.

Hammel, Eugene A. 1968. *Alternative social structures and ritual relations in the Balkans*, Englewood Cliff, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Herzfeld, Michael 1983. Interpreting kinship terminology: the problem of patriliny in rural Greece, *Anthropological Quarterly* 56/4, 157-66.

Hocart, A.M. 1928. The Indo-European kinship system, *Ceylon Journal of Science* 1, 179-204.

Iszaevich, Abraham 1981. Corporate household and ecocentric [sic.; egocentric?] kinship group in Catalonia, *Ethnology* 20, 277-290.

Ives, John W. 1998. Developmental processes in the pre-contact history of Athapaskan, Algonquian, and Numic kin systems, in Maurice Godelier, Thomas T. Trautmann and Franklin Tjon Sie Fat (eds.), *Transformations of kinship*, Washington: Smithsonian Institution Press.

Just, Roger 2000. *A Greek island cosmos: kinship & community on Meganisi*, Oxford: James Currey, and Santa Fe: School of American Research Press.

Kryukov, M.V. 1998. The synchro-diachronic method and the multidimensionality of kinship transformations, in Maurice Godelier, Thomas T. Trautmann and Franklin Tjon Sie Fat (eds.), *Transformations of kinship*, Washington: Smithsonian Institution Press.

Kullanda, Sergey 2002. Indo-European 'kinship terms' revisited, *Current Anthropology* 43/1,

Lancaster, Lorraine 1958. Kinship in Anglo-Saxon society—I, *British Journal of Sociology* 9/3, 230-50.

Llobera, Josep 1997. Aspects of Catalan kinship, identity, and nationalism, *JASO* 28/3, 297-309.

Lounsbury, Floyd G. 1964a. The structural analysis of kinship semantics, in Horace G. Lunt (ed.), *Proceedings of the Ninth International Congress of Linguists*, The Hague: Mouton.

— 1964b. A formal account of the Crow- and Omaha-type kinship terminologies, in Ward H. Goodenough (ed.), *Explorations in cultural anthropology: essays in honor of George Peter Murdock*, New York etc.: McGraw-Hill Book Company.

Mallory, J.P., and D.Q. Adams 2006. *The Oxford introduction to Proto-Indo-European and the Proto-Indo-European world*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Mažiulis, Vytautas 1988 etc. *Prūsų kalbos: etimologijos žodynas* [The Prussian language: etymological dictionary], Vilnius: Mokslas.

Merrill, Robert T. 1964. Notes on Icelandic kinship terminology, *American Anthropologist* 66, 867-72.

Miller, M. 1953. Greek kinship terminology, *Journal of Hellenic Studies* 73, 46-52.

Miranda, Pierre 1974. *French kinship: structure and kinship*, The Hague and Paris: Mouton.

Mitterauer, Michael 2000. Die terminologie der Verwandtschaft: Zu mittelalterlichen Grundlagen von Wandel und Beharrung im europäischen Vergleich, *Ethnologika Balkanica* 4, 11-44.

Murdock, George 1949. *Social structure*, New York: Macmillan.

Naroll, Raoul 1958. German kin terms, *American Anthropologist* 60/4, 750-5.

Parkin, Robert 1995. The contemporary evolution of Polish kinship terminology, *Sociologus* 45/2, 140-52.

— 1998. Dravidian and Iroquois in South Asia, in Maurice Godelier, Thomas T. Trautmann and Franklin Tjon Sie Fat (eds.), *Transformations of kinship*, Washington: Smithsonian Institution Press.

— 2012. Kinship as classification: towards a paradigm of change, *Journal of the Anthropological Society of Oxford Online* 4/2, 183-211.

— forthcoming. Why do societies abandon cross-cousin marriage? Forthcoming in Festschrift for Harold Scheffler, ed. Warren Shapiro.

Pinson, A. 1979. Kinship and economy in modern Iceland: a study in social continuity, *Ethnology* 18, 183-97.

Priebsch, R., and W.E. Collinson 1948. *The German language* (3rd edn.), London: Faber & Faber.

Rich, George W. 1976 Changing Icelandic kinship, *Ethnology* 15/1, 1-19

Szemerenyi, Oswald 1977. Studies in the kinship terminology of the Indo-European languages, with special reference to Indian, Iranian, Greek and Latin, *Acta Iranica* (Varia 1977), 1-240.

Trautmann, Thomas R., and R.H. Barnes 1998. 'Dravidian', 'Iroquois', and 'Crow-Omaha' in North American perspective, in Maurice Godelier, Thomas T. Trautmann and Franklin Tjon Sie Fat (eds.), *Transformations of kinship*, Washington: Smithsonian Institution Press.

Wallis, W.D. 1918. Indo-Germanic relationship terms as historical evidence, *American Anthropologist* 20/4, 419-31.

Witowski, Stanley 1971. A universalist account of kinship semantics, University of Iowa: PhD thesis.

— 1972. Guttman scaling of semantic distinctions, in Priscilla Reining (ed.), *Kinship studies in the Morgan centennial year*, Washington DC: Anthropological Society of Washington.