

Slavka Keremidchieva¹
(Sofia)

Sorbian kinship terminology according to the data in Volume 11. “Degrees of Kinship” of the Slavic Linguistic Atlas (preliminary results)

Keywords: kinship names, Upper Sorbian, Lower Sorbian, dialects, OLA

The eleventh volume of the multi-year international project involving partners from all countries with a Slavic population – thirteen national commissions in total, is dedicated to kinship terminology. This terminology evidently belongs to the most archaic lexical stratum of any language, and as far as the Slavic languages are concerned, reaches back to the Proto-Slavic basic word-stock, with its core traced back to the Proto-Indo-European language (Толстая 2009: 9). Slavic linguistic studies exploring kinship names based on a multi-aspect approach account for hundreds of publications (a major part of them being contrastive), with some publications incorporating linguistic maps of separate kinship names. However, the lexis and morphology volume “Степени родства” [Degrees of kinship]², is the first of its kind as a collective and inclusive study reflecting – in a linguo-geographical aspect – the linguistic unity and diversity of the Slavic languages with regard to the kinship terminology (i.e. linguistic expression of the kinship system traditional for every nation, varying in complexity, and branched to a different extent). Tracing the chronotope isoglosses of the dialect lexemes from this thematic lexical group on the Slavic language continuum provides new and credible data relating to dialect division, the

¹ ORCID: 0000-0003-0615-6332.

² The volume has been accepted for publication in 2023, by the Scientific Council of the Institute for Bulgarian Language (“Prof. L. Andreichin”). The names of its authors who are members of various national commissions are marked on each map.

similarities and differences between the three Slavic language groups – the East Slavic, West Slavic, and the South Slavic languages – and in this sense will be of use to Slavic scholars including dialectologists, language geographers, etymologists, and language historians. At the same time, the analysis of the totality of kinship terms presented in the volume with their interconnection, correlation, and strict definiteness (Георгиева 2016: 47), reflecting accurately the connections and relationships between members in the hierarchy of the kinship system, reveals in full detail the structure of the kinship system and its degrees in the conceptual sphere of Slavic societies.

The volume includes maps of the main terms reflecting the system of blood kinship (biological, by origin, the so-called *nomina consanguinitatis*): L³ 1747 ‘отец’⁴ [father]; PM 1758 N sg mati; [mother], LSl 1794 ‘дочь’ [daughter]; Sl 1837 ‘отец матери или отца’ [mother’s or father’s father]; Sl 1842 ‘мать отца или матери’ [father’s or mother’s mother] etc., including the hypocoristic or pejorative forms of some of the basic terms in the direct line of consanguinity: (Sl 1793° *hypocor* (N V sg) сынъ ‘син’ [son], Sl 1805° *hypocor* (N V sg) ‘дочь’ [daughter], Sl 1839° *pejor* (N sg) ‘отец матери или отца’ [mother’s or father’s father], Sl 1843° *hypocor* (N V sg) ‘мать отца или матери’ [father’s or mother’s mother]. The methods of linguistic geography have been used to interpret also names for collateral blood kinship in which two or more persons have the same ancestor but do not descend or ascend from each other, e.g. (map Sl 1815° *hypocor* (N V sg) братъ [brother], (Sl 1829° *hypocor* (N V sg) sestra [sister], [male cousin] (maps L 1882 ‘сын дяди со стороны матери’ [son of an uncle on the mother’s side] and L 1884 ‘сын дяди со стороны отца’ [son of an uncle on the father’s side]), [female cousin] (maps L 1883 ‘дочь дяди со стороны матери’ [daughter of an uncle on the mother’s side], L 1885 ‘дочь дяди со стороны отца’ [daughter of an uncle on the father’s side]), as well as names for other collateral relatives: [uncle] (map L 1868 ‘брат отца’ [father’s brother]), [uncle] (maps LSl 1871 ‘брат матери’ [mother’s brother] and Sl 1872° *hypocor* (N V sg) ‘брат матери’ [mother’s brother]), [aunt]

³ Abbreviations with Latin letters preceding the title of the map mean that the material is collected by subject: F – phonetics, L – vocabulary, M – morphology, MP – morphology and prosody. Sl – word formation, LSl – vocabulary and word formation.

⁴ The names of the cards are aligned with the formulated question in the OLA Questionnaire which contains over 3,500 questions. The OLA network includes ca. 850 settlements, for which each national commission has presented the relevant authentic material collected in the 1960s.

(Sl 1876° *hypocor* (NV sg) teta || -ъка), [nephew] (maps L 1878 'сын брата' [brother's son], L 1880 'сын сестры' [sister's son]), [niece] (L 1879 'дочь брата' [brother's daughter], L 1881 'дочь сестры' [sister's daughter]). The volume also features maps with the terms for [twins] (L 1806 'двое детей, одновременно родившихся у одной матери' [two children born simultaneously to the same mother]) in the naming of which the dominant attribute is the time of birth, as well as the names for [orphan] (F 1833 *sirota*) in which the semantic structure of the basic noun [child] is upgraded with a supplementary dominant motivational sign – [a child without parents].

A few maps encode with *nomina affinitatis* the relationships in the system of affinal kinship (kinship by bond of marriage and by matchmaking) which is a result of relationships between two families after their representatives – a man and a woman – get married: [son-in-law] (L 1855 'зять'), [daughter-in-law] (L 1857 'жена сына' [son's wife], L 1859 'жена брата' [brother's wife]), [father-in-law] (L 1848 'отец мужа' [husband's father]), [mother-in-law] (L 1850 'мать мужа' [husband's mother]), [father-in-law] (L 1852 'отец жены' [wife's father]), [mother-in-law] (L 1854 'мать жены' [wife's mother]), [brother-in-law] (L 1860 'брат мужа' [husband's brother]), [sister-in-law] (L 1865 'сестра мужа' [husband's sister]), [brother-in-law] (L 1866 'брат жены' [wife's brother]), etc. Other mapped names reflect the complex system of another type of institutional kinship – i.e. that in which one individual becomes a member of the family via adoption by one of the parents and thus enters into family relations with him/her – [stepfather] (L 1831 'отчим, неродной отец' [father not by blood, stepfather] and a supplementary map with the same title), [stepson] (L 1834 'сын от первого брака одного из супругов' [son from the first marriage of one of the spouses] (для отчима или мачехи – [for the stepfather or the stepmother]), [stepdaughter] (L 1835 'дочь от первого брака одного из супругов' [daughter from the first marriage of one of the spouses] (для отчима или мачехи – [for the stepfather or the stepmother])). These names emerged on the Slavic territory at a later stage of social development and reflect a more complex and branched kinship naming system.

Dozens of linguistic maps – following lexical, lexical word formation, word formation, motivational and semantic criteria – present the linguistic areas of various chronological layers of lexis in Slavic kinship terminology – ancient Indo-European terms such as: *отьсь [father], *mati [mother], *дъkti [daughter], *сынъ [son], *brat(р)ъ [brother], *sestra [sister], *stryjъ [uncle], *svekrъ [father-in-law], *svekry [mother-in-law], *snъxa [daughter-in-law], *zetyъ [son-in-law], *dъverъ [brother-in-law], *jetry

[sister-in-law], *šurь [brother-in-law]; Proto-Slavic forms of Indo-European origin, such as: *baba [grandmother], *dědъ [grandfather], *vъnukъ [grandson], *dětę [child], *otrokъ [child], *orbę [child], *tъstъ [father-in-law], *tъstja [mother-in-law], *pastorъkъ [stepfather], *svěstъ [sister-in-law], *svojakъ [uncle], among others; many derivatives in different Slavic languages from common Slavic roots such as: *bab-, *děd-, *bat-, *brat(r)-, *sestr- etc., which are still in use in Slavic languages today, albeit with irregular distribution.

This volume also includes maps supplemented with comments on loanwords from non-Slavic languages which illustrate fairly well, in terms of both quantity and geography, the expansion of foreign lexemes or elements over the Slavic language territory.

The present brief study seeks to show the degree of survival of the old Slavic kinship terminology in the Sorbian languages (Upper Sorbian and Lower Sorbian), as well as the frequency and distribution of loanwords (incl. foreign-language elements and hybrids) therein. In OLA, the Sorbian languages, as part of the community of West Slavic languages, are presented with four points located in the territory of Germany (near to its eastern border with Poland): 234. Dissen // Dešno, Kr. Cottbus // wokr. Chošebuz; 235. Baergen // Hory, Kr. Kamenz // wokr. Kamjenc; 236. Halbendorf // Brězowka, Kr. Weißwasser // wokr. Běla Woda; 237. Radibor // Radwor, Kr. Bautzen // wokr. Budyšin. As classified by Sorbian dialectologists who have collected and processed the on-site material, p. 234 is representative of Lower Sorbian, p. 237 – of Upper Sorbian, and points 235 and 236 represent the transition between Lower Sorbian and Upper Sorbian. As early as at this stage an observation shall be adduced: notably, that in the majority of maps, p. 234 and p. 236, on the one hand, form a uniform linguistic area of kinship names, and on the other hand, p. 235 and p. 237 account for another uniform linguistic area.

This study shall be conducted based on a brief contrastive aspect with the rest of the Slavic dialects, however the limited volume of this particular format does not allow for an analysis of all Sorbian kinship names mapped in the atlas.

Although kinship terminology accounts for an archaic and rather conservative group of names, linguistic data from the maps in “Степени родства” [Degrees of kinship] confirms the conclusion that as far as this type of terminology is concerned, contraction of the area of Proto-Slavic lexemes at the expense of the expansion of regional dialect words (Вендина 2009: 70) is definitely evident and distinct as a trend. This group also has a small number of **universal Slavic lexemes** covering the entire language

territory, though not evenly and densely, e.g.: **mqž-ъ** on map L 1729 ‘муж, сунпур’ [man, husband] has a large continual area in a major part of South Slavic dialects, and *čel-o-věk-ъ*⁵ [man, human] – also a native word occurring infrequently as competitive, is already dominant in the Serbian and Bosnian points. The isogloss of **mqž-ъ** again migrates to all West Slavic dialects where it forms a fragmented area in Czech and Sorbian dialects, and an almost monolithic one in Slovak dialects. Consequently, the Sorbian dialects have kept two lexemes of native origin denoting [man, husband]: *mqž-ъ* (Upper Sorbian) and *čel-o-věk-ъ* (Lower Sorbian). What is more, the respective semantic map suggests that the lexeme *mqž-ъ* has developed two meanings – [man, husband] and [man, human] – in Sorbian, Slovak, sporadically in Ukrainian, and its large distant area in the South Slavic languages is fragmented only in the Serbian and Bosnian points where it functions with the sole meaning of [man, husband]. Moreover, as is evident on map L 1730 ‘мужчина’ [man], the Lower Sorbian dialects have kept other Slavic names as well: the word with the same root *mqž-ъsk-ъ* which is dominant in the Czech, Slovenian, and Croatian dialects, but also the prominently archaic lexeme *děd-ъ* which apart from here is also found in one single Slovenian and in one Russian point.

By keeping the all-Slavic word for blood kinship of the first degree **dět-ę** (L 1775 ‘ребенок’ [child]), the Upper Sorbian dialects connect predominantly with the dialects from the West Slavic group – the West and Central Slovak and West Czech ones, as well as with the South Slavic dialects where its areas are compact and continual without a competitive lexeme. Their fragmentation begins in the Slovenian dialects in which the competitive lexeme *otrok-ъ* prevails. Another native lexeme with a clear motivational sign – *gol-ę*, is mainly characteristic of the Lower Sorbian dialects. It is worth noting that by its nature *gol-ę* is an exclusive lexeme in the Slavic linguistic landscape, because, apart from Sorbian, it is not found in any other Slavic language. Perhaps it is not too early to sum up here that although in a number of cases the Sorbian dialects have not preserved the all-Slavic kinship terminology heritage, they stand out with their original, dialectal word formation which, especially in the case of names of blood relatives, competes successfully with loanwords. Many of the native words are unique because their areas are confined to the Sorbian grid, and confirm the rule that the lexical exclusives, unlike the derivatives, are more often than not new to the Slavic language community in either formal or

⁵ The dialect forms (construct) are spelled according to the principles of the morphological transcription accepted by OLA.

semantic terms. In addition, the maps clearly show that the isoglosses of chronologically more recent names draw up an area picture in which “the scenario of a universal Slavic distribution is absent” (Вендина 2014: 375), something which applies fully to Sorbian dialects as well.

The names of direct blood kinship of the second degree – [grandfather] and [grandmother] – should also be included in the common Slavic lexis, with the proviso that despite being commonly Slavic in form, they have developed different meanings in different Slavic languages. They are used for both blood kinship of the second degree (in this case, there is a hidden possessive reference – [my grandfather], [my grandmother]), as well as any [older man] or any [older woman] in general. This can be well traced on maps Sl 1837 ‘отец матери или отца’ [mother’s or father’s father], Sl 1841 ‘старый мужчина’ [old man], Sl 1842 ‘мать отца или матери’ [father’s or mother’s mother], Sl 1844° ‘старая женщина’ [old woman], whereas the respective semantic maps present the clearest picture. The primary form **děd-ъ** which is still used to refer to [mother’s or father’s father], [grandfather], is best preserved in the East Slavic group of languages. Among the West Slavic languages, only Upper Sorbian has kept the lexeme *děd-ъ*, while the rest use various derivatives or descriptive constructions, incl. in Lower Sorbian – *star-Ъ nan-ъ*. In the South Slavic grid of OLA, the Proto-Slavic heritage has been preserved unevenly – as points and islands, and only in the Croatian and Bosnian grids its area spreads almost homogeneously and continually, whilst in the Bulgarian grid it is absent altogether. However, if we also refer to the Proto-Slavic continuants and the forms with the same root *děd-* with endings -a, -o, -e, (*děd-a*, *děd-o*, *děd-e*, *děd-ъ=-a*, *děd-ъ=-o*), we can put forward a claim about the all-Slavic character of this name for a direct blood relative of the second degree. The semantic map № 71 illustrates very well how starting from the east (above all in Ukrainian), partly in the west (Slovak), and especially in the south (Slovenian excluded), the lexeme gradually expands its semantic range and while in Russian and Belarusian it means [grandfather] only, in almost all points in Ukrainian the meaning of [old man] appears to be present already, and in the south-westernmost Ukrainian dialects the meaning of [maternal uncle] is added. Among West Slavic languages the lexeme displays two meanings, [grandfather] and [old man], only in island Slovak areas. In Polish, the lexeme is not found and in Sorbian it is monosemantic: in p. 234 it means only [man] and in p. 235 and p. 237 its only meaning is [grandfather]. To the south, the semantics of the lexeme expands, and in Macedonian and Bulgarian points the lexeme *děd-o*

regularly manifests two, often three and even four meanings in one and the same point: [grandfather], [old man], [wife's father], [husband's father].

As far as the name **bab-a** is concerned however, its all-Slavic distribution would be possible to accept only formally, because in the individual Slavic languages this kinship term designates different referents and demonstrates different manners of distribution. For example, *bab-a* is used to designate a direct blood relative of the second degree [father's or mother's mother] in all Slavic languages except Polish which uses only derivatives of *bab-a* (Sl 1842 [father's or mother's mother]). The distribution of this lexeme throughout the Slavic linguistic lands is as follows: in the South Slavic languages its area is monolithic but its fragmentation begins on Bosnian and Croatian territory, to become a point area (only one point) on Slovenian territory. The *bab-a* areas in Czech and Sorbian are dotted and scattered, while in eastern Slovak points the isogloss forms a complete range which continues in Ukrainian and is broken in Belarusian and Russian. More specifically, the diverse mosaic of names for 'father's or mother's mother' in Sorbian is presented on map Sl 1842 as follows: p. 234 *star-A mam-a*, p. 235 *bab-a*, p. 236 *star-A mat-ъ* and the exclusive lexeme *ov-ъk-a* at p. 237.

Similar to *děd-ъ*, *bab-a* too has expanded its meaning at the macro level (all-Slavic) and has transferred it to non-kinship names. It is noteworthy that the lexeme *bab-a* has expanded its semantics predominantly in points where its primary meaning is [father's or mother's mother], as is the case in South Slavic languages (except Slovenian), where it is a polysemantic lexeme in the same point and refers to, in addition to [father's or mother's mother], also to [old woman], [wife's mother], and in some south-eastern Bulgarian dialects – to [husband's mother]. In eastern Slovak points and in a large part of Ukrainian dialects *bab-a* beside [mother of the father or mother] and [old woman] also means [woman], and in Belarusian – [father's or mother's mother] and [woman]. Russian dialects witness the prevalence of points in which the lexeme only means either [father's or mother's mother] or [woman], as in Czech – only [father's or mother's mother] or only [old woman] or only [woman], while in Lower Sorbian it means only [old woman]⁶.

Present-day Slavic languages use numerous inherited Proto-Slavic lexemes (a significant part of these are Indo-Europeanisms) which are kinship

⁶ In many Slavic languages, including Sorbian, *bab-a* also has the meaning of 'folk midwife'; however, such semantics is not recorded in the OLA indexes and therefore cannot be noted and commented upon here.

names in all Slavic languages except one or two. Such lexeme is for example **зѣт-ъ** [son-in-law], whose large and almost homogeneous pan-Slavic area has been completely destroyed only in Sorbian by the German element in the hybrid name (*šviger*)-*syn-ъ* (map L 1855 'зять' [son-in-law]). With the original and exclusive name *nan-ъ* for first-degree blood relative **от-ѣс-ъ** [father] (map L 1747 'отец'), the Sorbian dialects are detached from most of the Slavic languages where *ot-vc-ъ*, though with various degrees of distribution, is still in use.

It is interesting to explore the distribution and frequency of the old names for [mother] which survive, as suggested by the maps of Volume 11, in all Slavic languages. These are names which originate from the Proto-Slavic **mati*, -*ere* which is of Indo-European origin, as well as from the reduplicated expressive form **mam-a* (and its derivatives). Map PM 1758 N sg *mati* suggests that the more archaic noun *mat-i* characterizes all East Slavic dialects and also part of the West Slavic ones – Czech and Slovak. *Mat-i* is the only lexeme in Slovenian which dominates in Croatian and Bosnian points, while in Serbian it is replaced by *ma-j-ka*, which prevails over the far less widespread *mam-a* in Macedonian and Bulgarian points. Sorbian dialects use *mam-a* (p. 234–235) and the more recent form *mat-ъ* (p. 236–237).

The monolithic eastern area of the Proto-Slavic lexeme **SVEk//r-ъ** [father-in-law] has been gradually penetrated in Ukrainian by *tvst-ъ* which has become dominant in Polish, therefore there **SVEk//r-ъ** has some scattered point areas, to be completely displaced by loanwords and descriptive constructions in Sorbian and Czech. All Sorbian points see the domination of a hybrid name unique across the Slavic language world – (*šviger*)-*nan-ъ* which is still in competitive usage with the native words *pri-xod-ъn-ъ nan-ъ* (p. 236) and *mōž-ov-ъ nan-ъ* (p. 237) both referring to [husband's father]. With all these lexemes, the Sorbian dialects stand apart from the large and compact eastern areas and part of the western (Slovak) and southern areas of the Proto-Slavic lexeme **SVEk//r-ъ** and from the western (Polish), part of the southern (Slovenian), and part of the eastern (Ukrainian) areas of *tvst-ъ* (map L 1848 'отец мужа' [husband's father]). The absence of the lexeme **тѣст-ъ** [father-in-law] (map L 1852 'отец жены' [wife's father]) again in Czech and Sorbian where it has been displaced by loanwords and other lexemes (the hybrid (*šviger*)-*nan-ъ* across the entire Sorbian grid and the constructions in competitive usage *žen-in-ъ nan-ъ* in p. 237, *pri-xod-ъn-ъ nan-ъ* in p. 236) does not give grounds to include this name of Proto-Slavic origin referring to a non-blood relative by marriage into the list of kinship terms with pan-Slavic distribution today. The picture

is analogous with regard to the Sorbian names for ‘husband’s mother’ (map Sl 1850 ‘мать мужа’), where the same type of competition occurs between native derivative constructions and hybrid names with German elements such as (*šviger*)-*mat-a* (p. 234–235), (*šviger*)-*mat-ѡ* (p. 236–237), *pri-xod-ѡn-A mat-ѡ* (p. 236), *mŕž-ov-A mat-ѡ* (p. 237).

Again in Czech and Sorbian only, ((*šviger*)-*nan-ѡ* in all points and in competition with *pri-xod-ѡn-Ѣ nan-ѡ* (p. 236) and *mŕž-ov-Ѣ nan-ѡ* (p. 237)), the Slavic lexeme **děver-ъ** [husband’s brother] (map L 1860 ‘брат мужа’) has been replaced by German-Slavic lexemes or native constructions, while its areas to the east and the south are large and continual.

The Sorbian dialects have inherited neither the basic terms (*dŕkt-I*; the morphologically reformed *dŕkt-ѡ*, *dŕkt-ę*; the accusative form with an ancient stem ending -er- *dŕkt-er-ѡ*), nor their derivatives (*dŕkt-ѡk-a*; *Dŕkt-er-a*, *Dŕkt-er-ѡ=-a*, *Dŕkt-er-ѡk-a*) in the names for [daughter], as is seen on map LSI 1794 ‘дочь’. Here too, the names are Slavic, however formed with the root *děv-* – *děv-ѡč-ę* (p. 234), *děv-ѡk-a* (p. 236–237), as is predominantly the case in Slovak and sporadically in Polish and East Slavic dialects; as well as with a root *gol-* – *gol-ic-a* (p. 235) which is again an isolated name in the Slavic linguistic lands.

Certainly, the number of preserved Proto-Slavic roots in the Slavic language territory is much larger, and this confirms the conclusion drawn by T. Vendina, namely, that from a synchronic point of view the closeness between Slavic languages should rather be sought at the morphological level (Вендина 2009: 24; 74). Evidence is available practically in every lexical, lexical-morphological and motivational map from the volume “Степени родства” [Degrees of kinship]. For example, the all-Slavic unity in the roots of names shows on map F 1833 *sirota* [orphan] where all registered names derive from the Proto-Slavic **siръ*. The Sorbian dialects are part of the large and almost monolithic eastern, western and partly southern area of the preserved Proto-Slavic lexeme *sir-ot-a* which, coupled with the competitive lexeme *sir-ot-ѡk-a* registered in p. 234, corresponds to certain Russian dialects.

Map L 1831 ‘отчим, неродной отец’ [stepfather, father not by blood] displays some lexemes and descriptive constructions naming the referent ‘stepfather’, however areas with the Proto-Slavic root **отъс-*, though varying in configuration and continuity, are found in every Slavic language with the exception of Sorbian where the referent is named via another descriptive construction of native origin – *pri-rod-ѡn-Ѣ nan-ѡ*, and in p. 234 – with the exclusive *nan-ѡk-ѡ*.

Although Slavic names for the main term of kinship are available, these are formed with a different root – *prvja-tel-vstv-o* in Upper Sorbian *v* and *svoj-it-~~bb~~-a* in Lower Sorbian, thus disrupting the all-Slavic unity at the level of lexis with regard to the Proto-Slavic **rodъ* which occurs as a root in the remaining the Slavic dialects, though to a varying degree (L 1886 ‘родня, совокупность, родственников’ [family, relatives]).

The absence of a single older and chronologically heterogeneous term for one of the relatives by marriage, notably the [wife of the mother’s brother], has resulted in an exceptional lexical and word-formation diversity in the names on map LSI 1874 ‘жена брата матери’ [wife of the mother’s brother]. This map displays various derivatives of the all-Slavic roots *DaD-*, *tet-*, *uj-*, *stryj*, but also a series of loanwords from neighbouring, non-Slavic languages like Turkish, Hungarian, Romanian, and German. Nevertheless, the Sorbian dialects do share the usage of the native word *tet-a* whose areas though not compact, are found also in Czech, Slovak, and Croatian.

Native names with the Proto-Slavic root **ujъ* are used in the Sorbian dialects for [husband of mother’s sister] and [mother’s brother], however there is a non-distinction of the terms for the two relatives: in p. 234 – //*uj-Bk-ъ* and //*Uj-b* in the rest of the points (map L 1877 ‘муж сестры матери’). The same finding of non-distinction of the names for fourth-degree blood relatives by marriage applies also to the monolexic words for the cousins on both the mother’s and the father’s sides in Sorbian, Czech, Slovak, and part of the South Slavic dialects (L 1882 ‘сын дяди со стороны матери’ [son of the maternal uncle, male cousin], L 1884 ‘сын дяди со стороны отца’; [son of the paternal uncle, male cousin], L 1883 ‘дочь дяди со стороны матери’ [daughter of the maternal uncle, cousin – she], L 1885 ‘дочь дяди со стороны отца’ [daughter of the paternal uncle, female cousin]). In Sorbian, the native words referring to [male cousin] and [female cousin] have only been preserved in p. 234 – *tet-~~vk~~-o* and *tet-en-~~vc~~-a*, while in the remaining points, the French loanwords (*kuzen*)-*ъk-ъ* and (*kuzin*)-*a* settled via German mediation, and have fully replaced Slavic words. The same case of competition between native words and loanwords is seen on maps L 1878 ‘сын брата’ [brother’s son, nephew], L 1879 ‘дочь брата’ [brother’s daughter, niece], L 1880 ‘сын сестры’ [sister’s son, nephew] and L 1881 ‘дочь сестры’ [sister’s daughter, niece] where with regard to Sorbian dialects a conclusion can be drawn that native names *bratr-ov-Ъ syn-ъ* (p. 237), *bratr-ov-Ъ gol-~~vc~~-b* (p. 235); *bratr-a gol-ic-a* (p. 235), *bratr-ov-A gol-ic-a* (p. 237); *sestr-in-Ъ<-jъ>syn-ъ* (p. 237), *sestr-in-Ъ gol-~~vc~~-b* (p. 235); *sestr-in-A gol-ic-a* (p. 235, 237) – have

been kept in Upper Sorbian while in Lower Sorbian the expansion of the German loanwords is complete – (*nef*)-*e* and (*nixt*)-*a* (exclusive) (p. 234, 236). The lexical wealth of the native kinship terminology compared to loanwords is immediately obvious.

Wherever they have spread, no matter whether numerous as in Polish and Sorbian (the map of German loanwords shows that Sorbian ranks first among the Slavic languages in terms of loanwords with German elements), or few, the loanwords have settled permanently and have no variant use. And while the foreign-language elements adopted for both lineal and collateral consanguinity names (though having completely displaced the Slavic names in some places), are neither numerous nor have a significant impact on the old Slavic naming system as a whole, in the case of *nomina affinitatis* the picture is entirely different. The terms for affinal kinship (by marriage or by matchmaking) display not only a partial breakdown but a total disappearance of the original Slavic naming system which is replaced by a foreign one and forms chronologically new areas. Exploring the linguistic areas with regard to the displacement of the native lexis by the foreign-language one results in the logical conclusion that the more distant a relative, i.e. the more peripheral his/her place in the branched kinship system, the more often his/her naming stops being precise.

The above said is confirmed by the registered lexemes, like for example on map L 1857 ‘жена сына’ [son’s wife] and L 1859 ‘жена брата’ [brother’s wife]. The first map exhibits the preserved wealth of native names in all Slavic languages, with the old word *s{nɔ}χ-a* kept alive and exhibiting high frequency in all South Slavic dialects, partly in competition in Czech, and only in Sorbian – fully displaced by the native construction *pri-χod-ɔn-A dɛv-ɔk-a* (p. 236–237) and by the semi-calques (*šviger*)-*dɛv-ɔk-a* (p. 234–236), (*šviger*)-*gol-ic-a* (p. 235). An altogether different picture is seen in the names used for the more distant relative [brother’s wife] (map L 1859). While in the South Slavic dialects the situation remains almost the same and *s{nɔ}χ-a* has a compact and continual area which in Slovenian alone has been fully destroyed by German and Italian loanwords, the dominance of the loanwords is complete in Czech, Slovak and Sorbian – (*švager*)-*ɔn-ic-a* (p. 234, 236), (*švager*)-*ɔn-a* (p. 237) and (*šveger*)-*ɔn-ic-a* (p. 235). The same distribution and frequency characterize the names for [husband’s brother] (L 1860), [husband’s sister] (L 1865), [wife’s brother] (L 1866), [wife’s sister] (L 1867) – all of these referring to more distant relatives by marriage or by matchmaking.

In all West Slavic languages, including a number of cases in Slovenian, part of Ukrainian, and not infrequently Belarusian, the areas of loanwords

are large, monolithic, and continual, often delineated by the isoglosses of different word-formation variants of one and the same loanword. With the invasion of foreign language elements in the kinship terminology, the tendency to simplify the expression of kinship ties became more prominent, and with the loss of the old Slavic names, the names of differentiation disappeared. This tendency is most clearly manifested in West Slavic languages in which for example, German elements form the words for [son's wife], [brother's wife], [husband's sister] and [wife's sister]. Further on, in all West Slavic languages and additionally in Belarusian, in the better part of Ukrainian, and in Slovenian, the German loanword (*švager*)-*Ъ* refers to [sister's husband], [wife's brother] and [husband's brother] (semantic map № 76). Contrary to this situation, the East Slavic and South Slavic dialects with the exception of Slovenian for most of the cases, have kept quite intact the old Slavic system of *nomina affinitatis*.

The motivational map for [twins] (map L 1806 'двое детей, одновременно родившихся у одной матери' [two children born simultaneously to the same mother] (*N pl*)), which illustrates well the mental models of name-givers from different Slavic languages in the choice of one motivational sign or another, as well as the diversity of native word-formation methods used to create various names (e.g. in Upper Sorbian, names have been formed from the stem *dv-uj-ъn-*, not unlike in East Slavic dialects), also contains foreign-language elements having penetrated dialects, elements which in Lower Sorbian derive from a stem with identical semantics in the German language – (*cviling*)-.

Words of foreign origin that have penetrated the Slavic languages attest to dynamic changes in lexis determined by extralinguistic factors – geographic location and contacts with non-Slavic ethnic groups. In many cases, as maps clearly suggest, the expansion of loanwords is complete leading to two main consequences of great importance: the breakdown of the old system of kinship terminology, and the emergence of a number of characteristic and distinctive features in individual Slavic languages or groups thereof. For example, German loanwords are more widespread in Slavic languages which at an early stage of language development have come into contact with a foreign intonation environment (Sorbian, Czech, Slovak, Polish) (Žigo 2015: 16).

The volume "Степени родства" [Degrees of kinship] interprets, in the light of linguistic geography, the archaic lexis from the basic vocabulary in a bid to ascertain whether, where, and to what extent the Slavic dialects have preserved the most ancient kinship names of Indo-European origin, as well as names having emerged in the Proto-Slavic language

from Indo-European roots. The maps capture adequately the continuity in Slavic languages regarding kinship names since the disintegration of the Proto-Slavic family to the present day. The language material adduced in the volume proves that a similar hierarchy in family relations has persisted for centuries in this relatively conservative system. The inevitable dynamic processes determined by extralinguistic circumstances (geographical, historical, cultural, etc.) resulting in linguistic and ethno-cultural contacts with non-Slavic peoples, are the most important trigger for the changes, especially in names for affinal kinship (by marriage or by matchmaking) which most clearly display the breakdown of the ancient, primary system of naming and the emergence of differences in the Slavic language territory (Žigo 2015: 17).

The atlas provides a good opportunity, when reading the chronotope isoglosses on the maps and taking into account the linguistic criteria, to determine to a relative degree the time of origin of the linguistic areas. The isoglosses unmistakably delineate the new and old areas, and tracing them makes it possible to see the typology of the process of breakdown of Proto-Slavic areas and allows for interpretations according to different aspects of the dialectal differentiation that has emerged over the Slavic language continuum.

Works of reference

- Žigo, P. (2015). Tendencie v pomenovaní rodinných vzťahov v slovenčine. In: Wierzbicka–Piotrowska, E. (ed.). *Dialog pokoleń w języku potocznym, w języku wsi i miasta, w literaturze, w publicystyce, w tekstach kultury*. Warszawa: Towarzystwo Kultury Języka, 331–342.
- Вендина, Т. И. (2009). *Русские диалекты в общеславянском контексте*. Москва, Нестор–История.
- Вендина, Т. И. (2014). *Типология лексических ареалов Славии*. Москва – Санкт-Петербург: Нестор–История.
- Георгиева, Цв. (2016). *Родството и роднинските названия в българския език (семантика и лексикографско представяне)*. София: Авангард Прима.
- Толстая, С. М. (2009). Категория родства в этнолингвистической перспективе. В: Толстая, С. М.; Агапкина, Т. А.; Узенёва, Е. С. (ред.) *Категория родства в языке и культуре*. Библиотека Института славяноведения РАН. Москва Индрик, 7–22.

Transliteration of references in Cyrillic script

- Vendina, T. I. (2009). *Russkie dialekty v obshcheslavjanskome kontekste*. Moskva, Nestor-Istoriia.
- Vendina, T. I. (2014). *Tipologija leksicheskikh arealov Slavii*. Moskva – Sankt-Peterburg: Nestor-Istoriia.
- Georgieva, TŠv. (2016). *Rodstvoto i rodninskite nazvaniia v bulgarskii ezik (semantika i leksikografsko predstaviane)*. Sofiia: Avangard Prima.
- Tolstaia, S. M. (2009). *Kategoriia rodstva v etnolingvističeskoj perspektive*. V: Tolstaia, S. M.; Agapkina, T. A.; Uzenëva, E. S. (red.) *Kategoriia rodstva v iazyke i kul'ture*. Biblioteka Instituta slavjanovedeniia RAN. Moskva: Indrik, 7–22.

Abstract

The study expounds up-to-date data on kinship names in the Sorbian dialects based on an analysis of linguistic maps with commentary available in Volume 11. “Степени родства” [Degrees of kinship] of the Slavic Linguistic Atlas which has been prepared for publication by the Bulgarian National Commission. The language material is authentic, collected and verified on site by Sorbian dialectologists. Emphasis is put on kinship names that belong to the all-Slavic vocabulary, as well as on own dialect word formation which lends originality to the Sorbian kinship names. The study outlines the linguistic areas of foreign language loanwords and elements which have replaced completely the native lexis. With *nomina affinitatis*, a disintegration of the old original naming system and an emergence of differences in the Slavic language territory can be traced. Particular attention is paid to the place of Sorbian dialects both among West Slavic languages, and in the entire Slavic language span. The key methods used in the study are linguo-geographical and comparative.

Slavka Keremidchieva, Ph.D, Professor in the Department of Bulgarian Dialectology and Linguistic Geography at the Institute for Bulgarian Language “Prof. Lyubomir Andreychin”, Bulgarian Academy of Sciences. Participated in the development of the collective academic works of the *Bulgarian Dialect Dictionary* (leader) and the *Bulgarian Dialect Atlas. Generalizing volume*. Head of the Bulgarian commission of the international project Slavic Linguistic Atlas (until 2023). Author and co-author of the following works: *Говорът на Ропката (Родопска граматика)* “The speech of Ropkata. Rhodope grammar” (1993), *Говорът на село Зарово, Солунско* “Speech of the village of Zarovo, Thessaloniki” (2000, with M. Vacheva–Hoteva), *Кратък речник на диалектните думи* “Short dictionary of dialect words” (2001, with L. Antonova–Vasileva), *Български диалектен атлас. Обобщаващ том. I–III. Фонетика. Акцентология. Лексика* “Bulgarian

Dialect Atlas. Generalizing volume. I–III. Phonetics. Accentology. Lexicon” (2001), *Копривицица – история и език* “Koprivshtitsa – History and Language” (2007), *Казано на каменски. Етнолингвистично изследване на кв. Каменица – Велинград* “Told in Kamensky. Ethnolinguistic study of the district of Kamenitsa – Velingrad” (2008, with G. Puhalev and I. Genev–Puhaleva), *Еркеч – паметта на езика* “Erkech – the Memory of the Language” (2012, collective), *Български диалектен атлас. Обобщаващ том. IV. Морфология* “Bulgarian Dialect Atlas. Generalizing volume. IV. Morphology” (2016), *Речник на един архаичен родопски говор – говора на Ропката* “Dictionary of an archaic Rhodope dialect – the dialect of Ropkata” (2022 with L. Vasileva), *Езикът на българската кухня* “The Language of Bulgarian Cuisine” (2023, with M. Koteva, A. Kocheva), et al. She has published over 160 studies, articles, reports, and reviews dedicated to various problems of Bulgarian and Slavic dialect phonology, lexicology, lexicography, and geolinguistics.

e-mail: slavka_ker@abv.bg

