

## STRUCTURE AND ORIGIN OF THE KINSHIP TERMINOLOGY IN ROMA'S LANGUAGE

Svetislav KOSTIĆ

Institute of Indology, Faculty of Philosophy,  
Charles University, Celetná 20, 116 42 Prague 1, Czechia

Romani, a New Indo-Aryan language spoken about thousand years outside India, is a typical contact language; it has been shaped by the influence of genetically and typologically different languages. Many of its features are mixed (some of them inherited, others adopted) and appear on all language levels, but chiefly upon the lexical and semantic levels.

0.1. Romani is a NIA language already spoken for one thousand years outside India. As for its typological features, it is a contact language which is formed by the influence of genetically and typologically different languages. Many of its features are mixed; some of them are genetic or *inherited* (Indian) and some others are adopted from other languages during the periods of Roma migration through Asia and Europe. These *contact-features* appear on all language levels, but the lexical, as well as semantic levels, are particularly significant.

0.2. Dealing with some Romani lexical and *onomastic phenomena* concerning human beings, *individuals* and their relations inside the *family*, clan, *ethnos* and *caste*, in Indian terms *jāti*, we will not consider them by particular dialects, but as a common Romani phenomenon, since they occur in more or less all dialects in a similar way.

We have divided the naming units concerning human beings and social groups into several classes.

The *first* class includes terms and naming units concerning family members and relatives, which can be original or inherited from the Indian stage of Romani history. An important layer of this onomasiologic system consists of loan terms from contact languages (Persian, Turkish, Greek, Slavic etc.) There are also terms (monolexic and polylexemic units) coined in Romani after terminological models in the contact languages.

The *second* class consists of names of Roma individuals (anthroponyms) which are interesting from the sociolinguistic viewpoint. A mimicry of the surrounding society and language is apparent. The Roma's first names and surnames are mostly adopted from the contact and environment people. On the other hand, there is a Roma's segregation from the *gadže's* communities. Hence there are (nick)names current only inside the Roma community and family.

The *third* class includes naming units designating social groups distinguished by their genetic origin and profession.

A) Ethnonyms and gentonyms (names by genetic features), which are either original i.e. inherited from the Indian stage (Roma, Dom, Sinti, Džat etc.) or adopted from the contact languages and peoples: Athinganos, Cigan, Zigeuner, Gypsy, Gitano etc. Some of them are considered to be *abusive appellatives* ( e.g. Cigan). This is, of course, connected with the social status of the Roma people in different European states.

B) Socionyms and professionyms are adopted according to the Roma's social position, lifestyle, 'caste' and profession. Such names are e.g. Gurbets (nomadic Roma), Arli, Jerli (settled Roma), Kalderaš ('kettle-repairs'), Lovars ('horse-traders', 'chanters') etc.

0.3. In this paper we deal only with one segment of this onomastic system: with kinship terminology. We describe the structure of this system with respect to the origin of different types of onomastic units and the history of particular terms.

The Roma's family system has many common features with the Indian one. For thousands of years the *joint family system* has been typical for India and it is still preserved today. Most Roma communities in Europe also live in such families, where more than one brother lives together with wives, children, parents, uncles etc. The similarity is apparent not only in structure of the family and in the regulations by which its distinct members are governed, but also in the terminology. There are many *naming units* of Indian origin preserved in Romani, besides the *new naming units* coined in the manner typical for the Indian Linguistic Area.

This kind of terminology is a very stable part of the language and, judging by IE terminology, it is of long historic duration. All IE language groups contain the same corpus of terms. Romani, as a migrating language, did not preserve the system to that extent. There are only a few terms belonging to the oldest lexical layer.

The second layer consists of Indian nouns developed in Romani as terms by significant semantic shift.

A newer and very extensive layer is that of relative-denoting-terms borrowed from different contact languages: Persian, Turkish, Greek, Slavic, Hungarian etc.

The last onomasiologic type presents monolexic and polylexemic onomastic units *coined* in Romani after Indian or after European language manners.

### **1.0. Terms from the oldest stage, genetic (inherited) lexical layer (Indic terms)**

The original PIE terms like *pater/ pitar/ πατήρ* (father), *mater/ mātar, μήτηρ* (mother), *duhitar/ θυγάτηρ* (daughter), *svasar/ soror* (sister) etc. which occur in many IE languages are not present in Romani.

1.1. The oldest terms denoting relatives in Romani are those derived from the Old and Middle Indian terms: *phral* < *bhrātar* (brother), *phen* (sister), *bori* (daughter-in-law), *džamutro* < *jāmātar* (daughter's husband), *sastro* < *śvaśura* (father-in-law), *sasvi/sasuj* < *śvaśrū* (mother-in-law).

1.1.1. *Phral* is a directly derived noun from the Skt. *bhrātar* (nom. *bhrātā*). During the development the following derivative phonological changes were performed:

A) Voiced root sounds (sonants) lost their voicedness: [bh] > [ph]. This change is typical for the West Indic language Panjabi and some adjacent dialects, where *bhrā* (pronounced *p'rā*) is developed from *bhrātā*.

B) Weakening and *cerebralization* of the dental consonant [t] between two vowels. This change arose in Prakrits, where [d] and [t] became sometimes [l] or [ʃ], e.g. *Sātyavāhana* > *Sālavāhana*. Similar changes occurred during the development of Skt. to *dēvel* (Rom).

C) Weakening and elision of the final vowel [ā]: [ā] > [a] > [0], like in *devatā* > *de(ve)l*.

1.1.2. *Phen* arose in the similar way. From Skt. *bhāginī* by the weakening and disappearance of [g] arose *bha'inī* and after elision of the final [-ī] and by metathesis of the root aspirated labial [bh] arose Hindi *bahin*, *bahan*. In western NIA, e.g. Panjabi and Lahnda, the metathesis did not take place, but only voiced aspirated [bh] became unvoiced and unaspirated. Instead of the aspiration a shift of tone took place. Thus Panjabi *bhain* (pronounced *p'ein*) arose. In Romani deaspiration did not take place and thus the noun *phen* arose.<sup>1</sup>

1.1.3. *Bori* developed from Skt. past passive participle of the verb *vah-* ('to lead', 'to carry away', 'to bear') > *voḍha/uḍha*. The feminine form of this participle is *voḍhī* ('carried [away]'); of course carried to the bride-groom's home). The Indic voiced cerebral consonants as a rule give in Romani [r]. A change [v] > [b] is not unusual in NIA. Other lexemes denoting 'bride' and 'daughter-in-law' are *vaḍhūfī* in Skt., *vahuliā*<sup>2</sup> in Prakrits and *vadhū* in Skt. and Hindi. Here the etymological relation with the root *vah-* is also evident. The nouns: *vivāha* ('marriage', 'wedding') in Skt. and *vivāh* ('marriage', 'wedding', lit. 'carrying away') in Hindi which consists of the prefix *vi-* ('away, out') and the strengthened stem *vāha* are also connected with this verb root. This is the basis of the Romani *bijav* ('wedding'). Here the change [v] > [b] also took place. The changes occurred in the following order: *vivāh* > (elision of the intervocalic [v]) *vi'āh* > *vyāh* > *byāh* > (glide) > *byav* > *biyav*.

1.1.4. *Džamutro* ('son-in-law') corresponds to the Skt. and Hindi *jāmātā* (*jāmātar*). Hindi also has a variant form *jāmāī* and Persian loan-word *dāmād*. The noun *jāmātar* developed from the verb root *\*jam-* which means 'to marry sb.' and the suffix *-tar* (Romani variant is *-tro*).

The noun *jāmātar* is not related to the root *jan-/gen-* 'to generate', 'to produce', since there is a stronger argument for *\*jam-*. It is paralleled in Greek *γαμ-βρόζ* ('son-in-law') < *γαμέω/γαμώ* ('to marry') and no hypothetical historic change of Latin *gener* < *\*gemer* can serve as an argument for the verb root *jan-*. Admittedly, the Greek form has an inserted consonant [β], but this is a usual

<sup>1</sup> See also *phral* in 1.1.1.

<sup>2</sup> This is one more example for the change of the occlusive cerebral [t] to liquid consonant [l]. Cf. *devatā* > *dēvel* (1.1.1.), *bhrātar* > *phral* (1.1.1.) and *yuvatī* > *džuvli* (1.2.4.).

phenomenon accompanying labial nasal [μ]. Instead of expected *γαμρόζ* or *γαμερόζ* we have there *γαμβρόζ*. Maybe the Latin term *gener* really originates from the verb *gigno* (?) and it designates the ‘genitor’ or ‘parent’, an ‘agent engaged in the generative/production process’, or the two verb roots (*jan-* and hypothetical *\*jam-* ‘to marry’) had been contaminated.

The Greek *γαμέω/γαμώ* also means ‘to have sexual intercourse’, ‘to copulate’ and has a parallel verb in Skt. *yabh-* (‘to have sexual intercourse’, ‘to copulate’) with its variants *jabh-/jambh-* and derived noun *jambhana* (‘sexual intercourse’, ‘copulation’, a variant of *yabhana*). From this *\*jāmbhātar* could be developed (?).

1.1.5. *Sastro* – ‘father-in-law’ is etymologically connected with Skt. *śvaśura* from the oldest form *\*svaśura*. The term belongs to the oldest stage of PIE. We suppose its original meaning to be ‘householder’, ‘*pater familias*’. Thus we have Latin *socer*, Greek *έκυρόζ* *hekyros*, Slavic *svekrŭ* (Russ. - *свёкор*, Serb. *свекар*, Slovak *svokor*), Lith. *šėšuras*, Germ. *sweher*, *Schwäher*. This compound noun arose from: *sva-* (‘own’, cf. Lat. ‘suus’, Gk. *έ-* from *\*sve-*) + *śūra* (‘hero’, ‘man’; ‘master’, ‘householder’, which corresponds to the Greek *κύριος* [from *κύρος* – ‘decisive power’]). The consonant [t] in Romani *sastro* is only to simulate the other agent-nouns in Indic, like *kartar* (‘agent’), *śāstar* (‘ruler’) or kinship nouns *mātar* (‘mother’) and *pitar* (‘father’). In other Indic languages the corresponding terms are *sasura* in Prakrits, *sasur* in Hindi, *sasro* in Gujarati, *sāsrā* in Marathi etc.

1.1.6. *Śvaśrūh* – ‘mother-in-law’ is only the female counterpart of the *śvaśura*. Greek parallel is *έκυρά*, Latin *socrus* and Slavic *svekry* (Russ. *свекровь*, Serb. *свекрва*, Slovak *svokra*). Skt. *śvaśrūh* developed in Prakrit *sussū* and in Hindi *sās*. Romani terms *sasvi*, *sasuj*, both being developed from Skt. *śvaśr-* > *sas-*. To the older suffix [-u] a new NIA and Romani suffix [-i] has been attached. This vowel caused the previous vowel [u] to become the consonant [v]: *sasu-i* > *sasvi*, or after the vowel [u] it itself changed into consonant [j]: *sasu-i* > *sasuj*.

1.2. The terms denoting persons according to age (*raklo*, *rakli*, *čhavo*, *čhaj*) as well as to life-style and caste-origin (*rom*, *romni*, *das*, *dasni*, *gadžo*, *gadži* etc.) are derived from nouns of the middle Indian stage.

By *semantic shift* and *specialization* over time these common nouns became special relative-terms instead of the related lost ones.

1.2.1. The terms *raklo* and *rakli* (‘boy’ and ‘girl’, sometimes used instead of ‘son’ and ‘daughter’ or non-Roma children) recall formally and semantically the Hindi homologous nouns *laṛ’kā* and *laṛ’kī*. They are of the same origin, from the Old Indian *lāḍakā* or *lāḍikā* (‘boy’, ‘servant’, ‘slave’). This is connected with the verb root *lāḍ-*, *laḍ-* (‘to play’, ‘to sport’). In Hindi the noun is developed from the modified root *laṛ-* (the cerebral [ḍ] is developed in the cerebral of the new quality – [ṛ]) and the substantivizer suffix *kā-* (masc.) and *kī-* (fem.). The Romani variants are younger, since there is evident deformation of the original noun: *la-ṛa-kā* > *rak-l-o*. Three kinds of changes are apparent: a) change of the syllable order, b) decerebralization of *r* (*r* > *r*), and c) masc. gender marker [-o] instead of [ā] in Hindi.

1.2.2. Romani terms denoting ‘son’ and ‘daughter’ of Roma parents are not typical OIE relative naming units, but MIA and NIA nouns with the common meaning ‘child’, i.e. ‘boy’ (*čhavo*) and ‘girl’ (*čhaj*) are used instead. There are also Hindi, Panjabi, Bengali and other NIA appellatives of similar origin. Thus in Hindi we have *beṭā/beṭī* < Skt. *baṭu/vaṭu* (‘boy, lad’), Prakrit *biṭṭā*. Nouns *baccā* (‘male child, boy’) and *baccī* (‘female child, girl’) developed from the Sanskrit *vatsa* ‘calf, young animal’, through Prakrit *baccaa*. From the social point of view it is interesting that the *čhavo* and *čhaj* denote only Roma children. This *semantic shift* and *specialization* is very important, since it reflects the Indian caste-like-differentiation inside the Roma communities.

1.2.3. The etymology of *čhavo* (‘male child’) is rather vague. Some authors (e.g. Turner,<sup>3</sup> Boretzky<sup>4</sup> etc.) connect it with the Prakrit *chāva* (‘young animal’), Pali *chāpa* and *sāva* (‘child, boy’) and with Hindi *chāvā*, *chāvṛā*, Marvari *sāv*, Nepali *chāva*, Bihari *chāvā* and Asami *sāv*, *sāvā*, all of the same meaning. These nouns are evidently derived from the Sanskrit verb – *sū-*, *su-* (*sūte*, *sauti*) – ‘to give birth’. Forms in *sāv-* are derived from the quoted verb root, but if the lexemes in *chāv* were derived from it too, how to explain the reason for the great phonologic shift – palatalization of the sibilant [s] > [ch]?

1.2.4. The same principles of *semantic shift* and *specialization* concern the terms for husband and wife, developed from nouns *man* and *woman*, and from nouns designating Roma and non-Roma persons. The main distinction is between terms of Roma husband/wife (*rom/romni*) and non-Roma husband and wife (*gadžo/gadžī*, *das*, *dasni*, *džuvli*).

The term *gadžo* designates any person of non-Romani origin, but it is used especially to distinguish ‘husband of non-Roma wife’ (*gadži*) from Roma husband. Its feminine counterpart *gadži* denotes ‘gadžo’s wife’.

Most authors of Romani etymological dictionaries have said nothing of the etymology of *gadžo*, e.g. Calvet and Turner. Others try to derive it from MIA word denoting ‘house’, ‘household’ etc., e.g. Boretzky<sup>5</sup> derives *gadžo* < ai. *gārhya*, mi. *\*gajjha-*? nach sa. < *gaya* ‘Haus(halt)’.

We consider the noun *gadžo* to be *developed* from the Indic compound noun *grāmaja* < *grāma* ‘a village’ (Hindi *gāv*, Romani *gav*) + morpheme *-ja* (at the end of the compound nouns denoting a person according to his birth, from *jan-*, *jāyate* ‘to be born’). The morph *-o* is a typical marker of Romani and some other West NIA masculine nouns. The *gadžo* is probably *inherited* from MIA [Skt. *grāmaja* > *grāja* > *gāvaja* > *gāja* > *gadžo*]. The noun *grāmaja* really does occur in Old Indian, as Boethlingk has shown, also quoting its synonyms *grāmya* and

<sup>3</sup> TURNER, R. (1966), *A Comparative Dictionary of the Indo-Aryan Languages*, London.

<sup>4</sup> BORETZKY, Norbert/IGLA, Birgit (1994), *Wörterbuch Romani-Deutsch-English für den südeuropäischen Raum*, Harrassowitz Verlag, Wiesbaden.

<sup>5</sup> BORETZKY, op. cit., p. 316.

<sup>6</sup> BÖHTLINGK, Otto und ROTH, Rudolph (1855-1875), *Sanskrit-Wörterbuch*, p. 2/857.

<sup>7</sup> BÖHTLINGK, op. cit., p. 869.

*grāmina*. In Boethlingk's Dictionary<sup>6</sup> we find: *grāmaja* (*grāma* + *ja*), adj. im Dorfe geboren, auf bebautem Boden gewachsen, also:<sup>7</sup> *grāmya* = *grāmina* = *grāme jātah* = *grāmabhavo janah* = a) im Dorfe u.s.w. im Gebrauch seiend, dort entstanden, dort bereitet b) im Dorfe lebend, Dorfbewohner, in Dörfern, unter Menschen lebend, von Menschen gezogen, kultiviert, c) im Dorfe gestattet, auf die im Dorfe erlaubte Geschlechtslust gerichtet.

1.2.5. The terms *das m*, *dasni f*, *džuvli f*, denoting non-Roma 'husband' and 'wife' do not occur in the northern Romani dialects (Lovary, Slovak etc.) We have found them in Gurbet, Arli and Kalderaš dialects in the Balkans (see Uhlík's and Boretzky's dictionaries).

The origin of the appellative *das* should be searched in Old Indic *dāsa*, *dasyu* 'servant', 'slave'. During the time of language contacts its meaning was significantly shifted to any non-Roma persons, or rather to those who belong to the **ruling** population in the related period and region. It designates subordinate people!

The term *dasni* ('non-Roma wife') is only a female counterpart of the term *das*.

As for the noun *džuvli*, it developed from Skt. *yuvatī* ('young woman') by means of the palatalization: [y] > [j] and by the mentioned cerebralization: [t] > [ʃ] and its change in the liquid consonant: [ʃ] > [l]. (See also the change *bhrātā* > *phral* in the paragraph 1.1.1. and *vahulīā* in 1.1.3.)

1.2.6. The reason why only *čhavo*, *čhaj* and *romni* designate Romani, and *raklo*, *rakli*, *gadžo*, *gadži* non-Romani 'son', 'daughter', 'husband' and 'wife', is not obvious. It is fixed more or less by accident. There is only an ethno-social, but no etymological or historical reason to ascribe one term to the Roma and the other to the non-Roma person. Nevertheless we find several cases, e.g. in Lovari and Kalderari, when the word *raklo* is used for Roma children, esp. in overt address: *Mro rakloro!* ('My boy'), the same as *Miri gadži!* ('My wife').

1.3. Several relative appellatives are also inherited from the oldest stage of emigration from India, i.e. from their dwelling in Persia.

1.3.1. 'Mother' – *daj* (*dej*, *de*) originates in the OIA verb root *dhe-/dhai-* (*dhayati*- 'to suck') and it has parallels in New Persian *day* ('mother'). In other New Iranian languages it designates either 'mother' or 'nurse'. The 'mother' is its primary meaning. From this is derived also the appellative *dayo/dayi* ('mother's brother').

Etymologically *dhayati* is related to OSlav. *dojiti*, Russ. *доить*, Lot. *dēt* - 'to suck milk from the breast'. Also Armenian *diem* means 'I drink milk from the breast'. The same word occurs in Kurdish – *dae* and in Ossetian – *dejin*, *dejun*. Also the Hindi *dāī* ('nurse', 'midwife') is of Persian origin, as well as many other words.

1.3.2. *Dad* ('father', the vocative case sounds: *dade!* *dado!*) can also be classified as an Iranian word, because it occurs there, but generally its origin seems to be vague and rather of the *Lallwort* (or 'baby's babble') origin. As a *Lallwort* it sounds similar in many languages of the world. To this class belong many relative appellatives, e.g. Czech *táta* ('daddy'), *máma* ('mammy'), *děda* ('grandpa'), *baba* ('grandma, granny'), also in Sanskrit *tāta* (Eng. 'daddy'). It is most

obviously similar to the Iranian appellative *dād* or *dód* and hence we suppose that it is borrowed from there, rather than from Hindi. In Hindi *dādā* denotes ‘father’s father’, whereas Bengali *dādā* means ‘elder brother’. (Compare also Slav. *děda*, *děd* ‘grandfather’ and Russ. *d’ad’a* *дядя* = ‘uncle’.).

1.3.3. Some other terms are connected etymologically with the terms in NIA, e.g. *mami* (‘grandmother’), *kak*, *kako* (‘uncle, father’s brother’), *bibi* (‘aunt’) correspond to the Hindi appellatives: *māmā*, *kākā*, *bībī* (‘woman, wife’) of the same meaning too.

These terms are sometimes marked as loan words (see also below) by the *loan-morph-marker*, e.g. *ňāñus* (grandfather), cf. Hindi *nānā*.

1.3.4. Also *rom* (‘Rom’, ‘man’) and *romni* (‘Rom woman’, ‘woman’) are of Indian origin. As has been mentioned many times by other authors, their ‘ancestor noun’ designated an Indian caste *Doma*. The two nouns in Romani are also used as terms for ‘husband’ and ‘wife’.

**2.0.** The second and the largest group includes loan-words from different contact languages. These denote: ‘grandfather’, ‘grandmother’, ‘grandson’, ‘granddaughter’, as well as other relatives. It is an interesting phenomenon that Roma have forgotten their original Indic appellatives denoting ‘grandfather’, ‘grandmother’, ‘grandson’ etc. and *adopted* terms from contact languages. Why have Roma, as a constantly migrating people, leading nomadic life, in their *joint families*, lost these most significant appellatives?

Some of these terms are borrowed nouns from Greek, other from Rumanian, Hungarian, Slavic or other contact languages. In this paper we deal mainly with the Roma dialects in the Balkans (Arlj, Gurbet, Kalderar and other Vlax dialects) as well as with the dialects in Czechia and Slovakia (Ungrika, Lovary, Servika or Slovak). In these dialects the loan terms occur as follows. Often, esp. in northern dialects (Slovak Servika, Ungrika, Vlaxika etc.) loan-words end in *-os*, *-as*, *-is*, *-us*. These *distinctive* morphs are neither of Romani nor of Indian origin. They **serve to mark a loan-word as a foreign element**. Morphs of **original** Indian/Romani provenance **serve to ‘assimilate’ loan-words**, to make them similar to the Romani words by adding a NIA and Romani marker *-o* for masc. and *-i* for fem., etc. They belong to the Indian morphematic system.

The mentioned ‘distinctive’ morphs *-os*, *-us*, *-as*, *-is* are probably of Greek origin. A very interesting phenomenon is that in the Balkanic Romani dialects they occur very rarely, but are far more frequent in Hungarian, Slovak, Czech Romani and other northern groups. This fact can be explained as follows: In the vicinity of the Greek language it was clear what was Greek and what was Romani. There was no need to stress this difference by any marker. But now (in Slovak, Hungarian, Lovari and other northern Romani dialects) in the new contact environment, Greek suffixes are felt as foreign ones and thus serve as *markers* of words of foreign origin.

These borrowings are analysed here as a phenomenon, not by their distribution in the particular dialects. Our aim is to show the ability of Romani dialects to adopt different types of foreign terms of this kind.

### **Romani appellatives borrowed from non-Indic languages:**

**2.1. South Slavic:** *prababa* ('grandmother'), *kumos*, *kumo* ('godfather'), *tetka* ('aunt'), *ujkus* ('mother's brother').

The *kumos* is from the South Slavic *kum*, which is a corrupted form of the originally Latin *commater* ('mother by baptism, spiritual mother, godmother') or *compater* ('father by baptism, spiritual father, godfather'). The word was corrupted in the Balkanic Vulgar Latin dialect and adopted in other languages as *κουμπάροζ* (in Modern Greek) < *compater*, *кѣмotrъ* < *commater* in Pannonian and West Slavic, as well as in some South Slavic dialects (*kunpar*, *kumpar* < *compater*).

The *ujkus* is from South Slavic 'ujak'. Cf. with the loan term *ujcus* (read: *ujt-sus*) from WSlav. (Slovak) 'ujec'.

The term *krestňakos* is borrowed probably from Serbian or Slovak. It means 'godchild boy' and it is derived from the verb *krstiti/krestiti* ('to baptize').

It is not clear whether the originally Romance *familija* ('family') came directly from Rumanian or if it was mediated by a Slavic language. Similarly *pristašis* ('son-in-law', living in his wife's parents' household), Slavic by origin, seems to be mediated by Rumanian.

*Murš* ('male'), used to denote 'a male child', is probably an amalgamated form from Slavic *muž* ('man, male') and Indic/Romani *manuš* (of the same meaning).

**2.2.** The following terms, mainly in the *Servika* and *Ungrika* dialects, are of **West Slavic** origin: *ujcus* ('uncle') < Slovak 'ujec, ujo', *striko* ('uncle') < Slovak 'stryko', *teta* ('aunt') < Slovak 'teta', *sestrenica* ('cousin girl') < Slovak 'sestrenica', Czech 'sestřenice', *dvojňički* ('twins' < Slovak 'dvojčata', colloqu. 'dvojičky' and Czech 'dvojčata', *otčimos* ('stepfather') < Slovak 'otčim', Czech 'otčim', *macocha* ('stepmother') < Slovak 'macocha', *šougoris* ('wife's/husband's brother') < Slovak 'švagor', *šougorička* ('wife's/husband's sister'), *bratňakos*, *bratrančos* ('male cousin') < Slovak 'bratranec', (*v*)*nuki* or (*v*)*nučata* ('grandchildren') < Slovak 'vnuk' – pl. 'vnuci', 'vnúčata'.

Mainly Slavic vocative forms in **-o** of the noun 'mother': *mamo!* (*matko!*, *maminko!*) are borrowed, whereas in other cases the Romani *daje* is used.

**2.3. Hungarian** also brought some important relative terms into some Romani dialects: *bačis* ('uncle') < Hung. 'bácsi', *nena* ('aunt') < Hung. 'néni', *čalad* ('family') < Hung. 'család' < Slav. *čelad*, *fajta* ('clan, family, sort') < Hung. 'fajta'.

Also *apo!* is a Slavic-like-vocative of the borrowed appellative *apa* ('father') from Hungarian.

**2.4.** In our Central European Romani dialects only a few nouns of this kind have been adopted from **Greek**: *papus*, *papo*, *papici* < Gr. *παππούζ* 'grandfather', *kirvo* ('godfather') < Gr. *κύριοζ*, *kirvi* ('godmother').

This is clearly a word of the Greek origin. We consider that it developed from the Greek *kyrios* only by the assimilation of ending suffix Romani/Indic **-o** instead of Greek **-os** and by *glide* of **-rio** > \**ryo* > *rvo*. V. Černý in his article<sup>8</sup> says that it had also been mediated by an Armenian loan-word from Greek – *kiwro*

(denoting non-Armenians – Kurds, Turks etc.). He explains the development of *iw* from [y] (labial vowel [ü]) and by metathesis of the liquids [w] and [r]: *kiwro* > *kirvo*. Nevertheless Černý does not exclude that *kiwro* in Armenian may also be a loan-word mediated by Romani.

The term *papus* is taken either in its Greek form or it is assimilated by the Romani marker *-o*, e.g. *papo*.

Although the *godfather* does not belong among relatives, his social role in the traditional family, including the Roma's family, is very important. Apart from this noun borrowed from Greek, there are also other loan terms, e.g. the Latin one mediated by South Slavic, i.e. *kum*, and adopted and assimilated as *kumo(s)* etc.

**2.5.** From Rumanian *cumnat* ('wife's brother, husband's brother'), *cumnata* ('wife's sister, husband's sister') arose *kumnato/kunato* and *kunata/kumnata*.

**2.6.** Loan terms from Turkish also occur, e.g. *la'li* ('aunt') and *hanamiko* 'daughter-in-law's parents/relatives', which has different forms in different dialects: *anamiko*, *henamik*, *hanamik*, *anamiko*, *chenamig*. Its female counterpart *henamika* is rarer.

Some authors (e.g. Boretzky) explain the noun *xanamik* ('daughter-in-law's brother or relative') as a loan-word from Armenian *xmami*, but we consider it to be borrowed from Tur. *hanım* - 'lady' and *hanmlık*, which is derived from *hanım* and the Tur. suffix *-lık*. *Hanmlık* means in Turkish 'the status of a Lady, the behaviour of a Lady' and 'a Lady's or wife's relatives'. The same borrowed word *hanumluk* also occurs in some Balkan languages (Serb., Bulg., Alb.).

**3.0.** The third group includes words and onomastic units **coined in Romani** from different indigenous or loan-words, after the Indian model or after some contact language model.

**3.1.** Terms coined **in accordance with the Indian manner** of naming units:

In NIA as well as in Romani there are no special terms to express paired relative nouns like 'parents', 'brother and sister'. Romani onomastic units consist of more than one noun. They are polylexemic and strongly recall the Indian ones: *(e)daj (o) dad* ('parents', lit. 'mother and father'). The related Hindi naming units seem as follows: *mā̃-bāp* or *mātā-pitā* and Bengali ones: *mā̃-bābā*, *mātā-pitā*.

'Brothers and sisters'- *phrala-pheña* is rather more similar to the Indian 'compound' form *bhāi-bahin* in Hindi, *bhāi-bon* in Bengali, *bhrā-bhain (p' rā - p' en)* in Panjabi etc.

Other syntagmas recalling Indian naming units: *bari phen* – 'eldest (first born) sister', *baro phral* – 'eldest (first born) brother' etc. are significant from the point of view of the traditional family life style. (Cf. Hindi *barā bhāi* and *barī bahin*, with the same signification in family relations). They suggest the importance of the elder family members and the value of interpersonal relations in the traditional societies.

---

<sup>8</sup> ČERNÝ, V. (1994), *Odkud kam se ubirá "kirvo"?* In: Romano džaniben, 2/94, pp. 34-37.

3.2. Many terms are coined after European models, monolexemic, as well as polylexemic or syntagmatic, naming units. They are calques or translated loan-words from the contact languages.

The syntagmas *dujto phral*, *aver phral*, *dujevlastengero phral* ('cousin, uncle's brother') and *dujto phen*, *aver phen*, *dujevlastengeri phen* are coined perhaps after some Slavic model, cf. Russ. 'dvojurodnjy brat' (двоюродный брат) and 'dvojurodnaja sestra' (двоюродная сестра), where the relation is defined by the attribute 'other', or 'not direct' (related to 'brother' or 'sister').

In the same manner 'stepfather' and 'stepmother' in Servika and Ungrika Romani are named: *moštovno*<sup>9</sup> *dad* and *moštovno daj* ('present/current father and/or mother'), after Hung. *most* [read *mošt*] – 'now, nowadays' + adjectivizer suffix *-ovno* (< Slav. *-ovn-* + Romani *-o*) + Rom. *dad*, *daj*. Other synonymous designations of 'godfather' and 'godmother' are syntagmas (*krestno dad/daj*) of the Slavic origin: Slav. *krest* ('baptism') + Slav.-Rom. *-no* + Rom. *dad*, *daj*.

Dead parents are designated as *čoro/neboštičko dad/daj* < Rom. *čoro* ('poor') or Slovak and Czech *nebožtík* ('deceased person') + Rom. *dad/daj*.

Adjective *terno*<sup>10</sup> (lit. 'young male') and *terñi* (lit. 'young female') are used as Romani terms denoting 'bride' and 'bridegroom'. They seem to be calqued after the related terms in some Balkan languages, e.g. in Serb. we have also *mлада* ('young female') as a term for 'bride'.

The term *terñi bori* is very interesting. We can consider it to be coined according to the Slavonic and Balkan term denoting the 'young daughter-in-law', but the status of young wife (several months or even years in the new home) is similar in Indian society, as well as in every traditional society.

3.3. Other onomastic units are also formed syntagmatically, i.e. from the basic relative terms with certain attributes, which determine them:

- *Phuri baba* ('great grandmother'), *phuro papus*, *phuro bapus* ('great grandfather') < Rom. 'old' + Slav. 'grandmother'/'grandfather'.
- *Cikne/ churde*<sup>11</sup> *čhave* ('little children') < Rom. 'small, little/tiny' + Rom. 'children'.

These attributes are often possessive adjectives, or rather the genitive case of the 'relative' terms: *čhavengere čhave* ('grandchildren'), *le čhaskero čhavo* ('son's son'), *le čhaskeri čhaj* ('son's daughter'), *la čhakero čhavo* ('daughter's son'), *la čhakeri čhaj* ('daughter's daughter'), *romnjako phral* ('wife's brother'), *pejako čhavo/raklo* ('sister's son/boy'), *pejači čhej/rakli* ('sister's daughter', 'sister's girl').<sup>12</sup>

- Morphologically, and after non-Indian manner are formed the naming units *prapapus* and *dujore*.

<sup>9</sup> *Moštovno* is not from Hung. *második* ('other, second'), but just from *most* ('now').

<sup>10</sup> The adj. *terno* corresponds to Sanskrit adj. *taruṇa* ('young').

<sup>11</sup> Cf. Skt. *kṣudra* – 'little, tiny'.

<sup>12</sup> The last three units are from Romani dialects in the Balkans, the others are from Servika, i.e. from the Slovak Romani.

*Prapapus* is a combination of morphemes, genetically different – Slav. *pra-* ('before') + Gk. *papus* ('grandfather'). The term *dujore* (pl. of the number *duj* – 'two'), expressing 'twins', seems to be calqued after Slovak 'dvojičky' ('twins').

#### 4. CONCLUSION

The Romani onomastic units are based on the following historical layers and linguistic principles of development:

1. There are inherited terms from the Indian stage, slightly modified in Romani (*phen, džamutro* etc.)
2. Generated terms from IA (MIA) by semantic shift and specialization: *rom, romni, gadžo, gadži, raklo, čhavo* etc.
3. Borrowed terms from contact languages, either entirely adopted by assimilative markers (e.g. suffix *-o* m.sg.) or adopted with marking of their foreign origin – by *distinction markers* – e.g. Gk. suffix *-os, -is* etc.).
4. Coined onomastic units in Romani after models of its own (and Indian) onomastic units, or after contact language models.
5. Even in a single dialect we find many synonymous expressions denoting the same individuals within the family system. Often one of them may be 'pure' Romani and the other *borrowed* or *calqued syntagma*. We cannot say that the Romani terminology is a poor one. If the source of terms is not Indic, then there are plenty of loan-words. The Romani lexicon and onomasiologic system seems to be very flexible and productive one. This fact indicates to what extent it is a typical *contact* language.

#### REFERENCES

- BÖHTLINGK, Otto und ROTH, Rudolph (1855-1875), *Sanskrit-Wörterbuch*, Zweiter Theil, St. Petersburg.
- BOREZKY, Norbert/IGLA, Birgit (1994), *Wörterbuch Romani-Deutsch-English für den südeuropäischen Raum*, Harrassowitz Verlag, Wiesbaden.
- CALVET, Georges (1993), *Dictionnaire Tsigane-Français, dialect kalderash*, L'Asiathèque, Paris.
- ČERNÝ, Václav (1994), *Odkud kam se ubírá "kírvo"?* In: Romano džaniben 2/94, pp. 34-37.
- HÜBSCHMANNOVÁ, Milena (1996), *Šaj pes dovakeres*, Můžeme se domluvit, Vydavatelstvo Univerzity Palackého, Olomouc.
- KOŠTIĆ, Svetislav (1996), *Původ romských příbuzenských terminů*. In: Romano džaniben 1-2/1996, pp. 83-87.
- PETROVSKI, Trajko (1986), *Nekrvnoto srodstvo kaj Romite v SR Makedonija*. In: Makedonski folklor 38/1986, pp. 177-182.
- TURNER, R. (1966), *A Comparative Dictionary of the Indo-Aryan Languages*, London.
- UHLIK, Rade (1947), *Srpskohrvatsko-ciganski rečnik (Romane alava)*, Sarajevo.
- UHLIK, Rade (1983), *Srpskohrvatsko-romsko-engleski rečnik, Romengo alavari*, Svjetlost, Sarajevo.

#### Abbreviations

<b>Alb.</b>	Albanian	<b>m(asc.)</b>	masculine gender
<b>ai.</b>	altindisch	<b>mi.</b>	mittelindisch
<b>Bulg.</b>	Bulgarian	<b>MIA</b>	Middle Indo-Aryan
<b>Eng.</b>	English	<b>NIA</b>	New Indo-Aryan
<b>f(em.)</b>	feminine gender	<b>OIE</b>	Old Indo-Aryan
<b>Gk.</b>	Greek	<b>OSlav.</b>	Old Slavic
<b>Germ.</b>	German	<b>PIE</b>	Proto Indo-European
<b>Hung.</b>	Hungarian	<b>Rom.</b>	Romani
<b>IA</b>	Indo-Aryan	<b>Russ.</b>	Russian
<b>IE</b>	Indo-European	<b>Serb.</b>	Serbian
<b>Lat.</b>	Latin	<b>Skt. (sa.)</b>	Sanskrit
<b>Lith.</b>	Lithuanian	<b>Slav.</b>	Slavic
<b>Lot.</b>	Latvian	<b>Tur.</b>	Turkish