

## SERBO-CROATIAN KINSHIP TERMINOLOGY (1)

Eugene A. Hammel

### Introduction

Kinship terminologies have been a subject of anthropological concern for two principal reasons: their systemic character which makes them subject to formal analysis, and their correspondence with the categories of persons involved in particular social relations. Most investigations along these lines have been in the terminologies of groups whose languages are outside of Indo-European and in societies often considerably different from our own.

This paper is an investigation of a kinship system in the anthropologically neglected area of European peasant society; it has as its focal point the Serbo-Croatian kinship terminology, with comparative data drawn from neighboring Albania. In it we attempt three things: First, to record items of fact which have been investigated only occasionally and even more rarely published. Second, to perform a semantic analysis of the data of the kind which anthropologists have been doing for a half-century, but to which Lounsbury (1956) has recently brought a welcome degree of formal rigor. Third, to point out those features of social organization in Yugoslav peasant society which achieve the same or different categorizations of kin as does the terminology, and to consider the logical relationship between the two categorizations. The data are presented in sufficient detail so that the reader may check the analysis in terms of them, and the conclusions in terms of both data and analysis. The analysis itself is given in a formal fashion so that the reader may determine whether or not it is logically adequate to the problem. The work is thus open to discussion on matters of fact, of procedure, and of final inference.

The data presented here were gathered from ten sources, two of which were literary and eight of which were informants. Three of the informants and one literary source present information from Croatia-Slavonia, and the remaining five informants and one literary source present information from Serbia. In several cases, informants presented information which was limited in amount but nevertheless entirely consistent with the fuller information given by another informant from the same geographic area. In such cases, the information from the informants was combined, so that the informant giving the maximum amount of information is listed here as the principal source and those giving lesser amounts as supplementary sources. Thus, from the ten original sources we have drawn five lists of kin terms. In Table I each of these lists is numbered (I-V), and the principal and

supplementary sources for each list are given in Appendix I. Some additional data were drawn from two other literary sources but were not considered as basic to the analysis because of their scanty character or doubtful provenience; these are Krauss (1885) and Durham (1928).

### Kin Terms

In the list of terms to follow (Table I), the first column contains the term for the kin class in Serbo-Croatian (in capital letters) followed in parentheses by its nearest English equivalent. Alternate terms occurring in free or limited variation with those found in the first column of the table are specified in Appendix II. In the second through sixth columns of Table II (numbered I-V) are the appropriate denotata of the term given in the first column. These are written with the customary abbreviations for kin types. Where no confusion is possible, abbreviations for English kin classes may be used to conserve space, e.g., GrFa, ChSo. Any class so denoted contains all the kin types that the English class of identical denotation would include. A question mark after the denotation of a kin type indicates that the informant was in doubt or that the source was not clear on the matter; any other points in doubt are so indicated by reference to an endnote. Terms of address are the vocative forms of the referential terms given (cf. pp. 13, 15).

One will note that no affinal terms have been included. The method of classifying affines is rather different from that of classifying consanguineal relatives and is not dealt with here (2).

While the reader is again referred to Appendix I for a detailed list of the informants included in the composite sources given in Table I, we may note briefly that Sources I-III present information from Croatia-Slavonia and Sources IV-V from Serbia.

T A B L E I

Term	S O U R C E				
	<u>I</u>	<u>II</u>	<u>III</u>	<u>IV</u>	<u>V</u>
MAJKA (mother)	Mo	Mo	Mo	Mo	Mo
OTAC (father)	Fa	Fa	Fa	Fa	Fa
SIN (son)	So	So	So	So	So
ĆERKA (daughter)	Da	Da	Da	Da	Da
BRAT (brother)	Br	Br	Br	Br	Br
SESTRA (sister)	Si	Si	Si	Si	Si
STRIC (uncle)	FaBr	FaBr	FaBr	FaBr	FaBr
		FaFaBr	FaFaBr		
			FaMoBr(3)		
		MoFaBr	FaFaBrSo	FaFaBrSo	
			FaFaSiSo	FaFaSiSo	
			FaMoBrSo	FaMoBrSo	
			FaMoSiSo	FaMoSiSo	
UJAK (uncle)	MoBr	MoBr	MoBr	MoBr	MoBr
		FaMoBr			
		MoMoBr			
			MoFaBr		
			MoMoBr		
			MoFaBrSo	MoFaBrSo	
			MoFaSiSo?	MoFaSiSo	
			MoMoBrSo	MoMoBrSo	
			MoMoSiSo	MoMoSiSo	
TETKA (aunt)	FaSi	FaSi	FaSi	FaSi	FaSi
	MoSi	MoSi	MoSi	MoSi	MoSi
		FaFaSi	FaFaSi		
		FaMoSi	FaMoSi		
		MoFaSi	MoFaSi		
		MoMoSi	MoMoSi		
			FaFaBrDa	FaFaBrDa	
			FaFaSiDa	FaFaSiDa	
			FaMoBrDa	FaMoBrDa	
			FaMoSiDa	FaMoSiDa	
			MoFaBrDa	MoFaBrDa	
			MoFaSiDa	MoFaSiDa	
			MoMoBrDa	MoMoBrDa	
			MoMoSiDa	MoMoSiDa	
BRAT OD (cousin)(4)	FaBrSo			FaBrSo	FaBrSo
				MoBrSo	MoBrSo
				FaSiSo	FaSiSo
				MoSiSo	MoSiSo
SESTRA OD (cousin)(4)	FaBrDa			FaBrDa	FaBrDa
				MoBrDa	MoBrDa
				FaSiDa	FaSiDa
				MoSiDa	MoSiDa

<u>Term</u>	<u>I</u>	<u>II</u>	<u>III</u>	<u>IV</u>	<u>V</u>
DED (grandfather)	FaFa MoFa	FaFa MoFa	FaFa MoFa	FaFa MoFa FaFaBr FaMoBr MoFaBr MoMoBr	FaFa MoFa FaFaBr FaMoBr MoFaBr MoMoBr
BABA (grandmother)	FaMo MoMo	FaMo MoMo	FaMo MoMo	FaMo MoMo FaFaSi FaMoSi MoFaSi MoMoSi	FaMo MoMo FaFaSi FaMoSi MoFaSi MoMoSi
NEĆAK (nephew)	SiSo	SiSo(5) BrSo(5)	SiSo(5) BrSo(5)	SiSo(6) BrSo	
NEĆAKINJA (niece)	SiDa	SiDa(5) BrDa(5)	SiDa(5) BrDa(5)	SiDa(6) BrDa	
BRATANAC (nephew)(7)	BrSo	BrSo		BrSo FaBrSoSo FaSiSoSo MoBrSoSo MoSiSoSo	BrSo
BRATANICA (niece)(7)	BrDa	BrDa?		BrDa FaBrSoDa FaSiSoDa MoBrSoDa MoSiSoDa	BrDa
BRATIĆ (cousin)	FaBrSo	BrSo?(8)	FaBrSo FaSiSo MoBrSo MoSiSo		
BRATIČNA (cousin)		BrDa?(8)	FaBrDa FaSiDa MoBrDa MoSiDa		
SESTRIĆ (nephew)(9)	SiSo	SiSo		SiSo FaBrDaSo FaSiDaSo MoBrDaSo MoSiDaSo	SiSo
SESTRIČINA (niece)	SiDa	SiDa		SiDa FaBrDaDa FaSiDaDa MoBrDaDa MoSiDaDa	SiDa
STRIČEVIĆ (cousin)	FaBrSo	FaBrSo	FaBrSo		
STRIČEVIČNA (cousin)	FaBrDa	FaBrDa	FaBrDa		

<u>Term</u>	<u>I</u>	<u>II</u>	<u>III</u>	<u>IV</u>	<u>V</u>
UJČEVIĆ (cousin)(10)	MoBrSo	MoBrSo	MoBrSo		
UJČIČNA (cousin)	MoBrDa	MoBrDa	MoBrDa		
TETIĆ (cousin)	FaSiSo MoSiSo	FaSiSo MoSiSo	FaSiSo MoSiSo		
TETIČNA (cousin)	FaSiDa MoSiDa	FaSiDa MoSiDa	FaSiDa MoSiDa		
UNUK (grandson)	SoSo DaSo	SoSo DaSo	SoSo DaSo	SoSo DaSo BrSoSo BrDaSo SiSoSo SiDaSo	SoSo DaSo BrSoSo BrDaSo SiSoSo SiDaSo
UNUKA (granddaughter)	SoDa DaDa	SoDa DaDa	SoDa DaDa	SoDa DaDa BrSoDa BrDaDa SiSoDa SiDaDa	SoDa DaDa BrSoDa BrDaDa SiSoDa SiDaDa
PRAUNUK (greatgrandson)	ChChSo	ChChSo	ChChSo	ChChSo Br/SiChChSo	ChChSo Br/SiChChSo
PRAUNUKA (greatgranddaughter)	ChChDa	ChChDa	ChChDa	ChChDa Br/SiChChDa	ChChDa Br/SiChChDa
PRAPRAUNUK (greatgreat-grandson)	GrGrGrSo	GrGrGrSo		BrGrGrSo GrGrGrNe	
PRAPRAUNUKA (greatgreat-granddaughter)	GrGrGrDa	GrGrGrDa		GrGrGrDa GrGrGrNi	
BELA PČELA (greatgreat-grandchild)					GrGrGrCh
PRANEČAK (greatnephew)		BrSoSo BrDaSo SiSoSo SiDaSo	BrSoSo BrDaSo SiSoSo SiDaSo		
PRANEČAKINJA (greatniece)		BrSoDa BrDaDa SiSoDa SiDaDa	BrSoDa BrDaDa SiSoDa SiDaDa		
PRADED (greatgrandfather)	GrGrFa	GrGrFa	GrGrFa	GrGrFa	GrGrFa
PRABABA (greatgrandmother)	GrGrMo	GrGrMo	GrGrMo	GrGrMo	GrGrMo
PRAPRADED (greatgreat-grandfather)	GrGrGrFa			GrGrGrFa	
PRAPRABABA (greatgreat-grandmother)	GrGrGrMo			GrGrGrMo	
ČUKUNDED (greatgreat-grandfather)	GrGrGrGrFa	GrGrGrGrFa		GrGrGrGrFa	GrGrGrGrFa

<u>Term</u>	<u>I</u>	<u>II</u>	<u>III</u>	<u>IV</u>	<u>V</u>
ČUKUMBARA (greatgreat-grandmother)	GrGrGrGrMo	GrGrGrMo		GrGrGrMo	
BODJAK (cousin)	FaSiSo MoSiSo MoBrDa	male cousin	male cousin	male cousin	
BODJAKINJA (cousin)	FaSiDa MoSiDa MoBrDa	female cousin	female cousin	female cousin	
STRICEVI (2nd cousin)					FaBrChCh
UJČEVIĆI (2nd cousin)(11)					MoBrChCh
TEKIĆI (2nd cousin)					FaSiChCh MoSiChCh
RODBINA	used, but undefined	father's kin		father's kin	FaBrChCh FaSiChCh
SVOJTA	used, but undefined	mother's kin		mother's kin	MoBrChCh MoSiChCh
BODJENI (adjective)		lineal or primary relative		lineal or primary relative	lineal or primary relative
NERODJENI (adjective)		collateral relative		collateral relative	collateral relative

## Analysis

The first step of abstraction of the data given in Table I was to group Sources I-III (Croatian) and Sources IV-V (Serbian). The differences between members of a single group are less than those between members of the separate groups. Although some similarities between members of the two groups (I-III and IV-V) are obscured by such grouping, reference to Table I will always indicate the original distributions, and these are preserved in the symbolic notation in Table II. As an example, we may note the use of the term nećak by members of both groups, although the term is absent in the rural Serbian data. The virtue of the grouping is that certain central principals of organization are thus clearly isolated as Croatian or Serbian.

In the analysis to follow, we will make certain general observations about the common characteristics of both the Serbian and the Croatian groups, pass to a discussion of the principles of organization peculiar to one or the other, and conclude with a tabular and textual recapitulation of the principal similarities and differences between the two bodies of data.

In terms of biological distance from Ego, there is an area of agreement between all the terminologies listed, i.e., that including all lineal relatives (with the minor exception here of some disagreement on the denotata for the terms čukunded and čukumbaba, all primary relatives, and all collateral relatives of the first ascending generation. Inconsistencies occur outside of this area in the total body of data, as they do in the testimony of any one informant. A further note of interest is that, within the area of perfect agreement, except for the second and lower descending generations, complementary male and female kin types (Fa-Mo, Br-Si) are designated by different lexical roots, while the complementary male and female kin types outside this area of agreement are designated by morphologically feminine or masculine variants of the same root (nećak-nećakinja, unuk-unuka). The distinction of sex of relative by separate lexical root extends outside this area of perfect agreement only in those cases where terms for relatives within the area are extended outside it (FaSiSo and Br = BRAT; FaSiDa and Si = SESTRA).

A distinctive feature within the area of agreement in the first ascending generation is the merging of aunts and the separation of uncles (Au, FaBr, MoBr). These distinctions are common to both the Croatian and the Serbian systems in the first ascending generation, and are further operative for the subsuming of more removed relatives under the same terms. For example, consult Table I under TETKA (Au), Source II, for Croatian FaSi, FaFaSi. See Source IV under the same term for Serbian FaSi, FaFaSiDa. These distinctions are retained in both systems but applied differently to more removed kin, as will be explained below.

Another feature, basic to the Serbian system but absent in the Croatian one, is the merging of siblings and cousins of the same sex.

The terminological merging is found in common usage in reference to relatives of Ego's generation and is basic to the categorization of collateral relatives of the descending generations. Fuller explanation of this feature will be given below, but we may note here that the terminological merging of the children of Br and FaBrSo follows from the designation of Br as brat and FaBrSo as brat od strica. For the purposes of analysis to follow, we will assume that the classes BRAT and BRAT OD, and SESTRA and SESTRA OD are merged into two: BRAT and SESTRA, even though common usage for non-primary relatives in these categories is often specific, e.g. brat od strica (4).

In detailed analysis of the kin classes we have found it convenient to denote individual kin types and the significata of kin classes in a simple symbolic notation. The biological features which are distinguished in the notation are: generation level, lineality or collaterality, sex of relative, and sex of linking relative(s). Each of these features but sex is presented in the notation by a symbol: generation = G, lineality = L, collaterality = C. We have chosen to indicate sex in a manner after that suggested by Radcliffe-Brown; capital letters indicate males and lower case letters indicate females.

Within G (or g) the following generation classes may be distinguished, where the superscripts <sup>n</sup>, <sup>m</sup> are any positive integers:

$G^0$  = Ego's generation

$G^1$  = first ascending generation

$G^{1+n}$  = second and higher ascending generations

$G^{-1}$  = first descending generation

$G^{-1-n}$  = further descending generations

The basic elements of the notation have thus been defined. These may be combined in the notations for kin types or classes. Where the kin type denoted is also a terminological class, the notation for the type will be completely enclosed in parentheses. Where the kin type denoted is not also a terminological class, it will not be so enclosed. As an example, in  $(G^{nL})G^{nC}G^0C$ ,  $(G^{nL})$  is a terminological class,  $G^{nC}$  is not, but  $(G^{nL})G^{nC}$  is;  $G^0C$  is not, but the total expression is. Combinations of basic kin types are to be read from left to right; the first kin type is the first linking relative, the second kin type the second linking relative, and so on, to the relative denoted by the class. The juxtaposition of any two kin types in the notation, unseparated by a comma, indicates a consanguineal link, just as FaFaBrSo is read, "father's father's brother's son," without specific indication of the genitive in the abbreviation. As an example,  $(G^1L)G^1C)G^0C$  is read, left to right, FaBrSo. Alternatively, it may be read from right to left as, "a collateral male relative of Ego's generation, related to Ego through a collateral male relative of the first ascending generation and a lineal male relative of the first ascending generation." The superiority of the notation over the verbal description in terms of economy is apparent, and its superiority over the standard abbreviated notation, FaBrSo, lies in the fact that we are no longer dependent on

the meanings of English kin types in dealing with a different terminological system. It enables us to work in Serbo-Croatian without knowing the language.

### Serbian

In the Serbian system, we may begin the analysis by distinguishing generation levels and then making further distinctions within those levels on the basis of the criteria mentioned above, i.e., lineality or collaterality, sex of the relative, sex of the linking relative. All five generation levels are distinguished:  $G^0$ ,  $G^1$ ,  $G^{1+n}$ ,  $G^{-1}$ ,  $G^{-1-n}$ .

In  $G^{1+n}$  and  $G^{-1-n}$ , distinguish:

- a) Sex of relative. This will, within any one generation, distinguish all individuals. Example: DED =  $(G^2)$  = "any male relative of the second ascending generation." UNUKA =  $(g^{-2})$  = "any female relative of the second descending generation." Since the structure of the system does not change with further ascending or descending generations, e.g., PRADED =  $(G^3)$ , PRABABA =  $(g^3)$ , we are tentatively omitting specification of the prefixation pattern for particular generations.

In  $G^1$ , distinguish:

- a) Lineality and collaterality. This will establish the latent classes of parents and parent's siblings.
- b) Sex of relative. This establishes the terminological classes OTAC = Fa =  $(G^1L)$ , MAJKA = Mo =  $(g^1l)$ , and TETKA = Au =  $(g^1c)$ .
- c) Sex of the linking relative in  $G^1$  in the latent class, uncle. This establishes the terminological classes STRIC = FaBr =  $(G^1L)G^1C$  and UJAK = MoBr =  $(g^1l)G^1C$ .

In  $G^0$ , distinguish:

- a) Sex of relative. This establishes the classes of BRAT = Br =  $(G^0)$  and SESTRA = Si =  $(g^0)$ . Here we have merged the BRAT and BRAT OD, SESTRA and SESTRA OD classes into two, as noted above.

In  $G^{-1}$ , distinguish:

- a) Lineality and collaterality. This will establish the latent classes of child and sibling's child (if sibling = BRAT or SESTRA, as noted).
- b) Sex of the linking relative in  $G^0$  in the latent class of

sibling's child. This yields, in  $G^{-1}$ , the latent classes of BrCh and SiCh, in addition to that of own child.

- c) Sex of relative. This yields the terminological classes SIN = So = ( $G^{-1}L$ ), ČERKA = Da = ( $g^{-1}l$ ), BRATANAC = BrSo = ( $G^0$ ) $G^{-1}C$ ), BRATANICA = BrDa = ( $G^0$ ) $g^{-1}c$ ), SESTRIC = SiSo = ( $g^0$ ) $G^{-1}C$ ), and SESTRICINA = SiDa = ( $g^0$ ) $g^{-1}c$ ).
- d) Note that sex of the linking relative is occasionally not distinguished, yielding the classes SIN, ČERKA, NEČAK, NEČAKINJA, as in the Croatian system. See endnotes 5, 6.

The categorization of relatives may be schematically represented as follows (English kin types are briefly indicated--see Table I):

		PRADED GrGrFa		PRABABA GrGrMo	
		DED GrFa		BABA GrMo	
STRIC FaBr	UJAK MoBr	OTAC Fa		MAJKA Mo	TETKA Au
		BRAT Br/Co	ego	SESTRA Si/Co	
BRATANAC Br/CoSo	BRATANICA Br/CoDa	SIN So		ČERKA Da	SESTRIC Si/CoSo
		UNUK GrSo/Ne		UNUKA GrDa/Ni	
		PRAUNUK GrGrSo/Ne		PRAUNUKA GrGrDa/Ni	
				SESTRICINA Si/CoDa	

One will note that the primary asymmetry in the schematic representation as well as in the generation list preceding it lies in the difference between the grouping of relatives in  $G^1$  and  $G^{-1}$ , and within  $G^1$ , itself. The sex of the linking relative is not distinguished in the class TETKA. Further, as we will make clear in an illustration to follow, it is the sex of the linking relative in  $G^1$ , i.e., the first in the chain of relatives moving out from Ego, that classifies uncles as STRIC or UJAK. It is the sex of the linking relative in  $G^0$ , i.e., the last in the chain of relatives moving out from Ego, that classifies nephews and nieces as BRATANAC-BRATANICA or SESTRIC-SESTRICINA. In both cases, however, it is the sex of a terminologically primary relative that is crucial.

Since the prefix, pra-, is used in a regular fashion (except in the case of čukunded and čukumbaba) to indicate generations successively removed from Ego, we may take as basic classes of the Serbian system those indicated by the terms: DED, BABA, STRIC, UJAK, OTAC, MAJKA, TETKA, BRAT, SESTRA, BRATANAC, BRATANICA, SIN, ČERKA, SESTRIC, SESTRICINA, UNUK, and UNUKA (see Appendix II for alternate terms). If we accept the schematic representation of the kin classes as illustrative of the rules of the system and bear in mind the equivalence of siblings and cousins, as stated, as well as the distinctions between FaBr, MoBr, and Au, we may classify any kin type in the system. We may not in this way "explain" the system, but only illustrate its consistency.

Let us consider the class in which we would place Ego's FaFaBrSo. To Ego's father, that individual is FaBrSo, therefore son of stric, or brat od strica. As such, he may be considered equivalent to brat by Fa. To Ego, then, that individual is equivalent to FaBr, or in the class STRIC. In the same way, FaMoBrSo is the son of father's ujak, and therefore is brat od ujaka to father, or terminologically equivalent to FaBr to Ego. As such, he is again in the class STRIC to Ego. On the other hand, MoFaBrSo is the son of mother's stric, and is mother's brat od strica, therefore MoBr to Ego, and would be in the class UJAK to Ego. Likewise, MoMoBrSo is terminologically equivalent to MoBr to Ego and is therefore in the class UJAK to him. Thus, all males of the first ascending generation related to Ego through Fa are in the class STRIC, and all related to Ego through Mo are in the class UJAK. This explanation was explicitly furnished by one of the Serbian informants.

When we turn to the designations for collateral relatives in the first descending generation, the merging of siblings with cousins is again crucial. For example, FaBrSoSo is assigned as follows: FaBrSo to Ego is brat od strica and equivalent to brat. The son of brat is in all cases bratanac; therefore FaBrSoSo is equivalent to BrSo in the class BRATANAC. Likewise, FaSiSoSo is the son of Ego's brat od tetke; the latter is equivalent to brat, and the son is therefore again classified as BRATANAC. On the other hand, FaBrDaSo, being the son of Ego's sestra od strica, or of an individual equivalent to Ego's sestra, is in the class SESTRIC. Again, FaSiDaSo is the son of sestra od tetke, or of an individual equivalent to sestra, and is therefore in the class SESTRIC, regardless of the sex of the relative in any but the final linking position.

For another example, how is it that FaFaBr is merged with FaFa in the class DED? This merging is a corollary of the position of Ego with respect to FaFaBr. Ego's father is BrSo to FaFaBr; as such, he is in the class BRATANAC to FaFaBr. Ego, as the son of a member of the class BRATANAC, can only be unuk to FaFaBr. If Ego is unuk to FaFaBr, then FaFaBr is ded to him.

If the reader would like to construct further examples, it might be helpful to point out the specific reciprocal term pairs. Reciprocal

sets are separated by a colon, the slash (/) separates classes distinguished by sex of relative or linking relative.

Praded/prababa : praunuk/pr aunuka

Ded/baba : unuk/unuka

Otac/majka : sin/ćerka

Brat/sestra : brat/sestra

Stric/ujak/tetka : bratanac/bratanica/sestrić/sestričina

Four other systems of designating relatives occur in the testimony of Source V and are mentioned in the literature; these crosscut the other terminological categories. The class RODJAK-RODJAKINJA applies broadly to all collaterals and is translated, "cousin," or "relative." More specifically, it applies to collaterals in Ego's or the descending generations at least twice removed. Another system differentiates between RODBINA and SVOJTA, i.e., between father's and mother's relatives, respectively. The third system differentiates between the descendants, in the first descending generation, of Ego's FaBr, MoBr, and Au (9). The classes in the third system are: STRIČEVI, UJČEVI, and TETKIĆI, respectively. The fourth system distinguishes lineal and primary from collateral relatives in cases where these are otherwise terminologically merged with the classes RODJENI and NERODJENI, respectively.

The definitions of these classes are such that they crosscut those previously described and each other. One will note, for example, that all members of STRIČEVI are also in the class RODBINA and that all UJČEVI are also in the class SVOJTA. Members of the class TETKIĆI, however, may be in either the class RODBINA or the class SVOJTA. Membership in the class RODBINA is expressed by the phrase po ocu (through father), and in the class SVOJTA by the phrase po majci (through mother). These expressions may combine with the adjectives rodjeni and nerodjeni to indicate agnatic or cognatic collaterality or lineality. For example, FaFa = rodjeni ded po ocu, MoFaBr = nerodjeni ded po majci. Brat od strica may also be referred to as nerodjeni brat.

### Croatian

The Croatian terminology abstracted here from Sources I-III shows more internal differentiation than does the Serbian terminology (Sources IV-V). There is sufficient consistency, however, to enable us to present it as a unit, noting the differences between sources where necessary. If we distinguish generation levels as before, further criteria may be applied in each generation to differentiate the terminological classes:

In  $G^{1+n}$ , distinguish:

- a) Lineality and collaterality. The latent classes of grandparent and great uncle/great aunt are thus distinguished.

- b) Sex of relative. This establishes the terminological classes of DED = GrFa =  $(G^2L)$ , BABA = GrMo =  $(g^2l)$ , and TETKA = GrAu =  $(g^2c)$ .
- c) Sex of the first linking relative (Source II) or last linking relative (Source III). This establishes the terminological classes STRIC = GrUn =  $(G^2L)G^2C$  (Source II),  $(G^1L)G^2C$  (Source III); UJAK = GrUn =  $(g^2l)G^2C$  (Source II),  $(g^1l)G^2C$  (Source III).

All of the examples here are from  $G^2$ . In very specific referential usage, the terms for collaterals could be preceded by the prefix, pra-, or the word star (old), but in common usage and in the vocative, the terms are as given. In further extensions into higher generations, the remarks previously made about the use of the prefix, pra-, apply.

In  $G^1$ , distinguish:

- a) Lineality and collaterality. This distinguishes the latent classes of parent and uncle/aunt.
- b) Sex of relative. This establishes the terminological classes OTAC = Fa =  $(G^1L)$ , MAJKA = Mo =  $(g^1l)$ , and TETKA = Au =  $(g^1c)$ .
- c) Sex of the first linking relative. This establishes the classes STRIC = FaBr =  $(G^1L)G^1C$  and UJAK = MoBr =  $(g^1l)G^1C$ .

In  $G^0$ , distinguish:

- a) Lineality and collaterality. The latent classes of siblings and cousins are thus distinguished.
- b) Sex of relative. The terminological classes BRAT = Br =  $(G^0L)$  and SESTRA = Si =  $(g^0l)$  are established. This criterion also makes a distinction in the latent class of cousin.
- c) Sex of the last linking relative in the cousin class. Sex of relative having been distinguished above, this establishes the classes TETIĆ = AuSo =  $(g^1c)G^0C$  and TETIČNA = AuDa =  $(g^1c)g^0c$ .
- d) Sex of the first linking relative among the remaining cousins, i.e., sex of the linking primary relative. Sex of relative having been applied, this establishes the classes STRIČEVIĆ = FaBrSo =  $(G^1L)G^1C)G^0C$ , STRIČEVIČNA = FaBrDa =  $(G^1L)G^1C)g^0c$ , UJČEVIĆ = MoBrSo =  $(g^1l)G^1C)G^0C$ , and UJČEVIČNA = MoBrDa =  $(g^1l)G^1C)g^0c$ .

In  $G^{-1}$ , distinguish:

- a) Lineality and collaterality. This distinguishes the latent classes of son/daughter and nephew/niece.
- b) Sex of relative. This establishes the classes  $SIN = So = (G^{-1}L)$ ,  $\acute{C}ERKA = Da = (g^{-1}l)$ ,  $NE\acute{C}AK = Ne = (G^0L)G^{-1}C$ , or  $(g^0l)G^{-1}C$ , and  $NE\acute{C}AKINJA = Ni = (G^0L)g^{-1}c$  or  $(g^0l)g^{-1}c$ .
- c) Sex of the linking primary relative may be distinguished to establish the classes  $SESTRIC\acute{A}$ ,  $SESTRIC\acute{I}NA$ ,  $BRATANAC$ ,  $BRATANICA$ , as in the Serbian system, above, but without extension to descendants of non-primary relatives, since siblings and cousins have not been merged.

In  $G^{-1-n}$ , distinguish:

- a) Lineality and collaterality. This establishes the latent classes of grandchild and grandnephew/grandniece.
- b) Sex of relative. This establishes the terminological classes  $UNUK = GrSo = (G^{-2}L)$ ,  $UNUKA = GrDa = (g^{-2}l)$ ,  $PRANE\acute{C}AK = GrNe$ , compounded on  $NE\acute{C}AK$ , above, and  $PRANE\acute{C}AKINJA = GrNi$ , compounded on  $NE\acute{C}AKINJA$ , above. Use of the prefix, pra-, is again regular for further descending generations.

The categorization of relatives may be represented schematically as follows:

UJAK GrUn	STRIC GrUn	DED GrFa	BABA GrMo	TETKA GrAu
UJAK Un	STRIC Un	OTAC Fa	MAJKA Mo	TETKA Au
UJ\acute{C}EVIC Co UJ\acute{C}EVI\acute{C}NA Co	STRIC\acute{E}VIC Co STRIC\acute{E}VI\acute{C}NA Co	BRAT Br	ego	SESTRA Si
				TETIC Co TETI\acute{C}NA Co
	BRATANAC? Ne BRATANICA? Ni	SIN So	NE\acute{C}AK \acute{C}ERKA Da	SESTRIC\acute{A}? Ne SESTRIC\acute{I}NA? Ni
		UNUK GrSo UNUKA GrDa	PRANE\acute{C}AK GrNe PRANE\acute{C}AKINJA GrNi	

The rarer alternates in  $G^0$  are listed here with a question mark; all terms are used precisely as in the Serbian scheme, with the following exceptions. Consider the fuller set of terms as basic. NEČAK/NEČAKINJA may replace either SESTRIC/SESTRICINA, BRATANAC/BRATANICA, or both. From the testimony of Source I, as well as from an alternate given by Source IV, NEČAK/NEČAKINJA may tend to replace only SESTRIC/SESTRICINA, or at least to replace that set before BRATANAC/BRATANICA (5, 6). The alternate classes BRATIC/BRATICNA given by Sources I and III are similar to the classes RODJAK/RODJAKINJA, except that they include only first cousins once removed.

One will note that the grouping of relatives in  $G^1$  and  $G^2$  is formally identical, in strong contrast to the Serbian system. Reference to Table I and to the notations to follow in Table II, however, will indicate that Sources II and III, while having the same formal organization of categories in  $G^2$ , place different kin types in the kin classes of the same name. To Source III, the decisive criterion is whether or not the relative is on the mother's or father's side; to Source II, it is the identity of the relative to his parent that decides the question. Source III, in differentiating between relatives of the second ascending generation, continues application of the criterion of sex of the linking primary relative; Source II used the same terms for these relatives that his individual parents did. Both sources were explicit on this matter. The merging of generations between collaterals in  $G^1$  and  $G^2$  is often avoided, as noted above, by the use of the term star (old), as in stari stric to indicate stric in  $G^2$  as opposed to stric in  $G^1$ . The prefix, pra-, may serve the same purpose.

### Tabular Summary

In Table II will be found the symbolic notations for the major kin classes listed in the two analyses above. Each of these notations is an abstraction from the data presented and constitutes a minimum definition for the kin class, thus including the maximum number of kin types. For collateral relatives, since precise degree of collaterality is not specified, the notations are actually hypotheses which may be tested as data for more removed relatives become available. Each of the notations includes all of the kin types given in Table I for the corresponding terminological class. It may include more, as just noted in the case of collateral relatives. It will include no less, and will include no kin types subsumed under any other terminological class except those which crosscut the system (RODJAK, RODJAKINJA, ROJBINA, SVOJTA, STRICEVI, UČEVI, TETKIĆI, RODJENI, NERODJENI). In other words, the notations are non-contradictory minimal statements of the signifi-  
cata of the classes.

In Table II, a blank indicates identity with the item in Column II. Absence of a term is indicated by a dash (—); therefore, only the differences from Column II are given in Columns III and IV. The Roman numerals for columns again refer to the sources in the preceding analysis: III includes I; IV includes V. Essential differences and

similarities between the two major systems (II-III, IV) and the variants between II and III should be clear in Table II. Source IV merges L and C in  $G^2$  where II and III do not. IV restricts the uncle-aunt terms to  $G^1$  and differentiates between uncles as II and III do. II, however, alters the means of differentiation in  $G^{1+n}$ . Other differences in the systems are developments of the basic ones stated. Rare alternates have been ignored for the present. (X) = any relative.

TABLE II

Term	SOURCE		
	II	III	IV
DED	$(G^2L)$		$(G^2)$
BABA	$(g^21)$		$(g^2)$
OTAC	$(G^1L)$		
MAJKA	$(g^11)$		
STRIC	$(G^nL)G^nC$	$(G^1L)G^nC$	$(G^1L)G^1C$
UJAK	$(g^n1)G^nC$	$(g^11)G^nC$	$(g^11)G^1C$
TETKA	$(g^nc)$		$(g^1c)$
BRAT	$(G^0L)$		$(G^0)$
SESTRA	$(g^01)$		$(g^0)$
SIN	$(G^{-1}L)$		
ĆERKA	$(g^{-1}1)$		
NEĆAK	$(G^0L/g^01)G^{-1}C$		$(G^0/g^0)G^{-1}C$
NEĆAKINJA	$(G^0L/g^01)g^{-1}c$		$(G^0/g^0)g^{-1}c$
SESTRIĆ	$(g^01)G^{-1}C$		$(g^0)G^{-1}C$
SESTRIČINA	$(g^01)g^{-1}c$		$(g^0)g^{-1}c$
BRATANAC	$(G^0L)G^{-1}C$		$(G^0)G^{-1}C$
BRATANICA	$(G^0L)g^{-1}c$		$(G^0)g^{-1}c$
UNUK	$(G^{-2}L)$		$(G^{-2})$
UNUKA	$(g^{-2}1)$		$(g^{-2})$
PRANEĆAK	$(G^{-2}C)$		—
PRANEĆAKINJA	$(g^{-2}c)$		—
STRIČEVIĆ	$(G^nL)G^nC)G^0C$	$(G^1L)G^nC)G^0C$	$(G^1L)G^1C)G^{-1}C/g^{-1}c$
STRIČEVIČNA	$(G^nL)G^nC)g^0c$	$(G^1L)G^nC)g^0c$	(STRIČEVI)
UJČEVIĆ	$(g^n1)G^nC)G^0C$	$(g^11)G^nC)G^0C$	$(g^11)G^1C)G^{-1}C/g^{-1}c$
UJČEVIČNA	$(g^n1)G^nC)g^0c$	$(g^11)G^nC)g^0c$	(UJČEVI)

<u>Term</u>	<u>II</u>	<u>III</u>	<u>IV</u>
TETIĆ	$(g^n c)G^0 C$		$(g^1 c)G^{-1} C/g^{-1} c$ (TETKIĆI)
TETIČNA	$(g^n c)g^0 c$		
BRATIĆ	--	$(G^1 L/g^1 l)G^0 C$	--
BRATIČNA	--	$(G^1 L/g^1 l)g^0 c$	--
RODJAK	$(G^m L/g^m l \quad G^{1-n} C)$		
RODJAKINJA	$(G^m L/g^m l \quad g^{1-n} c)$		
RODBINA	$(G^1 L)X$		
SVOJTA	$(g^1 l)X$		
RODJENI	$(L/l)$		
NERODJENI	$(C/c)$		

A few specific notes are necessary. In column III, BRATIĆ and BRATIČNA are subclasses of RODJAK and RODJAKINJA. In columns II and IV, the classes BRATANAC and BRATANICA are actually not different as far as formal equivalence goes, since the terms in each system are derived in the same way from BRAT, which alone is different in the two systems. In column IV, STRIČEVI, UJČEVI, and TETKIĆI are the formal equivalents of the same classes in column II except for the generation difference of the relative and the specification of the linking relative.

### Essential Features of the Terminologies

The principal differences and similarities between the Serbian and Croatian systems have been indicated. If we may now recapitulate and rephrase some of these, the following points become clear.

1. As Anderson (Ms) has pointed out, the classification of immediate collateral relatives in the first ascending generation is "mixed," i.e., bifurcate-collateral for males and lineal for females. Both the Serbian and Croatian systems are identical in this respect. The sex of the linking primary relative is the criterion of bifurcation.

2. Classification of collateral relatives in further ascending generations in the Croatian system continues the application of this mixed system, while that in the Serbian system is purely by sex and generation. In the Croatian system, there is some discrepancy on the criterion of bifurcation, but the most formal one is again sex of the linking primary relative.

3. Classification of relatives in Ego's generation is identical for primary relatives both in the Serbian and Croatian systems. For collaterals, however, the mixed system of the first ascending generation is perpetuated in Ego's generation in the Croatian terminology,

while it is not in the Serbian terminology, which is generational in arrangement.

4. Classification of lineal relatives in the first descending generation is identical in both terminologies, but differs for collaterals. In the Serbian system, a distinction is usually made between BrCh and SiCh; since primary and removed "brothers," primary and removed "sisters" were merged in Ego's generation, the children of primary and removed "siblings" are also merged, according to the basic sex distinction between Br and Si. In the Croatian system, on the other hand, all sibling's children may be merged as opposed to one's own children. Lineality is thus operative in both terminologies, but in one it distinguishes particular collaterals and in the other simply collaterals in general as opposed to lineal descendants.

5. In the second descending generation, the Serbian system merges all individuals of one sex, just as in the second ascending generation. The Croatian system preserves the lineality introduced in the first descending generation.

6. Generation is overridden in the Croatian system by the effects of (2), above, in the terminological merging of aunts and particular uncles between the first and second ascending generations. The emphasis on particular lineal descent continues to be evident in Ego's generation in the use of terms derived from the lexical roots of the terms for aunt and particular uncles for the collateral relatives of Ego's generation. Similar evidence of lineality is seen in the Serbian system in the less commonly used classes which denote the descendants of particular uncles and aunts as a group, and is also noted by Krauss.

We may conclude that the mixed classification of uncles and aunts and the criterion of sex of the linking primary relative are basic to both systems, but that the greater emphasis on lineal descent in the Croatian system perpetuates their terminological results further in that system than in the Serbian. Lineality is not as extensive in the Serbian system, and the generational merging in that system does not occur in the Croatian, i.e., the logical exclusiveness of the two principles is manifest in the data. These distinctions are particularly clear on examination of Table II, where the classificatory principles have not been removed from the symbology by further reduction of the notations.

### Social Organization

Detailed information on the social organization of speakers of Serbo-Croatian is scarce in the literature, and the author has had no opportunity to undertake independent investigation of the subject. A brief summary of the salient features must suffice.

The extended family, or zadruga, as a residence unit and corporate economic body, was widely distributed in Yugoslavia in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries; its character and existence in more remote times is more a matter of conjecture than historically recorded fact. Its strength as a social institution began to wane in the nineteenth century under the influence of a number of factors, among which were the general influence and prestige of western European ideas and an increase in private property associated with, among other factors, a cash economy. These matters have been discussed at some length by Mosely (1940, 1953). The extended family has persisted longer in the area generally covered by our Serbian terminology than in that covered by the Croatian terminology.

The right to use of real property and items of agricultural and domestic equipment was shared communally by the members of the extended family and was inherited by successive resident members of the family. Since residence was usually patrilocal property would be used communally by a group of male agnates coresident in what was essentially a minimal lineage (women did not inherit permanent rights to property). One inherited the right to use of property equally with one's brothers and father's brother's sons, that property having been used equally by one's father and father's brother(s). The right to use of this body of property was transmitted equally to one's own sons and one's brother's sons in the next generation. Thus, complete equality in the use of property prevailed, being determined only by coresidence in the extended family.

Upon segmentation of an extended family, the division of the communal property was not on an equal basis by coresidence but was reckoned by shares, generation by generation from the founder of the extended family to the lowest generation participating in the inheritance. Thus, if two brothers separated, they would share equally in their father's property. If one had a single son and the other two, and these sons separated after the death of their fathers, one would retain half the property, being sole heir to his father's half of the original body of property, and the other two would each retain one-fourth, being co-heirs to one-half of the original body of property.

On the matter of residence, we may note that extended family organization of this sort may lead to coresidence of Fa, FaBr, FaBrSo, Br, So, BrSo, SoSo, and BrSoSo. After marriage, FaSi is not coresident. MoBr and MoSi are never coresident (12). That is, only members of the class RODBINA are present, and not all of them, since no tetkići are present.

The inheritance of names may be of some importance in these matters. Names were applied to individuals more or less as necessary to distinguish any individual from any other. Within the family, first names were sufficient, unless there were two individuals of the same first name. In that case, they were distinguished by first name plus a patronymic. If it was necessary to distinguish two individuals with

the same first names and patronyms, a patronymic derived from the first name of the paternal grandfather could be applied. The family itself had a name of morphologically patronymic form; it would appear that this was derived from the first name of the founder of the family. Further than this, every individual could use a patronym derived from the first name of the founder of his maximal lineage. That name is the one reported by Halpern (1956) as the name of the clan, or vamilija, in modern rural Serbia and the one reported by Krauss (1885) as the name of the bratstvo, or sib, in the indefinite historical past. Modern Serbian usage acknowledges the first, or Christian, name and the "last name" only. The importance of the bratstvo lies in the recognition of maximal kinship by its members and by their possession of a common patron saint and saint's day celebration. The saint's day celebration (krsna slava) is held jointly by members of the bratstvo when not prevented by other factors such as geographical distance, lack of social contact, enmity, etc. Women take the name of their husband's bratstvo in modern usage; the situation in the past is not clear.

### Relationship of Terminology and Social Structure

If we may begin with an examination of the central characteristics of the Serbian and Croatian terminologies, the merging of aunts may correlate with the unimportance of these relatives in matters of residence, property inheritance, and inheritance of the family name. MoSi is completely removed from a male Ego in these matters; FaSi may participate in the use of common domestic property before marriage, but is completely removed after marriage. The position of a female Ego is similar, with some added features that will be noted below.

FaBr and MoBr may be separated in correlation with the same pattern of participation and non-participation in residence, use of property, and family name. While Fa and FaBr are linked in the use of common property, the separation of Fa and FaBr is crucial in the inheritance of property on the division of an extended family. Mo and MoSi, on the other hand, are separate both terminologically and in residence.

The apparent restriction of the term sinovac (BrSo, alternate for BRATANAC. See Appendix II, endnote 7) to male speakers has some correlation with the communal use of property by a male's sons and his brother's sons. The term sinovac (BrSo) is lexically related to sin (So). Women, not having title or use of property in their own extended family after marriage, do not participate in a male's recognition of the semi-equivalence between So and BrSo.

I find no specific correlates in social organization for the Serbian merging of lineals and collaterals along generational lines. One may present an historical explanation here, however. The merging of siblings with cousins of the same sex and generation occurs in Sanskrit, and there is possible evidence for it in Old Slavonic (Delbrück, 1889; Hammel, Ms.). Lineals and collaterals may have been

merged in the second ascending generation in Old Slavonic (Miklosich, 1862-65; Delbrück, 1889; Hammel, Ms. Cf. the Russian term for uncle with the Serbian for grandfather and the O.S. root for these. Cf. also Latin avus, avunculus). The logically opposed criterion of emphasis on lineal descent in the Croatian system may correlate with the earlier decline of the extended family in areas subject to greater Western influence and with the rise of private property in particular. Similarly, the Croatian distinction between own children and any sibling's children may correlate with inheritance of individual property along western European lines.

The variation in informant's testimony on the use of the terms nećak and nećakinja in Serbia, as well as the lack of extension of these terms into the second descending generation in Serbia, may indicate that the terms are either replacing the BRATANAC-SESTRIĆ series or being replaced by them. The nature of the correlation of these terms with social factors has already been discussed; the remainder of the arguments on the matter are philological and are not directly germane to the present paper. If I may give a tentative conclusion without going into all the supporting arguments, I suspect that the term nećak, although old as a term of social reference in Indo-European, is of recent introduction into the Serbian kinship system as a term for Br/SiSo. As such, it may well correlate with the decreasing importance of the patrilineage and greater emphasis on the nuclear family; note that it appears to be more common in urban areas in Serbia.

The other characteristics of the Serbian and Croatian systems are consistent within the systems themselves, i.e., they arise from the permutation of the basic characteristics, and require no explanation in terms of external factors.

I am not prepared to consider any of the social features given as sufficient conditions for the terminological ones. That they are only necessary conditions is illustrated by the Gheg terminology in Appendix III, wherein the classifications of aunts and uncles is lineal but associated with a pattern of residence and property inheritance similar to the Serbian. Further evidence in this regard is to be found in Anderson (Ms), in the association of similar social organization with bifurcate-collateral terminology. If the associational pattern is not disturbed by the occurrence of this terminology without contemporaneous or historical co-occurrence of the social organization described, the terminology may be regarded as a logically sufficient condition for the social organization.

## Appendix I

### Serbo-Croatian Sources

Source I: Hraste 1956.

Source II: Male. Born in Dalmatia, resident in Yugoslavia until middle age. Urban.

Source III: Female (two sisters). Born in Zagorje (Croatia), and resident there until adulthood. Rural.

Source IV: Male. Born in Serbia and resident there until adulthood. Urban, but from a large family.

Source V: Halpern 1956.

Grouped with II is another male Dalmatian. Grouped with IV are three other urban male Serbs and one native American male from a Serbian family. The data from Krauss, 1885, are of varied and indeterminate provenience, but seem to confirm Sources I and II, in large part. Durham's material (1928) confirms that of Source IV.

Bibliographical items in addition to those listed above are:

Bakotić, 1936; Durham, 1928; Krauss, 1885; Lodge, 1941; Mosely, 1940, 1943, 1953.

## Appendix II

### Alternate Terms

- Source I:    baba = baka  
              bratučed = stričević.    That is, all persons descended from two brothers are "bratučedi." The term may be qualified by ordinal numerals, and is approximately equivalent to English "cousin of x degrees of removal," but in the data is listed as being only agnatic.
- ujac = ujak  
              rodica = rođakinja  
              sinovka = sinovica  
              nećaka = nećakinja  
              bratanac = bratić = bratanić (listed for a female Ego only)  
              sestričić = sestrić (listed for a female Ego only)
- Source II:    stari stric = stric  
              stari ujak = ujak  
              stara tetka = tetka  
              teta = tetka  
              nećak = bratanac = bratić = sinovac (nećak was first choice)  
              nećakinja = sinovica (unsure on bratična, bratanica)  
              nećak = sestrić  
              nećakinja = sestričina  
              kći = ćerka = kćerka
- Source III:    stari stric = prastric = stric (the same equivalence is true for ujak and tetka)
- baba = baka = stara mama  
              majka = mati = mama  
              otac = tata  
              stričevićka = stričišna  
              tetična = tetišna  
              ujčević = ujčić  
              bratić = stričević, tetić, ujčić  
              bratična = stričevićna, tetična, ujčićna  
              sinovac is not used.
- Source IV:    bratanac = sinovac  
              sestrić = nećak  
              sestričina = nećakinja  
              bratanac = nećak            ( from a source merged  
              bratanica = nećakinja    ( with Source IV

baba = nana (nana is more polite and is always used in  
GrMo's presence or to address her)  
nana = majka (in some villages)  
bata = otac (usually as a term of address, always in  
villages)  
bata = young boy, among urban middle and upper class  
seka = young girl (usually in the vocative, seko)  
prapraded = čukunded  
praprababa = čukumbaba  
prapraunuk = čukununuk  
prapraunuka = čukununuka

Source V: majka = mama = mati  
otac = tata = čale  
kći = kćerka

### Appendix III

#### Albanian Kinship Terms

The terms listed here were drawn from Hahn (1854), Jokl (1923), Durham (1928) and the testimony of two northern Albanian informants. While the material is recorded here in the modern Albanian script, we must note that only those terms followed by the symbol (I) have reliable spelling. They were written by the informants. Jokl's recordings are certainly reliable, but they constitute such a small part of the list that their accuracy is of small importance for our limited purposes. Durham's terms are denoted by (D) where they differ notably from the others. The greatest uncertainty here lies with the author's transcriptions of Hahn's modified Greek script into the modern Latinic orthography. The transcriptions are sufficiently accurate to indicate differences between terms, but readers wishing to use them for further research are advised to consult Hahn's original list (*op. cit.*, Book Two, pp. 113-115) and his discussion of phonetics and orthography (*op. cit.*, Book Two, pp. 1-27). (/ë/ is mute, and lengthens the vowel of the preceding syllable, as far as I can determine.)

GrGrGrFa	katragjysh (I)
GrGrFa	stërgjysh katragjushi (D) (I)
GrGrMo	stërgjyshë
GrFa	gjysh (I)
FaFa	gjýsh (Tosc)
GrMo	gjyshë (Gheg)
FaMo	gjýshe (I) (Tosc) gjýshëlja (Argyrokastron.)
GrFa	tatë (Tosc)
MoFa	tatë (Tosc) apë (I) (See E1Br, Fa)
MoMo	jóshë (Tosc) nanëdaje (I)
Fa	babá tatë játë átë (Old Gheg) (See E1Br) ljáljë (Tosc)

Fa (cont'd.) ápä (I) - term of endearment (See MoFa)  
             át (I)  
             babë(I)

Mo           nânë (I)  
             nennë (Tosc)  
             mémme (Tosc)  
             émme (Tosc)  
             mómme (Gheg) (See ElSi)  
             nännë (Gheg) (See mommë, nânë)

Ch (pl)      djentë(Tosc)  
             bíjtë (Gheg)  
             ápë (I) - term of endearment (See Fa, ElBr, MoFa)

So           bir (I)  
             djalë (I)

Da           bíljë (Tosc)  
             bíjë (Gheg) (I)  
             vajzë (I)  
             vaiza eme (D)

GrSo         nipp  
             nip (I)  
             bir (I)

GrDa         besë (Tosc)  
             mbesë (Gheg) (I)

Br           vëlá  
             vëllá (I)

Si           mótrë  
             motër (I)

ElBr         átë (Gheg - used to denote eldest brother when Fa is old)  
             (See Fa)  
             ápë (I) - term of endearment (See Fa, Ch, MoFa)

ElSi         mommë (Gheg - used to denote eldest sister when Mo is old,  
             the term nannë then being applied to Mo instead of  
             mommë)

Ne           nipp  
             nip (I)

Ni           besë (Tosc)  
             mbesë (Gheg) (I)

FaBr         ungj (Tosc) (I)  
             dshadshá (Tosc)  
             axhë (I)  
             adah (D)  
             mighe (D)

MoBr         ndáiho (Tosc)  
             ndájo (Tosc)  
             dajë (I)

Un	ungj (Gheg) dshadshá (Gheg)
FaSi	hállë (Tosc) hallë (I)
MoSi	tése (Tosc) teze (I) djeshe (D)
Au	jajë (Gheg) thjajë (in Berat) émtë (in Premeti)
1st Co (male)	kushërí (Tosc) kushërin (Gheg) kushri (I)
1st Co (female)	kushërírë (Tosc) kushërinë (Gheg) kushrinë (I)
2nd cous	kushërí i dúte, kushërirë i dúte.
3rd cous	kushërí i trétë, kushërirë i trétë.
GrNe	stërnip (I)
GrGrSo	stërnip (I)

While the author's acquaintance with Albanian is too cursory to allow him to attempt any detailed analysis, some points of interest are evident. First, the classification of relatives in the first ascending generation is not of the "mixed" type, but is evidently lineal for the Gheg and bifurcate-collateral for the Tosc. Second, sex distinctions are usually made by changes in lexical root for near relatives and by changes in suffixation on the same root for more distant relatives. In this, Albanian is similar to Serbian except for the generations twice removed from Ego, where the Albanian situation is exactly the reverse of the Serbian one. Third, generation is overridden in Albanian in the merging of GrSo and Ne, GrGrSo and GrNe. This pattern is not found in Serbian, although it occurs in Italian (nepote) and appears to have occurred in other Indo-European languages (Lat., nepos; OHG, eninchil). Fourth, extension of terms through succeeding generations may be accomplished by prefixation. Fifth, and a point of considerable interest, is the shifting of the term for Fa to Eldest Br, and of the term for Mo to Eldest Si, when the respective parents are no longer young. Hahn (op. cit., Book Two, p. 114 footnote) speculates on this situation as follows (with appropriate subjunctive caution): "Sollte etwa die Gleichheit der Benennung für Neffe und Enkel in so vielen Sprachen sich daraus erklären, dass der Grossvater im Verhältnis zu seinen Enkeln als der ältere Bruder seines Sohnes angesehen wird?"

The nature of the Albanian kinship system itself is of considerable interest, but adequate data are lacking for any thorough analysis. The

problem is further complicated by the uncertainty as to the philological relationships of Albanian and the nature and extent of linguistic and other cultural borrowing. We present these data here only as a point of terminological contrast to the Serbian system in a cultural matrix which is similar in many important respects.

**SOURCES:**

1. Two male Albanians, one of whom was a primary informant, the other occasionally interjecting comments. The principal informant gave most of the terms in "Northern Albanian."
2. Hahn, 1854.
3. Hasluck, 1954.
4. Jokl, 1923.
5. Durham, 1928.

## NOTES

- (1) The author is indebted to many for their advice and criticism during the research which led to this paper: Martin A. Baumhoff, Philip E. Mosely, Robert F. Murphy, Edward Norbeck, Julian A. Pitt-Rivers, John H. Rowe, and David M. Schneider. He alone, however, is responsible for any errors of fact or interpretation which may occur. A particular note of thanks is due the informants and those who assisted the author in the gathering of the data; without them the research would not have been possible: Steve Boljanich, Dragomir Dimitrijevič, V. Andre Drignakovitch, Mrs. Jovan Eremia, Joseph Gera, Dragoslav Georgevich, Douglas Jeffreys, Ante Kadić, Michael Marku, Andre Simić, Marin J. Stude, Dragisha Ristić, and J. M. Vesel.
- (2) Possible indications of social groupings found in the affinal terminology may lie in the use of the terms, zet (SiHu, DaHu), snaha (BrWi, SoWi).
- (3) The informant was in doubt here because of the MoBr link.
- (4) The terms for classes are my contractions for the Serbo-Croatian terms: brat od strica, brat od ujaka, brat od tetke, sestra od strica, sestra od ujaka, sestra od tetke. The general translation for these is, "Br/Si through Un/Au."
- (5) Informant's first choice over alternates for SiSo, BrSo, SiDa, BrDa.
- (6) NEĆAK-NEĆAKINJA is absent in the rural Serbian terminology, is applied to SiSo-SiDa by two urban Serbian informants, and to SiSo-SiDa, BrSo-BrDa by only one of the urban Serbian informants.
- (7) Only one informant, merged with Source I, indicated that the alternate sinovac could be used by a woman for BrSo. He was a man. Source II, a woman, specifically denied it.
- (8) Krauss, 1885, also lists these terms for BrCh. Source II was unsure of this term.
- (9) Krauss, 1885, lists sestričić, diminutive of sestrić, as SiSoSo.
- (10) Krauss, 1885, lists ujačivić, diminutive of ujić, as MoBrSoSo, and ujić (= ujčević of Sources I, II, and III) as MoBrSo.
- (11) Krauss, 1885, lists ujčevići as MoBrSoCh.
- (12) Kinship in the zadruga may be by adoption.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

Anderson, Robert Thomas

- Ms. Changing kinship in Europe. Ph.D. dissertation, University of California, Berkeley, California. June, 1956. 153 lvs.

Bakotić, Lujo

- 1936 Rečnik srpskohrvatskog književnog jezika. Belgrade.

Delbrück, Berthold

- 1889 Die indogermanischen verwandtschaftsnamen. Ein beitrage zur vergleichenden altertumskunde. Abhandlungen der philologisch-historischen klasse der königlich-sächsischen gesellschaft der wissenschaften. Band XI. No. V. Leipzig.

Durham, M. Edith

- 1928 Some tribal origins, laws, and customs of the Balkans. London.

Hahn, Johann Georg von

- 1854 Albanesische studien. Jena.

Halpern, Joel M.

- 1956 Social and cultural change in a Serbian village. Pre-publication monograph, HRAF-25, Halpern-1. Human Relations Area Files, Inc., New Haven.

Hammel, E. A.

- Ms. Notes on old slavonic kinship terminology.

Hasluck, Margaret M.

- 1954 The unwritten law in Albania. Cambridge.

Hraste, Mate

- 1956 Nazivi za rodbinu i svojtu. Jezik: časopis za kulturu hrvatskoga književnog jezika. Izdaje hrvatsko filološko društvo. Br. 1, Godište V, pp. 1-4. Zagreb.

Jokl, Norbert

- 1923 Linguistisch-kulturhistorische untersuchungen aus dem bereiche des albanischen. Berlin u. Leipzig.

Krauss, F. S.

- 1885 Sitte und brauch der südslawen. Wien.

Lounsbury, Floyd G.

- 1956 A semantic analysis of Pawnee kinship usage. *Language*, 32:1:158-194.

Miklosich, Franz, ritter von

- 1862-65 *Lexicon palaeoslovenico-graeco-latinum emendatum auctum edidit.* Vindobonae.

Mosely, Philip E.

- 1940 The peasant family: the zadruga, or communal joint-family in the Balkans, and its recent evolution. In *The cultural approach to history*, Caroline F. Ware, ed., New York, pp. 95-108.
- 1943 Adaptation for survival; the Varžič zadruga. *Slavonic and East European Review*, xxi, pt. 1, March, pp. 147-173.
- 1953 The distribution of the zadruga within southeastern Europe. In *The Joshua Starr Memorial Volume, Jewish Social Studies, Publication No. 5*, New York, pp. 219-230.

