

Annales Universitatis Paedagogicae Cracoviensis

Studia Linguistica 18 (2023)

ISSN 2083–1765

DOI 10.24917/20831765.18.10

Slavka Keremidchieva

Bulgarian Academy of Sciences, Sofia, Bulgaria

ORCID 0000-0003-0615-6332

Polish dialect kinship names according to the data in Volume 11. “Degrees of Kinship” of the Slavic Linguistic Atlas (preliminary results in a comparative perspective)

Słowa kluczowe: stopnie pokrewieństwa, *Ogólnosłowiański atlas językowy*, gwara polska

Keywords: kinship names, Slavic Linguistic Atlas, Polish dialect

The eleventh volume of the series on lexical word formation of the Slavic Linguistic Atlas (OLA), which is ready for publication, is dedicated to kinship names in Slavic languages. Kinship terminology belongs to the most archaic lexical stratum of any language, and for the Slavic languages, it goes back to the Proto-Slavic basic word-stock, and its core can be traced back to the Proto-Indo-European language (Tolstaya 2009: 9). It reflects both the socio-economic processes and the mental models revealing the conceptual approach in the organization and systematization of kinship relations which the folk name-givers arranged on the basis of their cognitive conceptualization. “Степени родства” [*Degrees of kinship*] is an inclusive and large-scale study created by the national commissions of thirteen European countries with Slavic population – which, in a linguo-geographical aspect, reflects the linguistic unity and diversity of the Slavic languages with regard to the kinship nomenclature. The projection of the dialectal lexical and word-building similarities and differences in this lexical thematic group on the Slavic language territory provides a credible picture of dialect division, as well as of the similarities and differences between the three Slavic language groups – East Slavic, West Slavic and South Slavic – and builds a reliable basis for further linguistic and cultural history research.

The volume includes maps of the main terms reflecting the system of blood kinship or consanguinity (biological, by origin, the so-called *nomina consanguinitatis*): L 1747¹ ‘отец’ [father]; PM 1758 N sg mati; [mother], LSl 1794 ‘дочь’ [daughter]; Sl

¹ The names of the cards are aligned with the wording of the question in the OLA Questionnaire.

1837 'отец матери или отца' [mother's or father's father]; Sl 1842 'мать отца или матери' [father's or mother's mother] etc., including the hypocoristic or pejorative forms of some of the basic terms in the direct line of consanguinity: (Sl 1793° *hypocor* (*N V sg*) *сынъ* 'син' [son], Sl 1805° *hypocor* (*N V sg*) 'дочь' [daughter], Sl 1839° *pejor* (*N sg*) 'отец матери или отца' [mother's or father's father], Sl 1843° *hypocor* (*N V sg*) 'мать отца или матери' [father's or mother's mother]). The methods of linguistic geography have been used to interpret also names for collateral blood kinship in which two or more persons have the same ancestor, but do not descend or ascend from each other, e.g., (к. Sl 1815° *hypocor* (*N V sg*) *братъ* [brother], (map Sl 1829° *hypocor* (*N V sg*) *sestra* [sister]), [cousin] (maps L 1882 'сын дяди со стороны матери' [son of an uncle on the mother's side] and L 1884 'сын дяди со стороны отца' [son of an uncle on the father's side], [cousin – she] (maps L 1883 'дочь дяди со стороны матери' [daughter of an uncle on the mother's side], L 1885 'дочь дяди со стороны отца' [daughter of an uncle on the father's side]), as well as names for other collateral relatives: [uncle] (map L 1868 'брат отца' [father's brother]), [uncle] (maps LSl 1871 'брат матери' [mother's brother] and Sl 1872° *hypocor* (*N V sg*) 'брат матери' [mother's brother]), [brother's son], L 1880 'сын сестры' [sister's son]), [nephew – she] (L 1879 'дочь брата' [brother's daughter aunt] (Sl 1876° *hypocor* (*N V sg*) *teta* || -ъка [aunt]), [nephew – he] (maps L 1878 'сын брата', L 1881 'дочь сестры' [sister's daughter]). The volume also features maps with the terms for [twins] (L 1806 'двое детей, одновременно родившихся у одной матери' [two children born simultaneously to the same mother]) in the naming of which the dominant attribute is the time of birth, and the names for 'сираче' [orphan] (F 1833 *sirota*) in which the semantic structure of the basic noun [child] is upgraded with a supplementary dominant motivational sign – [a child without parents].

A few maps encode with *nomina affinitatis* the relationships in the system of affinal kinship (kinship by bond of marriage and by matchmaking), which is a result of relationships between two families after their representatives – a man and a woman – get married – [son-in-law] (L 1855 'зять'), [daughter-in-law] (L 1857 'жена сына' [son's wife], L 1859 'жена брата' [brother's wife]), [father-in-law] (L 1848 'отец мужа' [husband's father]), [mother-in-law] (L 1850 'мать мужа' [husband's mother]), [father-in-law] (L 1852 'отец жены' [wife's father]), [mother-in-law] (L 1854 'мать жены' [wife's mother]), [brother-in-law] (L 1860 'брат мужа' [husband's brother]), [sister-in-law] (L 1865 'сестра мужа' [husband's sister]), [brother-in-law] (L 1866 'брат жены' [wife's brother]), etc. For the purposes of the study, maps for agnate and enate nouns have also been added. Four maps present names, which reflect the complex system of another type of institutional kinship – adoption, in which one individual becomes a member of the family via adoption by one of the parents, and thus enters into family relations with him/her – [stepfather] (L 1831 'отчим, неродной отец' [father not by blood, stepfather] and a supplementary map to it with the same name), [stepson] (L 1834 'сын от первого брака одного из супругов' [son from the first marriage of one of the spouses] (для отчима или мачехи – [for the stepfather or the stepmother]), [stepdaughter] (L 1835 'дочь от первого брака одного из супругов' [daughter from the first marriage of one of the spouses] (для отчима или мачехи – [for the stepfather

or the stepmother]). These names have emerged on the Slavic territory at a later stage of social development and reflect a more complex and branched kinship naming system.

The linguo-geographic maps – lexical, lexical word formation, word formation, motivational and semantic – present the areas of various chronological layers of lexis in Slavic kinship terminology – ancient Indo-European terms such as: *отъсь [father], *mati [mother], *дъкти [daughter], *сынъ [son], *bratъ [brother], *sestra [sister], *stryjъ [uncle], *svekrъ [father-in-law], *svekry [mother-in-law], *snъxa [daughter-in-law], *zęty [son-in-law], *dęverъ [brother-in-law], *jętry [sister-in-law], *šurъ [brother-in-law]; Proto-Slavic forms of Indo-European origin, such as: *baba [grandmother], *dędъ [grandfather], *vъnukъ [grandson], *dętę [child], *otrokъ [child], *orbę [child], *tъstъ [father-in-law], *tъstja [mother-in-law], *pastorъkъ [stepfather], *svęstъ [sister-in-law], *svojakъ [uncle], among others; many derivatives in different Slavic languages from common Slavic roots, such as: *bab-, *dęd-, *bat-, *brat(r)-, *sestr- etc., which are still in use in today's Slavic languages, although with irregular distribution.

The maps and comments on loanwords from non-Slavic languages included in the volume illustrate fairly well the expansion of foreign lexemes or elements over the Slavic language territory.

This volume, similarly to all lexical word formation volumes of OLA released so far, confirms, drawing upon language facts, the evident trends for the contraction of the area of Proto-Slavic lexemes at the expense of the expansion of regional dialect words (Вендина 2009: 70) even with regard to such an archaic and relatively conservative group of terms as kinship names. This group also has few **universal Slavic lexemes** covering the entire language territory, although not evenly and densely everywhere, e.g.: **mqž-ъ** on map L 1729 'муж, сунпур' [man, husband] has a large continual area in the points from the Bulgarian and the Macedonian grid, and *čel-o-vęk-ъ*² [man, human] – also a native word which infrequently occurs in competition with **mqž-ъ** but is already dominant in the Serbian and the Bosnian points. In the Croatian and the Slovenian grid, the isogloss of **mqž-ъ** again forms a dense area, and then migrates to all West Slavic dialects where it forms a fragmented area in Czech and Sorbian dialects, and an almost monolithic one in Slovak dialects where the name *xolp-ъ* for the same affinal relative has point areas. However, **in the Polish dialects** *xolp-ъ* is already a competing lexeme and, apart from the westernmost Polish points where it is absent, it evenly fragmentizes the large **mqž-ъ** area here. In the East Slavic languages, **mqž-ъ** has larger point areas (in Ukrainian and Belarusian) which are fragmented predominantly by derivative formations with the root **mqž-** (in Russian). As can be seen on the corresponding semantic map (No. 69), in **Polish dialects** the lexeme functions only with the meaning of 'man, husband'.

An all-Slavic word for first degree of blood kinship is also **dęt-ę** (L 1775 'ребенок' [child]). Its areas differ – in South Slavic dialects, they are compact and continuous, without a competing lexeme. Their destruction begins in Slovenian, where the competing lexeme *otrok-ъ* takes precedence. In the languages of the West Slavic group, there are

² Names are spelled according to the general phonetic transcription of OLA. For details see: <https://www.slavatlas.org>.

large dense areas of *dět-ę* in West and Central Slovak, in West Czech and in Upper Sorbian points. In **Polish dialects**, the lexeme *dět-ę* appears sporadically, as it is displaced by suffixal derivatives formed from the same root *dět-* (*dět-ьsk-o*, *dět-ь=-ak-ъ*, *dět-ь=-o*). The situation is similar in Belarusian and Ukrainian, and the lexeme *ǫrb-en-ъk-ъ*, which also has a Proto-Slavic origin, is dominant over the entire Russian language territory.

The names of direct blood kinship of the second degree – ‘grandfather’ and ‘grandmother’ – should also be included among the common Slavic lexis, with the proviso that despite being common Slavic in form, they have developed different meanings in different Slavic languages. They are used for both blood kinship of the second degree (in this case, there is a hidden possession reference – ‘my grandfather’, ‘my grandmother’), as well as any ‘older man’ or any ‘older woman’ in general. This can be well traced on maps Sl 1837 ‘отец матери или отца’; ‘grandfather’, Sl 1841 ‘старый мужчина’; ‘old man’, Sl 1842 ‘мать отца или матери’; ‘grandmother’, Sl 1844° ‘старая женщина’; ‘old woman’, whereas semantic maps № 71 and № 72 present the clearest picture. The primary form **děd-ъ**, which is still used to refer to, the father of the mother or the father’, is best preserved in the East Slavic languages with compact areas in Ukrainian and Belarusian, while in Russian dialects the primary form *děd-ъ* and its main competing derivative *děd-uš-ьk-a* are in variant use. Among the West Slavic languages, only Sorbian has kept the lexeme *děd-ъ*, while the others use various derivatives, e.g., in **Polish** these are: *D1ěD2-ъk-ъ*, *děd-us-ь*, *děd-ь=-a* among others. In several **Polish** points, lexemes of German origin competing with the Slavic names have been registered: *(op)-a* (in three) and *(gros)-ъk-ъ* (in two). In the South Slavic grid of OLA, the Proto-Slavic heritage *děd-ъ* has been preserved unevenly – as points and islands, and only in the Croatian and Bosnian areas it spreads almost homogeneously. However, if we also refer to the Proto-Slavic continuants, the forms with the same root *děd-* with endings *-a*, *-o*, *-e*, (*děd-a*, *děd-o*, *děd-e*, *děd-ь=-a*, *děd-ь=-o*), we can consider the all-Slavic character of this name for a direct blood relative of the second degree.

While it is possible to accept the all-Slavic distribution of the name *děd-ъ* (*děd-a*, *děd-o*, *děd-e*, *děd-ь=-a*, *děd-ь=-o*), for **bab-a** this would be possible only formally. In the individual Slavic languages, this kinship term designates different referents and demonstrates a different distribution. The kinship name *bab-a* designates a direct blood relative of the second degree, ‘father’s or mother’s mother’ in all Slavic languages except **Polish**, where only derivatives of *bab-a* are used: *baB-ъk-a*, *BAb-us-ь=-a*, and German loanwords *(om)-a* and *(gros)-ъk-a* have scattered point areas (Sl 1842 ‘мать отца или матери’). The distribution of this lexeme throughout the Slavic linguistic lands is as follows: in the South Slavic languages, its area is monolithic but its fragmentation begins on Bosnian and Croatian territory, to become point area (only one point) on Slovenian territory. The *bab-a* areas in Czech and Sorbian are dotted and scattered, while in Eastern Slovak points the isogloss forms a complete range, which continues in Ukrainian, where as in Belarusian, it is already broken up by various suffixal derivatives from the same root *bab-*, which are dominant in Russian. Both *děd-ъ* and *bab-a* have expanded their meaning on a macro level (all-Slavic) and have transferred it to non-kinship names. It is noteworthy that the lexeme *bab-a* has expanded its semantics only in points in which its primary meaning is ‘mother of the father or mother’,

as is the case in South Slavic languages (except Slovenian), where it is a polysemantic lexeme in the same point and refers, in addition, to 'mother of the father or mother', also to 'old woman', 'mother of the wife', and in some south-eastern Bulgarian dialects – also to 'mother of the husband'. *Bab-a* is a polysemantic lexeme both in Eastern Slovak points and in a large part of Ukrainian dialects, where in addition to 'mother of the father or mother' and 'old woman', it also means 'woman'. In eastern Ukrainian dialects, there are only two meanings – 'mother of the father or mother' and 'old woman', and in Belarusian – 'mother of the father or mother' and 'woman'. The Russian points in which the lexeme has two meanings – 'mother of the father or mother' and 'woman', are few and scattered; there is a predominance of dialects in which the lexeme means only either 'father's or mother's mother' or 'woman', as in Czech – only 'father's or mother's mother' or only 'old woman' or only 'woman', while in Lower Sorbian it means only 'old woman'. In **Polish**, *bab-a* is a monosemantic lexeme in the single meaning of 'woman'.

Present-day Slavic languages contain a lot of inherited Proto-Slavic lexemes (a significant part of them are Indo-Europeanisms), which are kinship names in all Slavic languages except for one or two. Such lexemes are for example: *zēt-ъ*, whose large and almost homogeneous pan-Slavic range was completely destroyed only in Sorbian by the German element in the hybrid name (*šviger*)-*syn-ъ* (к. L 1855 'зять'). In **Polish dialects**, in addition to *zēt-ъ*, both the native word *syn-ov-ъc-ъ*, and the German loanword (*švigerzon*)-*ъ* are used, rarely though. The large and continuous East area of the Proto-Slavic lexeme **SVEk//r-ъ** 'father-in-law' (к. L 1848 'отец мужа') is gradually penetrated in Ukrainian by *ъst-ъ*, which became dominant in **Polish**, therefore in Polish SVEk//r-ъ has scattered point areas, to be completely displaced by loanwords and descriptive constructions in Sorbian and Czech. The lack of lexeme **ъst-ъ** 'wife's father' (к. L 1852 'отец жены') in Czech and Sorbian, where it was displaced by loanwords, does not give grounds for this, Proto-Slavic in origin, name for a non-blood relative by marriage to be included into the list of kinship terms with pan-Slavic distribution. Only in Czech and Sorbian, the Slavic lexeme **dēver-ъ** 'husband's brother' (к. L 1860 'брат мужа') was completely replaced by loanwords, and its large and continuous East and South Slavic ranges became point areas in **Polish** and Slovak, as well as in Slovenian.

Over the all-Slavic linguistic territory, the languages belonging to all Slavic groups have preserved terms originating from the proto-Slavic **mati*, -*ere*, which is of early Indo-European origin, as well as the reduplicated expressive form **mam-a* (and its derivatives). Map PM 1758 Nsg *mati* reveals that the more archaic noun *mat-i* characterizes all East Slavic and also part of the West Slavic – Czech and Slovak – languages. *Mat-i* is the only lexeme in Slovenian, it dominates in Croatian and Bosnian points, while in Serbian it is replaced by *ma-j-ka*, which dominates over the far less widespread *mam-a* in Macedonian and Bulgarian points. It is absent in **Polish** and Sorbian, while *mam-a* and the relatively newer form *mat-ъ* are in use in Sorbian, as well as in **Polish**, where the areas of *mam-a* and *mat-ъ* are broken by derivatives (*mat-ъk-a*, *mat-ъk-a*) and only in one **southern Polish** point is the old form *mat-i* registered.

The number of preserved Proto-Slavic roots in the Slavic language territory is much larger, which confirms the conclusion of T. Vendina that, from a synchronic point of view, the preserved all-Slavic lexemes do not account for a relevant percentage and, therefore,

the closeness between Slavic languages should better be sought at morphological level (and above all in roots) (Vedina 2009: 24; 74). Evidence is available practically in every map from the volume “Степени родства” [*Degrees of kinship*]. The all-Slavic unity in the roots of names shows for example in map F 1833 *sirota* [orphan] where all registered names derive from the Proto-Slavic *sirъ. The *slr-ot-a* area is compact only on the **Polish language territory**, although the same lexeme is dominant in Slovak, in all East Slavic and South Slavic languages (except for Bulgarian).

Being West Slavic, the **Polish language** is a natural member of the dialectal oppositions on the Slavic language territory, which, more generally, can be defined as: **East Slavic** and **West Slavic** versus **South Slavic**; **South Slavic** and **East Slavic** versus **West Slavic**; and **East Slavic** versus **West Slavic** and **South Slavic**. For example, although the large and continual yet not quite monolithic, the East Slavic *orv-es-ъn-ik-ъ* area was partially destroyed in West Slavic languages (in **Polish** and Slovak) to a point area (in Czech), it is clearly opposed to the South Slavic dense range, delineated by the isogloss of names formed with the root *vъrst-*, which, in turn, is also mostly destroyed in its periphery by the invasion of descriptive names with the root *-lět-* in Slovenian and by foreign loanwords in Eastern Bulgarian dialects (к. L 1807 ‘ровесник, сверстник’; ‘a person of the same age, peer’). Interestingly, no terms for these referents are registered in the Sorbian points.

The South Slavic languages (without Slovenian) present a large continuous area of the Proto-Slavic lexeme *zēt-ъ*, which from being dense in the Bulgarian and Macedonian grid begins to break up in the Serbian one. In the East Slavic dialects, it turns into insular and point zones (in Ukrainian and Russian), in opposition to all West Slavic languages and Belarusian, in which loanwords have settled. In **Polish**, for example, the native word *svoj-ak-ъ* has only four point areas, totally replaced by the expansion of the German loanwords (*švager*)-ъ, (*švager*)-ъ (L 1858 ‘муж сестры’; ‘sister’s husband; brother-in-law’).

The opposition between the South and the East, on one side, and the West, on the other, is evident on map L 1859 ‘жена брата’; ‘brother’s wife’ – the large southern *s{nъ}X-a* area, monolithic in the Bulgarian, Macedonian and Serbian grid, torn apart in Croatian and Bosnian, corresponds to small insular and point areas in the Russian grid against the loanwords in all western languages and Slovenian (see below).

The West Slavic area of *rod-in-a* on map L 1836 ‘семья, родители и их дети вместе’; ‘family, parents and their children’ does not include Sorbian; however, it has small insular areas in Ukrainian and thus opposes all other Slavic languages. In **Polish**, as well as mainly in Slovak, in addition to *rod-in-a*, the loanword (*famili*)-*j-a*, (*famelj*)-*a* (from German *Familie*<Lat. *familia* ‘семья’) is in variable use.

The confrontation of East Slavic versus West Slavic and South Slavic can be observed, for example, in names with the root *svoj-* in East Slavic languages on map L 1867 ‘сестра жены’; ‘wife’s sister’. They form a homogenous area in Russian and an insular area in Belarusian and Ukrainian, which is opposed to the rest of the Slavic languages, in which loanwords prevail – of Turkish origin in some of the southern languages, and of German in the western languages. In **Polish**, for example, the native noun *sestr-a* has rare point areas, while the entire territory is occupied by loanwords

(*švager*)-*žk-a*, (*švagr*)-*ov-A*, (*švagr*)-*ov-žk-a* from German *Schwager* ‘sister’s husband; brother of the husband or the wife’.

Exclusive are lexemes which have areas in only one national grid and they are numerous in this volume. Such is, for example, the exclusive lexeme *kob-et-a* (к. L 1738 ‘женщина’; ‘woman’), which has areas only in **Polish dialects**, where it dominates over the competing *bab-a*, and in the northernmost **Polish dialects** – over *žen-žk-a*. This lexeme with an unspecified etymology from the middle of the 16th century began to appear first in literary texts, and by the end of the 17th century it was gradually gaining ground in colloquial speech. (Brückner 1985: 241).

The number of derivative exclusives is very large. The analysis of maps L 1848 ‘отец мужа’; ‘husband’s father’ and L 1850 ‘мать мужа’; ‘husband’s mother’ reveals many unique lexemes that enrich Slavic languages and at the same time testify to the different ways in which the Slavs have conceptualized and named kinship relations: native terms *тъх-an-ъ* and *тъх-an-a*, as well as the German loanword – (*švigermutr*)-*a*, are exclusive for Czech dialects, while the hybrid German-Slav formations (*šviger*)-*nan-ъ* and (*šviger*)-*mat-ъ* – for Sorbian languages. While in the **Polish** grid the area of derivative exclusives *star-žk-ъ* and *star-už-ъ* is insular, in the Russian grid the areas of the only lexemes *pap-aš-a* and resp. *mat-aš-a*, *mat-on-žk-a* are dispersed and sporadic, similarly to those with the root *bat-*. Only in Slovenian, the old word for mother *mat-i*, which is preserved in other Slavic languages as well, means also ‘mother-in-law’, just like *mat-žk-a* in a small **Polish area** and *maj-ьk-a* – in Croatian. As seen on map L 1877 ‘муж сестры матери’; ‘husband of the mother’s sister’, specific unique lexemes are found almost everywhere: in Russian points – *DaD-uš-ьk-o*, in Ukrainian *DaD-o*, in Czech – *stryj-ьd-a*, *stryj-ьč-ьk-ъ* etc., in Slovak – *tet-žš-ь*, (*bač*)-*i*, in **Polish** – *po-tet-žk-ъ* ‘stepfather’ etc.

Further analysis of the maps may suggest that the unique lexemes (exclusives) mostly refer to kinship names for collateral kinship or to non-kinship names. This is to be expected, because *nomina affinitatis* reflect the changes which have occurred in the earlier all-Slavic naming system as a result of the social and historical changes which are specific to every nation. As a rule, the lexical exclusives, unlike the derivatives, are more often than not new to the Slavic language community in formal or semantic terms.

The four lexical maps (and the supplementary ones) – L 1882 ‘сын дяди со стороны матери’; ‘son of the uncle on the mother’s side’, L 1884 ‘сын дяди со стороны отца’; ‘son of the uncle on the father’s side’, L 1883 ‘дочь дяди со стороны матери’; ‘daughter of the uncle on the mother’s side’, L 1885 ‘дочь дяди со стороны отца’; ‘daughter of the uncle on the father’s side’ – for the names of blood relatives of the fourth degree – paternal and maternal first cousins – can also be analyzed from various aspects. The naming strategies in the individual groups of Slavic languages are interesting – East Slavic languages use only descriptive constructions which form monolithic and continual area. Of the West Slavic languages, only in **Polish** the isogloss of the attributive combinations outlines a large and almost homogeneous central-eastern area, and of the South Slavic languages only Serbian uses a similar naming strategy, as there the area of descriptive three-component constructions covers the entire territory – it is clearly

outlined, but it is torn apart by one-word names. Additional maps (to each of the four main ones), in which the descriptive constructs are marked with the same symbol, allows for the analysis of different types of constructs. This may help not only in a more precise onomasiological analysis, but also in establishing whether in languages where descriptive constructions are the main strategy of nominating these referents, a difference is made when naming 'uncle's son/daughter on the mother's side' and 'uncle's son/daughter on the father's side'. Thus, it becomes clear that East Slavic languages do not use different names for these referents, and only in a few southwestern Ukrainian points is such a distinction observed. In **Polish** and Serbian **dialects** there are different specific names for 'uncle's son on the father's side' and 'uncle's son on the mother's side' – **Polish constructs** for designating 'uncle's son on the mother's side' are mainly *tet-č-ьn-ъ brat-ъ*, while constructs for naming 'uncle's son on the father's side' have another attribute: *stryj-ьn-ъ brat-ъ*. The same method is applied to differentiate between the names of the two referents in Serbian – a cousin on the mother's side is named *brat-ъ otъ uj-bk-a* or with a foreign language element – *brat-ъ otъ (daj)-ъ*, and a cousin on the father's side – *brat-ъ otъ stryj-ьc-a*. In all **Polish dialects**, in which descriptive constructs with native elements are not used, the French loanword (*kuzin*)-ъ, resp. (*kuzin*)-ъk-a has settled via German mediation.

Wherever they have spread, whether they are numerous as in **Polish** and Sorbian, or less numerous as in Slovenian, words of foreign origin which have penetrated the Slavic languages have settled permanently and have almost no variant use. They are the evidence of the dynamic change in lexis, determined by extralinguistic factors – geographic location and contacts with non-Slavic peoples and languages. In many cases, as clearly suggested by the maps, the loanwords have completely replaced native terms of kinship, with two major consequences: the breakdown of the old system of kinship terminology, and the emergence of a series of characteristics and distinctive features in separate Slavic languages or groups. For example, German loanwords are more widespread in those Slavic languages that came into contact with a German intonation environment at an early stage of language development (Czech, Slovak, **Polish**, Sorbian) (Žigo 2015: 16).

The path of loanwords from the Romance languages was preconditioned by different circumstances – due to cultural reasons (French loanwords in **Polish** and Russian) in some cases, while in others the territorial proximity (or foreign-language environment) and intensive cultural, social and commercial contacts (Italian and Friulian loanwords in Slovenian and Croatian, Romanian loanwords in Ukrainian, in the Bulgarian dialect of Vinga in Banat and in Serbian in Romania) play a significant role, and thirdly, as a result of the long-lasting and strong cultural influence of the Latin language on European languages (there are numerous Latin loanwords in all South Slavic and West Slavic languages and in Ukrainian).

Whereas the foreign-language elements that have penetrated the terminology for consanguinity in the direct line and for collateral kinship, although fully replacing Slavic nouns, are neither numerous, nor exert significant influence on the old Slavic naming system in general, the picture is completely different with *nomina affinitatis*. The terms for affinal kinship display not only partial breakdown; in fact, the early Slavic kinship

terminology has entirely disappeared to be replaced by a foreign one and to form chronologically new areas. Evidence of this process can be seen on maps L 1729 'муж, супруг'; 'man, husband', L 1831 'отчим, неродной отец'; 'stepfather', L 1834 'сын от первого брака одного из супругов' (для отчима или мачехи); 'son from the first marriage of one of the spouses (stepfather or stepmother), stepson', L 1835 'дочь от первого брака одного из супругов' (для отчима или мачехи); 'daughter from the first marriage of one of the spouses (stepfather or stepmother), stepdaughter', L 1848 'отец мужа'; 'husband's father', L 1850 'мать мужа'; 'husband's mother', L 1852 'отец жены'; 'wife's father', L 1855 'зять'; 'son-in-law', L 1857 'жена сына'; 'son's wife', L 1858 'муж сестры'; 'sister's husband', L 1859 'жена брата'; 'brother's wife', L 1860 'брат мужа'; 'husband's brother', L 1865 'сестра мужа'; 'husband's sister', L 1866 'брат жены'; 'wife's brother', L 1867 'сестра жены'; 'wife's sister', L 1870 'жена брата отца'; 'wife of the father's brother', LSI 1874 'жена брата матери'; 'wife of the mother's brother', L 1877 'муж сестры матери'; 'husband of the mother's sister', L 1886 'родня, совокупность родственников'; 'family, relatives'.

By tracing the areas which reveal the replacement of the native lexis by foreign-language words, it might be assumed that the more distant relative a person is, the more peripheral place he or she occupies in the branched kinship system, and the more often his or her naming ceases to be precisely formulated. This is corroborated by mapped lexemes, for example, on map L 1857 'жена сына'; [son's wife; daughter-in-law] and L 1859 'жена брата'; [brother's wife; sister-in-law]. The first map shows the preserved variety of native kinship terms in all Slavic languages, where the old form $s\{n\tilde{z}\}x-a$ is alive and with high frequency in all South Slavic languages, partly competing in Czech, and only in Sorbian is it completely replaced by the native derivative *pri-χod-ъn-A dĕv-ъk-a*, and also by the hybrid terms (*šviger*)-*dĕv-ъk-a*, (*šviger*)-*gol-ic-a*. In **Polish**, only native words are used: *syn-ov-A*, *snъš-ъk-a*, *ne-vĕst-a*, *ne-vĕst-ъk-a*. The situation looks completely different with the nouns denoting more distant relatives – such as 'brother's wife' (к. L 1859). While in South Slavic dialects the situation remains almost unchanged and $s\{n\tilde{z}\}x-a$ outlines a dense and continuous large area which only in Slovenian is totally replaced by German and Italian loanwords, Czech, Sorbian and Slovak were completely taken over by loanwordst. However, **Polish language** differs from West Slavic languages, as it has preserved the native terms *brat-ov-A* and *brat-ov-ъk-a* and only occasionally has allowed for the loanwords *švagr-ov-A*, *švagr-ov-ъk-a* and (*švager*)-*ъk-a*. In **Polish dialects**, however, the distribution and frequency are different for 'husband's brother': (*švager*)-*ъ*, (*švager*)-*ь* (L 1860), 'husband's sister': (*švager*)-*ъk-a*, (*švagr*)-*ov-A*, (*švagr*)-*ov-ъk-a* (L 1865), 'wife's brother' (*švager*)-*ъ*, (*švager*)-*ь* (L 1866); 'wife's sister' *švagr-ov-A*, *švagr-ov-ъk-a* and (*švager*)-*ъk-a* (L 1867) – names of affinal relatives. For all of them in all West Slavic languages – and in Slovenian, partly in Ukrainian, and occasionally in Belarusian – the areas of loanwords are large, dense and continual, often outlined by the isoglosses of different derivative variants of one and the same loanword. In contrast, the East Slavic dialects (mostly Russian, in some cases Belarusian and part of Ukrainian) and the South Slavic dialects except for Slovenian in most cases, keep quite intact the old Slavic system of affinal kinship names. These dialects have preserved the old names for 'свекър' [father-in-law], 'свекърва'

[mother-in-law], 'зет' [son-in-law], 'снаха' [daughter-in-law], 'девер' [brother-in-law], 'зълва' [sister-in-law], 'шуреј' [brother-in-law] and the like. For example, as it could be clearly seen in map L 1866 'брат жєны'; 'wife's brother', there is a single *šur-a*, *šur-e* area in Croatian; however, this term is standardly used in South Slavic languages; its derivative is alive in Russian, while in all West Slavic languages loanwords have entered the scene (in **Polish** – (*švager*)-ъ, (*švager*)-ь) to become dominant in Belarusian, while in Ukrainian they compete with native derivatives from the same root *šur-*. An illustration of the rare cases of categorical invasion of loanwords in the names for non-blood relatives in South Slavic dialects can be seen in map L 1867 'сестра жєны'; 'wife's sister', where the Turkish word (*baldaz*)-a is the only lexeme in part of the Macedonian and in all Bulgarian points, as well as in some Bosnian and Serbian points.

The invasion of foreign-language elements in kinship terminology has boosted the trend of simplification in kinship relations, and the loss of ancient Slavic names has led to further differentiation. This trend is most evident in the West Slavic languages where, for example, German elements form the terms for 'жена сына'; [son's wife; daughter-in-law], 'жена брата'; [brother's wife; sister-in-law], 'сестра мужа'; [husband's sister; sister-in-law], 'сестра жєны'; [wife's sister; sister-in-law]. In all West Slavic languages, as well as in Belarusian, part of Ukrainian and Slovenian, the German loanword (*švager*)-ъ designates 'sister's husband', 'wife's brother' and 'husband's brother'. The same trend of simplification in kinship terms, as a result of the replacement of native terms by foreign ones, is seen in a few cases in Slovenian and partially in Croatian, from the South Slavic group. Contrary to expectations, the loanwords in the rest of the South Slavic languages – predominantly from Turkish and Greek origin, have failed to capture large areas (apart from the dense area of (*baldaz*)-a); they are different for every kinship name and are not numerous, so their presence neither simplifies nor deprives the system. Among the East Slavic languages, the loanwords are the fewest in Russian – mostly from French, and besides, they compete with native lexis for usage.

Today, the system of kinship names does not admit new terms, so in this sense it is closed and well preserved.

The maps in the general Slavic volume "Степени родства" [*Degrees of kinship*] adequately capture the continuity in Slavic languages regarding kinship names since the disintegration of the Proto-Slavic family to the present day. The language material interpreted in the volume proves that the same hierarchy in family relations has persisted for centuries. The inevitable dynamic processes determined by extralinguistic circumstances (geographical, historical, cultural, etc.), which has provoked linguistic and ethno-cultural contacts with non-Slavic peoples, are the most important trigger for the changes, especially in names for affinal kinship (by marriage or by matchmaking). *Nomina affinitatis* most clearly display the breakdown of the ancient, primary system of naming and the emergence of differences in the Slavic language territory (Žigo 2015: 17).

The accurate reading of the multilayered maps in the volume "Степени родства" [*Degrees of kinship*] provides information not only about the well-preserved all-Slavic basic vocabulary for this most archaic lexis, but also about mutual influences and contacts of historical, cultural and social nature between the Slavic peoples, as well

as about the influence of non-Slavic ethnic groups on the Slavic ones over time and space, which have resulted in some inevitable language changes. After all, the kinship names, which express relations and connections in the family, are the source of rich information about the structure of society and, at the same time, provide linguistic evidence for the historical path of the society.

Bibliography

- Vendina, T.I., 2009, *Russkie dialekty v obshchslavyanskom kontekste*, Moskva: Nestor-Istoria [Вендина, Т.И., 2009, *Русские диалекты в общеславянском контексте*, Москва: Нестор-История].
- Brückner, A., 1985, *Słownik etymologiczny języka polskiego*, Warszawa: Wiedza Powszechna.
- Tolstaya, S.M., 2009, *Kategoriya rodstva v etnolingvističeskoj perspective*, [w:] *Kategoriya rodstva v yazyke ikuljture. Biblioteka Instituta slavyanovedeniya, RAN*, Moskva: Indrik, s. 7–22 [Толстая, С.М., 2009, *Категория родства в этнолингвистической перспективе*. – В: *Категория родства в языке и культуре. Библиотека Института славяноведения РАН*, Москва: Индрик, s. 7–22].
- Žigo, P., 2015, *Tendencie v pomenovaní rodinných vzťahov v slovenčine*, [in:] *Dialog pokoleń w języku potocznym, w języku wsi i miasta, w literaturze, w publicystyce, w tekstach kultury*, Warszawa: Towarzystwo Kultury Języka.

Polish dialect kinship names according to the data in Volume 11. “Degrees of Kinship” of the Slavic Linguistic Atlas (preliminary results in a comparative perspective)

Abstract

The article discusses data on kinship names in Polish dialects on the basis of an analysis of 82 linguistic maps and the comments to them from Volume 11. “Degrees of Kinship,” which has been prepared for publication by the Bulgarian National Commission as part of the lexical-word-formation series of the Slavic Linguistic Atlas. The language material is authentic, collected and verified on site by Polish dialectologists and includes terms for biological kinship and for relation by marriage and by matchmaking. Special attention is paid to the similarities and contrasts between Polish dialects and East and South Slavic dialects, on the one hand, and the Polish language and the other West Slavic languages, on the other. Emphasis is placed on kinship names that belong to the all-Slavic vocabulary, as well as the expansion of foreign language loanwords and elements that have completely replaced the native lexis. With *nomina affinitatis*, the disintegration of the old original naming system and the emergence of differences in the Slavic language territory can be traced. The research has employed linguo-geographical and comparative methods.

Polskie gwarowe nazwy stopni pokrewieństwa na podstawie danych z tomu 11. *Stopnie pokrewieństwa Ogólnosłowiańskiego atlasu językowego (OLA) (wstępne wyniki w perspektywie porównawczej)*

Streszczenie

Na podstawie analizy 82 map językowych i komentarzy do nich z tomu 11. *Stopnie pokrewieństwa*, przygotowanego do druku przez Bułgarską Komisję Narodową w ramach leksykalno-słowotwórczej serii *Ogólnosłowiańskiego atlasu językowego (OLA)*, w artykule omówiono dane

dotyczące nazw stopni pokrewieństwa w gwarach polskich. Przedstawiona materia językowa jest autentyczna, została zebrana i zweryfikowana w terenie przez polskich dialektologów i zawiera nazwy pokrewieństwa biologicznego oraz wynikającego z relacji małżeńskich i ze swatania. Szczególną uwagę zwrócono na podobieństwa i różnice zachodzące między dialektami polskimi a dialektami wschodnio- i południowosłowiańskimi – z jednej strony, językiem polskim i innymi językami zachodniosłowiańskimi – z drugiej. Przyjrano się nazwom stopni pokrewieństwa należącym do słownictwa ogólnosłowiańskiego, a także zwrócono uwagę na ekspansję zapożyczeń z języków obcych, które całkowicie zastąpiły słownictwo rodzime. W wypadku *nomina affinitatis* można zauważyć rozpad starego pierwotnego systemu nazewnictwa i pojawienie się różnic w słowiańskiej przestrzeni językowej. Na potrzeby badań zastosowano głównie metody językowo-geograficzną i porównawczą.