



universität
wien

MASTERARBEIT

Titel der Masterarbeit

„Proto-Indo-European kinship terms“

Verfasserin

Veronika Milanova

angestrebter akademischer Grad

Master of Arts (MA)

Wien, 2014

Studienkennzahl lt. Studienblatt:

A 066 599

Studienrichtung lt. Studienblatt:

Indogermanistik und historische Sprachwissenschaft

Betreuerin:

Univ.-Prof. Mag. Dr. Melanie Malzahn

Proto-Indo-European kinship terms

Veronika Milanova

University of Vienna

In memory of Vera Kuznetsova (1923-1997):
a loving grandmother, inspiring teacher and enthusiastic historian.

Acknowledgements

I am most obliged to my adviser Prof. Melanie Malzahn who suggested the research topic for my master's thesis, provided me with her recommendations and materials, and sometimes had to *lead me by the hand* to the comprehension of complicated facts. She was also very kind to proof-read the text of my thesis and to underline many stupid mistakes and wrong formulations I would have otherwise overlooked.

In addition, I am enormously grateful to Prof. Heiner Eichner who explained to me his theory concerning the Anatolian languages and etymological subtleties of some kinship terms.

I would also like to thank all Professors of the Institut für Sprachwissenschaft, especially Prof. Stefan Schumacher for his advice about the origin of Albanian kinship terms and detailed scripts of lectures, Prof. Hans Christian Luschützky for his well-structured classes about the diachronic phonology and morphology and the history of the Italic and of the Slavic languages, and Prof. Martin Peters for his inspiring lectures about certain aspects of Indo-European grammar.

Furthermore, I am indebted to Prof. Chlodwig Werba for the knowledge of Old Indic I acquired from him, to Prof. Marina Zorman for her exhaustive introduction into the Hittite Language, to Prof. Kim MacCone who shared with me his ideas about the fosterage and avunculate in the PIE society by permitted to read the manuscript of his new book "The Romulus Syndrome" and to Professors of my first *alma mater* (Udmurt State University) Elena Gusynina and Rimma Zhuchaeva who taught me Latin and Gothic and were the first to inspire me to get interested in Indo-European Studies many years ago.

I am also deeply thankful to the colleagues Bärbel Manske who introduced me to Prof. MacCone's book and Georgios Kostopoulos for his valuable remarks at my research topic presentation.

Finally, I would like to thank my parents and my boyfriend for their moral and financial support and my grandmother from whom I inherited my cognitive abilities and my interest to history matters.

Contents

List of Abbreviations	11
------------------------------------	-----------

1. Introduction	13
------------------------------	-----------

1.1. PIE kinship terminology. History of the research.	13
1.2. PIE family in the anthropological perspective	14
1.2.1. Types of human families and the communis opinio on the PIE family	14
1.3. Purpose and procedure of the work	15

2. Kinship terms	16
-------------------------------	-----------

2.1. Terms denoting consanguineal relatives	16
2.1.1. Father	16
2.1.1.1. <i>*ph₂tér/ph₂tr-</i> ´	16
2.1.1.2. <i>*ph₂trou-/ph₂tr̥u-</i> and its derivatives	19
2.1.1.3. The nursery words <i>*atta-</i> , <i>*tata-</i>	20
2.1.2. Mother	21
2.1.2.1. <i>*méh₂ter-/ méh₂tr-</i>	21
2.1.2.2. <i>*meh₂trou-/meh₂tr̥u-</i> and its derivatives	22
2.1.3. Son	23
2.1.3.1. <i>*suH-nu-/suH-ju-</i>	23
2.1.3.2. <i>*putlo-</i>	23
2.1.4. Daughter	24
2.1.5. Brother	26
2.1.6. Sister	27
2.1.7. Grandparents	29
2.1.7.1. <i>*h₂euh₂-o-</i>	29
2.1.7.2. <i>*an(n)-</i> (<i>*Hen(n)-</i>)	31
2.1.8. Grandchildren, nephew/niece	32
2.2. Terms denoting affinals	35
2.2.1. Husband and wife	35
2.2.1.1. <i>*u̯iH-ró-</i> , <i>*h₂ner</i> , <i>*potis-</i> , <i>*potnih₂-</i>	35

2.2.1.2. *g ^h en(h ₂)- ‘woman’	36
2.2.1.3. Widows and concubines	38
2.2.2. Father/mother-in-law	40
2.2.3. Son-in-law	43
2.2.4. Daughter-in-law	44
2.2.5. Husband’s relatives	45
2.2.5.1. *deh ₂ i <u>u</u> ēr-/deh ₂ i <u>u</u> r- ‘husband’s brother’	45
2.2.5.2. *H ₂ énh ₂ ter-/H ₂ ính ₂ tér- ‘husband’s brother’s wife’	46
2.2.5.3. *ǵ ₂ H-?- ‘husband’s sister’	48
2.2.6. Wife’s relatives	50
2.2.6.1. Derivatives of *sue- and *b ^h end ^h -	50
2.2.6.2. ‘Wife’s brother’ in Indic and Slavic	52
3. Theoretical remarks and conclusions	53
3.1. Terms denoting consanguineal relatives (analysis)	53
3.2. Terms denoting affinals (analysis)	55
3.3. Kinship systems and the PIE family	57
3.4. Conclusion	61
References	63
English abstract	73
Deutsche Zusammenfassung	75
Lebenslauf	77

List of Abbreviations

Alb. = Albanian

Arab. = Arabian

Arm. = Armenian

Att. = Attic Greek

Av. = Avestan

Boeot. = Boeotian

BSl. = Balto-Slavic

CLuv. = Cuneiform Luvian

EM = *Dictionnaire étymologique de la langue latine*, Ernout/Meillet 1959

Fris. = Frisian

Gaul. = Gaulish

Ger. = German

Gheg = the northern variety of Albanian

Gmc. = Germanic

Goth. = Gothic

Gr. = Greek

HierLuv. = Hieroglyphic Luvian

Hit. = Hittite

Hung. = Hungarian

IEW = *Indogermanisches etymologisches Wörterbuch*, Bd.1. Pokorny 1959

EWAia = *Etymologisches Wörterbuch des Altindoarischen*, Mayrhofer 1992-2001

Iir. = Indo-Iranian

Ital. = Italian

Lat. = Latin

Latv. = Latvian

Lith. = Lithuanian

LEIA = *Lexique étymologique de l'irlandais ancien*, Vendryes 1959

*LIV*² = *Lexikon der indogermanischen Verben*, Rix 2001

Lyc. = Lycian

NIL = *Nomina im Indogermanischen Lexikon*, Wodtko/Irslinger/Schneider 2008

MBret. = Middle Breton

MHG = Middle High German

MW = Middle Welsh
Myc. = Mycenaean
OAv. = Old Avestan
OCorn. = Old Cornish
OCS = Old Church Slavonic
OCz. = Old Czech
OE = Old English
OFr. = Old French
OFris. = Old Frisian
OHG = Old High German
OInd. = Old Indic
OIr. = Old Irish
ON = Old Norse (Old Icelandic)
OPers. = Old Persian
OPrus. = Old Prussian
ORus. = Old Russian
Osc. = Oscan
OW = Old Welsh
Phryg. = Phrygian
RusCS = Russian variety of Church Slavonic, the liturgical language of Russia
SC = Serbo-Croatian
SerbCS = Serbian variety of Church Slavonic, the liturgical language of Serbia
Sl. = Slavic
Sogd. = Sogdian
Skt. = Sanskrit
Swed. = Swedish
Toch. = Tocharian
Ved. = Vedic
YAv. = Young Avestan
Žem. = Žemaitis (a dialect of Lithuanian)

Chapter 1. Introduction

1.1. PIE kinship terminology. History of the research.

The reconstruction of the Proto-Indo-European (PIE) kinship terminology is of great importance for Indo-European studies because this precise lexical group belongs to the most conservative vocabulary along with such lexical groups as names of animals and plants, anatomical parts, natural phenomena, etc. The reconstruction of these words does not only give insights into archaic patterns of word formation but also into the life of the Proto-Indo-Europeans, into their social structure and beliefs.

Accordingly, the literature on this topic is abundant. From the time of William Jones until now one can hardly find any historical linguist who has never written something about a certain PIE kinship term. However, there are only few scholars who analysed this lexical group systematically.

The first of them was Delbrück with his influential monograph “Die indogermanischen Verwandtschaftsnamen” (1889). In this book he tried to reconsider old and often naïve etymologies of PIE kinship terms by employing the methodological achievements of the historical linguistics of his time.

The next work that should be mentioned is the book by Trubachev “История славянских терминов родства и некоторых терминов общественного строя”¹ (1959) preceded by an article by Isachenko (1952), in which he analysed the PIE kinship terms with the emphasis on the Slavic evidence. Many ideas of Isachenko and Trubachev were subsequently criticised by Friedrich in the article “Proto-Indo-European Kinship” (1966).

The next monograph on the topic “Studies in the kinship terminology of the Indo-European languages” (1977) was written by Szemerényi. Although most of the etymologies presented in this book cannot be taken seriously any more today, it still remains worth mentioning.

Among the studies of the recent decades, one should point out the article by Hettrich “Indo-European kinship terminology in linguistics and anthropology” (1985), the monograph by Tremblay “La déclinaison des noms de parenté indo-européens en *-ter-*” (2003) and a series of articles by Pinault, especially, “Analyse étymologique d’un nom de parenté indo-européen” (2005) and “A Star is born. A “New” PIE **-ter-*Suffix” (2007).

¹ “History of Slavic kinship terms and some terms of social order” (my translation)

1.2. PIE family in the anthropological perspective

The kinship terminology is a topic not only studied by linguists but also by ethnologists and social anthropologists. The scholars whose contribution to the studies of the human family in general as well as to the study of PIE kinship deserves special attention are Morgan (“Systems of consanguinity and affinity of the human family”, 1870; “Ancient Society”, 1877), Murdock (“Social Structure”, 1949), Lévi-Strauss (“Les Structures Elementaires”, 1949; “Structural Anthropology”, 1963), Goody (“Indo-European society. Past and present”, 1959) and Lounsbury (“A formal account of the Crow- and Omaha-type kinship terminologies”, 1964).

Although the emphasis of my paper is on the linguistic aspect of the PIE kinship terminology, I cannot wholly ignore the anthropological perspective and, therefore, will take into consideration the basic terms of social anthropology, first of all, the terms concerning the classification of human families.

1.2.1. Types of human families and the communis opinio on the PIE family²

Families can be classified on the basis of different criteria:

- 1) Leadership: patriarchal (the leader is a man) vs. matriarchal (the leader is a woman) vs. egalitarian (the leading position does not depend on gender).
- 2) Lineage: patrilineal/ agnatic (male-line) vs. matrilineal/ enatic/ uterine (female-line) vs. bilateral
- 3) Location: patrilocal/ virilocal (a young couple lives in the husband’s family/clan) vs. matrilocal (a young couple lives in the wife’s family/clan) vs. neolocal (a young couple settles in a new place apart from both families)
- 4) Spouse’s origin: endogamous (marriage to a member of one’s own family/clan) vs. exogamous (marriage to a member of another family/clan)
- 5) Amount of spouses: monogamous (one spouse) vs. polygamous: group marriage (a group of men, who are brothers to each other, marries a group of women, who are sisters to each other), polyandry (a woman has more than one husband), polygyny (a man has more than one wife).

According to the communis opinio, PIE families were patrilineal, patrilocal, exogamous and mostly monogamous; therefore, they were typical patriarchal and androcentric formations. Some scholars, however, doubted it. Thus Thomson (1950 [1941]), Isachenko (1952), and Trubachev (1959), who followed Marxist ideas about the evolution of the human family,

² The description of the types of human families is a summary from Lévi-Strauss (1969 [1949]:29-68) and *EIEC* (332-5).

claimed that patriarchal state was adopted by the Proto-Indo-Europeans at a later stage of their unity, in an earlier epoch the PIE society had been matrilineal, gynocentric and had practised group marriages. Most PIE kinship terms, especially those that denoted consanguineous relatives, were formed, according to these scholars, exactly in that early epoch. What arguments they employed to support their theories and why their arguments are likely to be rather erroneous will be touched upon in detail below in my thesis.

1.3. Purpose and procedure of the work

The purpose of my thesis is a critical survey of PIE kinship terms from different perspectives with reference to the question what they could tell us about the PIE family and, further, the PIE social system.

I am quite conscious that within the scope of a master's thesis one cannot draw universal conclusions and make new sensational discoveries about the PIE family because such research needs much more time, profound study of history, ethnology, social anthropology and folklore and, probably, even field investigations³. Still in this work I will try to draw my conclusions, mainly, by analysing the linguistic evidence.

In the largest part of my work (chapter 2.) I will give a linguistic analysis of the terms denoting consanguineous (2.1.) and affinal (2.2.) relatives. In chapter 3. I will summarise the data from the previous chapter (3.1., 3.2.), will give a short description of the basic kinship systems (3.3.) formulated by Morgan (1871) and try to ascribe the PIE kinship terminology to one of those types.

³ Among reclusive social groups of the contemporary IE nations who have preserved old traditions (like Russian "Old Believers") or among the non-IE nations whose social structure is identical to the alleged PIE social structure.

Chapter 2. Kinship terms

2.1. Terms denoting consanguineal relatives

2.1.1. Father

2.1.1.1. **ph₂tér/ph₂tr-*'

The basic reconstructed form for 'father' attested in 8 branches of Indo-European (IE) is a hysterokinetically inflected word **ph₂tér-/ ph₂tr-*' (cf. *IEW* 829; *EIEC* 194f.; *NIL* 554ff.): e.g., Ved. *pitár-*, Av. *pitár-*, Gr. *πατήρ*, Lat. *pater*, OIr. *athair*, Goth. *fadar*, Toch. A *pācar*, Toch. B *pacar*, Arm. *hayr*. The distribution of this word permits to assume that **ph₂tér-* was formed in the PIE epoch. Anatolian, Albanian, Slavic and Baltic have replaced this term for 'father' (see section 2.1.1.3).

Internal etymology

While it is clear that the word refers to both the biological father and to a father in the figurative sense, the internal etymology of this term is highly debated. There are two basic strategies for the first element: (1) to derive it from a given root, or (2) to derive it from a nursery word.

Thus Bopp (1871 [1837]:189) suggested that “**pâtár-*” should be derived from the verbal root “**pā-* ‘ernähren, herrschen’” (~ **peh₂(i)-* ‘schützen, hüten, weiden’, as per *LIV*²: 460). Since then this interpretation of the root semantics has been supported by many scholars including most recently Tremblay (2003:81ff., esp. 85).

One of the supporters of the second point of view was Szemerényi (1977: 6ff. with references to many previous authors)⁴. He stated that “**pātér-*” as well as “**mātēr-*” were formed on the basis of the nursery words *pa-pa*⁵ and *ma-ma*, the simplest combinations of sounds children can pronounce in the first year of their life (ibid.: 6&7, with references to Jakobson 1959).

The nature of the second element, the hysterokinetically inflected suffix **-ter/*-tj* — which occurs in many other IE kinship terms —, is also a matter of debate. Scholars like Bopp (1871 [1837]:189) and Tremblay (2003:81ff.) considered it to be an agentive suffix (see, e.g., Tichy 1995); thus, in their opinion, **ph₂tér-* obviously means ‘protector’ or ‘breadwinner’. Surely, this interpretation cannot satisfy everyone, in particular, those who believe that some

⁴ e.g., Kretschmer (1896), Delbrück (1889), Buck (1949), Jakobson (1959), etc.

⁵ Note that the nursery word **papa* is also attested in many IE daughter languages: Lat. *pāpa*, Gr. *πάππα*, Palaic *pāpa*, etc.

kinship terms in **-ter/-t_r* can have an onomatopoeic base because the agentive suffix would make no sense in such a context. That is why alternative theories have been formulated.

According to the hypothesis originally suggested by Cowgill and Sihler (Sihler 1988) and further developed by Carruba (1995), the kinship terms in **-ter/-t_r* are compounds, the second element being **h₁ter-* meaning ‘blood’, ‘tribe’, or ‘family’. As for the first element, Carruba (1995:155) basically follows the older theories. He sets up either **pa-h₁tér* ‘the one who is called *pa(pa)* in the family/clan’ or **peh₂-h₁tér* ‘the protector of the family/clan’. However, both derivatives do not conform to the PIE rules of compounding.

There exists a third view on the nature of **-ter/-t_r*. On the basis of the thematic contrastive suffix **(t)ero-/(t)ro-* several scholars⁶ assumed that athematic **(t)er/-t_r* in the IE kinship terms had rather a contrastive function. In recent time this theory has been further developed by Pinault (2005, 2007, 2012a). The suffix **(t)ero-/(t)ro-* was used to form adjectives from adverbs in **(t)er/-t_r*: e.g., Lat. *sub* (**supV-*) ‘under, below’ > *sup-er* adv. ‘above’ > *sup-er-o-* adj. ‘locating above’; Gr. *πρό* adv. ‘in front of, forth’, *πρότερος* adj. ‘frontal; earlier’, Ved. *katará-* (< **k^hó-tero-*, **k^ho-/k^he-* ‘what/who’) ‘which’, etc. (Meier-Brügger 2000:206). Pinault (2007: 273, with references to Benveniste 1948:120f.) states that the contrastive value of the adverbs in **(t)er/-t_r* is inherent to the suffix.

According to Pinault, along with thematisation, another derivational process of building an adjective (with further nominalisation) from an adverb is possible: “from an adverb **X-tér*, one could derive a de-locatival noun **X-tér*, with animate gender, nom.sg. **X-tér-s* > **X-tér*, referring to something or somebody by the contrastive situation or identity” (Pinault 2007:273-4). Formally, this process is the same as the derivation of the hysterokinetic nomen agentis nom. sg. Proto-IIr. **dātá* < **dh₃tér(r)*, gen.sg. Proto-IIr. *dātrás* < **dh₃tér* ‘giver (in a specific situation)’ (see Tichy 1995:57) from de-locatival **dh₃tér* ‘while giving’. The only difference is the base of derivation: a verbal root for deriving a situative nomen agentis and an adverb for deriving a contrastive or particularizing noun.

In the case of kinship terms the contrastive base is neither a verb nor an adverb but an abstract or collective noun. Thus Pinault (2007:277) considers the contrastive base for **ph₂tér* ‘father’ to be the zero grade of an abstract **ph₁-éh₂-* derived from the root **peh₁-* (= **peH-* ‘sich bewegen’ as per LIV² 459), which according to him had the meaning ‘field, fold’ (attested in Ved. *páthas* ‘fold, herd’) – “the area where the members of the social group as well as the cattle can move” (ibid., footnote 19). Accordingly, “**ph₁h₂-ter-*” ‘father’ ultimately was the ‘(man) belonging to his extended family’. The contrastive suffix **-ter/-t_r*-

⁶ e.g., Lohmann (1965:217) and Szemerényi (1977:10)

in this context had the function of differentiating the man belonging to a specific family circle in contrast to the men belonging to other families and clans.

*ph₂tér in Baltic and Slavic

The word for ‘father’ in Baltic and Slavic offers some problems. In Baltic one finds the forms OPrus. *towis* ‘father’, Lith. *tévas* ‘id.’ and Latv. *tēvs* ‘father, old man’. Szemerényi (1977:7) made an attempt to prove that these words are derived from PIE *ph₂tér- by assuming a cluster simplification Proto-BSl. *ptē- to *tē-⁷; for a parallel he referred to the similar simplification in Old Avestan *ptā* > *tā*. The second part of the word -*wis/ -vas/ -vs* may, according to him, be due to a contamination with the word “*awos” (~ *h₂euh₂os, cf. *EIEC* 237-8) ‘grandfather’⁸. This hypothesis is surely highly speculative. The expected Proto-Baltic form of *ph₂tér is approximately *paters or *pters. In the nom. sg. the final *r* could be omitted (like in *b^hréh₂ter- > OPrus. *brāti* ‘brother’) and one could theoretically expect *(p)te- or the like; however, in oblique cases it is preserved (*d^hugh₂tér- > OLith. (gen.sg.) *dukteĩs*). Therefore, the origin of the word remains obscure. It might rather be an inner-Baltic formation, possibly connected to the nursery term *tata- discussed in section 2.1.1.3.

In Slavic the following three words are usually taken as reflexes of *ph₂tér-: Proto-Sl. *strǫjb-⁹ ‘paternal uncle, father’s brother’ (Derksen 2008:470), Bulg. *nácmrok* ‘step-father’, OCzech. *pastorek* ‘step-son’, SerbCS *pa-storǫkǔ* (SC *pǎstorak*) ‘id.’, etc. (as if from *pō¹⁰-ph₂tor- cf. Trubachev 1959:20; *NIL* 555) designating either a step-father or a step-son (what meaning is basic depends on the proto-form in the root) and a divine name ORus. *Stri-bogǔ* (< *ph₂riǰ-b^hagos ‘father-god’, cf. Blažek 2001:29).

The main difficulty here is the origin of the cluster *str-*. Some scholars¹¹ see it as a modification of the cluster *pt(r)-; thus Pohl (1980:62f.) tries to prove the regularity of such a cluster modification based on other examples from Slavic: e.g., IE *ōkū-ptro- > ORus. *jastrǫbǔ* ‘hawk’ or PSl. *grebti > Rus. *zpecmu*, Czech. *hřésti*, OPol. *grześć*. Pohl’s arguments seem to me unconvincing because the sound change in his examples only takes place in the

⁷ Prof. Heiner Eichner (p.c.) pointed out to me that *h₂* in Baltic and Slavic is reflected as either a zero phoneme or *ǎ* (Slav. > *o*).

⁸ In Baltic continuations of *h₂euh₂os mean ‘father’s brother’: e.g., OPrus. *awis*, Lith. *avýnas*

⁹ ORus. *strǫi* ‘uncle’; Cz. *strýc* ‘uncle, cousin’; SCr. *stríc* ‘uncle (father’s brother)’, etc.

¹⁰ Possibly, *h₂ep- or *h₂po- ‘after, by, at’ (> Skt. *ápa-* adv. ‘away, from’; Gk. *ἀπό* ‘from, away from’; Lat. *ab* prep. ‘from, away’) (Derksen 2008:407). In this case it means ‘quasi-’, ‘not real’ (father).

¹¹ e.g., Vey (1931, 1953) and Vaillant (1950)

medial position and is one of the effects of “the law of open syllables”¹². Consequently, it could explain *st* in *pa-storŭkŭ* but not the word-initial *str-* in the other two words¹³.

Kortlandt (1982:26), on the other hand, does not believe that these three Slavic words are derived from **ph₂tér-* and suggests other etymologies for them. ORus. *Stri-bogŭ* might be a shortening from *Strŭzybogŭ* ‘God beware’ (cf. Preobraženskij 1918: 398), SerbCS *pa-storŭkŭ* might be a cognate of Lith. *pãstaras* ‘the last’ and Lat. *posterus* ‘next, following’ (cf. Zubatý 1891:315-17)¹⁴; and **strŭjb-* originates from the IE **stru-jo-*¹⁵ (Lith. *strŭjus* ‘uncle, old man’; OIr. *sruith* adj. ‘old, venerable’; OW *strutiu* m. ‘old man’)¹⁶.

2.1.1.2. **ph₂trou-/ph₂tru-* and its derivatives

The attested evidence shows that PIE had no common terms for ‘uncle’ and ‘aunt’ in its modern English sense but rather for ‘father’s brother/sister’ or ‘mother’s brother/sister’. The latter were not independent formations but derivations from other words. For ‘paternal uncle’ we find several forms derived from **ph₂tr’-*.

Rau (2011:23) gives a very profound analysis of these words. One of them is a secondary amphikinetic *u*-stem **ph₂trou-/ph₂tru-* (Gr. *πάτρωσ* ‘male kinsman on the father’s side’). Comparing this word with other secondary amphikinetic *u*-stems¹⁷ he draws the conclusion that the formation originally had the function ‘the one in charge of

¹² similar examples from Eckert et al. (1983:57-60): **met-teĩ* → **me-tteĩ* → *me-sti* ‘to sweep’ (1. Sg. Prs. Rus. *меты*), **ved-teĩ* → **ve-dteĩ* → *ve-tteĩ* → *ve-sti* ‘to lead’ (1. Sg. Prs. Rus. *веды*), **plekt-teĩ* → **ple-kiteĩ* → **ple-tteĩ* → *ple-sti* ‘to plait, to weave’ (Lat. *plectere*), etc.; also **seb-dmŭ* → **se-bdmŭ* → *se-dmŭ* (Rus. *семь*, Germ. *sieben*)

¹³ Some kind of sandhi-effect is theoretically possible but highly speculative. However, Prof. Heiner Eichner (p. c.) considers such a sound change probable.

¹⁴ There is an alternative etymology of SerbCS *pa-storŭkŭ*. For some reason, it has not been mentioned in recent works, although it does not seem to me too implausible. Skok (1972:616 with references to Fraenkel 1923 and Meillet 1934) states that masculine SC *pãstorak* is a recreation based on the feminine *pãstorka*. The latter can be reconstructed in the following way: Proto-Sl. **pa-dŭkter* (**pa-* ‘not real, quasi-’ + **dŭkter* < **d^hugh₂tér* ‘daughter’) → **padkter* (cluster simplification) > **padter* → (see footnote 12) **paster* + (Slavic diminutive suffix) *ŭkŭ* m., *-ŭka* f. This hypothesis can be supported by typological parallels from Lith. *pó-dukrė*, *pó-dŭkra* ‘step-daughter’. Besides, in Slavic there are words for ‘step-daughter’ with transparent etymology, e.g., OCS *padŭšti*, Rus. *на́дчеру́ца* ‘step-daughter’, built according to the same scheme: **pa* + **dŭšt/dŭčer* → *padŭšt/padčer* + (stem-suffix) *-i* or (Slavic feminising/diminutive suffix) *-ica*. If this etymology is correct, *pa-storŭkŭ* must have appeared earlier than *padŭšti*, before the first Slavic palatalization (**kte* > *št*, *č*, *ć*) (see Trubačev 1959:58; Eckert et al. 1983:51f.).

¹⁵ while the preceding etymologies did not convince too many other scholars, the etymology of IE **stru-jo-* has most recently been supported by Rau (2011:1)

¹⁶ The etymology of **stru-jo-* is also rather obscure. Pedersen (1909:81) and LEIA (S-189) assume that IE **stru-jo-* may have some etymological connection with the adj. **steh₂-ro-* (Skt. *sthūrā-* ‘big, strong, thick, massy’; YAv. *stūra-* ‘strong’; Gr. *στερεός* ‘hard’; Rus. *старый* ‘old’; ON *stórr* ‘big’), which is semantically justified. However, Schrijver (1995:453) argues that **stru-jo-* is derived from a different root.

¹⁷ e. g., **démou-/dŭmu-* (Gr. *δμῶς* ‘slave’ < ‘the one in charge of the house(hold)’) derived from **dómu-/dému-* ‘house’

something/someone’, therefore, **ph₂trou-/ *ph₂tr̥u-* was at first ‘the one in charge of the father’ (‘ascendant kinsman on the father’s side’).

Apart from **ph₂trou-/ *ph₂tr̥u-*, there are two other derivatives from it meaning ‘father’s brother’: **ph₂tr̥u-ij̥o-* and **ph₂treu-ó-*.

The form **ph₂tr̥u-ij̥o-* (Ved. *pit̥rya-* ‘father’s brother’; Yav. *tūiriia-* ‘id.’)¹⁸ is derived from the zero-grade of **ph₂tr̥u-* with the addition of the suffix **-ij̥o-*. This suffix, according to Rau, can have two meanings: 1) belonging to someone, or 2) standing in a relationship of descent to someone. Therefore, **ph₂tr̥u-ij̥o-* means ‘a descendant of **ph₂trou-*’ = ‘stemming from the same ascendant kinsman as the father’ > ‘father’s brother’ (Rau 2011:17-19&23).

**ph₂treu-ó-* (Lat. *patruus*) was made with suffixal *v̥ddhi*, which is also known as a means of genitival derivation. Thus it has the same function as the suffix **-ij̥o-* in the previous form (Rau 2011:20-3).

2.1.1.3. The nursery words **atta-*, **tata-*

**ph₂tér-* is widely acknowledged to be a formal term; i.e., young children in the PIE society hardly addressed their fathers like that. Apart from it, there were also other forms denoting ‘father’ that seem to be (originally) nursery words. The most frequent and ancient of them is **atta-*¹⁹ (= **h₂et-o-*, as per Vaan 2008: 60) (Hit. *attaš*; OCS *otičŭ*²⁰; Alb. *at(ë)*) and its possible variant **tata-* (CLuw. *tāta/i* ‘father’-; Rus. *тятя* (obs.) ‘daddy’, etc.) (cf. *EIEC* 194f.; Derksen 2008:383; Kloekhorst 2008:225f.).

In Albanian, Anatolian and Slavic the word **atta-* is used as the main term for ‘father’; however, it is also attested in some IE languages that preserved **ph₂tér-* as well. The distribution of the two terms in these languages is more complicated than simply ‘formal-informal’. For example, in Old Irish *athair* (< **ph₂tér-*) denotes ‘father’, while *aite* (< **atta-*) designates ‘foster-father, tutor, teacher’ (*EIEC* 195). In Greek the word *ἄττα* means either ‘father’ or ‘a venerable man’ (Sen 1987:258). *EM* (54) prefers interpreting the Latin *atta* as ‘grandfather’ rather than ‘father’. Sen (1987) analysed *fadar* and *atta* in different contexts of the Gothic Gospel and drew the conclusion that “*fadar* indicated intimate direct relationship involving the process of procreation, *atta* implied an intimate relationship founded primarily

¹⁸ Proto-Sl. **str̥j̥b-* and Lith. *str̥j̥jus* mentioned in 2.1.1.1. can be of the same origin if the sound change **ph₂tr-* > Balto-Slavic **str-* really took place

¹⁹ An onomatopoeic nursery word form **atta-* or the like is widely attested outside of IE: in Dravidian (Malayalam *attan* ‘father’); in Altaic (Turkish, Uighur, Kirghiz *ata* ‘father, ancestor’, Bashkir *ata* ‘father, male’); Etruscan *ateri* ‘parents, ancestors’ (quoted in Bomhard 2008:596-7); and in Sumerian *ad(da)* ‘father; forefather, great-grandfather’ (Volk 1999:79).

²⁰ < **otikos* (Szemerényi 1977:7); *ättikos* (Trubačev 1959:23)

on respect and admiration” (ibid. 258). Therefore, although **atta* definitely originates from children’s speech, in certain IE languages it functions not (only) as an informal synonym of **ph₂tér-* but has a broader (or abstracter) meaning, namely, ‘a person who is older than the speaker or exercises some authority over him/her’.

An explanation for the double structure of morphologically transparent kinship terms like **ph₂tér-* beside nursery words like **atta* may be sought in the existence of a foster-system among the Indo-Europeans reflected especially detailed in the foster-system of the Ancient Celts (Bremmer 1976: 65-76; Parkes 2006: 359-395)²¹. Ancient law documents and legends indicate that children were traditionally fostered in another family either of subordinate or, rarely, superior rank. They were given to that family either as infants²² or at the age of seven or eight and brought up and educated there until 14 (girls) or 17 (boys) years old. Under these circumstances, the relationship with the foster family was definitely closer than with the biological parents. That is why the usage of nursery terms is quite predictable here (see also section 2.1.7.1.).

Another curious fact about **atta-* is that, as a nursery word, it does not obey the regular sound laws of the daughter languages (e.g., Grimm’s Law in Germanic, see the Gothic example above). Thus in Slovenian there is a formal term for father *ôče* (gen.sg. *očéta*), which is a derivative of the ancient **atta-*, and simultaneously a nursery term *ati*, which is a new formation. Consequently, **atta-* is not really a proto-form but rather a pattern that can be (re)activated in a language in a certain time period.

2.1.2. Mother

2.1.2.1. **méh₂ter-/ méh₂tr-*

The most wide-spread term for ‘mother’ attested in all major IE branches excluding Anatolian²³ is **méh₂tēr-/ *méh₂tr-* or **máh₂tēr-/ *máh₂tr-* (IEW 700f.; EIEC 385f.; NIL 457ff.): e.g., Ved. *mātár-*, YAv. *mātar-*, Arm. *mayr*, Phryg. *ματαρ*, Gr. (Attic) *μήτηρ*, Lat. *māter*, ON *móþer*, OIr. *máthair*, OLith. (gen.sg.) *móters*, ORus. *mati*, (gen.sg.) *matere*, Toch. A *mācar*, Alb. *motër* ‘sister’(!)²⁴.

²¹ Prof. Kim McCone has kindly shared this idea with me by permitting to read the manuscript of his new book “The Romulus Syndrome” that has not been published yet.

²² This is how Parkes (2006:362) describes the Celtic tradition: “References to nursing-clothes and breast-feeding indicate that fosterage could be undertaken within a few days of birth, so a child would be suckled by its *muimme* foster-mother before being trained by its *aite* foster-father.”

²³ Anatolian forms were derived from a nursery word **anna-* (**Honno-*, as per Kloekhorst 2008:174)

²⁴ Designations of mother in Albanian are nursery words: *amë, mëmë, nënë* (Orel 1998:4, 260, 291).

Internal etymology

Like in the case of the term for ‘father’ one group of scholars believe that the word must have an internal etymology. Already Bopp (1871 [1837]:189) claimed that the word was based on the verbal root **mā*²⁵ (~ **meh₁* ‘ab(messen)’, as per *LIV*² 424f.) + agentive suffix **-ter-*; thus **māter-* (~ **meh₁ter-*) would be ‘the one who gives birth’. Tremblay (2003:81ff., 150) follows the interpretation of the root **mā-* by Eichner (1973:65ff.): **meh₂₋* ‘zeitlich passend sein, die/zur rechte(n) Zeit sein’. Therefore, “**meh₂tōr-*“ would be ‘the one who makes smth./ smb. ripe’ (i.e., ‘gives birth at the right time’)²⁶.

Another group of scholars, such as Delbrück (1889) and Szemerényi (1977:6ff. with references to many previous authors²⁷) believed that the root **mā-* in “**māter-*” has no other meaning except ‘mama’. Pinault (2007) agrees with them and formulates the etymology in the following way: **ma-* is simply a nursery word *mama* + the zero-grade of the collective suffix **-eh₂₋* (‘a group of mothers, motherhood’) + contrastive suffix **-ter/-tr̥*. Consequently, **mah₂ter-* is a ‘particular person belonging to the group of mothers’ (‘ibid.’: 277).

It should also be underlined that, unlike **ph₂tér/ph₂tr-*, **méh₂tēr-/ *méh₂tr-* is an acrostatically inflected word. Pinault (2005, 2007) assumes that such a change of stress paradigm is connected with the process of nominalization. A similar difference can be observed in case of hysterokinetic nomina agentis designating an agents in a specific situation (see 2.1.1.1.) and acrostatic nomina agentis designating an agents in general²⁸ (see Tichy 1995). Following this logic, one can conclude that hysterokinetic kinship terms in *-ter/-tr̥* reflect an adjectival inflectional paradigm ‘belonging to the group of ...’, while acrostatic ones reflect the paradigm of the nominalised adjectives. Therefore, **méh₂tēr-/ *méh₂tr-* must be a ‘mother of a specific family (in contrast to other mothers)’. Unfortunately, one can only speculate about the question why, in this case, not all kinship terms in *-ter/-tr̥* employed the acrostatic paradigm²⁹.

2.1.2.2. **meh₂trou-/meh₂tr̥u-* (cf. *NIL* 458) and its derivatives

Rau (2011:23) suggests that the terms designating mother’s relatives might have been formed analogically to the terms for ‘father’s relatives’. The Greek word μήτηρ (< **meh₂trous*)

²⁵ „<...> *mā* ‘messen’, welche mit der Präp. *nis* aus (*nir-mā*) ‘schaffen, hervorbringen’ bedeutet und auch wohl ohne Präposition dieser Bedeutung fähig sein muss“ (Bopp 1871 [1837]:189)

²⁶ Eichner (p. c.) believes that the word originally designated a womb.

²⁷ e.g., Kretschmer (1896), Delbrück (1889), Buck (1949), Jakobson (1959), etc.

²⁸ Nom.sg. Proto-Ir. **dātā* < **dóh₃tō(r)*, gen.sg. Proto-Ir. **dāt̥r̥š* < **dóh₃t̥r̥s* (Tichy 1995:57)

²⁹ As far as the difference in stress paradigm between **ph₂tér/ph₂tr-* and **méh₂tēr-/ *méh₂tr-* is concerned, Lohmann (1965:217), who was also a supporter of the contrastive suffix hypothesis, assumed that it was employed additionally for the contrast.

‘männlicher Verwandter der Mutter, Oheim, Großvater’ (*NIL* 458) follows the pattern **ph₂tér-* > **ph₂trou-*. According to this logic, the primary meaning of **meh₂trou-*/**meh₂tru-* must have been ‘ascendant kinsman on the mother’s side’ or ‘the one in charge of the mother’ (her father or brother); the Greek word obviously reflects all these meanings.

The forms Gr. μητριά ‘step-mother’, Arm. *mowrow* ‘id.’, and some West-Germanic words meaning ‘mother’s sister’ such as OE *mōdrige* (*NIL* 458) were probably a result of the feminisation of **meh₂trou-*/**meh₂tru-* (originally *devī*-formations: ***meh₂tréu_hh₂-*/***meh₂tru_heh₂-* >> **meh₂trú_uh₂-*/**meh₂trú_uieh₂-*).

2.1.3. Son

2.1.3.1. **suH-nu-/suH-ju-*

A common term for ‘son’ in PIE cannot be reconstructed. However, one can find at least two words that might have a PIE status. The most widespread of them is derived from the root **suH-* with the addition of either the suffix **-nu-* (Ved. *sūnús*; Av. *hunas*; Goth. *sunus*; OCS *synъ*; OPrus *souns*; Arm. *owstr*³⁰) or the suffix **-ju-* (Gr *υῖός*; Toch. A gen.sg. *seyo*; Toch. B *soy*) (*NIL* 686ff.).

The root **suH-* is considered to be the zero-grade of the verbal root **seuH-*³¹ ‘gebären’ (Ved. Pres. 3.Sg. *súte* ‘gebärt’; **su-né/n-H-* > YAv Pres. Ind. 1sg. *hunāmi* ‘gebäre’, 2sg. *hunāhi* ‘gebärst’) (*LIV* 538) or **seu_hh₃-* ‘füllen’ (**su-né/n-h₃-* > Hit. *sunnai-* ‘füllen’) (*LIV* 539).

2.1.3.2. **putlo-*

Another term for ‘son’ that may have a PIE status is **putló-*³² (OInd. *putrá*; OPers. *puça*; Av. *puθra*; Lat. (Plautus) *putillus* ‘young boy’; Osc. *puklum*) (*EIEC* 533; Szemerényi 1977:18). The word is formed on the basis of the root **pau-* ‘small’³³ with the addition of the diminutive suffix **-tlo-* (cf. *EIEC* 533). The word might have originally designated a young animal, which is quite probable taking into account the examples from Balto-Slavic that can be derived from the same root: Lith. *putytis* ‘nestling, cub’, OCS *pŭtištĭ* ‘nestling’ (cf. Trubachev 1959:51f.).

³⁰ probably, a product of contamination with *dowstr* ‘daughter’ (Olsen 1999:148f.)

³¹ as a verb it is only attested in Indo-Iranian

³² **ph₂u-tlo-* (cf. de Vaan 2008: 496)

³³ **peh₂-u-* > Lat. *paucus* ‘few, small in number’; Gr. *παῦρος* ‘little’, Got. *fawai* [nom.pl.] ‘few’ (de Vaan 2008:450f.)

One cannot fail to notice that it is impossible to interpret either of these terms specifically as a male child. Originally the forms **suH-nu-/*suH-ju-* might have meant ‘someone who was born’ and **putlo-* ‘someone who is small and immature’. Generally speaking, these words can simply mean ‘offspring’. On the one hand, it looks strange that the patriarchal PIE society did not have any specific term for ‘son’, although they had a term for ‘daughter’ (2.1.4). This fact was even used by Isachenko (1952:55, 60) as an argument supporting his theory about gynocentrism of the early Proto-Indo-Europeans. On the other hand, the lack of a specific term can be explained by the patriarchal mentality itself: ‘daughters’ were not considered to be the real offspring; thus the two ancient terms for ‘child’ only referred to sons³⁴.

2.1.4. Daughter

Hysterokinetically inflected **d^hugh₂tér-/ d^hugh₂tr’-* (cf. *IEW* 277; *EIEC* 147f.; *NIL* 126ff.) is the most widely attested kinship term in IE: e.g., Ved. *duhitár-*, OAv. *dugədar-*, Arm. *dowstr*, Gr. *θυγάτηρ*, Osc. *futír*, Goth. *dauhtar*, Gaul. *duxtir*, OLith. (gen.sg.) *dukterés*, OCS *dŭšti*, Toch. A *ckācar*, Toch. B *tkācer*. One can find it even in the Anatolian languages: e.g., Lyc. *kbatra-* (<**d^hugh₂tr-ah₂-*) (cf. Melchert 1993:33; *NIL* 126); HierLuv. acc.sg. ^{FILIA}*tú-wa/i-tara/i-na* and ^{FILIA}*tú-wa/i-ta[ra/i-na]* /tuatra/i-/ (Kloekhorst 2011:3, with references to Hawkins 1978:112-16)³⁵. Only Albanian lacks the respective cognate³⁶.

Later Italic and Celtic languages developed new forms. E.g., Latin *filius(-a)* (<**d^h(e)h₁i-l-* ‘suckling, child’, as per de Vaan 2008:219f.) is derived from the root **d^heh₁(i)-* ‘suckle, feed’ (*LIV* 138); the cognates in other IE languages are Lyc. *tideimi* ‘child’ and OCS *děte* ‘id.’, etc.) (Pinault 2007:276; Trubachev 1959:50). The origin of OIr. *der-*, *dar-*, *ter-* ‘daughter, girl’ (*NIL* 126) is debated; it might be derived from the expected form **ducht(a)ir* – the first syllable was dropped probably because of its homonymy with the prefix **do-/*du-* ‘bad’ (Hamp 1975:39-40). Nonetheless, some older Italic and Celtic languages preserved the PIE term: Osc. *futír*, Gall. *duxtir*, Celtib. *tuateres* (*NIL* 126).

³⁴ At the presentation of my research topic, a colleague of mine made a valuable remark that in Greece older people in rural areas sometimes say: “έχω δυο παιδιά κι ένα κορίτσι.” It means literally “I have two children and a daughter”. The word *παιδιά* (pl.) is also derived from the stem **peh₂-u-* ‘little, small’ (Beekes (2010:1142-3). Rus. *мальчик* ‘boy, (secondarily) young man’ (lit. ‘a little one’) can be used as a typological parallel too.

³⁵ Hittite ^{MUNUS}*duttarijata/i-* denoting a female functionary and ^{TUL}*Duqattarina-*, the name of the well, might be a cognate of the IE word for ‘daughter’, it is not proven though (Kloekhorst 2011:4).

³⁶ The Albanian word for ‘daughter’ is *bijë* < Proto-Alb. **birilā*. It can have some connection to Lat. *filia* (Orel 1998:25). Schumacher & Matzinger (2013:215, 247) derive (Old Gheg) /bīr/, /biri/ < **bīr* ‘son’ (< **bir* < **bīr^{wh}* < **b^hiH-ro-*) and its motion formation *bijë* < **bīr-īā* from the verbal root **b^heiH-* ‘schlagen’.

Internal etymology

The first attempt to find an internal etymology of this word belongs to the 19th century. At that time the principle language for reconstruction of PIE was Vedic; that is why scholars saw in the term for ‘daughter’ the OInd. root *duh-* ‘to milk’ (~ **d^heug^h-*, as per *LIV*² 148f.), thus daughter was interpreted as a ‘milk-maid’ or ‘suckling’ (Bopp 1871 [1837]:189). This etymology cannot be accepted for the reason that **d^heug^h-* means ‘to milk, to give milk’ only in Indo-Iranian and it is obviously not the basic meaning of the root. Based on cognates from other IE languages, one can draw the conclusion that the primary meaning must be rather ‘to be useful, fruitful, suitable’: Gr. τέρω ‘tauglich herrichten, verfertigen, herstellen’; Goth. *daug* = ON *duga* = OHG *tugan* ‘von Nutzen sein, taugen, glücken’, etc. (*IEW* 271; *LIV*² 148f.).

The reanalysis of the root **d^heug^h-* inspired Pârvulescu (1993) to formulate another variant of the etymology for ‘daughter’. He suggests that the original meaning of the word should be ‘a female servant, a helper in the household’³⁷. Pârvulescu also assumes that for constructing different kinship terms different suffixes **-ter* were employed: words for ‘father’, ‘mother’, and ‘brother’ were formed by adding the contrastive suffix, while for constructing the word **d^hugh₂tér-* the agentive suffix **-ter* was used.

Carruba (1995:154) has an almost identical suggestion: “**dhugh(éh₂)-h₁ter*”, in his interpretation, means something like ‘a member of the family or clan who works/ who is useful’. Semerényi (1997:22) imagines “**dhugətēr*” being ‘the person who prepares a meal’ and considers Goth. *ga-dauka* ‘a family member’ (lit. ‘someone who one eats with’) and Goth. *dauhts* ‘fest’ to be its cognates. The problem with this hypothesis is the obscure origin of the word *dauhts*; it can be an inner-Germanic formation (Lehmann 1986:88, 135).

Pinault (2007:276, inc. footnote 17; 2012:2) tries to derive PIE “**d^hh₁u-g-h₂-ter-*” from the same root as Lat. *fīlia* - **d^heh₁(i)-* ‘suckle, feed’ (*LIV* 138). **d^h(e)h₁-u-* means ‘suckling’ + “expressive suffix referring to females” **-g-* (as in Hit. *nega-* ‘sister’, Lith. *mergà* ‘girl, maiden’) + zero-grade of the collective suffix *-eh₂* (he claims that *h₁* in the root was dissimilated either before laryngeal metathesis **d^hh₁ug-h₂-* > **d^hug-h₂-* or afterwards **d^huh₁gh₂-* > **d^hug-h₂-*). Therefore, “**d^hh₁u-g-h₂-ter-*” can, according to him, be interpreted as

³⁷ He assumes the semantic change of the word to be ‘servant, maid’ > ‘girl’ > ‘daughter’ and sets typological parallels. “Some of these sources point to the economic role boys and girls play in a primitive society, either an agricultural or a pastoral one, where from an early age they perform various duties in the household or take an active part in the field-related labors <...>

Czech *chlapec*, Pol. *chłopiec* ‘boy’ < OCS *chlap* ‘servant’ (> Rus. *cholop* ‘serf’);

Lith. *vaikas* ‘boy’, also ‘girl’ (Žem.) (= OPrus. *waix* ‘servant’) < Lith. *veikti* ‘to work, do’;

Fr. *garce* ‘girl’ (now derogatory), *garçon* ‘boy’ < OFr. *garce* ‘servant’, *garçon* ‘valet’” (Pârvulescu 1993:88)

‘a certain person belonging to the group of (female) children’. This etymology would sound reasonable from a semantic point of view, but since there is otherwise no “expressive suffix *-g-”, it remains highly doubtful³⁸.

2.1.5. Brother

The acrostically inflected term **b^hréh₂ter-/ *b^hréh₂tr-* or **b^hráh₂ter-/ *b^hráh₂tr-* (cf. *IEW* 163f.; *EIEC* 84; *NIL* 38ff.) is also wide-spread in IE: e.g., Ved. *bhrátar-*, Av., OPers. *brātar-*, Arm. *elbayr*, Lat. *frāter*, Goth. *broþar*, OIr. *bráth(a)ir*, OCS *brat(r)ŭ*, OPrus. *brāti*, Toch. A *pracar*, Toch. B *procer*. Only in Anatolian and Albanian³⁹ it is unattested. The original term for ‘brother’ in Greek φρήτηρ (Att. ‘Mitglied einer Phraterie’, as per *NIL* 38) was displaced with an innovation ἀδελφεός (< **sm-guelbh-ejo-* ‘co-uterine’) (cf. *EIEC* 84).

Internal etymology

Bopp (1871 [1837]:190-1) considered **b^hréh₂ter-* to be a nomen agentis derived from the verbal root “*b^har” (< **b^her-* ‘tragen, bringen’, as per *LIV*² 76) - “der Erhalter, als der Mutter, der Schwestern und jüngeren Brüder Stütze nach des Vaters Tod” (ibid.: 190-1). The idea that the term is based on the root **b^her-* has not been challenged so far⁴⁰; however, different scholars interpret the connotations of the root in different way.

Szemerényi (1977:24-32) suggests segmenting the word as “*b^hr-ātēr”: **b^hr-* is the zero-grade of **b^her-* with the transitive meaning ‘to keep well-looked after, hold in honour’ and “*ātēr-”⁴¹, probably, the oldest word for ‘fire’. Therefore, according to Szemerényi, it must mean ‘fire-bearer’ or ‘fire-tender’ hinting on the duties of male children in the joint family. It would be an acceptable etymology if the form of the word conformed to the rules of PIE compounding.

³⁸ Note that Hitt. *nega-* ‘sister’ is isolated in IE, so that its etymology is unclear (cf. Kloekhorst 2008; the *g* may thus belong to the root); the same is true for Lith. *mergà* ‘girl, maiden’ (Smoczyński 38).

³⁹ The word ‘brother’ in Anatolian (Hit. *nēgna*; Luv. **nāna/i-* (*nāni(ya)* ‘brotherly’); Lyc. *nēne/i*) has no outer-Anatolian cognates. The Albanian word *vëlla* (Proto-Alb. **wəlāḍā* < **ḡwādł-ā* < **awá-del* ‘mother’s brother’s son’) might have originally meant ‘mother’s brother’s son’ (Proto-Alb. **awa* < **h₂eyh₂os* ‘mother’s father/brother’) (*EIEC* 84). Orel (1998:503f.) suggests another etymology for the Albanian word: **swe-laudā* (< **leudh-* ‘people’) ‘one’s own man’.

⁴⁰ with the exception of some marginal theories like the theory of Trier (1947:255, mentioned in Szemerényi 1977:24). This scholar assumed that the word **b^her-* denoted a ‘fence’, thus ‘brother’ was ‘a member of the family’ (lit. ‘someone within the fence’).

⁴¹ **HeH₂tr-* (cf. *EIEC* 202) → Av. *ātars̥* (gen.sg. *āθrō*) ‘fier’; Arm. *ayrem* (< **ayr* < **ātēr*) ‘kindle, burn’; Lat. *āter* ‘black’ (‘burnt’).

Carruba (1995:154) and Pârdulescu (1996:103ff.) interpret the root **b^her-* in **b^hréh₂ter-* as ‘to give birth, to bring forth, produce’⁴². This idea finds support in Pinault (2007:276-7); he reconstructs the word as **b^hr-éh₂-ter-*: **b^hr-* is the zero-grade of **b^her-* (‘to bear’ > ‘to give birth’) with the addition of the collective suffix **-eh₂-* and the contrastive suffix **-ter-*. Accordingly, ‘brother’ refers to ‘belonging to the group of (male) children born by the same mother’. As it has been already shown in section 2.1.3., the primary meaning of two main designations of ‘son’ is ‘a little one’ and ‘child, offspring’. Thus it is not surprising that **b^hréh₂ter-/ *b^hréh₂tṛ-* might have originally meant ‘this specific person (= man) who is born by the same mother as me (in contrast to the people (= men) born by other women)’. This etymology is not implausible, especially, if we take into account the typological parallel Gr. ἀδελφεός mentioned above, which also refers to the person ‘born by the same mother’.

2.1.6. Sister

The amphikinetically⁴³ inflected word **sṷésor-/ *sṷesr’-* (*IEW* 1051; *EIEC* 521; *NIL* 680ff.) is another wide-spread kinship term in IE lacking only in Anatolian⁴⁴ and possibly Albanian⁴⁵: e.g., Ved. *svásar-*, YAv. *x^vanhar*, Gr. ἑοπ ‘(female) relative, daughter, niece’, Arm. *k’oyr*, Lat. *soror*, OIr. *siur*, Goth. *swistar*, OPrus. *swestro*, Toch. A *šar* Toch. B *šer* (< A.Sg. **sṷésrṃ* as per *EIEC* 521).

Internal etymology

An old but so far unchallenged etymology of **sṷésor-/ *sṷesr-* is ‘(one’s) own woman’ or ‘the woman of the clan’. In his recent article Harðarson (2014:25ff.) presents the research history of this word.

Already Pott (1833:126) assumed that it must be a compound (‘femina cognata’), the first element of which is a reflexive possessive “*sva*” (~**sṷé/ó-* > Ved. *svá-*, Gr. (ῥ)ός, etc.) ‘own’ and the second element is derived from the root “**su* (gignere)” (~**seuH-*, as per *LIV* 538). Therefore, he reconstructed it as “**sva-sutar*” (“**sutar*” as a nomen agentis ‘the one who gives birth’ vs. feminized **su-trī* > Ved. *strī* ‘woman’); according to him, in the forms

⁴² Pârdulescu gives numerous examples: Goth. *baíran* ‘to carry, bring, give birth’; ON *bera* ‘to bring forth, give birth’; OE. *beran* ‘to bring forth, give birth’; Av. *baraiti* ‘to bring forth (animals)’; Gr. φέρω ‘to bring forth, produce (of earth and trees)’; OIr. *breth* ‘child-bearing, parturition’ and also Alb. *bir* ‘son’; Goth. *baur* ‘id.’; Lith. *bérnas* ‘child’; OE *geboren* ‘brother’, etc. (Pârdulescu 1996:103-4)

⁴³ Pinault (2012:3) prefers setting up an acrostatic paradigm for **sṷésor-/sṷesr-* because the expected weak stem **sṷesr’-* is not attested.

⁴⁴ Hit. *neka-*; Lyc. *nere/i-*; HierLuv. *nanasri*, CLuv. *nānasri(ya)* adj. ‘of a sister’ (derivatives from *nāna/i* < **negna-* ‘brother’) (*EIEC* 521).

⁴⁵ Alb. *vájzë* ‘girl’ (< **varë* < **vëharë* < Proto-Alb. **swesarā*, as per Orel 1998:493); Schumacher (p. c.) doubts this etymology. The Albanian word for ‘sister’ is *motër* (< **meh₂ter-*).

like Lat. *soror* *t* was omitted. Bopp (1871 [1837]:191) and Schleicher (1861–1862 II: 338) shared his opinion.

Brugmann (1876: 394), on the contrary, argued that the primary form must have been “*sva-sa₂r*”, thus *t* in the words like Rus. *sestra* or Goth. *swistar* is epenthetic. In addition, he was the first to assume that “*sa₂r*” is also reflected in the feminine numerals ‘three’ and ‘four’⁴⁶. Bugge (1889: 75f.) developed this idea and reconstructed the feminine “suffix *-sr-es*, *-sor-es*”. Meringer (1904: 171f.) stated that **sor-* must be a root noun denoting a woman.

Ernout and Meillet (1935 [1932]: 758f.) and Benveniste (1935:104) claimed that **sor-* is also a part of Lat. *uk-sor* and YAv. *hāiriš-* ‘woman’ (< **sāriš-*⁴⁷).

Ehelolf (1936: 184–186) was the first to suggest that **sor-* should be reflected in the Anatolian feminine-making suffix *-(š)šara-* (Hit. *išha-šš(a)ra-* ‘mistress, lady’, *haššu-šš(a)ra-* ‘queen’, *šuppi-šš(a)ra-* ‘purified woman, priestess’). CLuv. *nāna-šra/i-* ‘sister’ belongs to this group of words too.

Semerényi (1964:334f.) tried to find an alternative way to interpret the word for ‘sister’: “**swe-*” (< “**suH-e-*”) ‘(all) that has been born, the kin, the extended family’ + **sū-* ‘woman, wife’ (< ‘the female who has brought forth / can bring forth’) → **swe-su-er-* = **sweswer-* (*-er-* analogically to the kinship terms in **-ter-*) → (syncope and dissimilation) **swesor-*. The second syllable of the word was then abstracted and used to construct other feminine forms like the feminine numerals for ‘three’ and ‘four’ and YAv. *hāiriš-* mentioned above.

In Semerényi (1966:215-18) this group of words was enriched with Gr. ὄαρ ‘woman’, CLuv. “*asr(i)-*” (*ašrul(i)-* ‘female’ and *nān-ašra/i-* ‘sister’) and Hit. “*-asar(a)-*” (*išh-ašš(a)ra-* ‘mistress, lady’) originating from the form “**oser-/osr-*”, which had been derived from **sor-*.

In 1977 Semerényi reconsidered his theory (p. 37ff.). This time instead of **sor-* he stated “**esōr-/ osr-*” (showing the same ablaut-pattern as **uédōr-/ *uódōr-* ‘water’) as a primary form: therefore, the Anatolian attestations as well as the word for ‘sister’ “**sū-esōr*”⁴⁸ and the feminine numerals ‘three’ and ‘four’ reflect the form “**esōr-*” and “**osr-*” also observable in Gr. ὄαρ. As for YAv. *hāiriš-*, Semerényi (1977:35&38) prefers to exclude it from the group of “**esōr-/ osr-*” derivatives; instead he adds YAv. *āñhairī-* ‘woman, female’

⁴⁶ Ved. *tisráḥ, cátasraḥ*; Av. acc. *tišrō, catañrō*; OIr. nom. *téoir, cethéoir*, acc. *téora, cethéora* (quoted in Pinault 2013:240)

⁴⁷ Ir. **sar-* > Av. *hār-*, remodeled with a suffix Ir. **-iš-* (based on forms like Ved. *haviṣ* ‘offering’) and further addition of the feminine suffix Ir. **-ī-* (like in Ved. *māhiṣ-* ‘lady, first wife’, Av. *təuuīš-* ‘power’) (Pinault 2013:240); a bit differently Harðarson (2014:35ff.): **sēr-i-/ser-i-* > **sār-i-* → **sāri-š-* → **sāriš-a-* adj. ‘Weiblichkeit besitzend, weiblich’, fem. **sāriš-ī-*.

⁴⁸ This time **sū-* was interpreted as ‘joint family, clan’ and **esor-* as a ‘woman’(ibid.: 43)

to the group and claims it to be derived from an adj. **āhara-*, which might be a vṛddhied derivative from **ahar-* (<**esōr-*) ‘woman’.

Some later scholars accepted Semerényi’s ideas to a certain extent and reconstructed the ancient word for ‘woman’ or the old feminine marker accordingly: **esor-* (cf. Oettinger 1986:124ff., Starke 1990:347, Watkins 2000:24), **(h₁)es-or-* (Kim 2005:130, Hackstein 2010:58, 62), or **h₁es-or-* (Rieken 1999:262)⁴⁹. However, Harðarson (2014:38-42, 48) interprets forms like YAv. *āñhairī-* and CLuv. *ašrul(i)-* as determinative compounds with the adverb “**(h₁)eh₁* bzw. **(h₁)oh₁* ‘heran, herbei, zu, hinzu’ etc. (Lokativ des Pronominalstammes **(h₁)e-/(h₁)o-* ‘der’). <...> Es bezeichnete die von außen stammende angeheiratete Frau (eig. die hinzu kommende Frau) im Gegensatz zur blutsverwandten Frau, d.h. der Schwester (ibid.: 48)“, e.g., YAv. *xvañhar-* ‘sister’ vs. *āñhairī-* ‘woman (taken from another family)’. To be sure, the existence of determinative compounds in PIE is very uncertain.

The most recent etymological suggestion for ‘sister’ belongs to Pinault (2013:244-5). He assumes that **s_ué sór* was originally a phrase ‘own female’ at the time when PIE did not have a feminising suffix at all⁵⁰. Like Semerényi (1964:334f.), he believes that the phrase was univerbated as **s_ué-sor-* and the second element was reinterpreted as a feminine suffix.

2.1.7. Grandparents

2.1.7.1. **h₂euh₂-o-*

It is debated whether a PIE term for ‘grandfather’ in its contemporary meaning can be reconstructed. Some IE branches have preserved words semantically connected to the concept ‘grandfather’ that can be derived from a basis **h₂euh₂-*⁵¹ (cf. *IEW* 89; *EIEC* 237-8) with the addition of various suffixes:

- 1) **h₂euh₂-o-* > Lat. *avus*, Arm. *haw*, Hit. *ḥuḥḥaš*, HierLuv. *huha-*, Lyc. *xuga* ‘grandfather’ (in general) (Kloekhorst 2008:352-3) and possibly ON *afi* ‘grandfather’ (Boutkan and Siebinga 2005:86), possibly Toch. B *āwe* ‘grandfather’ (Adams 2013 I: 61);

⁴⁹ all quoted in Harðarson 2014:29ff.

⁵⁰ Otherwise, it should have been **s_ué-h₂ sór* (Pinault 2013:244)

⁵¹ It is not clear whether one may set up a root-noun **h₂euh₂-* or rather an *o*-stem **h₂euh₂-ó-* or *h₂euh₂-o-* (see Kloekhorst 2008:353).

- 2) **h₂euh₂-ih₂-* (a motion-formation from **h₂euh₂-o-*) > Lat. *avia*⁵² ‘grandmother’, Gr. (Hesychius) *αἴα* ‘mother, grandmother’ (poet.) (cf. *EIEC* 239; Beekes 2009-10:31);
- 3) **h₂euh₂-en/on-* > Goth. *awo* ‘grandmother’; ON *ái* ‘great-grandfather’; (Proto-Germ. *awun* + *haima*-⁵³) > OE *ēam*, OFris. *ēm*, OHG *ōheim*, MHG *ōheim(e)*, *æheim(e)* ‘mother’s brother, uncle, son of a sister, cousin, relative’; (cf. Boutkan and Siebinga 2005:86f.);
- 4) **h₂euh₂-on-tro/tlo* > Lat. *avunculus* ‘mother’s brother’; (> Proto-Celt. **awon-tīr/-tro-* >) MW *ewythyr*, *ewythr* ‘uncle’, MBret. *eontr* ‘id.’, OCo. *euitor* ‘id.’, OIr. *amnair* (< **awn-er*, by analogy with the *ter*-stems) ‘mother’s brother’ (Matasović 2009:48);
- 5) **h₂euh₂-(i)jio-* > OPrus. *awis*, Lith. *avýnas*; (> Proto-Slav. **ujb* >) ORus. *uj*, Cz. *ujec*; Slk. *újec*; Pl. *wuj*; SCr. *üjāk* ‘mother’s brother’ (Trubachev 1959:81-4; Derksen 2008:507f.); OIr. *aue* ‘descendant, grandson’ (< Proto-Celt. **awyo-*) (Matasović 2009:49f.).

As it is obvious from the given examples, the derivatives from **h₂euh₂-* offer two main problems: generational skewing and the emphasis on the maternal line while the PIE society is considered to be patriarchal.

Generational skewing is probably the least of these challenges. Even the superficial analysis of the examples permits us to conclude that the form **h₂euh₂-o-*, **h₂euh₂-ó-* as well as Germanic secondary *n*-stems denote mostly grandparents, while forms with the diminutive suffix **-tro/-tlo-* (see also 2.1.3.2), with the genitival suffix *-(i)jio-* (see also 2.1.1.2), and with the Germanic element **haima*-⁵⁴ designate uncles, in some languages also cousins or grandchildren⁵⁵. The form **h₂euh₂-o-* can be interpreted as a grandfather (‘the elder of the clan’ or the like) and the other forms as ‘younger members of grandfather’s family’ or ‘belonging to grandfather’s household’. Consequently, forms denoting ‘uncle’ are derivatives of **h₂euh₂-o-* but not the same word: uncles are not equal to grandfathers.

As for the second point, it raises more questions. All attested continuants of **h₂euh₂-o-* mean ‘grandfather’ in general but the derivatives in **-tro/*-tlo-*, **-(i)jio-* and Germ. **haima-* denote specifically ‘mother’s brother’. In Latin this contradiction is especially conspicuous: *avunculus* ‘mother’s brother’ is definitely a derivation from *avus* ‘grandfather’; that means either *avus* was originally a ‘mother’s father’ or *avunculus* an uncle in general.

⁵² probably an inner-Italic development: a feminine form for *avus* parallel to *frātria* ‘brother’s wife’ from *frater* ‘brother’ (*EIEC* 239)

⁵³ The meaning of the second element is disputable: either ‘home’ or ‘dear’ (see Boutkan& Siebinga 2005:86)

⁵⁴ Consequently, **haima-* must also have had either a diminutive or a possessive function

⁵⁵ See also Hettrich (1985:457)

Hettrich (1985), Gamkrelidze and Ivanov (1995), and *EIEC* (238) assume that the primary meaning must have been ‘grandfather’ and ‘uncle’ in general; the forms for ‘uncle’ were restricted to the meaning ‘mother’s brother’ after a specific term for ‘father’s brother’ (like Lat. *patruus* and other forms mentioned in 2.1.1.2.) had been coined. Hettrich (1985:457) also believes that the terms for ‘uncle’ belong to the post-PIE time and are independent formations.

However, I would prefer the hypothesis of Bremmer (1976, 1983). As it has been said in the section 2.1.1.3., children could be brought up outside of the biological father’s family mostly by people of the subordinate class. Along with it, there was a practice described in Celtic, Greek, Indic, Iranian, Slavic, Germanic, Latin, and even Hittite sources (Bremmer 1976:67-73) of child fosterage in mother’s brother’s or, more rarely, mother’s father’s family. This practice was perhaps meant to make the ties between the two families even stronger. Thus, possibly, **h₂eu_hh₂-o-* and its derivatives were originally a designation of such a mother’s father/brother who became a foster father for a child⁵⁶ (see also 2.1.8). In this case, the meanings ‘grandfather’ and ‘uncle’ (in general) are secondary.

The etymology of this term is also disputed. Not all scholars agree that it is a simple nursery-term, especially, if one takes into account the laryngeals. In older sources one can find attempts to derive this term from the root **aw-* interpreting it as a cognate of either Ved. *ávati* ‘help, support’ (<**h₁euH-* ‘helfen, fördern’, as per *LIV*²:243f.) (Szemerényi 1977:48) or Lat. *avēre* ‘desire’ (~ **h₂eu-* ‘enjoy’, as per *LIV*² 274) (Walde-Hoffmann 1938: 89). Anyway, in recent time linguists prefer considering it to be onomatopoeic, which further supports Bremmer’s theory of an original foster term.

2.1.7.2. **an(n)-* (**Hen(n)-*)

Some scholars differentiate two roots **an(n)-*:

- 1) ‘father’s mother, ancestor’: OHG *ano* ‘(Ur)großvater, Ahn’, *ana* (Ur)großmutter, Ahne, Lat. *anna* ‘Pflegemutter’ (*IEW*:36); OIr. *Ana* ‘mother of gods’ (divine name); Gr. *ἀννίς*, Arm. *han*, OPers. *nyākā* (< *h₂n-īeh₂-keh₂*) ‘grandmother’; OPrus. *ane* ‘female ancestor’ and a derivative OCS *vŭnŏkŭ*; Rus. *внук* ‘grandson’ (Proto-Slav. < **ononko-* < PIE **h₂en-h₂en-ko-*) (cf. *EIEC* 238)
- 2) ‘mama, (old) woman’ (Hit. *annaš*, Palaic *ānnas*, Luv. *ānna/i*, Lyd. *ēna-*, Lyc. *ēne/i* ‘mother’) (*EIEC* 285f.).

⁵⁶ Among ancient Persians the term for ‘mother’s brother’ was used as a synonym for ‘up-bringer’ (Bremmer 1976:66)

This distinction can be seen in Hittite: *hannaš* ‘grandmother’ and *annaš*, ‘mother’ (**h₂enHo-* and **Honno-* respectively, cf. Kloekhorst 2008:285, 174); however, it can simply be analogical to the male forms *huhhaš* ‘grandfather’ and *attaš* ‘father’ (cf. *EIEC* 238f.). In other branches of IE there is no such difference; therefore, **an(n)-* (**Hen(n)-*) can also be a single root derived from child language. It is also possible, as in case of **atta-* (see 2.1.1.3.), that the word is not a proto-form but simply a reoccurring pattern for coining a nursery term.

2.1.8. Grandchildren, nephew/niece

The term **népōt-/ *népot-/ *nept-* m. (**neptih₂₋* f.)⁵⁷ (cf. *IEW* 764; *EIEC* 239f.; *NIL* 520ff.) designating grandchildren, nephews and nieces is attested in most major IE branches⁵⁸.

Internal etymology

The etymology of the word is debated. One of the interpretations of the earlier scholars⁵⁹ is “**ne-pot(is)-*“ ‘not a master’. Another suggestion (Szemerényi 1977:150) is “*(*H*)*ne-pot-*“ (from “**Han-*” ‘grandfather, ancestor’) ‘(little) master belonging to the grandfather’.

However, such etymologies cannot be uphold because they do not conform to the structure of the word. According to the current *communis opinio*, **népōt-* is a primary amphikinetic *t*-stem (see Vijūnas 2009: 169-180), such as **méh₁n-ōt-* ‘month, moon’ (> OE *mōnaþ*), **djéu-ōt-* ‘daylight’ (> Hitt. *šiwatt-* ‘day’, Luv. *tiwat-* ‘sun-god’, Ved. *dyút-* ‘light’), or **uid-ōt-* ‘things observed (rule, law)’ (> Goth. *witop* ‘law’) (ibid.: 181, 208); thus the correct segmentation is **nép-ōt-*. Therefore, in order to understand the original semantics of **nép-ōt-* one must explain the root **nep-*⁶⁰, which has no other obvious cognates.

Pinault (2012a:9) interprets **nep-* as a stem with the meaning ‘a group of children other than direct descendants’; he, further, analyses this as **né* enlarged with **-p-*. As for the element **ne-*, he compares it to **né-g-* ‘female relative’ > Hitt. *nega-* ‘sister’ or Hitt. *negna-* ‘brother’, which could reflect either **negno-* < **ne-ĝn(h₁)-ó-* ‘born nearby’ (Ved. *nédīyas-* ‘nearer’, *nédiṣṭha-* ‘nearest, next’, OIr. *nessam* ‘closer’, etc.) or be interpreted as **ne-* plus

⁵⁷ **h₂nep-ōt-*, as per Beekes (1969:45) and Schrijver (1991:21, 150-153, 363-366): Gr. ἀνεψιός ‘male cousin’ can indicate the initial laryngeal. Another reconstruction is **sn₁-neptjo-* parallel to Welsh *cefnder* ‘male cousin’, *cifnithr* ‘female cousin’ < **kom-nepōt-* ‘co-grandson’ and **kom-neptiH-* ‘co-granddaughter’ (Benveniste 1969 I: 234)

⁵⁸ Tocharian, Anatolian and Armenian have developed their own forms. Alb. *nip* ‘grandson, nephew’, *mbesë* ‘granddaughter, niece’ may be inherited; however, most probably, they are borrowings from Latin *nepōs* and *nepōtia* (Orel 1998:250, 300).

⁵⁹ e.g., Bopp 1871 [1837]:189f.

⁶⁰ or **h₂nep-*

“espressive” *-g- (see 2.1.4). As for the element *-p-, *né-p- can be either an abbreviation for *né-pu (*pu-tló- ‘son’), or can be due to aphaeresis of the strengthening particle *-pe (Lat. *nempe, quippe*, Hit. *-pa*, CLuv. *-pa*, Lyc. *-pe*, Slov. *pa* ‘but, yet, however’, etc.). To be honest, this clever etymology is rather *ad hoc* but I have not been able to find any better explanation yet.

Generational skewing

Another problem one must solve in the case of *népōt- is a generational skewing. It is noteworthy that in older languages or earlier attestations it denotes grandchildren or descendants, in younger languages and later attestations it tends to alter its meanings to ‘nephew/niece’. However, attestations indicate that different branches went through this semantic change independently and at different times.

In Indic it happened quite early and was marked by a change in morphology⁶¹: Ved. *nápāt-* ‘Abkömmling, Enkel’ and *náptar-* ‘Neffe’ (*NIL* 520-1) are both attested in the Rigveda⁶² and, consequently, can be dated to the period 1500-1000 BC⁶³. Lat. *nepōs/neptis* developed the meaning ‘nephew, niece’ in Later Imperial and Medieval Latin – from the end of the 2nd century AD (Szemerényi 1977:156)⁶⁴. OIr. (Ogham inscriptions: 4-6th century AD) NIOTTA (gen.sg.) means ‘of sister’s son’, other Celtic attestations – OCorn. *noi*, MBret. *ni* mean ‘nephew’ (*NIL* 521).

In Germanic the situation is contradictory. OE (≈ 700-1100 AD) *nefa* has both meanings. Still OHG (≈ 750-1050 AD) *nevo* and its feminine forms *nift(ila)* only denote ‘grandson’ and ‘granddaughter’; the meaning ‘nephew’ and ‘niece’ (specifically sister’s children) appears in MHG, the original meaning being attested even in the 19th century (Hettrich 1985:458). In OLith. (≈ beginning of the 16th century) *nepuotīs* and its feminine form *neptė* denote mostly grandchildren; however, Slavic attestations such as ORus. *neti(i)*⁶⁵ and RusCS *nestera* (< **nept-terah₂*-) (from the end of the 9th century) means only ‘nephew’ and ‘niece’ respectively, SC *něčāk* ‘sister’s son’ (*EIEC* 239; *NIL* 521).

⁶¹ The new forms were constructed by analogy with *-ter*-stems

⁶² A parallel development can be seen in Iranian: YAv. *napāt-* ‘Enkel’ and *naptar-* ‘Neffe’ (*NIL* 520-1)

⁶³ The dates are taken from *EIEC* (48, 99, 219-20, 306)

⁶⁴ This semantic change did not embrace the whole Romanic areal: Spanish *nieto* and Portuguese *neto* only have meaning ‘grandson’ (Hettrich 1985:458)

⁶⁵ Slavic and some Baltic forms reflect the form **nept-(i)jo-* > OLith. *neptis* ‘Neffe, Enkel’ and ORus. *neti(i)*, SerbCS *netiji* ‘Neffe’ (*NIL* 521ff.)

Hence it is obvious that the semantic change from grandchild to nephew/niece is a parallel but independent phenomenon. One could speak about a universal tendency existing in the IE languages. What is the reason for such a shift is a difficult question.

According to Isachenko (1952:67ff.) and Benveniste (1969), the original meaning of **népōt-* was neither ‘grandchild’ nor ‘nephew’ but a sister’s (if Ego is a man) or brother’s (if Ego is a woman) grandchild in the epoch when PIE tribes allegedly practiced cross-cousin⁶⁶ marriages. In case Ego’s children married their cross-cousins, the grandchildren were grandsons and granddaughters for both Ego and his sister (or her brother), thus ‘grandnephews/grandnieces’. This theory is rather implausible because, for the lack of positive evidence, the practice of cross-cousin marriages in the PIE and IE societies is doubtful⁶⁷ (see, e.g., Friedrich 1966:27-9; Beekes 1976a:44ff.).

Hettrich (1985:463ff.) assumes that this shift has to be viewed in connection with the “transition from a nomadic to a more sedentary way of life”, which demanded the extension of the existing kinship terms or coining new ones.

However, the most elegant explanation would be the one based on the hypothesis supported by Bremmer (1976, 1983) mentioned in the sections 2.1.1.3. and 2.1.7.1., especially, if one takes into account the Germanic, Celtic and SC evidence, in which the word means specifically ‘sister’s or daughter’s child’. Originally, **népōt-/*néptih₂-* might have designated foster children taken into the family of the **h₂euh₂-* ‘mother’s father/brother’; that is why for a foster father a **népōt-/*néptih₂-* could be either a grandchild or a nephew/niece⁶⁸. In this case, the word probably had both meanings from the beginning, attested in some languages and unattested in others. Thus what we consider to be a semantic change ‘grandchild’ into ‘nephew/niece’ might simply be a restriction and simultaneously extension (all nephews and niece, not only those who were brought up by a **h₂euh₂-*) of meaning due to the change of traditions.

⁶⁶ Cross-cousins are father’s sister’s or mother’s brother’s children. Cross-cousin marriages are usually closely connected to the practice of group marriages (see, e.g., Lévi-Strauss 1969 [1949]:119-33).

⁶⁷ “The conclusion must be that there is not much evidence for cross-cousin marriage for the Indo-Europeans, and that where it occurs more frequently it seems to have been taken over from non-IE peoples.” (Beekes 1976a:46)

⁶⁸ “Tacitus in his exemplary ethnography of the primitive Germans depicts a beneficent avunculate, and other Germanic and Old English oral literature indicates a specific degree of fondness and loyalty between these two relatives which in matters of vengeance and even inheritance seems at times to have taken precedence over the father-son tie; the relations of Beowulf to Hygelac and of Gawain to Arthur are illustrative (Friedrich 1966:26 with references). Numerous examples of affectionate relationship between sister’s son and mother’s brother are reflected in Medieval epics: Charlemagne and Roland, Mark and Tristan, etc. (Bremmer 1976:70). The tradition of avenge for the sister’s son can also be observed among the Ossetes, an Indo-Iranian community (ibid. 67). Among South Slavs mother’s brother has always the best place at a wedding feast and is mourned longer than father’s relatives (ibid. 69).

2.2. Terms denoting affinals

2.2.1. Husband and wife

2.2.1.1. **uiH-ró-*, **h₂néř*, **potis-*, **potnih₂-*

For all words denoting ‘husband’ and ‘wife’ in IE this meaning is neither specific nor primary. Mostly those terms are based on the words for ‘man’ and ‘woman’. It is not surprising as in primitive societies adults’ marital status was obvious: an adult man was a husband, an adult woman was a wife.

The most wide-spread reconstructed terms for ‘man’ are **uiH-ró-* (NIL 726-9) and **h₂néř/h₂nr’-* (NIL 332-5). Both of them can denote a husband but it is not the only and definitely not the original meaning. **uiH-ró-* (Ved. *vīrá-* (kraftvoller) ‘Mann, Held, Sohn’, Lat. *vir* ‘Mann, Gatte’, Goth. *wair* ‘Mann’, Lith. *výras* ‘id.’ and its motion formation (**uiH-rah₂-* >) Ved. *vīrā-* ‘Heldin’, OLat. *vira* ‘Frau’ (NIL 726) can be derived from the root **ueiH-* ‘strength’ (< Ved. *váyas* ‘strength, youth’); primarily the word might have been an adjective meaning ‘young and strong’. **h₂néř/h₂nr’-* (Ved. *nár-* ‘Mann, Mensch, Held, Krieger’, Av. *nar-* ‘Mann’, Arm. *ayr*, Gr. ἀνήρ ‘Mann, Mensch’, Phryg. *αυαρ* ‘Mann, Gatte’ and its motion formation (**h₂něř-ih₂-* >) Ved. *nārī-*, Av. *nāirī-* ‘(Ehe)frau’) is probably connected to the notion of strength and power; according to IEW (765), Av. *hu-nara* ‘Wundermacht’, OIr. *sonirt* ‘tapfer, stark’ are considered to be derived from the same root **ner(t)-*“.

Another word used to denote husband and wife in IE is **pótis-* (Lat. *hospēs* ‘host’, OCS *gospodī* (< **ghos(t)-pot-*) ‘lord, master’, Lith. *pàts* ‘husband’, Gr. πόσις ‘id.’, Av. *paiti* ‘id.’, Ved. *pāti-* ‘husband, master’, Toch. A *pats* ‘husband’, Toch. B *pets(o)* ‘id.’) and its feminine form **potnih₂-* (Myc. *po-ti-ni-ja* ‘lady, wife, mistress’, Ved. *pātnī* ‘lady, wife’, Av. -*paθnā* ‘lady’, Gr. πότνια ‘lady, wife’) (cf. IEW 842; EIEC 371). This term is probably connected to the root **pet-* ‘to be strong, powerful’, and referred to the control over the household. As a verbal root it is, however, unattested⁶⁹.

The terms above are worth mentioning in this thesis; however, I would not categorise them as kinship terms proper. I would also leave a spare place for the term for ‘husband’: the man was in the centre of the patriarchal society and did not need any special designation.

⁶⁹ Pinault (2012, with references) summarises alternative interpretations of the root **pet/pot-*. He prefers interpretation as a particle or an adverb: cf. Lith. *-pāt* (emphatic particle, ‘precisely, just, self’), Lat. *-pte* (particle of emphatic identity), Hit. *-pat* expressing specification, limitation, identity (< **b^hod-*, derived from a demonstrative stem, as per Kloekhorst 2008:652). According to Dunkel (2005), **póti-* might also be a back-formation to the vocative **potēj-Ø*, reflecting a baby’s attempt to pronounce the vocative **ph₂ter-Ø*.

2.2.1.2. *g^hen(h₂)- ‘woman’

*g^hen(h₂)- (cf. *IEW* 473f., *EIEC* 648; *NIL* 177-85) is another ancient word for ‘woman’ along with *sor-/ser- discussed in 2.1.6. As a whole they correspond to each other semantically and morphologically⁷⁰. If they coexisted in PIE, *sor-/ser- was probably a more universal term for a female person of any age (in contrast to a male person⁷¹) and *g^hen(h₂)- was a designation of an adult married or marriageable woman. It is also possible that *sor-/ser- is a more ancient word and its usage was limited to a feminine marker once the other word had appeared. Strictly speaking, in its origin *g^hen(h₂)- is not a kinship term but it became one in many IE languages for the reason that being a wife was the main occupation of a woman.

The morphology of *g^hen(h₂)- is diverse and controversial:

- 1) *g^hén-: Hit. (acc.sg.) *kuinnan* ‘woman’ (< *g^hén-ṃ)⁷², OIr. *bé*⁷³ (n.) ‘woman’ (cf. *NIL* 177, 179-80), Lat. (gen.sg.) *virginis* (< *uir- ‘young’ + *g^hen-) ‘virgin, girl’ (Ledo-Lemos 2002:219-239);
- 2) *g^hon-eh₂-: CLuv. *uānā*- ‘woman’ (Melchert 1993a:s.v.), Lyd. *kāna*- ‘id.’ (cf. *NIL* 177, 180)⁷⁴;
- 3) *g^hn-áh₂-: *gnā*- ‘Frau, Herrin, Dame, Götterfrau’ (*RV*), OAv. *gānā*- ‘Frau, Weib’, Gaul. (acc.pl.) *mnas* ‘Frauen’ (cf. *NIL* 178)
- 4) *g^hénh₂-: Ved. *jāni*- ‘Frau, Weib’, YAv. *jaini* ‘id.’, Arm. (instr.sg.) *knaw* ‘(Ehe)frau’, Toch. A *śām* ‘id.’, Toch. B *śana* ‘id.’ (cf. *NIL* 177);
- 5) *g^hen-eh₂-: OIr. *ben* ‘Frau’, Goth. *qino*, OE *cwene*, OHD *quena* ‘(Ehe)frau’ OPrus. *genna* ‘Frau, Weib’, OCS *žena* ‘(Ehe)frau’ (cf. *NIL* 178);
- 6) *g^hṇ(n)-eh₂-: Boeot. *βανά* (Corinna) ‘woman, wife’, Gr. *γυνή*⁷⁵ ‘id.’ (cf. *NIL* 178; Beekes 2010:291f.)

Some scholars⁷⁶ consider *g^hen(h₂)- to be an original root noun being reflected in the examples in 1) above with various coexisting PIE suffix extensions⁷⁷. Thus Pinault

⁷⁰ Morphological parallels are shown in Harðarson (2014:47-8): “i-Stamm *sēr-i-/ser-i- ‘weiblich’ bzw. ‘Frau(chen)’ (Substantivierung), der eine vom Wurzelnomen abgeleitete Zugehörigkeitsbildung darstellt. Das Verhältnis dieser Bildung zu *sor-/ser- stimmt mit dem von *gūēn-i-/gūen-i- ‘Frau(chen)’ zu *gūon-/gūen- ‘Frau’ überein. Von *sēr-i-/ser-i- wurde ein s-Stamm *sēr-i-s- bzw. *seri-s- ‘Weiblichkeit’ deriviert. Eine dieser beiden Formen bildet die Grundlage des thematischen Adjektivs *sēris-o-, dessen Femininum sich in jav. *hāirišī*- ‘Frau’ fortsetzt.“

⁷¹ especially, in Hittite -ššara-forms

⁷² Hit. *ku-in-na[-aš]-ša-an* (*KUB* 12.60 i 24) as *kuinnan*=šān ‘his wife’ (Neu 1990:208-217), quoted in *NIL* 179; critical to his point of view – Güterbock (1992:1-3))

⁷³ occurs mainly in poetic and legal language

⁷⁴ Starke (1980:85): *g^hen-ah₂-

⁷⁵ u-vocalism is probably due to the zero-grade

⁷⁶ e.g., Meid (1966), Schindler (1972), Hamp (1979)

⁷⁷ Harðarson (1987:117ff.) also suggests a possible n-stem in Hittite forms SAL-an-za, (acc.sg.) SAL-na-an, (gen.sg.) SAL-na-aš

(2005:479f.) considers $*g^u enh_2-$ to have the same structure as the contrastive base of $*H_2énh_2-$ ‘husband’s brother’s wife’ (see 2.2.5.2.); in his opinion, both of them are formed with the addition of the collective suffix $*-eh_2-$ and mean ‘a group of women, womanhood’. He assumes that the root $*H_2én-$ designates an exchanged woman (who has come from outside) and $*g^u en-$ designates a woman in general.

Other scholars, including Jasanoff (1989:135-41), try to prove that the primary form was a proterokinetic h_2 -stem $*g^u éh_2-$ / $*g^u n-éh_2$ and all deviating forms are later developments. Jasanoff states that the final laryngeal in the sequence $*VRH\#$ was not vocalised but omitted causing a compensatory lengthening of the preceding vowel – $*\bar{V}R\#$. Thus, $*g^u éh_2-$ became $*g^u \acute{e}h_2-$ already in PIE. The proto-forms in the daughter languages like the non-ablating hybrid stem $*g^u \acute{e}nā$ (e.g., in Slavic, Germanic, dialectal Greek), $devī$ -forms (in Indo-Iranian), n -stems and the alleged root noun (in Anatolian and Celtic) were constructed by analogy with other forms within the paradigm or were results of contamination with other stems. In particular, OIr. *bé* came into being, according to Jasanoff (1989:138-40), as a result of a contamination of late PIE $*g^u \acute{e}h_2-$ with neutral n -stems⁷⁸.

Internal etymology

The etymology of this word is another big challenge. Johannes Schmidt⁷⁹ tried to connect it to the verbal root $*\acute{g}enh_1-$ ‘erzeugen’ (*IEW* 373-5, *LIV*² 163ff.; *NIL* 139-53) interpreting the word as ‘the one who gives birth’. Semantically it is credible if one takes into account Ved. *jāyā́-* ($<*\acute{g}nh_1-iah_2-$) ‘woman, wife’ (*NIL* 141) but problematic phonologically⁸⁰. There were attempts to derive $*g^u en(h_2)$ from the verbal roots $*g^u em-$ ‘(wohin) gehen, kommen’ (*IEW* 464-5; *LIV*² 209f.) – thus ‘the one who comes (into her husband’s family)’ – and even from $*g^u h_1 en-$ ‘schlagen’ (*IEW* 491-3; *LIV*² 218f.) – ‘a chased one’.

Szemerényi (1977:75-8) tried to associate $*g^u en(h_2)-$ with $*g^u ou-$ ‘cow’ (cf. *IEW* 482f.; *EIEC* 134f.) and gave typological parallels from IE and non-IE, old and contemporary languages. He considers $*g^u en-$ to be a root noun that can be further segmented as $*g^u -en$ in the same way as $*gh(e)m-en-$ ‘man’ ($>$ Lat. *homo*), – “that means that the basic unit is $*g^u u-$, best known as $*g^u ou-$ ” (ibid. 76).

This theory has been criticised by many scholars and most recently by Ledo-Lemos (2002:56-68). Morphologically it seems hardly imaginable how $*g^u -en$ could be derived from $*g^u u-$. In addition, Szemerényi’s segmentation $*g^u -en$ is wrong because $*gh(e)m-en-$ (~

⁷⁸ e.g., OCS *ime(n)* ‘name’ and Goth. *hairto(n)* ‘hearts’

⁷⁹ Schmidt (1879:134) (referred to in Trubačev 1959:106f.).

⁸⁰ Schmidt assumed that here we deal with the contamination of velars, labiovelars and palatals.

**d^hg^hm-on*, as per *EIEC* 366) is a locative of **dhg^hom-* ‘earth’. *-*en/-on* is the ending of the locative so that this element makes no sense in the case of **g^u-en*⁸¹. The situation becomes even more complicated if we take into consideration that the term for ‘woman’ might not have been a root noun but a proterokinetic *h*₂-stem. From the point of view of semantics this interpretation is also problematic as **g^uóu-* is a generic term, a designation not only for a cow but also for a bull⁸². Therefore, scholars prefer marking the word **g^uen(h₂)-* as unanalysable.

2.2.1.3. Widows and concubines

In order to obtain the whole insight into the relationship within the PIE family, one should take into account other two words: the term for ‘widow’ and the term for ‘concubine’.

The word *(*H*)*uid^heueh₂-* ‘widow’ (cf. *EIEC* 642) is wide-spread and has definitely a PIE status: e.g., OIr. *fedb*, Lat. *vidua*, OE *widuwe*, OCS *vīdova*, OPrus. *widdewu*, OInd. *vidāvā*, Av. *vidavā*, Hit. ^{SAL}*udati*, Alb. *ve*⁸³.

Trubachev (1959:112, with references to Delbrück 1989:442-5) reconstructed the word as an original *u*-stem (that was later rebuilt into a *h*₂-stem) from the verbal root “**vidh-*” ‘to be empty, to lack’ (→ Lat. *viduus* ‘deprived of husband or wife’, ἡίθεος ‘unmarried young man’, etc.). *IEW* (1127f.) and *EIEC* (642) interpreted the root “**vidh-*” as a particle **ui-* ‘away’ + **d^heh₁-* ‘to put, to set’ (*LIV*² 136ff.) thus ‘to separate’ (OInd. *vidhā-* ‘distribute, bestow’).

Tichy (1993:15-19) suggests that the word might be connected to the root **h₂uid^h-*⁸⁴ ‘verletzend, tödlich treffen’ (> Skt. *vīdhyati*, as per *LIV*² 294f.). She assumes that **h₂uid^h-eueh₂-* ‘widow’, which originally could be a collective noun ‘the family of the killed one’, and **h₂uid^h-eueh₂-o-s* ‘a male relative (brother) of the killed one’ are *v*ṛddhied derivations from an adj. **h₂uidh-ú-* ‘mortally wounded’, i.e., ‘relatives of the mortally wounded’⁸⁵.

⁸¹ Speculatively, one can connect the two words if one takes a proterokinetic *u*-stem **g^uóh₃-u-/g^uh₃-éu-* (cf. Beekes 1973:240) as the proto-form for ‘cow’ and employs the principle of root extension (see, e.g. Persson 1891). One can theoretically assume that there was a proto-root ***g^ue-* that was extended with **-h₃-* (→ **g^ueh₃-* and, further, with the suffix **-u-*) and with **-n-* (→ **g^uen-* and, further, with the suffix **-h₂-*), parallel to **g^ue/h₂-* “to move by foot” (*LIV*² 205) and **g^ue/m-* ‘to come’ (*LIV*² 209f.).

⁸² I would not criticise Szemerényi’s attempt to prove the plausibility of the metaphorical transfer ‘cow → woman’. The archetypal image of a woman-cow, proto-mother, the goddess that can have both zoomorphic and anthropomorphic manifestations existed in IE (e.g., Vedic *Áditi*) and non-IE cultures (e.g., Egyptian *Nut* and *Hathor*), which is not surprising as cows and women were a “means” of surviving in rural and, especially, in nomadic societies. Such beliefs were reflected in the daily life of ancient people and in their clothing like horned crowns of Egypt or the horned *kika*, an Old Russian headdress worn by married women at a fertile age and changed for the *kika* without horns when a woman grew old. Consequently, such a metaphoric designation of fertile women in a traditional society is quite possible.

⁸³ It may be an inherited word (from Proto-Alb. **widewā*) or a borrowing from Latin (Orel 1998:497).

⁸⁴ The quality of the initial laryngeal is not quite clear (see Darms 1978:332, 334f.).

⁸⁵ In Greek the original meaning of the word was forgotten; that is why Gr. ἡίθεος (<**h₂uid^h-eueh₂-o-s*) ‘unmarried young man’.

It should be pointed out that the masculine forms in the daughter languages were all derived from feminine forms and are, mostly, independent formations. Therefore, it is possible that in the PIE epoch the notion ‘widower’ did not exist. A man’s status did not change after his wife’s death because he either had several wives or could marry again.

However, the woman whose husband had died gained a special status. In some IE societies she had to either follow her husband (e.g., to commit a suttee), or marry his brother⁸⁶, or stay unmarried forever (Szemerényi 1977:86 with references). On the other hand, *EIEC* (642) doubts that women could not marry again and refers to the examples from the epics and traditions of IE nations. Pēnelopē from *Odyssey* was courted by suitors who thought that Odysseus had died. In early India a widowed woman could choose a husband for herself after the contest (*svayámvara*).

It is also probable that the status of a widow was somehow connected to property rights, i.e., **(H)uid^heueh₂-* might have been either the only category of women who could inherit property or could have her husband’s property at her disposal⁸⁷ before a male heir’s coming of age or, on the contrary, who was left without means of subsistence and needed help from her relatives.

A widow in IE societies is a large research topic for a separate thesis and I am not ready to draw the final conclusion what was her position. Still preliminary I can state that the occurrence of a term for ‘widow’ and absence of a term for ‘widower’ is an implication to a patriarchal society. This argument was not denied even by the scholars who considered PIE people to have been matriarchal, e.g., Isachenko (1952:73f.) assumed that this term was formed rather late, after the transition of the Proto-Indo-Europeans from a matriarchal to a patriarchal state.

The Iranian languages and Middle Irish preserved a common term for ‘concubine’⁸⁸ – **parikeh₂-* (*IEW* 789; *EIEC* 123): e.g., Av. *pairikā* ‘demonic courtesan’, MIr. *parīk* ‘id.’, NPers. *parī* ‘peri (≈ angel)’, MIr. *a(i)rech* ‘concubine’. Matasović (2009:127f., with references to Lubotsky, p.c.) suggests the etymology ‘the one that is around’ (from **peri-* ‘around’) and assumes that Lat. *Parcae* ‘Fates’ might also belong to the cognates.

The reconstructed term for ‘concubine’ and the evidence from mythology (e.g., Greek mythology) and daily practice (e.g., Roman laws) of IE nations implies the fact that in IE societies (and probably in the PIE society too) there was a clear distinction between the

⁸⁶ The tradition of a childless widow marrying her brother-in-law is referred to as levirate (Isachenko 1952:74).

⁸⁷ It could explain why widows were an object of a special desire in some IE society.

⁸⁸ I suppose that the reconstruction of such a word for more languages is problematic because this notion was definitely referred to by euphemisms in most languages.

legitimate wife and her children (e.g., Lat. *liber*) and concubines whose children could not inherit the property or administrative post of the father. Consequently, a man could theoretically have several wives, however, their rights and the rights of their children were not equal.

2.2.2. Father/mother-in-law

Both terms for father- and mother-in-law are apparently formed on one basis, namely a proterokinetically inflected heteroklitic⁸⁹ stem **s_uék_ur̥-/-uén-* (cf. *IEW* 1043f.; *EIEC* 85, 195f., 386f.; *NIL* 672ff.). It is likely that the otherwise unattested base **s_uék_ur̥-* was originally a neutral collective stem and referred to both parents-in-law. The feminine form was derived by adding the feminine suffix *-h₂-* to the basis **s_uék_ur̥-h₂-* and was followed by metathesis **ur > *ru* resulting in **s_uekrú-h₂-*:

Ved. *śváśrú* ‘mother-in-law’, NPers. *xusrū* ‘id.’, Lat. *socrus* ‘id.’, OE *sweger* ‘id.’, Goth. *swaihro* ‘id.’, OCorn. *hweger* ‘id.’, OCS *svekry* (gen.sg. *svekrúve*) ‘husband’s mother’, etc.

The masculine form – by adding the thematic suffix *-o-* > **s_uék_ur̥-o-*:

Ved. *śváśura-* ‘father-in-law’, YAv. *x^vasura* ‘id.’, Lat. *socer* ‘id.’, Gr. *ἐκυρός* ‘husband’s father’, OHG *suehur* ‘father-in-law, wife’s father’, OLith. *šėšuras* ‘husband’s father’, OCS *svekrŭ* (Rus. *svekor*) ‘id.’, and probably Alb. *vjehërr* ‘father-in-law’ (< Proto-Alb. **wexuro* < **swesuro*, cf. *EIEC* 195, Orel 1998:510f.)

There are also a few marginal forms that can be derived from **s_uék_urah₂-* f., the motion formation of the previous stem⁹⁰:

Gr. *ἐκυρά* ‘husband’s mother’, Lat. (inscriptions) *socera* ‘wife’s mother’ and possibly Arm. *skesowr* ‘husband’s mother’, its derivative Arm. *skesr-ayr* ‘husband’s father’ (lit. ‘mother-in-law’s man’) and Alb. *vjehërrë* ‘mother-in-law’ (< Proto-Alb. **wexurā* < **swesurā*, cf. *EIEC* 195, Orel 1998:510f.)

In Indic and Germanic a *vṛddhi*-derivation **s_uēk_ur̥-o-* is attested:

OInd. *śváśura-* adj. ‘pertaining to the father-in-law’ (Kashmiri *hahar* ‘wife’s brother’), OHG *swāgur* ‘wife’s brother’ (NHG *Schwager*), Fris. *swāger* ‘wife’s brother’

As it is obvious from the examples above, we face here a similar problem as in the case of **h₂e_uh₂-o-*, namely whether the term refers to wife’s or husband’s parents or to both. One group of scholars (e.g., Delbrück 1889:515f.; Benveniste 1969; Darms 1978:12) stated that

⁸⁹ see Hoffmann (1975:327-337)

⁹⁰ These words might also be independent motion formations in daughter languages.

the original meaning was ‘husband’s parents’ as it is in Baltic, Slavic, Greek and Armenian. Others (Wordick 1970; Gates 1971:47f., Szemerényi 1977:67; Hettrich 1985:464ff.) believe that **suek̑ur-* already in PIE meant both husband’s and wife’s parents. Finally, one could assume that the original meaning was ‘wife’s parents’ proving it by OHG and Kashmiri examples and by the fact that the first element of the word – the reflexive stem **sue-* – was used in terms for wife’s relatives (see 2.2.6.1.). The attestations are diverse and rather contradictory; thus one can only speculate whose parents-in-law were designated as **suek̑ur-* in PIE.

Internal etymology

The problem of lineage would probably be solved, if one found a reliable etymology for this kinship term. One of the oldest suggestions is ‘(one’s) own blood’ interpreting the second element of the word as **kreuh₂-* ‘blood’ (*NIL* 444ff.). Although already in the 1950s this assumption was considered by Trubachev (1959:120f.) to be a mere “folk” etymology, it was supported and developed by some later scholars, mostly anthropologists (e.g., by Linke 1985, 1992). Linguists (e.g., Matasović 2004:81), however, usually criticize it due to its obvious implausibility from the point of view of morphology.

Szemerényi (1964: 316f.) sees in the second element a cognate of Gr. κύριος ‘master’ and OInd. *śūra-* ‘hero’ and interprets **swekuros* as ‘his own master’⁹¹. Later he rejects this version and reconstructs the term as **swe-k̑urus* (assimilation) < **swe-k̑orus* ‘the head of the joint family’: **swe-* as an adj. for **su-* ‘joint family, clan’ and **korus-* as a cognate of OInd. *śiras-* ‘head’, Gr. κάρη ‘id.’ and Lat. *cerebrum* ‘brain’ (Szemerényi 1977: 45-7, 65-6).

Another interpretation of **sue-k̑ur-* could be ‘strangers’ (Eichner, p.c.). The reflexive pronoun **sue-*, apart from the meaning ‘my/our own’, has a secondary meaning ‘somebody else’s own (= foreign, alien)’ attested, e.g., in Lith. *svėčias, svetys* ‘Gast, Fremder’ (Dunkel 2014 II: 759). The element *k̑* is probably a personifying suffix⁹² (like in Rus. *свояк* ‘wife’s sister’s husband’) + suffix **-ur/-uén-* like in **deh₂iūr-/deh₂iūr-* ‘husband’s brother’. Thus **sue-k̑ur-* could mean ‘strangers, his/her parents (not mine), other people, other family, etc.’

⁹¹ Schwarz (1987:405, footnote 44) accepts this idea and reconstructs the term similarly **swe-k̑uHro-* ‘guardian, authority, leader in charge of a family’.

⁹² This suffix was mostly used to individualise collective **i-* and **ih₂-* stems: Lat. *senex* ‘old man’ (**sen-i-* ‘age’ + *k*) (Oettinger 2004:169f.). Possibly, *k* could also individualise pronominal and adjectival stems. Alternatively, this *k̑* could have something in common with Pinault’s “expressive suffix **-g-* referring to females” (see section 2.1.4.) (Malzahn, p.c.); it is justified to assume that **sue-k̑-* meant originally ‘mother-in-law’ as a woman definitely interacted with her more than with the father-in-law.

One can only speculate about the emotional implications of such a designation: neutral, friendly, or hostile. Semantically, this etymology sounds reasonable; morphologically, it is still rather *ad hoc*. The most evident problem here is the distribution of *k* and *k̂*: why should one employ a palatal *k̂* in **sue-k̂-ur-*, while in all identical cases a velar *k* is employed?

Alternative etymology

Pinault (2012a:7) has quite a different theory for the word **sue-k̂-ur-*. He considers the second element to be a resultative neutral noun **tók-u-/ték-u-* ‘child’ from the root **tek-* ‘to beget’ (*LIV*² 618) (Gr. τέκος, τέκνον ‘child, young animal’); thus **sue-tek̂u-* ‘having/taking (others’) child as his (their) own’ is a bahuvrīhi compound. From that he forms an adverbial locative **sue-t(e)k̂u-er* ‘while taking (others’) child as his (their) own’ > **sue-tk̂u-er* > **suek̂uer* (cluster reduction) resulting in **suek̂ur-*⁹³ as a basis for nom. and acc.sg. ‘person(s)/family taking (others’) child as his (their) own’ > ‘parent(s)-in-law’⁹⁴.

In spite of an *ad hoc* morphological analysis of the word, semantically Pinault’s theory sounds fascinating. In this respect, an old interpretation of the Slavic word **tīstī* ‘wife’s father’⁹⁵ mentioned by Trubachev (1959:125ff.) deserves some attention. **tīstī* can be connected to the root **tek-* too (**te-k̂-t-i-*⁹⁶ probably parallel to **g̃mH-ti-* ‘son-in-law’, see 2.2.3; *k̂* > *s* can be a *satəm* development like **prek̂-* > Goth. *fraihnan*, OCS *prošiti* ‘ask’, see *LIV*² 490-1). As a derivative of **tek-*, according to Trubachev, **tīstī* can be either an abstract *ti*-stem (like Rus. *знать* ‘the noble’) or a Slavic *i*-stem that form nomina agentis (like **tatī* ‘thief’). If this etymology was correct, we would have ‘family of procreators’ or a ‘begetter’⁹⁷. Alternatively, **tīstī* could be connected to the nursery word **tata-*, **teta-* (see 2.1.1.3.): e.g., **tīt-sth₂i*⁹⁸ – ‘the one at the father’s place’ (Trubachev 1959:125f., with references).

⁹³ Apparently, Pinault’s theory excludes the participation of the heteroclitic suffix **uer-/uen-* in the formation **suek̂ur-*

⁹⁴ Pinault (2012a:7) also assumes that “[t]his term would then be originally a term of respect and politeness, praising the benevolence of the parents-in-law”. I find it rather unlikely; one can hardly imagine addressing one’s parents-in-law daily by a bahuvrīhi compound. It must have been an official term like **ph₂tēr-*. Typologically, it is more common to call one’s parents-in-law by nursery-words (*mama*, *tata/atta* etc.).

⁹⁵ OCS, ORus. *tīstī*, *testī* ‘wife’s father’, *tīšta*, *tešta* (< **tīstjā*) ‘wife’s mother’, OPol. *teść* – *teśćiowa*, Slov. *tast* – *tášča*, etc.

⁹⁶ I have no answer for the question why the zero-grade with an anaptyxis obtained an accent in the Slavic form (**te-k̂-t-i-* → Prtoto-Slav. **tīstī*).

⁹⁷ A derivative of **tek-* designating parents is attested in Greek; however, it has a different morphological structure: *τοκ-εἰς* (epic -ἦεϛ) [m.pl.] ‘parents’ (Iliad), sing. -εὐς ‘begetter, father’ (Hesiodus, Aeschylus) (Beekes 2010:1484).

⁹⁸ A zero-grade of **steh₂-* ‘sich stellen’ (*LIV*² 590)

2.2.3. Son-in-law

The IE term for ‘son-in-law’ that in some languages also designates sister’s husband and other male and possibly female relatives⁹⁹ in different branches has various morphological structures and is therefore extremely difficult to reconstruct (cf. *IEW* 369; *EIEC* 533; *NIL* 136ff.):

**ǵm̥(m)H-(e)r-o-*:

Gr. γαμβρός, γαμερός (inscriptions) ‘son-in-law, sister’s husband, father-in-law’, Lat. *gener* ‘son-in-law’;

**ǵé/ómH-ōt-er-*:

Ved. *jāmātar-* ‘son-in-law’, YAv. *zāmātar-* ‘id.’

**ǵ(e/o)mH-t-er-*:

Alb. *dhëndërr* (Proto-Alb. **dzanra*, as per Orel 1998:82) ‘son-in-law, bridegroom’

**ǵemH-t-o/ah₂-*:

Lat. *genta* ‘son-in-law’ (also < **ǵenh₁-to-*, as per de Vaan 2008:258), Lith. *žentas* ‘son-in-law, sister’s husband’ (also < **ǵenh₁-to-*, as per Derksen 2008:544)

ǵm̥H-t-i-:

OCS *zětĭ* ‘son-in-law’, SC *zět* ‘son-in-law, sister’s husband’ (also < **ǵenh₃-ti-*, as per Derksen 2008:543f.)

Most scholars prefer deriving the word for ‘son-in-law’ from the root **ǵemH-* ‘to marry’ (cf.; *NIL* 136ff.); however, the nature of this root is debated. The existing alternative interpretations are **ǵem-* ‘to match, pair’ (> Sogd. **ōzam* 1) ‘compensate’, 2) ‘condemn’) (Schwarz 1975:200) or **ǵem(H)-* ‘to pay (for the bride), to marry by paying’ (Tremblay 2003:156, footnote 188)¹⁰⁰. Furthermore, as it is obvious from the examples above, there are cases of contamination with other roots: first of all, **ǵenh₁-* ‘beget’ (*LIV*²:163ff.; *NIL* 139ff.) and **ǵneh₃-* ‘recognise’ (*LIV*² 168ff.; *NIL* 154).

From which of the three roots the word for ‘son-in-law’ was originally derived is not clear. Isachenko (1952:69ff. with references to Thomson 1950 [1941]) assumed that the word was derived from the root **ǵenh₁-* and meant ‘relative’ (the person (man) who is kin to me); the Indo-Iranian and Greek forms, in this case, appeared due to a “folk” etymology and were a result of contamination with the verb **ǵemH-* ‘to marry’. These scholars suggested that the

⁹⁹ According to Friedrich (1966:13), Welsh *geneth* ‘daughter’ is a cognate of this set of words.

¹⁰⁰ The Afghan root **zam-* (*zəman*, *zamne* ‘payment of wages, stipend’) is a cognate of Gr γαμέω ‘I marry’ (Bailey, *JRAS* 1972:110; Bailey 1979: 345). Szemerényi (1977:72) supports this version and refers to the typological parallels from Hungarian: *vőlégeny* ‘bridegroom’ (originally ‘buyer’) and *eladó lány* ‘bride’ (lit. ‘the girl who is for sale’)

term for ‘son-in-law’ might have also been a terms for ‘nephew’¹⁰¹. Such overlapping (my nephew = my daughter’s husband) is only possible in the society that practises cross-cousin marriages as an element of group-marriages and therefore highly speculative.

I would prefer the interpretation of Friedrich (1966:13-14). Although it is also old, there has not been any better reliable explanation yet. In his opinion, the forms above were really derived from three different roots at the time when the common PIE language was in the process of splitting (ca. 2300 BC). IE dialects were no more mutually intelligible but the tribes, at least their upper classes, interacted with each other and probably continued intermarriages beyond the language borders. “The kinship terms for brother- and son-in-law, different in derivation but similar in sound [and meaning], evolved as a consequence of and in order to facilitate interdialectal and interlingual communication” (ibid. 14).

2.2.4. Daughter-in-law

The IE term for ‘daughter-in-law’¹⁰² is a feminine thematic *o*-stem **snus-ó-* (*IEW* 978f.; *EIEC* 148; *NIL* 625f.): Ved. *snuṣá* (*AV+*), Sogd. *šwnšh*, Gr. *υός* (also ‘bride’), Arm. *now* (gen.sg. *nowoy*), Lat. *nurus*, OHG *snur*, *snora*, ORus., SerbCS *snūxa*, Alb. *núse* ‘bride, young woman, younger daughter-in-law’¹⁰³. It is not as wide-attested as the term for ‘sister’ or ‘brother’ but its distribution indicates a PIE status.

There are at least five different etymological suggestions for this word. Specht (1941:90) assumes that **snusó-* is a cognate of the Vedic verb *sanóti* (< **senh₂-*, *LIV*² 532) ‘achieve, attain, gain’ thus ‘the one who was gained (by buying or abducting)’. Brugmann (1907:21) assumes that the word was derived from the root **snu-* ‘bind, tie’¹⁰⁴ (~ **snéh₁-* ‘spin’, as per *LIV*² 571f.) implying the notion of binding two families.

According to another old theory, **snusó-* is a derivative of **sūnu-* ‘son’. Especially consistently this idea was explained by Szemerényi (1977:68f.): **snusó* << ***sūnu-sū-s* (**sū-* ‘woman’, e.g. Ved. *sū-* ‘mother’ < **seyH-* ‘to give birth’, see 2.1.3.1.) ‘son’s wife’. Semantically this version would be plausible if one did not have to face morphological and phonological problems, e.g., the omission of the first *ū*.

¹⁰¹ As a typological parallel Isachenko (1952:70) uses Rus. *племянник* ‘nephew’ (< *племя* ‘kin, tribe’).

¹⁰² According to Friedrich (1966:12), **snus-ó-* is not attested in the meaning ‘brother’s wife’; however, at least in contemporary Russian this word can have this meaning.

¹⁰³ Orel (1998:302f.) believes that the word is a borrowing from Lat. **nūptia*, a local variant of Lat. *nūpta* ‘married woman, wife, bride’. Schumacher (p. c.) states that it is definitely not a directly inherited word.

¹⁰⁴ > Gr. *νευρά*, OInd. *snāvan-*, YAv. *snāvarə* ‘string, cord’, *nervus* ‘sinew, muscle, nerve’, NHG *Schnur* 1) ‘cord, lace’, etc. 2) (obs.) ‘daughter-in-law’ (the relation of the two is not proven).

Gamkrelidze and Ivanov (1995:663, footnote 34) suggest a relationship with a verbal root **sneub^h-* ‘marry’¹⁰⁵ (Lat. *nūbere* ‘(einen Mann) heiraten’, RusCS *snuḃiti* ‘verkuppeln’, see *IEW* 977-8; *LIV*² 574; νόμφη ‘bride, young lady’, also appellation of a goddess of lower rank, ‘nymph’, Lat. *nupta* ‘bride’, see Beekes 2010:1026, de Vaan 2008:417). The problem here is the final *-b^h-*. *EIEC* (148) assumes that **snusó-* might have been derived from the unattested **sneḡ-* (**sneub^h-* was probably an enlargement of it).

Janda (2000:172-4) considers the word a thematic derivation from an *s*-stem **neues-* ‘agreement’ (see *LIV*² 455f.: **neḡ-* ‘nicken, (den Kopf) neigen’). **(s)nus-ó-* might have been originally an adjective from **neues-*¹⁰⁶, then it was either substantivized and meant “der mit rechtlich verbindliche Zunicken, Gewähren, Anvertrauen versehene” (ibid.:173) or it was simply a part of a noun phrase ‘the means of exchange negotiated by nodding’ or the like. The fact that **(s)nus-ó-* by its form is a typical masculine stem is an argument supporting the second variant: the adjective was probably in concord with a masculine noun that was later omitted.

The initial *s* can be explained either as a *mobile s* (Mayrhofer 1986:119f.) or as an analogy to **suekru-h₂-* and **suekur-o-*. As an additional argument supporting his theory Janda (2000:1973-4) puts forth derivatives of the root **prek-* ‘ask’ (*IEW* 821f., *LIV*² 490-1): Lith. *piršlỹs* ‘suitor’, Lat. *procus* ‘id.’, Arm. *harsn* ‘bride, daughter-in-law’. **prek-* and **neḡ-* and their derivatives can, therefore, reflect the PIE ritual of marriage proposal – proposing and nodding in reply.

2.2.5. Husband’s relatives

2.2.5.1. **deh₂iueṛ-/deh₂iur-*, **dah₂iueṛ-/dah₂iur-*, also **daiueṛ-/daiur-* ‘husband’s brother’

The hysterokinetically inflected **deh₂iueṛ-/deh₂iur-* ‘husband’s brother’ (cf. *IEW* 179; *EIEC* 84; *NIL* 58-60) is attested in eight branches of IE: e.g., Ved. *devar-*, Pašto *lēwar*, Gr. δᾶήρ (< *δααρήρ), Arm. *taygr*¹⁰⁷, OE *tacor*¹⁰⁸, Lith. *dieveris*, RusCS *děverĭ*, Lat. *lēvir*¹⁰⁹.

¹⁰⁵ The exact meaning of this word is debated: *IEW* and *LIV* assumed that the word means ‘to marry’ (about a woman), *EM* (449) argues that it is rather about the man courting or seeking a bride.

¹⁰⁶ Like OInd. *vatsá* ‘calf’ is a possessive derivation from **uetos-* ‘Jahr’: **uets-ó-* ‘one-year-old’ > ‘one-year-old calf’ (Janda 2000:173)

¹⁰⁷ Godel (1975: 82, 96): “**u* is reflected by *g*, <...> except in a word final after a vowel”.

¹⁰⁸ Germanic attestations reflect the proto-form **taikura-* (*NIL* 58). The medial *k* is mostly interpreted as a reflex of Verschärfung **-u-* > **-g-*. Seebold (1982:174f., 182f.) assumes that it happens between an *i*-diphthong and a syllabic liquid or nasal thus **daiur* > **daiuur* > **dajgur* > **taikura-*. A similar example is OE *ācurna* OHG *aih-hurno* ‘squirrel’ (Lat. *viverra* ‘polecat’).

¹⁰⁹ Fraenkel (1962:94) and Leumann (1977:68) assume that the word might have been modified by “folk” etymology *laevus* ‘left’ + *vir* ‘man’. Leumann (1977:155) also has an alternative suggestion: the word is probably borrowed into Latin from Sabinian, in which **d* > *l*. A similar example is *lingua* (Goth. *tuggo*, NHG *Zunge*)

Internal etymology

Oettinger (2009) assumes that the form **daiuer-* belongs to the late PIE epoch and corresponds to an early PIE form **sh₂aiuér-*¹¹⁰. This form is probably a secondary derivative from the verbal root **sh₂ei-* ‘bind’ (*IEW* 891-2; *LIV*² 544). The primary base could have been an *ē/e*-akrostatic (see Eichner 1973:68ff.) heteroclitlic neuter noun: nom., acc. sg. **sh₂é-ur̥*, gen.sg. **sh₂éj-ur̥-s* ‘binding, connection’. On this basis an amphikinetic masculine noun was formed: nom.sg. **sh₂éj-uōr*, gen.sg. **sh₂i-ur̥-és*. Later it changed its inflectional type to hysterokinetic under the influence of other kinship terms (e.g., **ph₂tér-/ph₂tr’-*). Semantically this theory sounds credible; however, some scholars (e.g., Kloekhorst 2008:391; Eichner, p.c.) are sceptic about the phonological development ***sh₂ > *d*.

Pinault (2012a:7f.) interprets **dah₂iūér-* as a former locative of the term for ‘bridegroom, husband’ thus meaning ‘on the side of the husband, close to the husband’. The word for ‘bridegroom, husband’ **dah₂i-éu-/dah₂i-u-*¹¹¹, in its turn, is based on **dah₂i-* ‘wedding’ or ‘bride’ by adding the suffix **-e(u)-* or *-i(u)-* that is also used in other kinship terms, e.g., in **suH-iu-* ‘son’ (see 2.1.3.1.). **dah₂i-* is originally an action noun that means ‘marrying, leading to marriage’ used usually with the preverb **ue-* ‘away, apart’. Therefore, the verb is **ue-deh₂-/ue-dh₂-*. The attested form **ued^h-* (*LIV*² 659)¹¹² is probably the zero-grade of it. *dah₂i-éu-/dah₂i-u-* is also someone who pays **uéd-no-*¹¹³ (< **uéd-mno-* < **uédh₂-mn-o-* (regular laryngeal loss) **uédh₂-m(o)n-*¹¹⁴ ‘wedding’) (Pinault 2012a:8). This theory is very fascinating and plausible semantically. Nevertheless, it has a weak point: the form **dah₂i-éu-/dah₂i-u-* is not attested in any IE language.

2.2.5.2. **H₂énh₂ter-/H₂ñh₂tér-* ‘husband’s brother’s wife’

The designation of **deh₂iūér*’s wife was of great importance at least in the eastern and south dialects of IE (cf. *IEW* 505f.; *EIEC* 522; *NIL* 204-7):

**H₂ñh₂ter-*:

Ved. *yātar-*, Pashto *yōr*, Npers. (Isfahan) *yād*

**H₂énh₂ter-*:

¹¹⁰ He gives a similar example from Hittite: *išhaḫru* ‘tear’ (< ***sh₂ákru-* or ***sh₂ékru-* > **dákru-* or **déh₂kru-* > CLuv. *tahhara-*) (Oettinger 2009:127)

¹¹¹ Of the same inflectional type as **d₁-éu-/d₁-u-* ‘day-lit sky, day’ (Ved. *dyáu-/div-*, Gk. Ζεύς, Hit. *šiuš*, Lat. *diēs*, etc.)

¹¹² Ved. *vadhú-*, Av. *vaδū-* ‘bride’ **uad^hú-* ‘being connected with wedding’ or ‘being led (to marriage)’ ← **uedh₂ú-*; Goth. *ga-widan* ‘bind’, Lith. *vedù* ‘lead’, OCS *vedo* ‘id.’ > **uéd^h-e/o-* Derksen 2008:517)

¹¹³ Gr. ἔδνον, Hom. (pl.) ἔδνα pl., ORus. *věno* ‘brideprice’

¹¹⁴ cf. OE *weotuma*, *wituma* m. ‘bride-price, dowry’, ODu. *withemo* ‘id.’ (cf. Kroonen 2013:583)

Gr. ἐνάτηρ (Homeric: (pl.) εἰνατηρες), Lat. (pl.) *ianitricēs*, Arm. *nēr*, (gen.sg.) *niri*,
OLith. *jéntė*, (gen.sg.) *jenteřs*

H_iénh₂ter-*iah₂-

Latv. (Courlandish) *jentere*

**H_i(e)nh₂-tr-*

OCS *jetry*, (gen.sg.) *jětrŭve*

**H_iénh₂ter-/H_iñh₂tér-* is the fifth kinship term in *-ter/-tr-*. The inflection type of it is not determined though. *EWAia* (II 410) suggests a proterokinetic paradigm **H_iénh₂ter-/H_iñh₂tér-*. Beekes (1972:34) and Tremblay (2003:93) assume that the word was amphikineticly inflected: **H_iénh₂tōr-/ H_iñ(h₂)-tr-*. Pinault (2005:465ff.; 2007:276f.), who believes that the original paradigm of stems in **-ter-* was hysterokinetic that tended to become acrostatic during the process of nominalisation (see 2.1.1.1. and 2.1.2.1.), admits that the two allomorphs could coexist for some time and the conspicuous inflectional paradigm **H_iénh₂ter-/H_iñh₂tér-* or **H_iénh₂tōr-/ H_iñ(h₂)-tr-* might be a product of contamination (Pinault 2005:478).

Internal etymology

**H_iénh₂ter-/H_iñh₂tér-* is a term rather difficult to interpret. In my opinion, the only etymological suggestion worth mentioning belongs to Pinault (2005:465ff.; 2007:276f.)¹¹⁵. He reconstructs the term for ‘husband’s brother’s wife’ in the following way: the base is derived from the verbal root **h₁aj-* ‘to acquire/give’ (*LIV*² 229) > **h₁ĭ-én* ‘acquisition, gift’ + zero-grade of the collective suffix *-eh₂-* + contrastive suffix **-tér* > **H_iñh₂tér-* (adj.) ‘belonging to the group of acquired/given women’ > (nominalisation) **H_iénh₂ter-* ‘exchanged woman’.

Contrastive value of the suffix **-ter/-tr-*

It is logical to assume that the kinship terms in **-ter/-tr-* should refer to a special group of relatives in contrast to other relatives.

For example, Isachenko (1952:60-1) considered **ph₂tér-*, **máh₂ter-*, **d^huġh₂tér-*, **b^hráh₂ter-*, **H_iénh₂ter-* and their derivatives (e.g., **ph₂trou-*) to be the relatives of the “inner

¹¹⁵ Tremblay (2003:94) considers **H_iénh₂tōr-/ H_iñ-tr-* a cognate of Rus. *jadró* ‘kernel, core’ (< **h₁en-d(h)r-óm*, as per Derksen 2008:157) and Ved. *Índra-* (← **Hind-ró-* ‘large, abundant’) and interprets it as ‘reinforcement’ or an (additional) ‘uterus’ of a family. It is possible semantically but rather improbable morphologically. Carruba (1995:155) reconstructs it as **ĵemH-h₁ter* ‘die Gleiche/(Zusammen)haltende in der Sippe’ derived from “**ĵem-*”; he might have meant **h₁em-* ‘nehmen’ (*LIV*² 236) ‘(zusammen)halten, paaren’ but there is otherwise no evidence for such a root.

circle”¹¹⁶, i.e., the people who the Ego may not marry. **H₂ienh₂ter-* was included in this circle because, according to Isachenko, in a group marriage she was a sister or a cousin of the Ego. The term for ‘son’ was excluded for the reason that in the conditions of the matrilineal society sons left their mother’s family and lived in their wives’ families. Isachenko did not explain why **b^hrah₂ter-*, unlike **suHnús*, was within the circle, although he was also the one to leave. The function of **s_uésor-* in this system is not clear either. The idea about the inner circle deserves appreciation; however, in order to explain what this notion could really imply, one should understand the general principle of grouping PIE relatives.

Pinault (2007:277) tries to present the kinship terms in *-ter/-t_r* in quite a different system – each term with this suffix can be opposed to the term without it:

d^huĝh₂tér-* vs. **suHnús*/pultós*

**b^hrah₂ter-* vs. **népōt-*

**H₂ienh₂ter-* vs. **s_uésor-*

**ph₂tér-* vs. **máh₂ter-* (exception: remade after **ph₂tér-*).

Therefore, **d^huĝh₂tér-* is not only ‘a certain female child (in contrast to female children from other families)’ but in opposition to **suHnús*/**pultós*. **b^hrah₂ter-* is not only ‘a male born by the same mother as someone (in contrast to males born by other mothers)’ but also in opposition to **népōt-*, who is a more distant relative. **H₂ienh₂ter-* is not only ‘an exchanged woman in a certain family (in contrast to other exchanged women in other families)’ but in opposition to **s_uésor-*, who is ‘(one’s) own woman’. Finally, **ph₂tér-* is not only the ‘(man) belonging to his family (in contrast to men from other families)’ but also in opposition to **máh₂ter-*.

2.2.5.3. **ĝ_hH-?*- ‘husband’s sister’

The term for ‘husband’s sister’ attested in Greek, Latin, Phrygian, Armenian, Slavic, and possibly in Old Indic is **ĝ_hH-?*- (cf. *IEW* 367f., *EIEC* 521f.). In some languages (in Old Indic, Greek and Latin) this word developed a secondary meaning ‘brother’s wife’ (see Eichner-Kühn 1976:28-72; Olsen 2013:206, footnote 3&4). The form of the stem and the nature of the laryngeal¹¹⁷ are debated. Most scholars reconstruct the proto-form as **ĝ_hh₂-ōu-*.

Beekes (1976:13-16; 2010:258f.) suggests deriving Greek and Phrygian forms from **γαλ-α_F-o-* < **ĝ_hh₂-eu-o-* (a thematised stem form **ĝ_hh₂-eu-*, which is probably an oblique stem of **ĝ_hh₂-ōu-*): Gr. (Homeric) γαλόωϝ: (gen.sg.) γαλόω, (dat.sg., nom.pl.) γαλόωϝ, (gen.pl.)

¹¹⁶ Isachenko (1952:60 with references) compares the kinship terms in **-ter/-t_r* with designations of inner organs: Gr. ὕστρος ‘abdomen’, Lat. *uterus*, etc.

¹¹⁷ *EIEC* (521f.) reconstruct it as *h₃*

Griffiths&Lubotsky (2009:118-21) interpret *giri-* in the given AVP excerpts as ‘mountains’,¹²² thus doubting the existence of a Vedic continuant of **ǵl̥H-?*- altogether.

As for the etymology of the word **ǵl̥H-?*-, there have not been any credible suggestions yet. However, Latin, Greek and Old Indic show curious parallels: Lat. *glōs* ‘sister-in-law’ and *glīs* ‘dormouse’, Gr. γαλόωσ ‘husband’s sister’ and γαλέη ‘weasel, marten’ and Ved. *giri-* both ‘sister-in-law’ (?) and ‘mouse’. Oettinger (1998:649-54) gives a number of examples of similar metaphorical transfer from other IE and non-IE languages: e.g., Ital. *belladonna* ‘beautiful woman’ and ‘weasel’, Ger. (dial.) *Gevatterle* ‘weasel’, Swed. *jungfru* ‘virgin’ and ‘weasel’, Arab. *irsa* ‘bride’ and ‘weasel’, Hung. *menyét* ‘daughter-in-law’ and ‘weasel’, etc. (ibid. 651).

Oettinger concludes that this semantic change – either as a taboo on employing the animal’s name or as a comparison between young women and gracious, quick moves of a weasel – is apparently universal and not connected to any language family. It is also obvious from his examples that the primary meaning is ‘young woman, husband’s sister,’ etc. and not ‘weasel’ or ‘mouse’. This means, unfortunately, that the parallels above are of no use for determining the etymology of the kinship term **ǵl̥H-?*-.

2.2.6. Wife’s relatives

2.2.6.1. Derivatives of **sue-* and **b^hend^h-*

In contrast to clearly-attested and fairly systematised terms for husband’s relatives, the attestation for wife’s relatives are rather sporadic and, in most cases, do not permit to reconstruct a common proto-form for more than one or two language branches. That is why most scholars assume that there were no PIE terms for wife’s relative. This situation can be explained by patrilocality of ancient Indo-Europeans: a woman was brought into her husband’s family where she had to interact with her brothers- and sisters-in-law thus each of them needed their own designation, while a man did not see his in-laws that often.

The attested terms for wife’s relatives are mostly based on the reflexive stem **sue-* or the verbal root **b^hend^h-* ‘bind’. The derivatives of **b^hend^h-* are Gr. πενθερός ‘father-in-law, brother-in-law, son-in-law’, Ved. *bándhu-* ‘relative’, Lith. *beñdras* ‘participant, sharer’, each of them implying the meaning ‘ally (e.g., in a war)’ (Beekes 2010: 1171f.). Lith. *laíg(u)onas* ‘wife’s brother’ (< **loǵG-h₃n(h₂)-o-* ‘someone with binding, associative charge’, as per Olsen

¹²² “It seems to us that Eichner-Kühn too lightly dismissed the possibility that this ritual is aimed at a ‘homesick aboriginal slave from the mountains’. The text of ĀpastambaGS 8.23.7, quoted above, implies that the *dāsa-* ‘slave’ was among the categories of servants whose running away the preceding sūtra was meant to curtail.” (ibid.:120)

2013:207, footnote 7)¹²³ can probably be attached to this set not etymologically but semantically.

The derivatives of **sue-* are more numerous. One can reconstruct a common form for Greek and Germanic: **sueliion-/ *sueliHon-* (as per *EIEC* 85): Gr. εἰλίονες (< **φελίονες*) ‘wife’s sister’s husband’, (Hesychius, pl.) ἀέλιοι ‘wife’s sisters’ husbands’¹²⁴ (< **ση-suelioi* ‘co-brothers-in-law’) and ON (pl.) *svilar* ‘id.’. According to Olsen (2013:209), the *n*-stem **sueli(i)on-* probably goes back to a compound of the so-called “Hoffmann-type”¹²⁵ **sueli-h₃onh₂-* ‘whose charge is a cross-connection’.

Parallel to **sueli-h₃onh₂-*, Olsen (2013:210-11) reconstructs the proto-form for OHG (*gi-*)*swiō* ‘sister’s husband’: **sui-h₃onh₂-* (**suei-h₃onh₂-*). **suei/sui* might be some form of the reflexive possessive pronoun **suo-* (> Rus. *свой* ‘one’s own’)/**seu-o-* (> Lat. *suus* ‘id.’) (see e.g. Dunkel 2014 II:752ff.). Therefore, the whole proto-form means ‘having his own charge, authority’, i.e., ‘a married man responsible for the speaker’s sister’. A thematised version of this stem **suo_i-h₃n(h₂)-o-* (Proto-Germanic **swainaz* > ON *sveinn* ‘boy, young man, servant, thrall, herdsman’, OE *swān* ‘man, warrior, herdsman’ etc.) designated someone who is under authority of **sui-h₃onh₂-*. The thematised stem, according to Olsen, could be the basis of Lith. *svainė* ‘wife’s sister’, Latv. *svaine* ‘id.’ (< **suo_i-h₃nh₂-ah₂-*) and Arm. *k’eni* ‘id.’ (< **sui-h₃nh₂-ah₂-*).

Olsen’s theory does not account for the masculine Baltic forms: Lith. *svainis* ‘wife’s sister’s husband’ and Latv. *svainis* ‘id.’. If her reconstructions are correct, they must reflect **sui-h₃onh₂-* (phonologically it is hardly imaginable though). Otherwise, they can be based on the stem **suo_i-h₃n(h₂)-*; however, in this case they cannot mean ‘the one under authority of **sui-h₃onh₂-*’ as Gmc. **swainaz* but rather ‘someone with binding, associative charge’. Another variant could be the secondary derivative form the feminine forms at the time when the original meaning of the compound **sui-h₃onh₂-* and its thematised derivative had been forgotten. Therefore, although Baltic and Armenian forms are structurally similar to Germanic **swainaz*, Olsen (2013:211) considers them accidental cognates because of their semantic difference.

There is a simpler etymology for the Armenian, Germanic and Baltic forms above as well as for the Slavic forms such as Rus. *свояк* ‘wife’s sister’s husband’ and *свояченица*

¹²³ The basis of the word might be a cognate of Lat. *ligō* ‘bind’

¹²⁴ (Hesychius) οἱ ἀδελφᾶς γυναικᾶς ἐσχηκότες ‘who have sisters as wives’ (Beekes 2010:24f.)

¹²⁵ The suffix *-ion-* is interpreted here as stemming from an independent noun **h₃onh₂-* (Lat. *onus* ‘charge, burden’); thus the words with this suffix would ultimately be bahuvrīhi compounds meaning ‘having the load/charge of smth.’: **h₂iú- *h₃onh₂-* > Ved. *yúvān* ‘having a lot of life-force’ > ‘young’ (see Olsen 2013:210 with references to Pinault 2000 and Dunkel 2001); this analysis, however, is not widely-accepted.

‘wife’s sister’. They all can reflect the proto-form **súéj̥-(n)o-/súój̥-(n)o-*, a reflexive possessive adjective ‘eigenen, sein eigenen; sein’ (Dunkel 2014 II:752).

The common Indic and Germanic form **súēkuro-* (Kashmiri *hahar* ‘wife’s brother, Sindhi *hūrā* ‘husband/wife’s brother’, OHG *swāgur*) is a vṛddhied derivation from *súékuro-* (see 2.2.2).

2.2.6.2. ‘Wife’s brother’ in Indic and Slavic

The term for ‘wife’s brother’ is clearly attested in Indic and Slavic: Ved. *syālá-*, OCS *šurǐ*; SC *šúra*; Rus. *уыпуи* (cf. *EIEC* 85). In earlier sources (e.g., *IEW* 915, Trubachev 1959:139) this attestations are considered to be cognates. In later works their relation is mostly doubted (e.g., Szemerényi 1977:94, Darms 1978:447) or denied (Derksen 2008:488).

Olsen (2013:207, footnote 7) tries to reconstruct the proto-form for them on the basis of the verbal root **seh₂(i)-* ‘bind, connect’ (*LIV*² 544). She suggests two ways to derive the Indic word from this root. It can be either a full-grade of the *-ro/-lo* derivative **sġeh₂-ró-/-ló-*¹²⁶ or a secondary thematised collective **sh₂i-ōr-*. The problem is that none of these reconstructions conforms to the Slavic form presupposing the *u*-diphthong: **sġeur(io)-*. A possible solution here can be a contamination with **súékuro-*.

Trubachev (1959:139) assumed that both forms are based on the verbal root “**sġū-*” ‘sew’ (~ **sġeuH-*, as per *LIV*² 545). The Slavic form could be **sġuH-ro- > *šūro-*. As for the Indic form, it is not clear how one should deal with the diphthong *-eu-*.

Therefore, the derivation of Slavic **sġeur(io)-* and Ved. *syālá-* from one common stem is rather problematic. As in the case of **ġemH-?-* ‘sister’s husband’, the most probable explanation is a contamination of forms similar in sound and meaning but different in their origin.

¹²⁶ A zero-grade of the verb **sh₂i-* > (laryngeals metathesis) > **sih₂* > (a new full grade) **sġeh₂-* (cf. *ibid.*)

Chapter 3. Theoretical remarks and conclusions

3.1. Terms denoting consanguineal relatives (analysis)

Table 1. Consanguineals

Kinship term	Proto-form	Celtic	Italic	Germanic	Baltic	Slavic	Albanian	Greek	Armenian	Anatolian	Iranian	Indic	Tocharian
father	<i>*ph₂tér & derivatives</i>	+	+	+	+?	+?	-	+	+	-	+	+	+
mother	<i>*méh₂tēr</i>	+	+	+	+	+	+ ¹ ₁₂₇	+	+	-	+	+	+
son	<i>*suH-nu-/-ju-</i>	-	-	+	+	+	-	+	+	-	+	+	+
daughter	<i>*d^hugh₂tér</i>	+	+	+	+	+	-	+	+	+!	+	+	+
brother	<i>*b^hréh₂tēr</i>	+	+	+	+	+	-	+	+	-	+	+	+
sister	<i>*súésōr</i>	+	+	+	+	+	+?	+	+	-	+	+	+
father's mother, ancestor	<i>*an(n)- (*Hen(n)-)</i>	+	+	+	+	+	-	+	+	+	+	-	-
grandfather/mother (maternal?)	<i>*h₂euh₂-o-/-ih₂-/-en/on-</i>	-	+	+	-	-	-	+	+	+	-	-	+
uncle (maternal?)	<i>*h₂euh₂-on-tro/tlo/(i)jo-</i>	+	+	+	+	+	-?	-	-	-	-	-	-
grandson/daughter	<i>*népōt-, *néptih₂</i>	+?	+	+	+	-	+?	+	-	-	+	+	-
nephew/niece	<i>*népōt-, *néptih₂</i>	+	+	+	+	+	-?	+?	-	-	+	+	-

The table indicates that the kinship terms denoting nuclear and extended consanguineous family members are fairly homogeneous in all major IE branches except Anatolian and Albanian. The lack of Albanian attestations can easily be explained by a very late writing tradition and an interaction of this language with several substrates and superstrates (e.g., with Turkish). The relatively late writing tradition of Baltic and Slavic nations can also account for the lack of clearly attested continuants of **ph₂tér* in their languages.

Anatolian problem

Numerous theories about the position of the Anatolian branch among other IE branches are mostly placed between two opposite poles.

One of these poles is the Indo-Hittite hypothesis (Sturtevant 1926), which explains the massive Anatolian innovations (or archaisms) in grammar¹²⁸ and vocabulary, including kinship terms, by its special status among IE languages. According to Sturtevant, Anatolian is

¹²⁷ Semantic change: Alb. *motër* 'sister' (see 2.1.2.1.)

¹²⁸ E.g., the lack of the feminine gender in the noun and the aspectual contrast between "present" and "aorist" as well as the subjunctive and optative moods in the verb.

not a descendant of common PIE but a co-equal branch of it, i.e., the theory presupposes a certain Pre-PIE language that split into Proto-Anatolian and PIE, the ancestor of the other IE languages.

The other pole is the hypothesis that is sometimes referred to as the “Schwund-Hypothese” formulated by Pedersen (1938) and Eichner (1975, 2013). It states that Anatolian is a usual IE branch. The huge differences can be explained by the influence of non-IE substrates and adstrates and the social status of the IE people who settled in that area. Eichner (p.c.) assumes that the Anatolian languages might be a sort of creoles. The original population (Hattians and Hurrians) was conquered by the Indo-Europeans who were organised in *Männerbünde*¹²⁹. *Männerbünde* consisted mostly of young adventurous men, possibly, younger sons in their families who had no right of inheritance and made their living by robbing. Those people obviously spoke a rather colloquial variant of an IE language. In addition, they married local women of non-IE origin. Thus, according to this hypothesis, the Anatolian languages that we know might have been the result of such a cultural and linguistic mixture.

Due to their radical character, neither the Indo-Hittite hypothesis in its original form nor the “Schwund-Hypothese” are widely-accepted nowadays. Most scholars believe that Anatolian was not a sister language of PIE but only the first branch to split from the common PIE tree at the time when the features reconstructed on the evidence of Greek and Indo-Iranian had not been developed.

Other conspicuous features shown by the evidence for consanguineous relatives

A conspicuous feature shown by the evidence is the possible lack of a specific term for paternal grandfather and paternal uncle if **h₂eu_h₂-o-* and its derivatives designate mother’s father/brother. Father’s father and brother might have been designated simply by **ph₂tér*, its derivatives or descriptive phrases: e.g., Skt. *pitā-mahá-* ‘great father’, or OE *ealda faeder* ‘old father’ (Beekes 1976:57f.), etc. (see 2.1.1.2.). Besides, there is an assumption that **ph₂tér* originally designated not (only) the biological father but the head of the extended family, who could also be a grandfather. This fact can explain the necessity to coin a special term for the biological father: **ĝenh₁-tōr*¹³⁰ (Lat. *genitor*, OInd. *janitār*; Gr. γενέτωρ) (cf. Delbrück 1889:68f.; Trubachev 1959:20).

¹²⁹ This topic is touched upon in the monograph by K. MacCone “The Romulus Syndrome” mentioned in part 2.1.1.3.

¹³⁰ With respective feminine forms: **ĝenh₁trih₂* (Lat. *genetrīx*, OInd. *janitrī*, Gr. γενέτειρα)

Thomson (1950 [1941]), Isachenko (1952) and Trubachev (1959) considered the institution of avunculate to be an argument supporting their theory that the PIE kinship terminology was formed in the matriarchal epoch. However, **h₂euh₂-o-* and its derivatives do not oblige scholars to reconsider the communis opinio on the patriarchal and patrilineal state of the PIE society. The child was given into his maternal uncle's or grandfather's family to make the ties between the two clans stronger. Therefore, the institution of fosterage and avunculate does not contradict patriarchal mentality and still can be found in patriarchal and egalitarian communities (e.g., among Chechens). The same can be said about the alleged gynocentrism of the words **b^hréh₂tr̥* (lit. 'born by the same woman'¹³¹) and **suH-nu-/-ju-s* (lit. 'someone born by a woman'). The biological fact that a woman gives birth is equally accepted in all societies.

Other conspicuous features are the same term for 'grandchild' and 'nephew/niece' possibly because it was a specific designation of a foster child in his mother's father/brother's family, the extremely wide-spread term for 'daughter' in contrast to the lack of a common word for 'son' indicating the marked character of the first notion, and the lack of specific terms for 'aunt' and 'cousin' (all attestations are secondary formations derived from the basic kinship terms).

3.2. Terms denoting affinals (analysis)

Table 2. Affinals

Kinship term	Proto-form	Celtic	Italic	Germanic	Baltic	Slavic	Albanian	Greek	Armenian	Iranian	Indic	Anatolian
father/mother-in-law	<i>*suekuros,</i> <i>*suekrúh₂s</i>	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	-
son-in-law, (sister's husband)	<i>*gemH-?-</i>	-	+	-	+	+	+	+	-	+	+	-
daughter-in-law	<i>*snusós</i>	-	+	+	-	+	- ?	+	+	+	+	-
husband's brother	<i>*deh₂iúē̃r</i>	-	+	+	-	+	-	+	+	+	+	-
husband's brother's wife	<i>*Hjénh₂tēr</i>	-	+	-	+	+	-	+	+	+	+	-
husband's sister, (brother's wife)	<i>*ǵH-?-</i>	-	+	-	-	+	-	+	+	-	+?	-
widow	<i>*(H)uid^heueh₂s</i>	+	+	+	+	+	+?	+? 132	-	+	+	+!

¹³¹ The word **bhréh₂tr̥-*, if it really meant 'born by the same woman', can be used as an argument against 'group marriages' where the term for 'brother' also refers to a parallel cousin.

¹³² ἡῖθεος 'unmarried young man'

contrast to other women in the PIE society, who had her husband's property at her disposal and like Pēnelopē could choose a new husband according to her will and taste.

The chart also indicates that there is no specific term for 'brother's wife'. **snusós* could be used for these purpose, parallel to **ǵemH-?*- denoting both daughter's and sister's husband. However, such a meaning **snusós* has only in Russian (*чoxa* is both a son's wife and a brother's wife for a woman). Greek, Latin and, possibly, Old Indic employed the word **ǵlH-?*- as reciprocal for a man's wife and sister. Still it is not clear how **deh₂iúér* 'husband's brother' called his sister-in-law. IE branches have independent formations for this concept.

3.3. Kinship systems and the PIE family

The systematic studies of human family began with the book by L.H. Morgan "Systems of Consanguinity and Affinity of the Human Family" (1871). His great contribution to anthropology was the idea that the whole diversity of human families in the world can be categorised as belonging to a limited number of ideal types. Nowadays, anthropologists distinguish six basic kinship systems named after six primitive tribes: Eskimo, Hawaiian, Sudanese, Iroquois, Crow, and Omaha (see the table 3 below). One should keep in mind that these systems are abstract schemes and can hardly be found in their pure form; by characterising family traditions of a certain society one will rather speak of certain predominant tendencies, e.g., Omaha or Hawaiian tendencies.

The Eskimo system¹³³ usually occurs in societies that place an emphasis on the nuclear family rather than on extended kin or larger kinship groups. There is no difference between patrilineal and matrilineal relatives. There is a term for cousin but without any further specification. The example is a contemporary English kinship terminology. The PIE evidence, such as the lack of the term for 'cousin', different designations for paternal and maternal uncles, etc., indicates that the PIE kinship system was not of this type.

The Hawaiian system, which can be illustrated by actual Hawaiian kinship terms, knows no distinction other than sex and generation. Uncles in this system are denoted by the same word as father, aunts – as mother. Cousins are referred to as brothers and sister. This system does not conform to the PIE kinship either.

¹³³ The description of kinship systems is taken mostly from the *EIEC* (332-5) and Schwimmer (1996-2001).

Table 3. Kinship system and the PIE family¹³⁴

Kin type	Eskimo	Hawaiian	<u>Sudanese</u>	Iroquois	Crow	<u>Omaha</u>	PIE
FaFa	GrFa	GrFa	FaFa	FaFa	FaFa	FaFa	<i>*h₂euh₂os</i> <i>*ph₂trous</i> <i>*ph₂tér</i>
FaMo	GrMo	GrMo	FaMo	FaMo	FaMo	FaMo	<i>*Hen(n)-</i> , <i>*h₂euh₂ih₂</i>
MoFa	GrFa	GrFa	MoFa	MoFa	MoFa	MoFa	<i>*h₂euh₂os</i> <i>?*meh₂trous</i>
MoMo	GrMo	GrMo	MoMo	MoMo	MoMo	MoMo	<i>*h₂euh₂ih₂</i>
Fa	Fa	Fa	Fa	Fa	Fa	Fa	<i>*ph₂tér</i>
FaBr	Uncle	Fa	FaBr	Fa	Fa	Fa	<i>*ph₂trous & derivatives</i>
FaSi	Aunt	Mo	FaSi	FaSi	FaSi	FaSi	<i>??*ph₂tru-?-</i>
Mo	Mo	Mo	Mo	Mo	Mo	Mo	<i>*méh₂tér</i>
MoSi	Aunt	Mo	MoSi	Mo	Mo	Mo	<i>?*meh₂trúih₂</i>
MoBr	Uncle	Fa	MoBr	MoBr	MoBr	MoBr	<i>derivatives of *h₂euh₂-</i>
Br	Br	Br	Br	Br	Br	Br	<i>*b^hréh₂tŕ</i>
FaBrSo	Cousin	Br	FaBrSo	Br	Br	Br	<i>?*b^hréh₂tŕ</i>
FaBrDa	Cousin	Si	FaBrDa	Si	Si	Si	<i>?*súesor-</i>
FaSiSo	Cousin	Br	FaSiSo	FaSiSo	Fa	Nephew	?
FaSiDa	Cousin	Si	FaSiDa	FaSiDa	FaSi	Niece	?
Si	Si	Si	Si	Si	Si	Si	<i>*súesor-</i>
MoSiSo	Cousin	Br	MoSiSo	Br	Br	Br	<i>?*b^hréh₂tŕ</i>
MoSiDa	Cousin	Si	MoSiDa	Si	Si	Si	?
MoBrSo	Cousin	Br	MoBrSo	MoBrSo	So	MoBr	?
MoBrDa	Cousin	Si	MoBrDa	MoBrDa	Da	Mo	?

The Sudanese system is also referred to as Descriptive. It means that there are a few basic kinship terms designating father, mother, brother, sister, son, daughter, husband and wife, and the rest of the relative are designated by the combinations of those basic terms: e.g. husband's mother, son's wife, etc. Morgan (1871) ascribed the PIE kinship system to this

¹³⁴ I borrowed this table form *EIEC* (333) and edited according to the results of my research.

type, his assumption is shared by Hettrich (1985). The forms like suffixal derivatives OE *mōdrige* ‘mother’s sister’, Ved. *pitṛvya-* ‘father’s brother’ (quoted in Rau 2011:17-19&23), YAv. *brātruuiia* ‘nephew’ (*NIL* 38), and, moreover, Lat. *frātris filius* ‘nephew’ (*EIEC* 334) can serve as supporting arguments for this theory. In addition, this type is not unfamiliar to IE societies: the kinship systems of the Ancient Romans and the Anglo-Saxons were predominantly of this type.

The Iroquois system occurs in societies where distinctions between paternal and maternal relatives are critical. This system merges father’s brother with father, mother’s sister with mother, father’s brother’s and mother’s sister’s children (parallel cousins) with sibling. Cross-cousins and their parents are designated with specific terms. This system could be employed by those who believe in the practice of cross-cousin marriages among Proto-Indo-Europeans. However, the absence of positive evidence of such marriages among IE societies as well as examples like **ph₂trous*, which proves that the terms for father’s brother were derivatives of **ph₂tér* but not exactly the same word, are arguments against it.

The Crow system mostly occurs in societies with strong matrilineal kinship emphases. Father’s sister’s son here is designated by the same term as father, father’s sister’s daughter by the same term as father’s sister. Thus we observe the skewing of generations. Father’s relatives in the Crow system are of less importance than mother’s kin, which excludes this type as suitable for PIE.

Finally, the Omaha system is a mirror image of the Crow type. The Ego uses the same terms for father, father’s brother and mother’s brother that he does in an Iroquois terminology. Nevertheless, there is a significant difference in cousin designations. Parallel cousins are merged with siblings and cross-cousin terms are quite peculiar and cut across generational divisions. This peculiarity of Omaha type is supposed to be the strong argument for Omaha tendencies in the PIE kinship system. Lounsbury (1964), Friedrich (1966), Wordick (1970), and Gates (1971) believed that one can only explain the problem of **h₂eu_h₂-* and **nepōt-* (referred to as *avunculus-nepos problem*) by ascribing the PIE kinship to the Omaha type. Hettrich (1985) formulated several arguments against it:

- 1) In Omaha-type father’s sister’s son (cousin) = sister’s son (nephew) = father’s father’s sister’s son (uncle) = (only in Omaha III) daughter’s son (grandson); mother’s brother’s son (cousin) = mother’s brother (uncle) = mother’s brother’s son’s son (grandnephew) = (only in Omaha III) mother’s father (see Hettrich 1985:454ff., especially 456, with references to Lounsbury 1964). In PIE the underlined notions are not attested as being designated by **h₂eu_h₂-* and **nepōt-*.

- 2) Hettrich finds it doubtful that **h₂eu_h₂-* and its derivatives denoted exclusively mother's relatives (see section 2.1.7.1).
- 3) The terms denoting 'mother's brother' are not continuations of the **h₂eu_h₂-o-* but derivatives of it.
- 4) Continuants of **nepōt-* could have changed their meaning into 'grandson' independently in the post-PIE epoch (2.1.8.)

Figures 1) and 3) do not need any further discussion. I will dwell upon the figures 2) and 4).

While Friedrich (1966:26) considered the special relationship between 'mother's brother' and 'sister's son' in the IE evidence "to mesh neatly with an Omaha system", Hettrich (1985:462) states that the two terms were "created in parallel processes <...> in different dialects" and confirms his assumption by referring to Delbrück (1889:504):

"Ich nehme also an, dass die Bezeichnung *népōtes* von dem *avo-s* ausging. Ist dieser der mütterliche Großvater, so sind die *népōtes* ihm gegenüber Enkeln, ist er der Oheim, so sind sie ihm gegenüber Neffen. Zu dieser Auffassung stimmt aufs Beste die Tatsache, dass in *népōt* die Bedeutung Neffe (abgesehen von Gr. ἀνεψιός) nur da hervortritt, wo ein Wort wie *avunculus* vorhanden ist, da wo dieses fehlt, nicht erscheint".

The question whether avunculate was a PIE or post-PIE tradition is, of course, highly speculative. However, the wide-spread character and antiquity¹³⁵ of this phenomenon could be an argument for its PIE status. Another question is whether avunculate as a PIE state of affairs can be considered a proof of the Omaha theory if, apart from the continuants **h₂eu_h₂-*, there are descriptive designations of mother's father and brother: e.g., Gr. μήτρως and Ved. *mātula* (who played an identical role in Greek and Indian society as, e.g., *amnair* (< **h₂eu_h₂-on-er*) in Old Irish society).

In addition, the motivation of lumping the terms for mother's father with mother's brother, and grandson with nephew is not the same in different societies either. The Omaha kinship system, as any other patriarchal system, implies that mother's relatives are less important; that is the reason for them being referred to by one name. In case of PIE, the motivation is quite different – the avunculate tradition.

In my opinion, the Descriptive tendencies in the PIE and IE kinship systems are stronger than the Omaha tendencies. Nevertheless, as *EIEC* (334) rightly points out, the lack of the reconstructed terms for cousins, "which would be the most diagnostic evidence for assigning PIE system to a particular type", prevents us from putting a full-stop in this topic.

¹³⁵ Bremmer (1976:67) was able to find traces of avunculate even in Hittite texts. King Labarna on his deathbed says: "Da mag doch niemand seinen Schwestersohn noch weiterhin als Pflegekind heranziehen!" (Sommer-Falkenstein 1938:2f.)

3.4. Conclusion

The detailed linguistic analysis of the kinship terminology denoting consanguineous and affinal relatives with some consideration of social anthropological, historical and mythological data on the topic indicates that the PIE system of kinship was patriarchal, virilocal, and patrilineal. The terms designating males as well as father's and husband's relatives in contrast to the terms designating females as well as mother's and wife's relatives are more diverse and distinctly attested in most IE branches.

The only matrilineal terms of special importance are the terms for mother's father and mother's brother. The affectionate relationship between the maternal grandfather and grandson, and, especially, between the maternal uncle and nephew reflected in ancient legends, in the Medieval literature and even in daily life of some IE nations was noticed by scholars long ago. However, conclusions for the PIE society differed. Some scholars (e.g., Thomson 1950 [1941], Isachenko 1952; Trubachev 1959) considered it to be a feature of a possible matriarchal social structure of the Proto-Indo-Europeans. Others (e.g., Hettrich 1985) tried to prove that the meaning 'maternal grandfather/uncle' must be secondary.

The best solution, in my opinion, is the acceptance of the institution of fosterage and avunculate in a predominantly patriarchal society (Bremmer 1976, 1983), i.e., upbringing of children outside of the extended family by foster parents or very often in the maternal grandfather's or uncle's family. The aim of such a tradition was making the ties between the two families double-strong – through a woman (**snusós*) and through a child (*népōts*).

It can also mean that the status of the father was formal for a child. The father was the one from whom one inherited property or an administrative post. That is why such terms as **atta-* were not simply informal terms for 'father' but often denoted other people: grandfathers, uncles, or foster-fathers.

I have not been able to find any convincing evidence for cross-cousin marriages suggested by Isachenko (1952) and Benveniste (1969); therefore, the PIE tribes must have been strictly exogamous. Whether they were monogamous or polygamous is not so clear. However, one can definitely exclude the primitive practice of group marriages (Thomson 1950 [1941], Isachenko 1952) particularly because father and his brothers as well as mother and her sisters were referred to differently. Polyandry is impossible in a patriarchal society. Consequently, the Proto-Indo-Europeans might have practiced either monogamy or, in exceptional cases, polygyny; probably both forms were presented depending on economic conditions and traditions of individual families.

As for the kinship system type, the PIE kinship terminology might reflect the Descriptive type, which is not unfamiliar to the IE daughter languages (e.g., Latin, Old English) with some resemblance to the Omaha system. However, the extent and meaning of this resemblance cannot be exactly determined due to the lack of the reconstructed term for ‘cousin’.

References

- Adams, Douglas Q. 2013. *A dictionary of Tocharian B*. (Revised and greatly enlarged. 2nd edition). Amsterdam: Rodopi.
- Bailey Harold W. 1972. A Half-Century of Irano-Indian Studies. In: *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society of Great Britain & Ireland* 104, 99-110.
- , 1979. *Dictionary of Khotan Saka*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Beekes, Robert Stephen Paul. 1969. *The Development of the Proto-Indo-European Laryngeals in Greek*. The Hague-Paris-London: Mouton.
- , 1972. The nominative of the hysterodynamic noun-inflection. In: *KZ* 86, 30-63.
- , 1973. The Greek *i-* and *u-*Stems and πόλις, -ηος. In: *Glotta* 51, 228-245.
- , 1976. Some Greek *aRa-*Forms. In: *Münchener Studien zur Sprachwissenschaft* 34, 9-20.
- , 1976a. Uncle and nephew. In: *Journal of Indo-European Studies* 4, 43-64.
- , 2010. *Etymological Dictionary of Greek*. Leiden: Brill.
- Benveniste, Émil. 1935. Un nom indo-européen de la «femme». *Bulletin de la Société de linguistique de Paris* 35, 104–106.
- , 1948. *Noms d'agent et noms d'action en indo-européen*. Paris: Adrien-Maisonneuv.
- , 1969. *Le vocabulaire des institutions indo-européennes*. Volume I&II. Paris: Éd. de Minuit.
- Blažek, Václav. 2001. Indo-European kinship terms in *-ǵ₂ter. In: Šefčík, Ondřej; Vykypěl, Bohumil (eds). *Grammaticus*. Brno.
- Bopp, Franz. 1871 [1837]. *Vergleichende Grammatik des Sanskrit, Send, Armenischen, Griechischen, Lateinischen, Litauischen, Altslavischen, Gotischen und Deutschen* (3^d edition). Volume III. Berlin: Dümmler.
- Boutkan, Dirk; Siebinga, Sjoerd Michiel. 2005. *Old Frisian etymological dictionary*. *Indo-European Etymological Dictionaries Online*. Alexander Lubotsky (ed). *Indo-European Etymological Dictionaries Online*. Leiden: Brill.

- Bremmer, Jan N. 1976. Avunculate and Fosterage. In: *Journal of Indo-European Studies* 4, 65-76.
- , 1983. The Importance of the Maternal Uncle and Grandfather in Archaic and Classical Greece and Early Byzantium. In: *Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik* 50, 173-186.
- Brugmann, Karl. 1876. Zur Geschichte der stammabstufenden Deklinationen. Erste Abteilung: Die Nomina auf -ar- und -tar-. In: *Studien zur griechischen und lateinischen Grammatik* 9, 361-406.
- , 1906. Grundriss der Vergleichenden Grammatik der indogermanischen Sprachen. Volume II.1. Zweite Bearbeitung. Straßburg.
- , 1907. Νύός, *nurus*, *snušá* und die griechischen und italischen femininen Substantiva auf -os. In: *Indogermanische Forschungen* 21, 315-322.
- Buck, Carl Darling. 1949. *A dictionary of selected synonyms in the principal Indo-European languages*. Chicago, University of Chicago Press.
- Bugge, Sophus. 1889. Etymologische Beiträge. In: *Beiträge zur Kunde der indogermanischen Sprachen* 14, 57-79.
- Carruba, Onofrio. 1995. Die Verwandtschaftsnamen auf -ter des Indogermanischen. In: Smoczyński, Wojciech (ed). *Kuryłowicz Memorial Volume*. Volume I. Cracow: Universitas.
- Darms, Georges. 1978. *Schwäher und Schwager, Hahn und Huhn*. München, Kitzinger.
- Delbrück, Berthold 1889. *Die Indogermanischen Verwandtschaftsnamen. Ein Beitrag zur vergleichenden Altertumskunde*. Leipzig. Abhandlungen der Königlich Sächsischen Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften, Phil.-hist. Kl., XI/5, 381-606.
- Derksen, Rick. 2008. *Etymological dictionary of the Slavic inherited lexicon*. *Indo-European Etymological Dictionaries Online*. Alexander Lubotsky (ed). Leiden: Brill.
- Dunkel, George. 2001. The sound-system of Proto-Indo-European. In: Huld, Martin E.; Jones-Bley, Karlene; Volpe, Angella Della; Dexter, Mirriam Robbins (eds). *Proceeding of the Twelfth Annual UCLA Indo-European conference, Los-Angeles, May, 26-28, 2000*. Washigton, DC: Institute for the Study of Man, 1-14.
- Dunkel, George E. 2005. Latin -pte, -pe, -per, -pse; IE Limiting *-po-te, *-pe-r and *póti- 'master'. In: Karlene Jones-Bley et al. (eds). *Proceedings of the Sixteenth Annual UCLA Indo-European Conference (Los Angeles, November 5-6, 2004)*. Washington, DC: Institute for the Study of Man (JIES Monograph Series, No. 50), 173-189.

- . 2014. *Lexikon der indogermanischen Partikel und Pronominalstämme*. Volume 1&2. Heidelberg: Universitätsverlag Winter.
- Eckert, Rainer; Crome, Emilia; Fleckenstein, Christa. 1983. *Geschichte der russischen Sprache*. Leipzig: Enzyklopädie.
- Ehelolf, Hans. 1936. Hethitisch-akkadische Wortgleichungen [IV. išḫaššara- = „Herrin“]. In: *Zeitschrift für Assyriologie und Vorderasiatische Archäologie* 43, 170–195.
- Eichner, Heiner. 1973. Die Etymologie von heth. *mehur*. In: *Münchener Studien zur Sprachwissenschaft* 31, 53-107.
- . 1975. Die Vorgeschichte des hethitischen Verbalsystems. In: Rix, Helmut (ed). *Flexion und Wortbildung. Akten der V. Fachtagung der Indogermanischen Gesellschaft, Regensburg 1973*. Wiesbaden, 71–103.
- . 2013. Das Anatolische in seinem Verhältnis zu den anderen Gliedern der indoeuropäischen Sprachfamilie aus aktueller Sicht. In: Thomas Krisch (ed). *Akten der 40. Österreichischen Linguistikkonferenz Salzburg 2013* (unpublished resource).
- Eichner-Kühn, Ingrid. 1976. Vier altindische Wörter. In: *Münchener Studien zur Sprachwissenschaft* 34, 21-37.
- Ernout, Alfred; Meillet, Antoine. 1985 [1932]. *Dictionnaire étymologique de la langue latine: histoire des mots*. (4th edition) Paris: Klincksieck.
- Fraenkel Ernst. 1962. *Litauisches etymologisches Wörterbuch*. Heidelberg: Winter.
- Friedrich, Paul. 1966. Proto-Indo-European Kinship. In: *Ethnology* 5 (1), 1-36.
- Gamkrelidze Tamaz; Ivanov, Vjačeslav. 1995. *Indo-European and the Indo-Europeans*. Berlin, New-York: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Gates, Henry P. 1971. *The kinship terminology of Homeric Greek. Memoir 27 of the International Journal of American Linguistics*. Baltimore: Waverly Press.
- Godel, Robert. 1975. *An introduction to the study of classical Armenian*. Wiesbaden: Dr. Ludwig Reichert Verlag.
- Goody, Jack. 1959. Indo-European society. Past and present 16:88-91. Reprinted in: J. Goody, (ed). *Comparative Studies in Kinship*. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1969, 235-9.
- Griffiths, Arlo; Lubotsky, Alexander. 2009. Two Words for ‘sister-in-law’? Notes on Vedic *yātar-* and *giri-*. In: Pirart, Éric (ed.). *Zarathushtra entre l'Inde et l'Iran: études indo-iraniennes et indo-européennes offertes à Jean Kellens à l'ocassion de son 65e anniversaire*. Wiesbaden: Reichert, 115-121.
- Güterbock, Hans G. 1992. Ist das hethitische Wort für "Frau" gefunden?, In: *Historische Sprachforschung* 105, 1-3.

- Hackstein, Olav. 2010. *Apposition and Nominal Classification in Indo-European and Beyond*.
Wien: Österreichische Akademie der Wissenschaften.
- Hamp, Eric. 1975. **dhugHtēr* in Irish. In: *Münchener Studien zur Sprachwissenschaft* 33, 39-40.
- , 1979. Indo-European **g^hen-Ha*. In: *KZ* 93, 1-7.
- Harðarson, Jón Axel. 1987. Das uridg. Wort für „Frau“. In: *Münchener Studien zur Sprachwissenschaft* 48, 115-38.
- , 2014. Das andere Wort für Frau im Urindogermanischen. In: Neri, Sergio (ed). *Studies on the collective and feminine in Indo-European from a diachronic and typological perspective*. Leiden: Brill, 23-55.
- Hawkins, J.D. 1978. The Luwian Word for “Daughter”. In: *Zeitschrift für vergleichende Sprachforschung* 92, 112-116.
- Hettrich, Heinrich. 1985. *Indo-European kinship terminology in linguistics and anthropology*.
Anthropological linguistics 27 (4), 453-480.
- Hoffmann, Karl. 1975. Ved. *dhánuṣ-* and *páruṣ-*. In: Narten, Johanna (ed). *Aufsätze zur Indoiranistik*. Volume 1. Wiesbaden, 327-337.
- Isachenko, Alexandr V. 1952. Индоевропейская и славянская терминология родства в свете Марксистского языкознания. In: *Slavia* 22 (1953/1954), 44-50.
- Jakobson, Roman. 1959. Why ‘Mama’ and ‘Papa’? In: *Perspectives in Psychological Theory*.
New York, 1960.
- Janda, Michael. 2000. *Eleusis. Das indogermanische Erbe der Mysterien*. Innsbruck.
- , 2005. *Elysion: Entstehung und Entwicklung der griechischen Religion*.
Innsbruck.
- Jasanoff, Jay. 1989. Old Irish bé ‘woman’. In: *Ériu* 40, 35-41.
- Kim, Ronald. 2005. Ossetic *silæ/syl* and the Indo-Iranian Word for ‘Female’. *International Journal of Diachronic Linguistics and Linguistic Reconstruction* 2, 123–168.
- Kloekhorst, Alwin. 2008. *Etymological Dictionary of the Hittite Inherited Lexicon*. *Indo-European Etymological Dictionaries Online*. Alexander Lubotsky (ed). Leiden: Brill.
- , 2011. The accentuation of the PIE word for ‘daughter’. In: Pronk, Tijmen (ed). *Accent Matters: Papers on Balto-Slavic Accentology*. Amsterdam: Rodopi.
- Kortlandt, Frederick. 1982. IE **pt* in Slavic. In: *Folia Linguistica Historica* 16 (3), 25-28.
- Kretschmer, Paul. 1896. *Einleitung in der Geschichte der griechischen Sprache*. Göttingen.
- Kroonen, Guus. 2013. *Etymological Dictionary of Proto-Germanic*. Leiden: Brill.

- Kuryłowicz, Jerzy. 1927. *a* indoeuropéen et *h* hittite. In: *Symbolae grammaticae in honorem Ioannis Rozwadowski*. Krakow: Uniwersytet Jagielloński, 95-104.
- Ledo-Lemos, Francisco José. 2002. *La palabra 'mujer' en indoeuropeo*. München: LINCOM Europa.
- . 2003. *Femininum Genus: a study on the origins of the Indo-European feminine grammatical gender*. München: LINCOM Europa.
- Lehmann, Winfred P. 1986. *A Gothic etymological dictionary*. Leiden: Brill.
- Leumann, Manu. 1977. *Lateinische Laut- und Formenlehre*. München: C.H. Beck'sche Verlagsbuchhandlung.
- Lévi-Strauss, Claude. 1969 [1949, 1967]. *The Elementary Structure of Kinship (Les Structures élémentaires de la Parenté)*. Revisited edition translated from French by Bell, J.H. & von Sturmer, J.R. Boston: Beacon Press.
- Linke, Uli. 1985. Blood as a metaphor of the Proto-Indo-European. In: *Journal of Indo-European Studies*, 13, 333-376.
- . 1992. Manhood, Femaleness, and Power: A Cultural Analysis of Prehistoric Images of Reproduction. In: *Comparative Studies in Society and History*, Volume 34(4), 579-620.
- Lohmann, Johannes. 1965. *Philosophie und Sprachwissenschaft*. Duncker & Humblot.
- Lounsbury, Floyd G. 1964. A formal account of the Crow- and Omaha-type kinship terminologies. In: Goodenough, W.H. (ed). *Explorations in Cultural Anthropology*. New York: McGraw-Hill, 351-94.
- Mallory, J. P.; Adams, D. Q. 1997. *Encyclopedia of Indo-European culture*, London, Fitzroy Dearborn.
- Martirosyan, Hrach K. 2010. *Etymological Dictionary of the Armenian Inherited Lexicon*. *Indo-European Etymological Dictionaries Online*. Alexander Lubotsky (ed). Leiden: Brill.
- Matasović, Ranko. 2004. *Gender in Indo-European*. Heidelberg.
- . 2009. *Etymological dictionary of proto-Celtic*. *Etymological Dictionary of the Armenian Inherited*. Leiden: Brill.
- Mayrhofer, Manfred. 1986. *Indogermanische Grammatik. Halbband 1. Lautlehre [Segmentale Phonologie des Indogermanischen]*. Heidelberg: Winter.
- . 1992-2001. *Etymologisches Wörterbuch des Altindoarischen*. Volume III. Heidelberg: Winter.
- Meid, Wolfgang M. 1966. Idg. **g^h*en Frau. In: *KZ* 80, 271-2.

- Meillet, Antoine. 1931. Essai de chronologie des langues indo-européennes. In: *Bulletin de la Société de linguistique de Paris* 32, 1–28.
- Meier-Brügger, Michael, 2000. *Indogermanische Sprachwissenschaft*. Berlin, New York: Walter de Gruyter.
- Melchert, H. Craig. 1993 [1989]. *Lycian Lexicon*. (2nd edition). Chapel Hill: Lexica Anatolica 1.
- . 1993a. *Cuneiform Luvian Lexicon*. *Indo-European Etymological Dictionaries Online*. Alexander Lubotsky (ed). Brill Online, <http://iedo.brillonline.nl/dictionaries>.
- Meringer, Rudolf. 1904. Wörter und Sachen. In: *Indogermanische Forschungen* 16, 101–196.
- Morgan, Lewis Henry Morgan. 1997 [1871]. *Systems of Consanguinity and Affinity of the Human Family*. Lincoln and London: University of Nebraska Press.
- Murdock, George Peter. 1949. *Social structure*. New York: Macmillan.
- Neu, Erich. 1990. Das hethitische Wort für „Frau“. In: *KZ* 103, 208-217.
- Oettinger, Norbert. 1986. Avestisch *hāiriš-* ‘Frau’ syn- und diachron. In: *Indogermanische Forschungen* 91, 116–128.
- . 1998. Wiesel und Gevatterin: Zu einem semantischen Problem. In: Bökönyi, Sándor (ed). *Man and the animal world*. Budapest: Archaeolingua Alapítvány, 649-654.
- . 2004. Griechisch γυνή „Frau“ und der Ursprung des „i-Kollektivums“. In: Kirsch, Thomas; Lindner, Thomas; Müller, Ulrich (eds). *Analecta homini universali dicata*. Volume 1. Stuttgart: Verlag Hans-Dieter Heinz.
- . 2009. Die Derivationsbasis von idg. **daj̥uér-* (**sh₂daj̥uér-*) ‘Bruder des Ehemannes’. In: *Die Sprache* 48, 127-131.
- Olsen, Birgit Anette. 1999. *The noun in Biblical Armenian: origin and word-formation*. Berlin, New York: Mouton de Gruyter.
- . 2013. A note on Indo-European in-laws. In: Cooper, Adam I.; Rau Jeremy; Weiss, Michael (eds). *Multi nominis grammaticus: studies in classical and Indo-European linguistics in honor Of Alan J. Nussbaum on the occasion of his sixty-fifth birthday*. Ann Arbor, New York: Beech Stave Press.
- Orel, Vladimir.E. 1998. *Albanian etymological dictionary*. Leiden: Brill.
- . 2003. *A handbook of Germanic etymology*. Leiden: Brill.
- Parkes, Peter. 2006. Celtic Fosterage: Adoptive Kinship and Clientage in Northwest Europe. In: *Comparative Studies in Society and History* 48 (2), 359-395.

- Pârvulescu, Adrian. 1993. IE. **dhughatēr* “daughter” and Grassmann’s law. A phonetic and semantic analysis. In: *Indogermanische Forschungen: Zeitschrift für Indogermanistik und Allgemeine Sprachwissenschaft* 98, 55-91.
- , 1996. IE. *bhrátēr* “brother”. In: *Indogermanische Forschungen: Zeitschrift für Indogermanistik und Allgemeine Sprachwissenschaft* 101, 99-106.
- Pedersen, Holger. 1909. *Vergleichende Grammatik der keltischen Sprachen*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht.
- , 1938. *Hetitisch und die anderen indoeuropäischen Sprachen*. Copenhagen: Munksgaard.
- Persson, Per. 1891. *Studien zur Lehre von der Wurzelerweiterung und Wurzelvariation*. Uppsala: Uppsala Universitets årsskrift.
- Peters, Martin. 1980. *Untersuchungen zur Vertretung der indogermanischen Laryngale im Griechischen*. Wien: Verlag der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften.
- Pinault, Georges-Jean. 2000. Védique *dámūnas*, Latin *dominus* l’origine du suffixe du Hoffmann. In: *Bulletin de la société de linguistique de Paris*. 95, 61-117.
- , 2005. Analyse étymologique d’un nom de parenté indo-européen. In: Schweiger, Günter (ed). *Indogermanica: Festschrift Gert Klingenschmitt; indische, iranische und indogermanische Studien*. Tübingen: Schweiger VWT-Verl, 465-485.
- , 2007. A Star is born. A “New” PIE *-ter-Suffix. In: *Verba Docenti. Studies in historical and Indo-European linguistics presented to Jay H. Jasanoff, ed. by Alan J. Nussbaum*. Ann Arbor-New York: Beech Stave Press, 271-279.
- , 2012. Tracing the expression of mastery and power in IE languages. *A handout read at the 14th Fachtagung der Idg. Gesellschaft: Etymology and the European Lexicon. Copenhagen, 22nd September, 2012* (unpublished source).
- , 2012a. Distance, proximity, exchange and kinship (semantics and etymology of Proto-Indo-European terms). *A handout read at Lund University, on November 1st, 2012* (unpublished resource).
- , 2013. The Lady (almost) Vanishes. In: Cooper, Adam I.; Rau, Jeremy; Weiss, Michael (eds). *Multi Nominis Grammaticus: Studies in classical and Indo-European linguistics in honour Of Alan J. Nussbaum on the occasion of his sixty-fifth birthday*. Ann Arbor, New York: Beech Stave Press.
- Pohl, Heinz Dieter. 1980. Slavisch *st* aus älterem **pt*? In: *Die Sprache* 26/1, 62-63.
- Pokorny, Julius. 1959. *Indogermanisches etymologisches Wörterbuch*. Volume 1, Bern/Stuttgart.

- Pott, August Friedrich. 1833. *Etymologische Forschungen auf dem Gebiete der Indo- Germanischen Sprachen, mit besonderem Bezug auf die Lautumwandlung im Sanskrit, Griechischen, Lateinischen, Littauischen und Gothischen*. Lemgo: Meyer.
- Preobrazenskij, Alexandr G. 1918. *Etymologičeskij slovar russkago jazyka*. Moskva: Liasner.
- Rau, Jeremy. 2011. Indo-European Kinship Terminology: **ph₂tr-ou-/ph₂tr- μ* and its Derivatives. In: *Historische Sprachforschung* 124, 1-25.
- Rieken, Elisabeth. 1999. *Untersuchungen zur nominalen Stammbildung des Hethitischen. (Studien zu den Boğazköy-Texten; 44)*. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.
- Schindler, Jochem. 1972. L'apophonie des noms-racines indo-europeens. In: *BSL* 67, 31-8.
- Schleicher, August. 1861–1862. *Compendium der vergleichenden Grammatik der indogermanischen Sprachen*. I: Kurzer Abriss einer Lautlehre. II: Kurzer Abriss einer Formenlehre. Weimar: Böhlau.
- Schmidt, Johannes. 1879. Zwei arische a-Laute und die Palatalen. In: *KZ* 25, 1-179.
- Schrijver, Peter. 1991. *The reflexes of the PIE laryngeals in Latin*. Amsterdam - Atlanta: Rodopi.
- . 1995. *Studies in British Celtic Historical Phonology*. Amsterdam - Atlanta GA.
- Schumacher, Stefan; Matzinger, Joachim. 2013. *Die Verben des Altalbanischen: Belegwörterbuch, Vorgeschichte und Etymologie*. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.
- Schwarz, Martin. 1975. Proto-Indo-European $\sqrt{\text{gem}}$. In: *Monumentum H. S. Nyberg*. Leiden: Brill; Téhéran: Bibliothèque Pahlavi.
- . 1987. Relative chronology in and across formal and semantic hierarchies: The history of ** dhwer(E)-* ‘go apart’ in Indo-European. In: Beekes, R.; Lubotsky, A.; Weitenberg, J. (eds). *Rekonstruktion und Relative Chronologie. (Akten der VIII. Fachtagung der Indogermanischen Gesellschaft, Leiden 31.8.-4.9. 1987)*. Innsbruck 1992.
- Schwimmer, Brian. 1996-2001. *Systematic Kinship Terminologies*. University of Manitoba. URL:<https://www.umanitoba.ca/faculties/arts/anthropology/tutor/kinterms/termsys.html#Sudanese> (03.08.2014).
- Seebold, Elmar. 1982. Der Übergang von idg. -w- zu germ. -k- und -g-. In: *Indogermanische Forschungen*, 172-194.
- Sen, Subhadra Kumar. 1987. Gothic *atta* and *fadar*: A Semantic Analysis. In: Beekes, Robert; Stephen Paul (eds). 1992. *Rekonstruktion und relative Chronologie*. Innsbruck: Inst. für Sprachwiss. d. Univ., 255-259.

- Sihler, Andrew L. 1988. Greek reflexes of the syllabic laryngeals with a postscript on PIE kinship terms in *H₂ter. In: *Bamberger*, 547-61.
- Skok, Petar. 1972. *Etimologijski rječnik hrvatskoga ili srpskoga jezika*. Zagreb: Jugoslavenska Akad. Znanosti i Umjetnosti.
- Smoczyński, Wojciech. 2007. *Słownik etymologiczny języka litewskiego*. Wilno: Univ. Wileński.
- Sommer, F.; Falkestein, A. 1938. *Die hettitische Bilingue des Hattušili I*. Berlin: Akademie der Wissenschaften.
- Specht, Franz. 1941. *Die indogermanische Familie und der Unsterblichkeitsgedanke*. München.
- Starke, Frank. 1980. Das luwische Wort für „Frau“. In: *KZ* 94, 74-86.
- , 1990. *Untersuchung zur Stammbildung des keilschrift-luwischen Nomens*. (Studien zu den Boğazköy-Texten 31). Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.
- Sturtevant, Edgar Howard. 1926. On the Position of Hittite among the Indo-European Languages. In: *Language* 2 25-34.
- Szemerényi, Oswald. 1964. *Syncope in Greek and Indo-European and the Nature of Indo-European Accent*. Napoli: Istituto Universitario Orientale di Napoli.
- , 1966. The Alleged Indo-European *sor- ‘Woman’. In: *Kratylos* 11, 206–221.
- , 1977. Studies in the kinship terminology of the Indo-European languages. In: *Acta Iranica (Varia 1977)*, Leiden, Brill.
- Thomson, George Derwent. 1950 [1941]. *Aeschylus and Athens: a study in the social origins of drama* (2nd edition). London: Lawrence & Wishart.
- Tichy, Eva. 1993. Kollektiva, genus femininum, und relative Chronologie im Indogermanischen. In: *KZ* 106, 1-19.
- , 1995. *Die Nomen agentis auf -tar- im Vedischen*. Heidelberg: Winter.
- Tremblay, Xavier. 2003. *La déclinaison des noms de parenté indo-européens en -ter-*. Innsbruck.
- Trubachev, Oleg N. 1959. *История славянских терминов родства и некоторых терминов общественного строя*. Moskva: Izdat. Akad. Nauk SSSR.
- de Vaan, Michiel. 2008. *Etymological Dictionary of Latin and the other Italic Languages*. *Indo-European Etymological Dictionaries Online*. Alexander Lubotsky (ed). Leiden: Brill.
- Vaillant, André. 1950. *Grammaire comparée des langues slaves*. Volume 1. Lyon.

- Vendryes, J. de. 1974. *Lexique étymologique de l'irlandais ancien* (Lettres R, S). Paris: CNRS.
- Vey, Marc. 1931. Slave *st* provenant d'i-e. pt. In: *Bulletin de la société de linguistique de Paris*. 32, 65-67.
- Vey, Marc. 1953. Le nom de l' 'autour' en slave. In: *Bulletin de la société de linguistique de Paris*. 49, 24 - 40.
- Vijūnas, Aurelijus. 2009. *The Indo-European Primary T-stems*. Innsbruck: Innsbrucker Beiträge zur Sprachwissenschaft.
- Volk, Konrad. 1999. *A Sumerian reader* (2nd edition). Rome: Editrice pontificio istituto biblico.
- Walde, Alois; Pokorny, Julius. 1926-1932. *Vergleichendes Wörterbuch der indogermanischen Sprachen*. Volumes 1&2. Berlin: De Gruyter.
- Walde, Alois; Hoffmann, Johann Baptist. 1938. *Lateinisches etymologisches Wörterbuch* (3^d edition). Heidelberg: Winter.
- Watkins, Calvert. 2000. *The American Heritage Dictionary of Indo-European Roots*. (2nd edition). Boston, New York: Houghton Mifflin Company.
- Wodtko, Dagmar S., Irslinger Britta, Schneider Carolin. 2008. *Nomina im Indogermanischen Lexikon*. Heidelberg: Universitätsverlag Winter.
- Wordick, Frank J.F. 1970. *A Generative-Extensionist Analysis of the PIE Kinship System With a Phonological and Semantic Reconstruction of the Terms*. University of Michigan thesis. Ann Arbor: University Microfilms.
- Zeilfelder, Susanne. 2001. *Archaismus und Ausgliederung. Studien zur sprachlichen Stellungen des Hetitischen*. Heidelberg.
- Zubatý, Josef. 1891. Slav. *pastorъкъ*. In: *Archiv für slawische Philologie* 13, 315-317.

English abstract

Kinship terms, along with names of animals and plants, anatomical parts, natural phenomena and numbers, belong to the most conservative vocabulary of the Indo-European languages. This lexical group does not only reflect archaic patterns of word formation but also the life, mentality, and the social structure of PIE tribes. For this reason the reconstruction and interpretation of PIE kinship terms is crucial for Indo-European studies.

For the same reason this topic is of special importance to anthropologists and ethnologists. Most of them consider the PIE society to have been patriarchal, virilocal, patrilineal, exogamous and predominantly monogamous. Furthermore, anthropology and ethnology tries to ascribe the PIE kinship system to one of the basic kinship types formulated by L.H. Morgan (1871). The evidence permits to assume that the PIE kinship terminology might have belonged either to the Omaha type or to the Descriptive (Sudanese) type. Both assumptions are provided with strong arguments that are presented in the course of this research.

However, the emphasis of this thesis lies mainly on the linguistic analysis of the reconstructed PIE kinship terms by summarising the data from earlier and recent works on this topic. A special attention will be paid to the kinship terms in **-ter-* and an attempt to find out the original function and semantics of this suffix. The final purpose of this critical survey is gaining the insight into the PIE family structure and further, into the PIE social system.

Deutsche Zusammenfassung

Verwandtschaftsnamen gehören genau wie die Bezeichnungen von Tieren und Pflanzen, Körperteilen, Naturerscheinungen und Zahlwörtern zu dem konservativsten Wortschatz der indogermanischen Sprachen. Diese Wortgruppe zeigt nicht nur sprachwissenschaftlich besonders archaische Wortbildungsmuster, sondern erlaubt auch einen Einblick in Lebensweise, Mentalität und die soziale Struktur der grundsprachlichen und (alt)indogermanischen Sprachgemeinschaften. Rekonstruktion der urindogermanischen Verwandtschaftsnamen und ihre Deutung sind aber nicht nur wichtig für Indogermanistik, sondern auch bedeutsam für Anthropologen und Ethnologen.

Die verbreitetste Forschungsmeinung ist, dass die urindogermanische Gesellschaft patriarchalisch, virilokal, vaterrechtlich, exogam, und grundsätzlich monogam war. Innerhalb der Anthropologie und Ethnologie wird weiterhin versucht, das indogermanische Verwandtschaftssystem einem der von L.H. Morgan (1871) formulierten klassischen Typen zuzuschreiben. Die Beleglage lässt vermuten, dass die urindogermanische Verwandtschaftsterminologie zu dem sog. Omaha-Typ oder zu dem Deskriptiven (Sudanischen) Typ gehörte. Beide Vermutungen stützen sich auf starke Argumente, die im Laufe meiner Untersuchung besprochen werden.

Der Schwerpunkt dieser Masterarbeit liegt allerdings auf der sprachwissenschaftlichen Analyse der rekonstruierbaren Verwandtschaftsnamen auf der Grundlage von älterer und rezentester Literatur. Besondere Beachtung gilt den Verwandtschaftsnamen auf **-ter*. Es wird versucht, die ursprüngliche Funktion und Semantik dieses Suffixes im Rahmen der Verwandtschaftsnamen festzustellen. Das Hauptziel dieser kritischen Zusammenfassung ist es, sich eine Vorstellung von der Struktur der urindogermanischen Familie und in weiterer Folge vom Sozialsystem der urindogermanischen Gesellschaft zu machen.

Lebenslauf

Persönliche Daten

Name	Veronika Milanova
Geburtsort	Izhevsk (Russland)
Geburtsdatum	30.07.1984
Wohnort	Wien

Ausbildung

1991-2001	Schule № 57, Izhevsk
2003-2008	Studium der Philologie (Englische Sprache und Literatur) an der Udmurtischen Staatlichen Universität, Abschluss (gleichwertig Mag. Phil.) mit Auszeichnung
2012 bis heute	Masterstudium der Sprachwissenschaft (Indogermanistik) an der Universität Wien

Relevante Tätigkeit

09.2008-01.2009	Post-Diplom-Praktikum am Lyzeum für Wirtschaft und Mathematik (Izhevsk), als Englischlehrerin
10.2009-08.2010	Izhevsker Staatliche Landwirtschaftliche Akademie, als Englischlehrerin
09.2012-11.2013	Verlag ABBYY Press (Moskau) als freiberufliche Redakteurin des Deutsch-Russischen Wörterbuchs

Auszeichnungen

2004-2008	Leistungsstipendium der Udmurtischen Staatlichen Universität
-----------	--

