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Abstract

This article deals with the ethnolinguistic situation in one of the most archaic areas of language and cultural contact between South Slavic and Eastern Romance populations—the Karashevo microregion in Banat, Romania. For the first time, the lexical-semantic group of kinship terms in the Krashovani dialects from the Slavic-speaking village of Carașova and the Romanian-speaking village of Iabalcea is being analysed in a comparative perspective as two...
separate linguistic codes which “serve” the same local culture. The main goal of the research was to investigate patterns of borrowing mechanisms which could link lexical (sub)systems of spiritual culture under the conditions of intimate language contact in symbiotic communities. It will be shown that, in such situations, the equivalent translation becomes relevant as a specific strategy of linguistic code interrelationships. Even though kinship terminology in closely contacting dialects has the potential to help linguists trace back the socio-historical conditions and outcomes of language contact (such as marriage patterns), linguistic methods have their limitations in the case of poorly documented vernaculars. These limitations could be overcome by compiling more data on “isocontacting” communities and, possibly, by analysing this data using quantitative tools.
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1. The research problem
The linguistic and cultural processes taking place in bilingual and multilingual communities have often been the focus of attention of linguists and anthropologists in recent decades. Increases in various kinds of migration flows
in the modern world have led to a drive to understand newly formed mixed communities, and provoked a growing interest in “old” contact situations that have directly affected the ethno- and linguogenesis of tribes and peoples around the world. One of the “watersheds” generally accepted in the (socio) linguistic typology of contact is the introduction of the concept of so-called “intimate language contact”, which is characterised by the following features. First of all, it requires prolonged intimacy between two communities (typically, through intermarriage over generations); secondly, it affects all parts of the linguistic structure; and finally, lexical borrowings are observed to affect all parts of the lexicon as a whole (as opposed to being localised in some semantical groups) [Clark 1994: 113].

Many attempts have been made to explore the genesis, functioning and consequences of intimate language contact using various approaches and lines of research, from case studies of language contacts conducted in the multilingual regions of Australia and Oceania, West Africa, Southeast Asia and Southeastern Europe to attempts to discover the origins of this phenomenon\(^1\). The latter include the biolinguistic point of view, according to which small, compactly living bilingual or multilingual communities can be a rudiment (or a later, certainly modified form) of so-called “societies of intimates”. Such communities have played a crucial role in the emergence of various forms of modern society [Givón 2002: 301–305]. As social structures, they were not fully integrated into national states, so many archaic cultural norms, including models of trust and interaction, have been maintained (or had been maintained until recently) by their members\(^2\). Apparently, sharing the same origin, i.e. belonging to the same tribe or nation, was not a prerequisite for the functioning of “societies of intimates”. Common confession, horizontal bonds between community members and similar economic and social status in a particular territory were of greater importance [Givón 2002: 306–309].

To all appearances, the concept of small-scale\(^3\) multilingualism also represents an attempt to describe a similar scientific object, i.e. “small socio-political groups which have no overarching hierarchical political structure joining them [Singer, Harris 2016] with the type of societal multilingualism characterised

\(^1\) The most recent overview of important works and theories is presented in [Grant 2020].
\(^2\) T. Givón names the following characteristics of “societies of intimates”: small number of community members, resource economy, geographically limited distribution, limited gene pool, cultural homogeneity, information homogeneity and stability, consensual leadership, kinship-based social interaction, refusal to interact with outsiders [Givón 2002: 306–309].
\(^3\) There are different terms used by different scholars in this regard: “reciprocal” [Jourdan 2007], “balanced” [Aikhenvald 2007], “traditional” [Brandl, Walsh 1982; Di Carlo 2016; Wilkins, Nash 2008], and “egalitarian” [François 2012]. The list of terms is given in [Dobrushina, Khanina 2018].
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by the absence of power or prestige relationships between languages” [Dobrushina, Khanina 2018]. Traditionally, small-scale multilingualism is linked to the “non-Western” world, which means that multilingual areas of Europe are not typically discussed in this context. However, I suggest that southeastern Europe (the Balkans) should not be excluded from this framework. Present or past contact situations in this peripheral region often respond to the general parameters of small-scale multilingualism settings (“a geographically confined basis; many shared cultural traits in the entire setting making it a meaningful geographic entity; complex exchange dynamics relying on a dialectic relationship between similarity and alterity; extensive multilingualism instead of or alongside a lingua franca” [Lüpke 2016: 63]).

For several recent decades, contacting Balkan languages and dialects have been studied by linguists from the RAS Institute of Linguistic Studies (recent joint publications are [Соболев et al. 2018; Sobolev et al. 2020]). In our work, we proceed from the assumption that the formation of the Balkan ethnolinguistic and cultural space was influenced by “mutual” language shifts of large groups of people. We focus on different local communities (often living near borders) and the linguistic contact which is occurring, or has occurred, in them between Greek and Albanian [Соболев 2017]; Slavic and Albanian [Морозова, Русаков 2018]; Slavic and Romance [Конёр 2020; Козак 2017]; and Slavic, Romance and Albanian [Makarova 2017] dialects. They are studied at the grammatical, lexical, phonological, and syntactical levels, often within the context of cultural and social practices. For this research, the connection between such practices and the language life of the community is particularly important. My goal was to use the material of the Slavic and Romance dialects of the bilingual Krashovani people living in the Romanian Banat to approach an understanding of the issues listed below.

(1) What role do spiritual culture and religion play in the speech behaviour of bilingual community members?

(2) What are the characteristics of a bilingual kinship terminology?

(3) Are borrowing mechanisms in bilingual communities different from those which we observe in (mostly) monolingual environments?

(4) And finally, what are the possibilities and what are the limitations of linguistic (e. g. lexicological) tools for solving these and similar problems?

Based on a case study of the Krashovani people, I will try to find some answers to the above questions.

---

4 In this article, the following proper names are used: Karashevo, a toponym naming the whole Slavic-speaking microregion (7 villages); Carașova, the name of the largest village and economic and cultural centre of the microregion; and Krashovani, an adjective which has the meaning of affiliation to the Karashevo microregion.
2. Methodology and data

The centre of my attention was the Krashovani kinship terminology in the Slavic-speaking village of Carașova and in the Romanian-speaking village of Iabalcea. This lexical-semantic group was chosen for analysis for the following reasons. In the scientific literature, one can easily find arguments about the ethno-linguistic and socio-anthropological aspects of kinship terminology in the Balkan languages and dialects. At the same time, its sociolinguistic dimension has been discussed only occasionally (see, for example: [Morozova 2019]). However, in the case of multilingual communities, kinship terminology may contain testimonies about certain stages of their formation. Since a significant proportion of names of family members are related to the basic (core) vocabulary, we can assume that the occurrence of foreign elements in this lexical-semantic group will denote corresponding “facts of life”, i.e. marriages (or the establishment of other types of kinship relations) between speakers of donor and recipient languages at certain stages of the community’s history. The recipient language speakers’ will to associate themselves with the culture that the donor language represents also plays an important role. Thus, kinship terminology can be directly related to the question of the first and second language (L1 and L2) acquisition and their functioning in the mind and speech of bilingual people. With all this in mind, my goal was to establish (and justify as far as possible) a relationship between the social conditions under which language contact has taken place in the Karashevo microregion and its linguistic outcomes.

The present research was conducted in several stages. During my first fieldwork trips in the microregion, I gathered words and word combinations related to the kinship system in the Slavic-speaking village of Carașova. To
achieve this, I used principally a standard BCSM lexeme which was normally intelligible to local people\(^8\). After Slavic lexemes from Carașova had been recorded, I started gathering their equivalents in the Romanian-speaking Krashovani village of Iabalcea, using practically the same method, except that this time my consultants were asked to translate a word recorded in Carașova into their local dialect (the issue of their bilingualism and L2 knowledge will be discussed in more detail later). Subsequently, I analysed the data from Carașova and Iabalcea as one cultural code, but two different linguistic codes. To do this, I needed to discover the etymologies of all their elements and then deduce how a certain notion found its way into Slavic or Romanian code. However, in order to be valid, the results of this analysis need to take into consideration the historical, cultural and language background of the Banat Krashovani.

3. The contact setting: Banat, Karashevo

To begin with, I shall briefly describe the language contact situation in the microregion of Karashevo, situated in the Romanian part of the Banat Highlands. In the case of Krashovani, both the broader territorial context (on a regional level) and the narrower one (on a microregional level) are of a great importance.

Banat is a historical region which nowadays belongs to three different states: Romania (two-thirds, or 18,966 km\(^2\)), Serbia (one-third, or 9,276 km\(^2\)), and Hungary, which now incorporates a small fragment of less than 300 km\(^2\) of the region. There is evidence that Banat has existed as a multilingual area for centuries and, notably, it has been an area of Romano-Slavic language and culture contact, some stages of which have even been referred to as symbiosis\(^9\). This symbiosis is supposed to have begun in the 5th or 6th centuries, when Slavic tribes came to the Balkans. The Slav presence in the plains of the Romanian Banat is proved by some archaeological finds, by the local toponymic terminology, mostly noted in the areas near the Tisa and Danube rivers, and by

---

\(^8\) Although Krashovani dialects have been traditionally quite isolated from the Slavic-speaking world, many modern channels of communication with both the Serbian and Croatian languages have appeared lately. As for the former, these channels include Serbian television, which is available in many Krashovani households, and also oral contact with musicians from Serbia, whom it has become very prestigious to invite to weddings, baptisms and other important ceremonies. Croatian seems to have begun to take a diglossia position above the Krashovani dialects to some extent, as this language is being actively spread in the microregion by the Catholic church and by the local governmental organisation “Zajedništvo Hrvata u Rumunjskoj/Uniunea Croaților din România” (“The Association of Romanian Croats”) [Konč 2020].

\(^9\) Since the end of the 1960s, anthropologists have been using the term “symbiotic” for communities in which ethnic and linguistic communities enter into additional distribution relationships (see [Barth 1969; Lehman 2001]. In recent linguistic works, the concept of “symbiosis” is used in a less-strict, non-terminological way [Соболев 2017: 423].
some vague data on a non-attested language, “Daco-Slavic” (Rom. daco-slava), that had been spoken by the Slavs of Dacia before they were assimilated by the Romanian (or proto-Romanian) population [Petrovici 1943: 1–5; Konior 2018].

During the late Middle Ages, Banat became a battleground in Europe’s war against the Ottoman Empire, which was gaining more and more power. In 1552, Timișoara, which later gained unofficial status as the capital of Banat, was occupied by the Turks. The Timișoara eyalet existed until 1716, when Eugene of Savoy conquered the city, and the Treaty of Požarevac (Passarowitz) was signed in 1718 [Бромлей 1963: 262–263; Крстић 2010: 86; Konior 2018]. Some historians believe it to have been the beginning of a new era for Banat, since that moment marked the start of its development as a separate region [Buzărnescu, Pribac 2002; Konior 2018].

One of the most important milestones for the further ethnolinguistic development of this territory is the formation of the Military Frontier (Rom. Granița militară bănățeană, BCSM Banatska vojna granica, Ger. Banater Militärgrenze) on the left bank of the Danube in the second half of the 18th century. The Military Frontier commanders were directly subordinate to the Habsburg court’s military council. In peacetime, local men were engaged in agriculture, and during wartime they served as soldiers, “a human fence against the Ottomans” [Clewing, Schmitt 2011: 316–317, 320; Павковић 2009, 58–61; Konior 2018]. Of all the parts of present Vojvodina (the regions of Srem, Banat and Bačka in Serbia), Banat stood particularly well with the authorities of the Habsburg monarchy. They expected it to become an economically prosperous region; people of different religions and nationalities were sent there, the main criterion for their selection being their professional skills. A special role was assigned to German colonists as loyal subjects, good workers, soldiers and builders [Митровић 2004: 125–126, 130; Clewing, Schmitt 2011: 320; Konior 2018]. Thus, a package of measures undertaken by the authorities formed the basis for the development of multi-ethnic and multilingual communities10.

Migrations were crucial in the history of the Karashevo microregion as well. This territory, situated in the central-southern part of the Romanian Banat, is now formed by seven (mostly) Slavic-speaking Catholic villages: Carașova, Lupac, Vodnic, Rafnic, Nermed, Clocotici and Iabalcea. Not all researchers share the same opinion concerning the ancestral homeland of the Krashovani. I. Popović, J. Erdeljanović, and M. Radan consider them to be

10 According to the 1770 census, in Banat there were 181,639 Romanians, 78,780 Serbs, 8,683 Bulgarians, 5,272 Romani, 42,201 Swabians, Italians and French, 353 Jews, from a total of 317,928 people. However, all these neighbouring ethnic and linguistic groups were to some extent isolated from each other. Historians believe that there have never been any serious or protracted interethnic conflicts in the territory of the region. This situation was due to the presence of a firm government which organised and supported colonisation, favouring the unity of the various branches of Christianity in the region [Hurezan, Colta 2002: 91; Konior 2018].
descendants of the first Slavs who came to the Balkans, settled north of the Danube and mixed subsequently with several waves of migrants (supposedly in the 15th–16th and 18th centuries) from different regions of the Balkan Peninsula. There is also evidence of Romanian participation in the Krashovani ethnogenesis through mixed marriages, with subsequent assimilation of the Romanian spouses by the Slavic-speaking people. T. Simu compares this situation to a specific process of diffusion called “osmosis”, and believes that it was facilitated by the ecclesiastical authority of that time in the microregion, consisting of Franciscans, Jesuits and secular priests who welcomed the assimilation of the Romanian population in order to spread the Catholic religion [Simu 1939: 80–83; Konior 2018].

4. Bilingualism, but not biculturalism

It appears that the Karashevo microregion had been multilingual before the 20th century; apart from the idioms that are in contact now (which are a BCSM dialect and a Romanian Banat dialect), at least Hungarian and German were widespread, but despite their status as dominant languages in the state, they did not deeply influence the Krashovani vernacular(s). Nowadays in the village of Carașova, the cultural and economic centre of the microregion, as well as in five other Krashovani villages, apart from Iabalcea, the first language (L1) of the local population is an archaic South Slavic dialect. Their lexis has been significantly influenced by the Romanian Banat dialect in the past and by the Romanian standard after the 1950s. The Romanian language (with a certain amount of dialectal features depending on the generation and individual traits of speech) is L2 in all Slavic-speaking Krashovani villages, including the village of Carașova, which is the focus of this research.

In Iabalcea, another Krashovani settlement that I focus on, the situation is the opposite; local people who share religion, culture and identity with other Krashovani use the Romanian Banat dialect as their L1, and passively know the Slavic Krashovani dialect as L2. Competencies differ, depending on the generation of the speaker. Study and analysis of the “Iabalcea phenomenon” (in which a part of the national minority uses the language of the majority, but stays in all possible contexts in the minority framework) over several years led me to the hypothesis that there was not just a language shift or language maintenance scenario; to an extent, both these scenarios took place, as, in Iabalcea, mixed marriages between Slavic-speaking people and Romanian-speaking people used to happen more often than in other Krashovani villages. It should be noted that this presumption is supported by the onomastic data. I found the following surnames on gravestones of the local cemetery in September, 2017: Beul, Ursul, Ifca, Rebegila, Kokora, Baciuna, Padineanț, Ghitoi, Filka, Toma. Apparently, only one of them is of Slavic origin (Ifca < Proto-Slav. *jьva). Also,
one of my informants provided examples of typical nicknames in Iabalcea. They are also Romanian: Ceapă, Gâscă, Straică, Chioru, Pușcă [Konior 2018]. Taking into account matrimonial strategies, the village of Iabalcea represented an exception to the rule according to which exogamy was frowned upon among Krashovani before the late 20th century (or even simply banned by the Catholic church, as one of my consultants mentioned)\(^\text{11}\). There could be several reasons for this irregularity:

(1) demographical and structural: Iabalcea is the smallest Krashovani village and possibly suffered from a lack of people, especially men during militarised periods of its history. There is a legend about Romanian workers who came once as seasonal workers, but married local women and “stayed with Krashovani”;

(2) geographical: the village is isolated from Romanian-speaking villages by the mountains on one side and by the other Krashovani villages on the other, so it could not easily be “separated” from the Karashevo microregion;

(3) socio-cultural: Iabalcea is an example of the socio-cultural inclusion of part of a minority that uses the majority’s language, while sharing all the cultural markers with the rest of the community. It is important to mention that the narratives gathered in the village of Carașova and in the village of Iabalcea demonstrate the unity of cultural codes in the Slavic-speaking and Romanian-speaking villages.

Several excerpts from my archive confirming this unity are given below. It is manifested in all three basic codes of one of the most significant ritual complexes in traditional culture, namely the wedding: “objective” (1), “personal” (2) and “actional” (3)\(^\text{12}\). Fragments of the narratives recorded in the village of Carașova are marked with the letter “C”, those recorded in Iabalcea with “I”.

The following fragment refers to one of the most specific and significant ritual objects of the Krashovani wedding. It used to be prepared in the groom’s house before the wedding and consisted of two main elements: lagija/ laghie\(^\text{13}\)—a round bread with a coin or a small hole in the middle, decorated

\(^{11}\) One of them reported: “There could not be many Romanians here, the priest would not have even let you marry them!”

\(^{12}\) The “objective” code relates to all objects used in the ceremony and celebration, the “personal” code consists of all characters who participate in the wedding, while the “actional” code refers to the rituals themselves. A variant of such a classification was originally proposed by N. I. Tolstoj in [Толстой 1982]. Consequently, it has been widely used by other members of the Moscow ethnolinguistic school [Гура 2012: 80–382; Узенёва 2010: 30–190]. This triad is quite helpful for researchers in their endeavour to comprehend and interpret complex cultural and linguistic phenomena related to traditional weddings but, obviously, it is neither visible in praxi, where all three codes are strongly interwined, nor does it exist in traditional community members’ perceptions.

\(^{13}\) Henceforth, the word used in the village of Karashevo is placed to the left of the slash and written in the BCSM Latin alphabet, and that used in Iabalcea to the right of the slash, written in the Romanian Latin alphabet.
with money and flowers. The bridesman (dever/dever) wore it on the shoulder with the help of a sash, which held a flask with rakija (čutura/sutură) on the other end [Radan Uscațu 2014: 71, 111].

(1) C. Se popravi večem od srede, šiju lagiju, to se kaže lagija, šta stave u čuturu, sveće, se pravi kolač tej od srede. U četvrtak, opet je sva famila kod devojke [...], poprave rizance, ja znam, čupaju živinu, kolače [...]. Perișore, sarmale ši pražitur.

I. Đeverii aveau śutura și colac. Acuma nu se fac niș colaș. A lu băiat avea sutură și colacu-n spače, car’ e-o joca pră mlada tot erau, or nașu, or starisfatu [...] cu colacu-n spače. They start cooking on Wednesday evening, they are make lagija, it is called lagija, which they put in čutura\(^{14}\), candles, this pie is being made from Wednesday. On Thursday again the whole family gathers at the girl’s house [...], they make noodles, I don’t know, they pluck chicken, [they make] pies [...]... Meat balls, cabbage rolls and cakes.

As can be seen in both fragments given below, in the Krashovani wedding tradition, a special role was played by bridesmen (đeverlje/deverii), who were the bride’s brothers or her other male relatives. They were considered to be her helpers and guardians. The young couple’s parents played a more minor role, being less important participants in the wedding ceremony than the ranks listed above. This fact was reflected in the order in which they followed the bride and groom in the first dance: Pa prvo igra mladoženja, pa posi mlada [...]. Posle kum, starisvat i deveri i posi mama i nena mladini.— ‘Firstly, the groom dances, then the bride [...]. Then godfather, groom’s man and bridesmen, then the bride’s mother and father’.

(2) I. Doi deveri cu sutură cu rachie păзаșe pră cineră să nu o fur’e. [...] Și cân se-mbracă dimineața cân se scoală, să se-mbракe nora [...], deverii vin ș-o fură, fură păpucu, fură șeva, și atunș trebuie să de banii să cumper’e aia, nu poaće cinera să se-mbrășe

Bridesmen used to have čutra and a wedding bread. They don’t even make wedding bread now. The guy wore čutura and wedding bread on his back, as those who danced with the bride, whether it was a godfather or a groom’s man [...], they also had wedding bread on their backs.

C. Mlada nikako ne sedela mlado že njom, samo deverlje su imali brigu za mladu.

The bride could not sit next to the groom at all, only the bridesmen looked after the bride.

---

\(^{14}\) Čutura/ciutură—a flask decorated in a special way on the occasion of a wedding.
Carnival elements in the Krashovani traditions reveal an important link between the Krashovani and the Romanian Banat cultures, in which carnival plays a significant role (see [Хедешан, Голант 2007, with references]).

(3) I. Moșu se fac la nuntă, marți, se fac moș, om, miuire, s-au mascat, iau țoal’e neobișnuicie pre ei, și vin și ei joacă [...]. Aia-s moși.

C. Mlade koje idu snaje su vreštale, [...] da ju malko razveseli.

Moși is made at the wedding, on Tuesday, men, women dress up, they put on masks, they wore unusual clothes and also went dancing [...]. This is moși.

Brides who went to live at the boy’s house, wept [...] [and the guests dressed up] to cheer her up a little bit.

The following fragment demonstrates the mutual translatability of local culture codes in both villages. It is excerpted from an interview recorded in Carașova with an old woman who had been born and spent her childhood in Iabalcea, until she moved out to Carașova, marrying a local man. Here she describes customs in her home village of Iabalcea. Speaking about wedding songs, she gives an example of one in Romanian, but she is aware of the fact that there is also a Slavic equivalent, which was also sung in the village, but less often. The lyrics in the two languages start with very similar formulas (see examples (a) from Carașova and (b) from Iabalcea below):

(a) Uzmi, mlado, stražni dan...
    take-IMP.2s bride.VOC last day
    ‘Take, bride, the last day…’

(b) Ie-ți, măreasă, ziuă bună...
    take-IMP.2s REFL bride day good
    ‘Say goodbye, bride…’

I./C. Atunci cântau. Și care a fost, aștia, de la nuntași, a știut să cânte, iar o cântat.

Then they were singing a song. And those who were among the wedding participants, they sang, everybody could sing and everybody sang.

[D. K.: Ce cântau?]
[Cântau de mireasă, cum plecă?]

[D. K.: What did they sing?]
[They sang about the bride, about her leaving [her parents’ house]:

15 Mošuli/moși, mascați are names for disguised men and women, which also refers to the dressing-up game (carnival) itself in Karashevo. As we can see, elements of the carnival were present in a traditional wedding in the microregion.

16 A-și lua ziuă bună = to separate from somebody, saying goodbye [DEX 2009].
“Ie-ți, măreasă, ziuă bună
De la tată, de la mumă,
De la frați, de la surori,
De la grădina cu flori, și de vecini, tot!”

“Așa cântau și aia cântau. Dar pe sârbește
or cântat: „Uzmi, mlado, stražni dan...”. Și
apoți nu mai țin mincă cum o fost [...]. Dar
pe românește asta cântau.

[...] și cântau pe românește în Iabalcea?

Da, da, mai mult pe românește, și pră
 cărșoveneste, numa mai mult.

Thus, using just a few examples, I have tried to demonstrate the possibility of a
comparative analysis of Krashovani Slavic and Romanian cultural lexis as one
cultural, but two different linguistic codes.

5. Krashovani kinship system and terminology

In this section, I will make an attempt to analyse the Krashovani kinship ter-
mminology from Carașova and Iabalcea, considering some known facts about
the language history of this population and their neighbours.

I. Consanguineous relationship

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Carașova</th>
<th>Etymology/motivation</th>
<th>Iabalcea</th>
<th>Etymology/motivation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1. roditelji, 
staresina | Proto-Slav. and Old Slav. rodъ [ERHSJ, 3: 151–153]; Proto-Slav. and Old Slav. starъ [ERHSJ, 3: 328] | părinți, 
neamuri | Lat. parentem |
|            | child speech word, see Proto-Slav. *mama [ERHSJ, 2: 365; ЭССЯ, 17: 183–185] | mama | child speech word, see Lat. mamma |
| 3. nena | child speech word, see Proto-Slav. *nana/ n’an’a [ЭССЯ, 24: 166] | tată | child speech word, see Lat. tata |

All the pairs of terms are consecutively numbered throughout this text. The number
given to a pair in this section will also be attributed to the same pair later in the paper.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Carașova</th>
<th>Etymology/motivation</th>
<th>Iabalcea</th>
<th>Etymology/motivation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>țetă</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>bătrănă majka, but also all-Rom. Slavism [DER 2001]; Lat. veteranus [DEX 2009]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Carașova

17. *ujka

Proto-Slav. *ujь [ERHSJ, 3: 540]


18. *tetka

Proto-Slav. *tetьka [ERHSJ, 3: 446–447]

Krash. Slav. tetcă

19. *striča

Proto-Slav. *stryjь [ERHSJ, 3: 344]

Krash. Slav. stricea

20. *tetka

Proto-Slav. *tetьka [ERHSJ, 3: 446–447]

Krash. Slav. tetcă

21. *unuk

Proto-Slav. *vъnukь [ERHSJ, 3: 545]

Lat. nepotem [DER 2001]

22. *unuka

Proto-Slav. *vъnukь [ERHSJ, 3: 545]

Lat. nepoată [DER 2001]

23. *prvi varul

Proto-Slav. *pъrvь [ЭССЯ, 5: 132]; Rom. văr ‘first male cousin’

Lat. verus [DER 2001]; Lat. *antaneus: local derivate

24. *prva verišora

Proto-Slav. *pъrvь [ERHSJ, 3: 61]; Rom. verișoară ‘first female cousin’

Lat. verus [DER 2001]

25. *drugi varul

Proto-Slav. *drugь [ЭССЯ, 5: 132]; Rom. văr ‘first male cousin’

Lat. verus [DER 2001]; Lat. *dui [DER 2001]

26. *druga verišora

Proto-Slav. *drugь [ЭССЯ, 5: 132]; Rom. verișoară ‘first female cousin’

Lat. verus [DER 2001]; Lat. *dui [DER 2001]

Considering the names of consanguineous relatives, there is clearly a significant simplification of the extensive Slavic kinship system. Thus, in the Krashovani varieties, the terms referring to cousins and second cousins in the line of mother and father do not differ, whereas the words 14., 21. unuk and 15., 22. unuka name both “grandson/granddaughter” and “nephew/niece” (see [МДАБЯ 2006: 123, 127, 129]). Patrilinear and matrilinear kinship is expressed by the same lexical means, which is typical for Slavic dialects that are in contact with non-Slavic languages [Morozova 2019]). However, in the Krashovani kinship system in both villages, the opposition “paternal uncle ~ maternal uncle” is preserved. The words 12. čukund ẹda, 13. čukunmajka usually refer to the fourth-generation ancestors [Белетић 1994: 200], but in the Krashovani varieties they mean “great-grandfather, great-grandmother” (i.e. third-generation relatives).
II. Affinal relationship

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Carașova</th>
<th>Etymology/motivation</th>
<th>Iabalcea</th>
<th>Etymology/motivation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>27. muž</td>
<td>Proto-Slav. *mọžь</td>
<td>bărbatu</td>
<td>Lat. barbatus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28. žena</td>
<td>Proto-Slav. and Old Slav. žena</td>
<td>muier’e</td>
<td>Lat. mulier</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29. prijetelji</td>
<td>Proto-Slav. and Old Slav. prijati</td>
<td>cuscri</td>
<td>Lat. consoc(e)rum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30. pretelice</td>
<td>Proto-Slav. and Old Slav. prijati</td>
<td>cuscre</td>
<td>Lat. consoc(e)rum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32. tetak</td>
<td>Proto-Slav. *tetъka</td>
<td>mătušoniu</td>
<td>calque from BCSM tetak</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33. strina</td>
<td>Proto-Slav. *stryjь</td>
<td>strina</td>
<td>Krash. Slav. strina</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34. tetak</td>
<td>Proto-Slav. *tetъka</td>
<td>mătušoniu</td>
<td>calque from BCSM tetak</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35. tast</td>
<td>Proto-Slav. and Old Slav. testь</td>
<td>socru</td>
<td>Lat. socrus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36. tašta</td>
<td>Proto-Slav. and Old Slav. testь</td>
<td>soacră</td>
<td>Lat. socrus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37. svekar</td>
<td>Proto-Slav. and Old Slav. *svekро</td>
<td>socru</td>
<td>Lat. socrus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38. svekrva</td>
<td>Proto-Slav. and Old Slav. *svekро</td>
<td>(mamă-)</td>
<td>child speech word, see Lat. mamma</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39. zet</td>
<td>Proto-Slav. and Old Slav. zętь</td>
<td>ginere</td>
<td>Lat. gener</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40. snaja</td>
<td>Proto-Slav. and Old Slav. *snъxa</td>
<td>noră</td>
<td>Lat. nurus</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

[ERHSJ, 2: 492−493]
[ERHSJ, 3: 677]
[ERHSJ, 3: 40−41]
[ERHSJ, 3: 40−41]
[ERHSJ, 3: 540]
[ERHSJ, 3: 446−447]
[ERHSJ, 3: 344]
[ERHSJ, 3: 446−447]
[ERHSJ, 3: 445−446]
[ERHSJ, 3: 445−446]
[ERHSJ, 3: 370]
[ERHSJ, 3: 370]
[ERHSJ, 3: 651−652]
[ERHSJ, 3: 297]
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Carașova

41. šurnjak, bajco
‘brother-in-law (wife’s brother)’

Iabalcea

cumnat, bajtο
Lat. cognatus [DER 2001]; Krash. Slav. bajco

42. jetrva, cejko
‘sister-in-law (brother in law’s wife)’

cumnată, teico
Lat. cognatus [DER 2001]; Krash. Slav. cejko

Among the peculiarities of the affinal relationship, it is worth noting the almost complete rejection of special terms denoting siblings (and their spouses) of both husband and wife. The words 41. šurnjak and 42. jetrva are considered to be archaic; they and other lexemes in this category (zaova, zaovac, svastika, svak etc.) used in BCSM dialects [МДАБЯ 2006: 176, 182, 192]) are replaced by vocatives masc. bajco and fem. cejko, in the case where the addressee is older than the speaker; otherwise personal names are used. In Iabalcea, the affinal relationship system is even more simplified; according to the East-Romance model, for the notion of “father-in-law” from both sides (husband’s and wife’s), the same lexemes are used, just as in the case of all their siblings (and the siblings’ spouses) 41. cumnat, 42. cumnată. The vocatives (masc. bajtο and fem. teico) are also used in this village.

III. Conventional (spiritual) relationship and social/marital status

Carașova

43. kum
‘godfather’

Iabalcea

nușu
Lat. nun [DLRLC 1955–1957]

44. kuma
‘godmother’

nașă
Lat. nun [DLRLC 1955–1957]

45. baba
‘midwife’
Proto-Slav. and Old Slav. baba [ERHSJ, 1: 82–83]

băbă, moașă
Krash. Slav. baba, but also all-Rom. Slavism [DER 2001]; unknown etym.

46. očul
‘stepfather’
Proto-Slav. and Old Slav. otco [ERHSJ, 2: 576–577]

tată vitrik, mășcioni
Lat. vitricus [DEX 2009]; local word unknown etym., poss., from Slav. stem mati-

47. mat’eja
‘stepmother’
Proto-Slav. *matjexa (cf. BCSM mačeha) [ERHSJ, 2: 346]

mama
Lat. vitricus [DEX 2009]; local lexeme (unknown etym.), poss., from Slav. stem mati-
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Carșova</th>
<th>Etymology/motivation</th>
<th>Iabalcea</th>
<th>Etymology/motivation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>posinkinja</td>
<td><em>stepdaughter</em></td>
<td>Proto-Slav. and Old Slav. synv</td>
<td>fată înfiată Lat. feta [DEX 2009]; Lat. filius [DEX 2009]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50. braća od mleka</td>
<td><em>milk brothers</em></td>
<td>Proto-Slav. and Old Slav. bratr</td>
<td>frače dă lapće Lat. frater [DER 2001]; Lat. lactem [DER 2001]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51. feljen</td>
<td>‘godson’</td>
<td>Lat. filianus</td>
<td>fin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>feljena</td>
<td>‘goddaughter’</td>
<td>Lat. filianus</td>
<td>fină Lat. filianus [DEX 2009]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52. rot</td>
<td>‘kin’</td>
<td>Proto-Slav. and Old Slav. rod</td>
<td>ńeam Hung. nem, related to Slav. němŭ ‘barbarian’ [DER 2001]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sirak</td>
<td>‘orphan’</td>
<td>Proto-Slav. and Old Slav. sirŭ</td>
<td>orfanLat. *orphanus or M. Gr. ὀρφανοτροφεῖον [DER 2001]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>velika deška</td>
<td>‘old maid’</td>
<td>Proto-Slav. and Old Slav. velik</td>
<td>fată mare Lat. feta [DEX 2009]; Lat. marem [DEX 2009]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>veliki sofli</td>
<td>‘bachelor’</td>
<td>Proto-Slav. and Old Slav. velik</td>
<td>June Lat. juvenis [DER 2001]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The terms listed above are not necessarily kinship terms in a narrow sense; however, they do characterise social/marital/familial ties among the Krashovani speakers of Slavic and Romanian varieties. Certain elements of this category cannot be traced in terms of Slavic influence on Romanian systems or vice-versa, as, for instance, those referring to the institution of midwives (45. baba/babă, moașă) or godparents (43. kum/nașu, 44. kuma/nașă) were characteristic for both Romanian and South Slavic cultures [СД 1995: 124−125; ALR I 1942: h. 212]. Other notions are easier to match with one of these cultures, e.g. milk brothers, as it is traditionally associated with Slavic (but also Islamic) cultures, although in the Slavic Krashovani variety the functions of the preposition od are extended under the influence of the Romanian syntax in 50. braća od mleka/fraće dă lapće. Generally, this category is rich in calques, but those will be discussed in more detail in section 7.

6. Kinship terminology: etymologies


As expected, there are some borrowings from the Romanian language: 23. (prvi) varul < Rom. văr ‘cousin’ + definite postpositive article -ul, 24. (prva) verišora < Rom. verișoră + definite postpositive article -a [DEX 2009]—in this case, as well as in 25. drugi varul and 26. druga verišora, we are dealing with simultaneous borrowing and calquing18 of language material. The case of

18 More precise terms for this processes are matter borrowing, or transfer of lexical material, and pattern borrowing, or imposition [Haspelmath 2009; Coetsem 1988; Morozova 2019].
51. *feljen*, 52. *feljena* < Lat. *filianus* (cf. standard Romanian *fin* ‘godson’) [DEX 2009] is important for the discourse about Romano-Slavic contact in Karashevo, as these lexemes clearly demonstrate how old this contact is. M. Radan refers to this borrowing as “another proof of the fact that Krashovani have been living in Banat since time immemorial” [Radan 2006: 71]. Apparently, 57. *fofli* ascends to Rom. reg. *foflea* ‘layabout’ [MDA2 2010]. 54. *Dete u kiki*, 50. *braća od mlęka*, 56. *velika defka* are calqued from corresponding Romanian expressions, although 54. *dете u kiki* (inner form “child in hair”) seems to be a local Krashovani derivate (cf. standard Romanian *copil din flori*, inner form “child from flowers” [DEX 2009]).

It is worth noting that the Turkism *čukun* - в 12. *čukundeda*, 13. *čukunmajka* [HJP 2006−2018], which is characteristic of Balkan Slavic, can be found only in the Krashovani Slavic dialect (and is absent in the dialect of Iabalcea).

The words 8. *bajca* and 9. *cejka* can be attributed to the Bulgarian dialect area. According to the “Dictionary of Bulgarian Kinship Terms”, the first one may be of Turkish origin [БСРЛ 2012: 46−48], and the second one is a child speech word [БСРЛ 2012: 685].


Words of unknown etymology are another relatively large group: 4., 48., 54. *copil* is a lexeme of unknown origin, supposedly autochthonous (cf. Alb. *moshë*, *kopil*) [DER 2001; Kostallari 1980: 867], as well as 12. *moșu*, 45. *moașă* (cf. Alb. *moshë* [DER 2001]). The word 32. and 34. *mătușoniu* is also used by Romanians from the neighbouring microregion Almaj (Rom. Valea Almăju-lui); I assume it is a calque formed using the Slavic pattern *tetak < tetka = mătușoniu < mătușă*19. This lexeme is not a unique example of correspondences between the microregions of Karashevo and Almaj. For instance, the word 11. *maică* in the Almaj variety of the Romanian Banat dialect, as well as in the Krashovani dialects, is used in the meaning of “grandmother” [ЭССЯ,

---

19 The word *mătușoniu* can be found in the 20th century regional prose, e.g. the novel “White letter” (Rom. “Litera albă”) by Viorel Marineasa, see a review on it: [Urian 2014].
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17: 135–136], and 13. maică bătrână means “great grandmother”, both in the Almăj village of Bozovici and in Iabalcea [Радан Ускату 2016; Vulpe 1986: 130; Конёр 2020]. 46. Măscioni and 47. mășcioan ̓e also seem to be local derivatives (as we do not find them elsewhere), which could ascend to the Slavic stem mati-, although their precise etymology is unclear. The case of 23. vărų-ntâi is quite similar, as it is a local term created using the “Romanian means” (i.e. the stem exists in Romanian, but the word itself does not).

In the Iabalcea code, we can observe multiple direct inserts from the Krashovani Slavic dialect: 20 8. baiță, 9. țeică, țeță, 10. dedă, 11. maică, 17. uică, 31. uină, 19. stricea, 33. strina, 18., 20. tetcă. However, it is not uncommon for the Krashovani Slavic correspondences to be used along with the Romanian words in the dialect of Iabalcea. Among kinship terms there is only one such case (7. soră and sestra), but there are more if we take a look at the wedding rank terminology: local people use both (s)tărisfat and nașu mic ‘groom’s man’, (s)tărisfaja and nașă mică ‘groom’s man’s wife’, mlada and mireasă ‘bride’. I suppose that alternating Krashovani Slavic and Romanian words is generally peculiar to the inhabitants of Iabalcea, as they (especially elder people) tend to insert Krashovani Slavic words freely while speaking the local Romanian dialect.

To summarise this section, the following issues are noteworthy:

1) on the denotatum level, the kinship systems in both villages are identical;

2) on the significatum level, the Krashovani Slavic code (village of Carașova) is an archaic South Slavic code with a few Turkish and Romanian borrowings, while the Krashovani Romanian code (village of Iabalcea), being mainly of Eastern Romance origin, contains multiple southern Slavic (Krashovani) elements, integrated and adapted in local people’s speech, as well as some words of unknown etymology;

3) there is a special link between the two codes mentioned above, conditioned by the unity of spiritual cultures in both villages, which manifests itself regardless of the use of different languages by Slavic-speaking and Romanian-speaking Krashovani.

In the following section, I will try to analyze this link in greater depth.

---

20 According to “A Linguistic Atlas of the Romanian language” and “A Dictionary of the Banat dialect”, in other Romanian Banat dialects, the following South Slavic kinship terms are used: brată (in the meaning of “elder half-brother”) [ALR I 1942: h. 161; DSB 1988: 108], diedă [ALR I 1942: h. 169], divâr [ALR I 1942: h. 161], secă [ALR I 1942: 203], strină [ALR I 1942: h. 203], tetac [ALR I 1942: h. 166], tetă [ALR I 1942: h. 167], uică [ALR I 1942: h. 165], uină [ALR I 1942: h. 168]. Slavic terminology of kinship is especially noticeable in the dialect of the village of Checea, located on the border with Serbia, where both Serbian and Croatian national minorities live.
Once the kinship term etymologies from both villages were established, it became possible to reconstruct the direction and mechanism of borrowing. This reconstruction needs explanation. When talking about direction of borrowing, we generally consider two main clusters of processes: a) archaic mutual influence which resulted in South Slavisms in Romanian, which are especially visible in the Banat dialect; b) old and new local borrowings which have been taking place between the Krashovani dialects of South Slavic (Carașova and five other villages) and Eastern Romance origin (the dialect of Iabalcea).

As for the mechanisms of borrowing, three principal strategies were identified: (a) borrowing (matter borrowing);\(^{21}\) (b) calquing (pattern borrowing);\(^{22}\) (c) so-called equivalent translation\(^{23}\), which, as far as I know, has not previously been discussed as a separate category in lexicological and language contact studies. The idea is that an equivalent translation strategy links those lexical units that were not affected by any of the two main contact-related processes—borrowing (a) or calquing (b)—under conditions of intimate (or even symbiotic) language contact and closeness of the contacting communities’ cultures. The following list shows cases of borrowing.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Carașova</th>
<th>Mechanism &amp; direction</th>
<th>Iabalcea</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2. mama</td>
<td>←↓→</td>
<td>mama(^{24})</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. bajca</td>
<td>←↓→</td>
<td>baiță(^{25})</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. cejka</td>
<td>→</td>
<td>țeică, țeță</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. deda</td>
<td>→</td>
<td>deda</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. majka</td>
<td>→</td>
<td>maică</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. ujka</td>
<td>→</td>
<td>uică</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. tetka</td>
<td>→</td>
<td>tetcă</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. striča</td>
<td>→</td>
<td>stricea</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. tetka</td>
<td>→</td>
<td>tetcă</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^{21}\) These cases are marked with the symbols \(\longleftrightarrow\) (Slavic to Romanian), \(\longleftrightarrow\) (Romanian to Slavic), or \(\downarrow\) for external borrowings (e.g. Turkisms).

\(^{22}\) Semantic calques are marked with \(\leftrightarrow\), \(\leftarrow\rightarrow\), \(\leftarrow\rightarrow\): loan translations with \(\leftarrow\rightarrow\), \(\leftarrow\rightarrow\): phraseological and syntactical calques with \(\leftarrow\rightarrow\), \(\leftarrow\rightarrow\) and loan blends, or partial calques, \(\leftarrow\rightarrow\), \(\leftarrow\rightarrow\).

\(^{23}\) This symbol \(\leftarrow\rightarrow\) marks a pair in which the designated notion is a common concept or it is equally present in the culture of Banat Romanians and South Slavs.

\(^{24}\) This lexeme is an Indo-European one with the widest distribution area; hence, this pair can only be marked as “mutual borrowing” conventionally.

\(^{25}\) The first set of symbols (marked with the subindex 1) is applicable if the word is of Turkish origin; the second one (marked with the subindex 2) if it ascends to Proto-Slav. \(*batę\), which is phonetically doubtful.
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As can be observed, most of the borrowing went from Slavic to Romanian; in particular, together with the Slavic sibling system, many respective terms are borrowed with minimal phonetical adaptation (17. ujka/uică, 18. tetka/tetcă, 19. striča/stricea etc.). The exception here is 51. feljen/fin and 52. feljena/fină, but I suppose it is not accidental that these terms belong to the social (or spiritual) kinship category. 8. Bajca/baiță and 9. cejka/teică, teță represent an interesting case of compromise between two kinship and terminological systems.

The fragments of the Krashovani kinship system affected by calquing are given below:

26 Bajco and cejko are terms which could be considered as “intermediary” between the two analysed kinship vocabularies.
or very similar to each other. The same models, or patterns, are used, while the language material itself comes from different languages.

Finally, the following pairs reflect a specific process of equivalent translation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Carașova</th>
<th>Mechanism &amp; direction</th>
<th>Iabalcea</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. roditelji, stareșina</td>
<td>⇐⇒</td>
<td>părinți, ńeamuri</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. nena</td>
<td>⇐⇒</td>
<td>tată</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. děte</td>
<td>⇐⇒</td>
<td>copilu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. defka</td>
<td>⇐⇒</td>
<td>fată</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. brat</td>
<td>⇐⇒</td>
<td>fraće</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. sestra</td>
<td>⇐⇒</td>
<td>soră</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. unuk</td>
<td>⇐⇒</td>
<td>nepot</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. unuka</td>
<td>⇐⇒</td>
<td>nepoată</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. blizanci</td>
<td>⇐⇒</td>
<td>gemeni</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29. prijetelji</td>
<td>⇐⇒</td>
<td>cuscri</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30. pretelice</td>
<td>⇐⇒</td>
<td>cuscre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27. muž</td>
<td>⇐⇒</td>
<td>bărbatu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28. žena</td>
<td>⇐⇒</td>
<td>muiere'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35. tast</td>
<td>⇐⇒</td>
<td>socru</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36. tašta</td>
<td>⇐⇒</td>
<td>soacră</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37. svekar</td>
<td>⇐⇒</td>
<td>socru</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38. svekrva</td>
<td>⇐⇒</td>
<td>soacră</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39. zet</td>
<td>⇐⇒</td>
<td>ginere</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40. snaja</td>
<td>⇐⇒</td>
<td>noră</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43. kum</td>
<td>⇐⇒</td>
<td>nașu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44. kuma</td>
<td>⇐⇒</td>
<td>nașă</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46. očul</td>
<td>⇐⇒</td>
<td>tata vitrik, mășcioni</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47. mat'eja</td>
<td>⇐⇒</td>
<td>mama vitrigă, mășcioan'ė</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48. posinak</td>
<td>⇐⇒</td>
<td>copil înfiat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49. posinkinja</td>
<td>⇐⇒</td>
<td>fată înfiată</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53. rot</td>
<td>⇐⇒</td>
<td>ńeam</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55. sirak</td>
<td>⇐⇒</td>
<td>orfan, orfană</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57. veliki fošti</td>
<td>⇐⇒</td>
<td>june</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As mentioned in the monograph “Foundation of linguocultural anthropogeography of the Balkan Peninsula” ("Основы лингвокультурной антропогеографии Балканского полуострова"), Balkan linguistic researchers have had, among other tasks, the specific one of solving “the problem of interlingual identification of linguistic units and their functions in language contact (with distinction of the behaviour of speakers and the point of view of linguists
studying language facts)” [Соболев 2013: 61]. The discovery of equivalent translation between non-isomorphic structures could be an important step forward in solving this problem.

The mechanisms and directions of borrowing analysed above provide us with the following results.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Slav. to Rom.</th>
<th>Rom. to Slav.</th>
<th>mutual</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Borrowing</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calquing</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Equivalent translation”</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The presence of all three main mechanisms in the lexical-semantic group of kinship terms (with the prevailing role of equivalent translation) proves the intensity of the language contact in the microregion, which also took place in the most intimate form, i.e. marriages between speakers of different languages, which evidently used to happen in the past, despite the alleged strict endogamy.

8. Conclusion

In one of her recent talks, F. Lüpke noticed that “multilingualism is maintained as long as different named languages fulfil social indexical functions and communicate function in a particular language ecology” [Lüpke 2019]. Along with the global processes of disintegration of traditional communities, nuclearisation of families, growing levels of labour migration flow and moving to big cities, dialect terminology related to the kinship system is gradually disappearing. In this situation, it is extremely important to gather field data, working with elder generations of local people, to yield “finer-grained” linguistic data that could give us some useful insights in building a typology of contact situations, and in linking the conditions and outcomes of the contact.

The study of kinship terms functioning in the conditions of a symbiotic society with shared cultural practice but two different languages as L1 showed us that the same rite (or action, or object, or kinship system element) can be reflected in speech with the use of two coding systems. The equivalent translation mechanism makes the vocabulary of the spiritual culture of bilingual (but monocultural) communities more flexible and fluid, not only in comparison with the monolingual environment, but also in comparison with bilinguals of other, less-close types of contact settings. I suppose the reason for this is that, in order to borrow language material, members of such communities did not have to turn to a “foreign” language, since they could freely use “their own” material. Thus, we are dealing not only with an intra-linguistic motivation for interference, but also with complex psycho-social mechanisms implying
(self-)representation in society, constructing (and “wearing”) identities, and the evolution of the notion of kin through many centuries.

Unfortunately, we as linguists lack reliable sources from the past and, thus, do not always have the tools to prove or disprove the hypotheses concerning the undocumented facts of a community’s language history. However, tracing down the mechanisms and patterns of changes at different levels of language, we can get closer to understanding the specifics of contact: its duration, its direction and its (a)symmetry, and—by adding available historical, anthropological and, maybe, quantitative linguistic data—possibly get a clue about the social conditions of a given interaction of languages.
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