Patterns and Mechanisms of Lexical Changes in the Languages of Symbiotic Communities: Kinship Terminology in Karashevo (Banat, Romania)

Паттерны и механизмы лексических изменений в языках симбиотических сообществ: термины родства в Карашево (Банат, Румыния)

Daria V. Konior

The Institute for Linguistic Studies
of the Russian Academy of Sciences
St. Petersburg, Russia

Дарья Владимировна Конёр

Институт лингвистических исследований
Российской академии наук
С.-Петербург, Россия

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.

Keywords

kinship terms, Romano-Slavic language contact, Karashevo, Banat, borrowing mechanisms, symbiotic communities, Balkan dialectology, Balkan lexicology

Резюме

Статья посвящена этнолингвистической ситуации в зоне древнего языкового и культурного контакта южнославянского и восточнороманского населения — микрорегионе Карашево в Банате, Румыния. Впервые лексико-семантические группы терминов родства в карашевских диалектах славяноязычного с. Карашево и румыноязычного с. Ябалча анализируются в сравнительной перспективе как два различных языковых кода, которые «обслуживают» единую локальную кульуру. Основная цель исследования — выяснить, какие паттерны и механизмы заимствования могут связывать лексические (под)системы духовной культуры в условиях тесного языкового контакта в симбиотических сообществах. Сообщается, что в таких ситуациях релевантно выделение эквивалентного перевода в качестве особой стратегии взаимодействия языковых кодов. Терминология родства в языках тесно контактирующих сообществ в большинстве случаев может помочь лингвистам проследить социо-исторические условия и последствия языкового контакта (например, брачные стратегии), однако чисто лингвистические методы обладают некоторыми ограничениями в случае плохо задокументированных идиомов. Эти ограничения могут быть преодолены с помощью привлечения большего количества данных из «изоконтактирующих» сообществ, а также, возможно, с помощью методик количественного анализа.

Ключевые слова

терминология родства, романо-славянский языковой контакт, Карашево, Банат, механизмы заимствования, симбиотические сообщества, балканская диалектология, балканская лексикология

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].

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[4] 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[5]. 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[6]. 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[7] in the microregion, I gathered words and word combinations related to the kinship system in the Slavic-speaking village of Carașova. To

---

[5] Studies on the system and terminology of kinship in various societies and languages are discussed in the issue-related journal "Алгебра родства" ("Algebra of kinship") [Попов 1995–2014]; for instance, see A. Zhugra's article on the Albanian kinship system published there [Жугра 1998]. The Slavic kinship system was described by O. N. Trubachev in his book "История славянских терминов родства и некоторых древнейших терминов общественного строя" ("History of the Slavic kinship terminology and of some of the oldest social system terms") [Трубачев 1959], whereas the Romanian one was explored by the linguist V. Scurtu; see his monograph "Termenii de înrudire în limba română" ("Kinship terminology in Romanian") [Scurtu 1996]. For respective lexis in some of the Balkan dialects, see [МДАБЯ 2006]. Other important works on this topic (in general, typological, and case-oriented perspectives) include [Szemerényi 1977; Tukey 1962; Needham 2013; Nikolayeva 2014].

[6] A good example of this phenomenon in the Balkans is the Pomak idiom. Pomaks, being Slavic people in origin, borrowed certain terms of close kinship and numerals from the Turkish language. The reason for this could be the fact that they consider Turkish as a marker of their Muslim identity [Friedman, Joseph 2017: 72].

[7] I conducted four field trips in the villages of Carașova and Iabalcea in 2014–2017. I would like to thank Prof. Dr. M. Radan and Prof. Dr. A. N. Sobolev for the organisational help.

achieve this, I used principally a standard BCSM lexeme which was normally intellegible to local people[8]. After Slavic lexemes from Caraşova 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 Caraşova 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 Caraşova 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 km²), Serbia (one-third, or 9,276 km²), and Hungary, which now incorporates a small fragment of less than 300 km² 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 Croaţilor din România" ("The Association of Romanian Croats") [Конёр 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 communities[10].

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. ъъъ

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*, *Ghițoi*, *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)[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)[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*[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 (*dẹver/đever*) wore it on the shoulder with the help of a sash, which held a flask with rakija (*čutura/śutură*) on the other end [Radan Uscatu 2014: 71, 111].

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

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.

I. Đeverii aveau śutură şi colac. Acuma nu se fac niś colaś. A lu băiat avea śutură şi colacu-n spaće, car'e-o joca pră mlada tot erau, or naşu, or starisfatu [...] cu colacu-n spaće.

Bridesmen used to have čutura 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.

As can be seen in both fragments given below, in the Krashovani wedding tradition, a special role was played by bridesmen (*dẹverlje/đeverii*), 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 đeveri cu śutura cu rachie păzaśe pră cineră să nu o fur'e. [...] Şi cân se-mbracă đimineaţa cân se scoală, să se-mbrăce nora [...], đeverii vin ş-o fură, fură păpucu, fură śeva, şi atunś trebuie să đɛ banii să cumper'e aia, nu poaće cinera să se-mbraśe

Two bridesmen with a flask of rakija guarded the bride, so she wouldn't be stolen. [...] And when she dresses up in the morning, when she gets up to dress up, the bride [...], the bridesmen come to steal her, they steal shoes, steal something, and in that moment you have to give them money, to buy her out, as she cannot get dressed.

C. Mlada nikako ne sedela mladoženjom, 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, muiere, s-au mascat, iau țoal'e neobișnuíce pre ei, și vin și ei joacă [...]. Aia-s moși.

Moși[15] 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*.

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

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,   ziua   bună...
       take-IMP.2s   REFL   bride   day   good
       'Say goodbye, bride...' [16]

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 pleacă:

[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 ziua bună = to separate from somebody, saying goodbye [DEX 2009].

"Ie-ți, măreasă, ziua bună De la tată, de la mumă, De la frați, de la surori, De la grădina cu flori, și de vecini, tot!"	"Say goodbye, bride, To your mum and dad, To your brothers and sisters, To the blooming garden, to your neighbours, to everybody!"
Așa cântau și aia cântau. Dar pe sârbeșțe or cântat: „Uzmi, mlado, stražni dan...". Și apoi nu mai țin mínce cum o fost [...]. Dar pe românéșće asta cântau.	That's how they sang, they sang this one. And in Serbian they sang: „Take back, bride, your last day...". I don't remember how it went [...]. And in Romanian they sang that song.
[D. K.: Și cântau pe românește în Iabalcea?]	[D. K.: And in Iabalcea they sang in Romanian?]
Da, da, mai mult pe românéșće, și pră cărșoveneșțe, numa mai mult.	Yes, yes, more in Romanian, in Krashovani as well, but more [in Romanian].

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 terminology[17] from Carașova and Iabalcea, considering some known facts about the language history of this population and their neighbours.

I. Consanguineous relationship

	Carașova	Etymology/motivation	Iabalcea	Etymology/motivation
1.	***roditelji***, ***starešina*** 'parents'	Proto-Slav. and Old Slav. *rodъ* [ERHSJ, 3: 151–153]; Proto-Slav. and Old Slav. *starъ* [ERHSJ, 3: 328]	***părinți***, ***ńeamuri***	Lat. *parentem* [DER 2001]; Hung. *nem*, related to Slav. *nĕmŭ* 'barbarian' [DER 2001]
2.	***mama*** 'mother'	child speech word, see Proto-Slav. *mama [ERHSJ, 2: 365; ЭССЯ, 17: 183–185]	***mama***	child speech word, see Lat. *mamma* [DER 2001]
3.	***nena*** 'father'	child speech word, see Proto-Slav. **nana/ n'an'a* [ЭССЯ, 24: 166]	***tată***	child speech word, see Lat. *tata* [DER 2001]

---

[17] 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.

	Caraşova	Etymology/motivation	Iabalcea	Etymology/motivation
4.	*dęte* 'son'	Proto-Slav. and Old Slav. *dětъ* [ЭССЯ, 5: 12–13]	*copilu*	unknown etym., cf. Alb. *kopil* [DER 2001; Kostallari 1980: 867]
5.	*dęfka* 'daughter'	Proto-Slav. *děva*, cf. *děvica* [ЭССЯ, 5: 22–23]	*fată*	Lat. *feta* [DEX 2009]
6.	*brat* 'brother'	Proto-Slav. and Old Slav. *bratrъ* [ЭССЯ, 2: 120]	*fraće*	Lat. *frater* [DER 2001]
7.	*sestra* 'sister'	Proto-Slav. and Old Slav. *sestra* [ERHSJ, 3: 226]	*soră*	Lat. *soror* [DER 2001]
8.	*bajca* 'older brother' (also as an apellative)'	poss., Turkism [БСРЛ 2012: 46–48]	*baiță*	Krash. Slav. *bajca*
9.	*cejka* 'older sister' (also as an apellative)'	child speech word [БСРЛ 2012: 685]	*țeică*, *țeță*	Krash. Slav. *cejka*
10,	*dęda* 'grandfather'	Proto-Slav. *dědъ* [ERHSJ, 1: 388–389]	*deda*	Krash. Slav. *dęda*
11.	*majka* 'grandmother'	Proto-Slav. and Old Slav. *mati* [ERHSJ, 2: 365; ЭССЯ, 17: 135–136]	*maică*	Krash. Slav. *maică*
12.	*čukundęda* 'great grandfather'	Turk. *kökün* 'root' or Lat. *secundus* [HJP 2006–2018; ERHSJ, 3: 192]; [ERHSJ, 1: 388–389]	*deda-moşu*	Krash. Slav. *dęda*; unknown etym., cf. Alb. *moshë* [DER 2001]
13.	*čukunmajka* 'great grandmother'	Turk. *kökün* 'root' or Lat. *secundus* [HJP 2006–2018; ERHSJ, 3: 192]; Proto-Slav. and Old Slav. *mati* [ERHSJ, 2: 365; ЭССЯ, 17: 135–136]	*maică bătrână*	Krash. Slav. *majka*, but also all-Rom. Slavism [DER 2001]; Lat. *veteranus* [DEX 2009]
14.	*unuk* 'grandson'	Proto-Slav. *vъnukъ* [ERHSJ, 3: 545]	*nepot*	Lat. *nepotem* [DER 2001]
15.	*unuka* 'granddaughter'	Proto-Slav. *vъnukъ* [ERHSJ, 3: 545]	*nepoată*	Lat. *nepotem* [DER 2001]
16.	*blizanci* 'twins'	Proto-Slav. and Old Slav. *bliznьcь* [ERHSJ, 1: 173]	*gemeni*	Lat. *geminus* [DER 2001]

	Carașova	Etymology/motivation	Iabalcea	Etymology/motivation
17.	**ujka** 'maternal uncle'	Proto-Slav. *ujь [ERHSJ, 3: 540]	**uică**	Krash. Slav. *ujka*, cf. Ban. reg. *uică* [DER 2001]
18.	**tetka** 'maternal aunt'	Proto-Slav. *tetъka [ERHSJ, 3: 446–447]	**tetcă**	Krash. Slav. *tetka*
19.	**striča** 'paternal uncle'	Proto-Slav. *stryjь [ERHSJ, 3: 344]	**stricea**	Krash. Slav. *striča*
20.	**tetka** 'paternal aunt'	Proto-Slav. *tetъka [ERHSJ, 3: 446–447]	**tetcă**	Krash. Slav. *tetka*
21.	**unuk** 'nephew'	Proto-Slav. *vъnukъ [ERHSJ, 3: 545]	**nepot**	Lat. *nepotem* [DER 2001]
22.	**unuka** 'niece'	Proto-Slav. *vъnukъ [ERHSJ, 3: 545]	**nepoată**	Lat. *nepotem* [DER 2001]
23.	**prvi varul** 'first male cousin'	Proto-Slav. *pьrvъ [ERHSJ, 3: 61]; Rom. *văr* 'first male cousin'	**văru-ntâi**	Lat. *verus* [DER 2001]; Lat. *antaneus*: local derivate
24.	**prva verišora** 'first female cousin'	Proto-Slav. *pьrvъ [ERHSJ, 3: 61]; Rom. *verișoară* 'first female cousin'	**verișoară**	Lat. *verus* [DER 2001]
25.	**drugi varul** 'second male cousin'	Proto-Slav. *drugъ [ЭССЯ, 5: 132]; Rom. *văr* 'first male cousin'	**văru al doilea**	Lat. *verus* [DER 2001]; Lat. *dui* [DER 2001]
26.	**druga verišora** 'second female cousin'	Proto-Slav. *drugъ [ЭССЯ, 5: 132]; Rom. *verișoară* 'first female cousin'	**verișoară a doua**	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. *čukundęda*, 13. *čukunmajka* usually refer to the fourth-generation ancestors [Бјелетић 1994: 200], but in the Krashovani varieties they mean "great-grandfather, great-grandmother" (i.e. third-generation relatives).

II. Affinal relationship

	Caraşova	Etymology/motivation	Iabalcea	Etymology/motivation
27.	**muž** 'husband'	Proto-Slav. *mǫžь [ERHSJ, 2: 492–493]	**bărbatu**	Lat. barbatus [DEX 2009]
28.	**žena** 'wife'	Proto-Slav. and Old Slav. žena [ERHSJ, 3: 677]	**muier'e**	Lat. mulier [DER 2001]
29.	**prijetelji** 'co-fathers-in-law'	Proto-Slav. and Old Slav. prijati [ERHSJ, 3: 40–41]	**cuscri**	Lat. consoc(e)rum [DER 2001]
30.	**pretelice** 'co-mothers-in-law'	Proto-Slav. and Old Slav. prijati [ERHSJ, 3: 40–41]	**cuscre**	Lat. consoc(e)rum [DER 2001]
31.	**ujna** 'maternal uncle's wife'	Proto-Slav. *ujь [ERHSJ, 3: 540]	**uină**	Krash. Slav. ujna, cf. Ban. reg. uină [DLRLC 1955–1957]
32.	**tetak** 'paternal aunt's husband'	Proto-Slav. *tetъka [ERHSJ, 3: 446–447]	**mătuşoniu**	calque from BCSM tetak
33.	**strina** 'paternal uncle's wife'	Proto-Slav. *stryjь [ERHSJ, 3: 344]	**strina**	Krash. Slav. strina
34.	**tetak** 'maternal aunt's husband'	Proto-Slav. *tetъka [ERHSJ, 3: 446–447]	**mătuşoniu**	calque from BCSM tetak
35.	**tast** 'father-in-law (for a man)'	Proto-Slav. and Old Slav. tъstь [ERHSJ, 3: 445–446]	**socru**	Lat. socrus [DEX 2009]
36.	**tašta** 'mother-in-law (for a man)'	Proto-Slav. and Old Slav. tъstь [ERHSJ, 3: 445–446]	**soacră**	Lat. socrus [DEX 2009]
37.	**svekar** 'father-in-law (for a woman)'	Proto-Slav. and Old Slav. *svekrъ [ERHSJ, 3: 370]	**socru**	Lat. socrus [DEX 2009]
38.	**svekrva** 'mother-in-law (for a woman)'	Proto-Slav. and Old Slav. *svekrъ [ERHSJ, 3: 370]	**(mamă-) soacră**	child speech word, see Lat. mamma [DER 2001]; Lat. socrus [DEX 2009]
39.	**zet** 'son-in-law'	Proto-Slav. and Old Slav. zętь [ERHSJ, 3: 651–652]	**ginere**	Lat. gener [MDA2 2010]
40.	**snaja** 'daughter-in-law'	Proto-Slav. and Old Slav. *snъxa [ERHSJ, 3: 297]	**noră**	Lat. nurus [DER 2001]

	Caraşova	Etymology/motivation	Iabalcea	Etymology/motivation
41.	*šurnjak*, *bajco* 'brother-in-law (wife's brother)'	Proto-Slav. **šurъ* [ERHSJ, 3: 424]; Balkan Turkism [БСРЛ 2012: 46–48]	*cumnat*, *baiţo*	Lat. *cognatus* [DER 2001]; Krash. Slav. *bajco*
42.	*jetrva*, *cejko* 'sister-in-law (brother in law's wife)'	Proto-Slav. **jętry* [ERHSJ, 1: 779]; child speech word [БСРЛ 2012: 685]	*cumnată*, *ţeico*	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. *baiţo* and fem. *ţeico*) are also used in this village.

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

	Caraşova	Etymology/motivation	Iabalcea	Etymology/motivation
43.	*kum* 'godfather'	Proto-Slav. **kumъ* [ЭССЯ, 13: 100–102]	*naşu*	Lat. *nun* [DLRLC 1955–1957]
44.	*kuma* 'godmother'	Proto-Slav. **kumъ* [ЭССЯ, 13: 100–102]	*naşă*	Lat. *nun* [DLRLC 1955–1957]
45.	*baba* 'midwife'	Proto-Slav. and Old Slav. *baba* [ERHSJ, 1: 82–83]	*babă*, *moaşă*	Krash. Slav. *baba*, but also all-Rom. Slavism [DER 2001]; unknown etym.
46.	*očul* 'stepfather'	Proto-Slav. and Old Slav. *otьcь* [ERHSJ, 2: 576–577]	*tata vitrik*, *măşcioni*	Lat. *vitricus* [DEX 2009]; local word unknown etym., poss., from Slav. stem *mati-*
47.	*mat'eja* 'stepmother'	Proto-Slav. **matjexa* (cf. BCSM *maćeha*) [ERHSJ, 2: 346]	*mama vitrigă*, *măşcioan'e*	Lat. *vitricus* [DEX 2009]; local lexeme (unknown etym.), poss., from Slav. stem *mati-*

	Caraşova	Etymology/motivation	Iabalcea	Etymology/motivation
48.	**posinak** 'stepson'	Proto-Slav. and Old Slav. *synъ* [ERHSJ, 3: 237]	**copil înfiat**	unknown etym., cf. Alb. *kopil* [DER 2001; Kostallari 1980: 867]; Lat. *filius* [DEX 2009]
49.	**posinkinja** 'stepdaughter'	Proto-Slav. and Old Slav. *synъ* [ERHSJ, 3: 237]	**fată înfiată**	Lat. *feta* [DEX 2009]; Lat. *filius* [DEX 2009]
50	**braća od mlęka** 'milk brothers'	Proto-Slav. and Old Slav. *bratrъ* [ЭССЯ, 2: 120]; Proto-Slav. **melko* [ERHSJ, 2: 442–443]: calque from Rom. *fraće dă lapće*	**fraće dă lapće**	Lat. *frater* [DER 2001]; Lat. *lactem* [DER 2001]
51.	**fęljen** 'godson'	Lat. *filianus* [DEX 2009]	**fin**	Lat. *filianus* [DEX 2009]
52.	**feljena** 'goddaughter'	Lat. *filianus* [DEX 2009]	**fină**	Lat. *filianus* [DEX 2009]
53.	**rot** 'kin'	Proto-Slav. and Old Slav. *rodъ* [ERHSJ, 3: 151–153]	**ńeam**	Hung. *nem*, related to Slav. *němŭ* 'barbarian' [DER 2001]
54.	**dęte u kiki** 'illegitimate infant'	Proto-Slav. and Old Slav. *dětъ* [ЭССЯ, 5: 12–13]; Proto-Slav. and Old Slav. *kyka* [ERHSJ, 2: 79]	**copil în flori**, **copil în chică**	unknown etym., cf. Alb. *kopil* [DER 2001; Kostallari 1980: 867]; Lat. *fluores* [DER 2001]; Proto-Slav. and Old Slav. *kyka* [ERHSJ, 2: 79]
55.	**sirak** 'orphan'	Proto-Slav. and Old Slav. *sirъ* [ERHSJ, 3: 243]	**orfan**	Lat. **orphanus* or M. Gr. ὀρφανοτροφείον [DER 2001]
56.	**velika dęfka** 'old maid'	Proto-Slav. and Old Slav. *velikъ* [HJP 2006–2018]; Proto-Slav. **děva*, cf. **děvica* ЭССЯ, 5: 22–23]: calque from Rom. *fată mare*	**fată mare**	Lat. *feta* [DEX 2009]; Lat. *marem* [DEX 2009]
57.	**veliki fofli** 'bachelor'	Proto-Slav. and Old Slav. *velikъ* [HJP 2006–2018]; Rom. per. *foflea* [MDA2 2010]	**june**	Lat. *juvenis* [DER 2001]

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 mlęka/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

Most of the *Krashovani Slavic terms* ascend to the Proto-Slavic stems: 1. *roditelji*, *starešina* [ERHSJ, 3: 151–153; ERHSJ, 3: 328]; 4., 54. *dęte* [ЭССЯ, 5: 12–13]; 5., 56. *dęfka* [ЭССЯ, 5: 22–23]; 6. *brat* [ЭССЯ, 2: 120]; 7. *sestra* [ERHSJ, 3: 226]; 10. *dęda* [ERHSJ, 1: 388–389]; 11. *majka* ERHSJ, 2: 365; ЭССЯ, 17: 135–136]; 14., 21. *unuk* [ERHSJ, 3: 545]; 15., 22. *unuka* [ERHSJ, 3: 545]; 16. *blizanci*; 17. *ujka* [ERHSJ, 3: 540]; 18., 20. *tetka* [ERHSJ, 3: 446–447]; 19. *striča* [ERHSJ, 3: 344]; 23. *prvi* [ERHSJ, 3 61]; 24. *prva* [ERHSJ, 3 61]; 25. *drugi* [ЭССЯ, 5: 132]; 26. *druga* [ЭССЯ, 5: 132]; 27. *muž* [ERHSJ, 2: 492–493]; 28. *žena* [ERHSJ, 3: 677]; 29. *prijetelji* [ERHSJ, 3: 40–41]; 30. *pretelice* [ERHSJ, 3: 40–41]; 31. *ujna* [ERHSJ, 3: 540]; 32., 34. *tetak* [ERHSJ, 3: 446–447]; 33. *strina* [ERHSJ, 3: 344]; 35. *tast* [ERHSJ, 3: 445–446]; 36. *tašta* [ERHSJ, 3: 445–446]; 37. *svekar* [ERHSJ, 3: 370]; 38. *svekrva* [ERHSJ, 3: 370]; 39. *zet* [ERHSJ, 3: 651–652]; 40. *snaja* [ERHSJ, 3: 297]; 41. *šurnjak* [ERHSJ, 3: 424]; 42. *jetrva* [ERHSJ, 1: 779]; 43. *kum* [ЭССЯ, 13: 100–102]; 44. *kuma* [ЭССЯ, 13: 100–102]; 45. *baba* [ERHSJ, 1: 82–83]; 46. *očul* [ERHSJ, 2: 576–577]; 47. *mat'eja* [ERHSJ, 2: 346]; 48. *posinak* [ERHSJ, 3: 237]; 49. *posinkinja* [ERHSJ, 3: 237]; 50. *braća* [ЭССЯ, 2: 120]; 50. *mlęko* [ERHSJ, 2: 442–443]; 53. *rot* [ERHSJ, 3: 151–153]; 55. *sirak* [ERHSJ, 3: 243]; 56. *velika* [HJP 2006–2018]; 57. *veliki* [HJP 2006–2018].

As expected, there are some borrowings from the Romanian language: 23. (*prvi*) *varul* < Rom. *văr* 'cousin' + definite postpositive article -*ul*, 24. (*prva*) *verišora* < Rom. *verișoară* + 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 calquing[18] 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. *fęljen*, 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" [Радан 2006: 71]. Apparently, 57. *fofli* ascends to Rom. reg. *foflea* 'layabout' [MDA2 2010]. 54. *Dęte u kiki*, 50. *braća od mlęka*, 56. *velika dęfka* are calqued from corresponding Romanian expressions, although 54. *dęte 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. *čukundęda*, 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].

The kinship lexics from Iabalcea is a more heterogeneous code compared to the Krashovani Slavic one. Most of the words in it are of Eastern Romance origin; they often have phonetic features of the Romanian Banat dialect: 1. *părinți*, *ńeamuri* [DER 2001], 5. *fată* [DEX 2009], 6. *fraće* [DER 2001], 7. *soră* [DER 2001], 13. *bătrân* [DEX 2009], 14., 21. *nepot* [DER 2001], 15., 22. *nepoată* [DER 2001], 16. *gemeni* [DER 2001], 23. *văru-ntâi* [DER 2001], 24. *verişoară* [DER 2001], 25. *văru al doilea* [DER 2001], 26. *verişoară a doua* [DER 2001], 27. *bărbatu* [DEX 2009], 28. *muier'e* [DER 2001], 29. *cuscri* [DER 2001], 30.*cuscre* [DER 2001], 35., 37. *socru* [DEX 2009], 36., 38. *soacră* [DEX 2009], 39. *ginere* [MDA2 2010], 40. *noră* [DER 2001], 41. *cumnat* [DER 2001], 42. *cumnată* [DER 2001], 43. *naş* [DLRLC 1955–1957], 44. *naşă* [DLRLC 1955–1957], 46. *vitrik* [DEX 2009], 47. *vitrigă* [DEX 2009].

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. *moşu*, 45. *moaşă* (cf. Alb. *moshë* [DER 2001]). The word 32. and 34. *mătuşoniu* is also used by Romanians from the neighbouring microregion Almăj (Rom. *Valea Almăjului*); I assume it is a calque formed using the Slavic pattern **tet**ak < **tet**ka = **mătuş**oniu < **mătuş**ă[19]. This lexeme is not a unique example of correspondences between the microregions of Karashevo and Almăj. For instance, the word 11. *maică* in the Almăj variety of the Romanian Banat dialect, as well as in the Krashovani dialects, is used in the meaning of "grandmother" [ЭССЯ,

---

[19] The word *mătuşoniu* 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].

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. *măscioan'e* also seem to be local derivates (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. *văru-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. *deda*, 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], *đivăr* [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.

7. Kinship terminology: patterns and mechanisms of borrowing

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.

	Carașova	Mechanism & direction	Iabalcea
2.	*mama*	← ↓ →	*mama*[24]
8.	*bajca*	← ↓ →$_1$	*baiță*[25]
		→$_2$	
9.	*cejka*	→	*țeică, țeță*
10.	*dęda*	→	*deda*
11.	*majka*	→	*maică*
17.	*ujka*	→	*uică*
18.	*tetka*	→	*tetcă*
19.	*striča*	→	*stricea*
20.	*tetka*	→	*tetcă*

[21] These cases are marked with the symbols «→» (Slavic to Romanian), «←» (Romanian to Slavic), or «↓» for external borrowings (e.g. Turkisms).

[22] Semantic calques are marked with «⇐», «⇒», «⇔»; loan translations with «⊂», «⊃»; phraseological and syntactical calques with «⊆», «⊇» and loan blends, or partial calques, «⋜», «⋝».

[23] This symbol («⇐ ⇒») 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.

	Caraşova	Mechanism & direction	Iabalcea
31.	*ujna*	→	*uină*
33.	*strina*	→	*strina*
41.	(*šurnjak*), *bajco*	(⇐⇒) →	(*cumnat*), *baiţo*[26]
42.	(*jetrva*), *cejko*	(⇐⇒) →	(*cumnată*), *ţeico*
45.	*baba*	→ (⇐⇒)	*babă*, (*moaşă*)
51.	*fęljen*	←	*fin*
52.	*feljena*	←	*fină*

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. *fęljen/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/baiţă* and 9. *cejka/ţeică*, *ţeţă* 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.

	Caraşova	Mechanism & direction	Iabalcea
21.	*unuk*	⇐	*nepot*
22.	*unuka*	⇐	*nepoată*
32.	*tetak*	⊃	*mătuşoniu*
34.	*tetak*	⊃	*mătuşoniu*
50.	*braća od mlęka*	⊆	*fraće dă lapće*
54.	*dęte u kiki*	⊆	*copil în flori, copil în chică*
56.	*velika dęfka*	⊇	*fată mare*
12.	*čukundęda*	⋛	*deda-moşu*
13.	*čukunmajka*	⋛	*maică bătrână*
23.	*prvi varul*	⋚	*văru-ntâi*
24.	*prva verišora*	⋚	*verişoară*
25.	*drugi varul*	⋚	*văru al doilea*
26.	*druga verišora*	⋚	*verişoară a doua*

The fact that these are all possible kinds of calques in the Krashovani kinship terminology, and they are present in all categories of kinship, seems quite significant to me. It is, actually, another proof of the possibility of intertranslating whole parts of bilingual terminology, if the speakers' cultures are identical

---

[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.

	Carașova	Mechanism & direction	Iabalcea
1.	roditelji, starešina	⇐⇒	părinți, ńeamuri
3.	nena	⇐⇒	tată
4.	dęte	⇐⇒	copilu
5.	dęfka	⇐⇒	fată
6.	brat	⇐⇒	fraće
7.	sestra	⇐⇒	soră
14.	unuk	⇐⇒	nepot
15.	unuka	⇐⇒	nepoată
16.	blizanci	⇐⇒	gemeni
29.	prijetelji	⇐⇒	cuscri
30.	pretelice	⇐⇒	cuscre
27.	muž	⇐⇒	bărbatu
28.	žena	⇐⇒	muier'e
35.	tast	⇐⇒	socru
36.	tašta	⇐⇒	soacră
37.	svekar	⇐⇒	socru
38.	svekrva	⇐⇒	soacră
39.	zet	⇐⇒	ginere
40.	snaja	⇐⇒	noră
43.	kum	⇐⇒	nașu
44.	kuma	⇐⇒	nașă
46.	oču l	⇐⇒	tata vitrik, mășcioni
47.	mat'eja	⇐⇒	mama vitrigă, mășcioan'e
48.	posinak	⇐⇒	copil înfiat
49.	posinkinja	⇐⇒	fată înfiată
53.	rot	⇐⇒	ńeam
55.	sirak	⇐⇒	orfan, orfană
57.	veliki fofli	⇐⇒	june

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.

	Slav. to Rom.	Rom. to Slav.	mutual
Borrowing	12	2	2
Calquing	5	7	0
"Equivalent translation"	0	0	28

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.

Bibliography

Dictionaries and linguistic atlases

ALR 1 1942
Puşcariu S., coord., *Atlasul linguistic român*, 1, 2: *Familia, Naşterea, Botezul, Copilăria, Nunta şi Moartea*, Sibiu, 1942.

DER 2001
Ciorănescu A., *Dicţionarul etimologic român*, Bucureşti, 2001.

DEX 2009
Coteanu I., Seche L., Seche M., *Dicţionarul explicativ al limbii române*, ediţia a II-a revăzută şi adăugită, Bucureşti, 2009.

DLRLC 1955–1957
Marcea D., Petrovici E., Rosetti A. et. al., coord., *Dicţionarul limbii române literare contemporane în 4 vol.*, Bucureşti, 1955–1957.

DSB 1988
Şerban V., coord., *Dicţionarul subdialectului bănăţean*, 4, Bîca—Buzunar. Timişoara, 1988.

ERHSJ, 1
Skok P., *Etimologijski rječnik hrvatskoga ili srpskoga jezika*, 1: *A—J*, Zagreb, 1971.

ERHSJ, 2
Skok P., *Etimologijski rječnik hrvatskoga ili srpskoga jezika*, 2: *K—poni*, Zagreb, 1972.

ERHSJ, 3
Skok P., *Etimologijski rječnik hrvatskoga ili srpskoga jezika*, 3: *poni—Ž*, Zagreb, 1973.

Kostallari 1980
Kostallari A., kryered., *Fjalor i gjuhës së sotme shqipe: (me rreth 41.000 fjalë)*, Tiranë, 1980.

MDA2 2010
Mic dicţionar academic, 1–2, Bucureşti, 2010.

БСРЛ 2012
Младенов М., ред., *Българска семейно-родова лексика. Енциклопедичен речник*. София, 2012.

МДАБЯ 2006
Соболев А. Н., ред., *Малый диалектологический атлас балканских языков. Серия лексическая*, 2: *Человек. Семья*, München, 2006.

СД 1995
   Толстой Н. И., отв. ред., *Славянские древности*, 1: *А (Август) − Г (Гусь)*, Москва, 1995.

ЭССЯ, 2
   Трубачёв О. Н., ред., *Этимологический словарь славянских языков. Праславянский лексический фонд*, 2, Москва, 1975.

ЭССЯ, 5
   Трубачёв О. Н, ред., *Этимологический словарь славянских языков. Праславянский лексический фонд*, 5, Москва, 1978.

ЭССЯ, 13
   Трубачёв О. Н., ред., *Этимологический словарь славянских языков. Праславянский лексический фонд,* 13, Москва, 1987.

ЭССЯ, 17
   Трубачёв О. Н., ред., *Этимологический словарь славянских языков. Праславянский лексический фонд*, 17, Москва, 1990.

ЭССЯ, 24
   Трубачёв О. Н., ред., *Этимологический словарь славянских языков. Праславянский лексический фонд*, 24, Москва, 1997.

Internet sources

HJP 2006–2018
   Hrvatski jezični portal, Zagreb, 2006–2018 (http://hjp.znanje.hr/).

Literature

Aikhenvald 2007
   Aikhenvald A. Y., Grammars in Contact: A Cross-Linguistic Perspective, A. Y., Aikhenvald, R. M. W. Dixon, eds., *Grammars in Contact: a Cross-Linguistic Typology*, Oxford, 2007, 1–66.

Barth 1969
   Barth F., Introduction, Barth F., ed., *Ethnic Groups and Boundaries: The Social Organization of Cultural Difference*, Bergen, 1969, 9–38.

Brandl, Walsh 1982
   Brandl M. M., Walsh M., Speakers of many tongues: Toward understanding multilingualism among Aboriginal Australians, *International Journal of the Sociology of Language*, 36, 1982, 71–81.

Buzărnescu, Pribac 2002
   Buzărnescu Ş., Pribac S., Sursele istorico-antropologice ale interculturalităţii interactive din Banat, R. Poledna, F. Ruegg, F. C. Rus, coord., *Interculturalitate. Cercetări şi perspective româneşti*, Cluj-Napoca, 2002, 164–177.

Clark 1994
   Clark R., The Polynesian Outliers as a locus of language contact, T. Dutton, D. T. Tryon, eds., *Language Contact and Change in the Austronesian World*, Berlin, New York, 1994, 109–140.

Clewing, Schmitt 2011
   Clewing L., Schmitt J. O., eds., *Geschichte Südosteuropas: Vom frühen Mittelalter bis zur Gegenwart (Kulturgeschichte)*, Regensburg, 2011.

Coetsem 1988
   Coetsem F., van, *Loan phonology and the two transfer types in language contact*, Dordrecht, 1988.

Di Carlo 2016.
   Di Carlo P., Multilingualism, Affiliation, and Spiritual Insecurity: From Phenomena to Processes in Language Documentation, S. Mandana, ed., *African language documentation: New data, methods and approaches*, 2016, 71–104.

Dobrushina, Khanina 2018
Dobrushina N., Khanina O., The typology of small-scale multilingualism, *Call for papers of conference "Typology of small-scale multilingualism", in April 15–17, 2019, Lion* (https://ilcl.hse.ru/).

François 2012
François A., The dynamics of linguistic diversity: Egalitarian multilingualism and power imbalance among northern Vanuatu languages, *International Journal of the Sociology of Language*, 214, 2012, 85–110.

Friedman, Joseph 2017
Friedman V. A., Joseph B. D., Reassessing sprachbunds: A view from the Balkans, R. Hickey, ed., *The Cambridge Handbook of Areal Linguistics*, Cambridge, 2017, 55–87.

Givón 2002
Givón T., *Bio–Linguistics: the Santa Barbara lectures*, Philadelphia, PA, 2002.

Grant 2020
Grant A., *The Oxford Handbook of language contact*, New York, 2020.

Haspelmath 2009
Haspelmath M., Lexical borrowing: Concepts and issues, M. Haspelmath, U. Tadmor, eds., *Loanwords in the World's Languages: A Comparative Handbook*, Berlin, 2009, 35–54.

Hurezan, Colta 2002
Hurezan P., Colta E. R., ed., *Interetnicitate în Europa Centrală și de Est. Lucrările Simpozionului Internațional Interdisciplinar*, Arad, 2002.

Jourdan 2007
Jourdan C., Linguistic paths to urban self in postcolonial Solomon Islands, M. Makihara, B. B. Schieffelin, eds., *Consequences of Contact*, Oxford, 2007, 30–48.

Konior 2018
Konior D. V., Text of the Krashovani traditional wedding in the light of Romano-Slavic contact in the Balkans, *Romanoslavica*, 54 (3), 2018, 102–122 (in print).

Lehman 2001
Lehman R., *Symbiosis and ambivalence: Poles and Jews in a small Galician town*, New York, Oxford, 2001.

Lüpke 2016
Lüpke F., Uncovering Small-Scale Multilingualism, *Critical Multilingualism Studies*, 4 (2), 2016, 35–74.

——— 2019
Lüpke F., Multiple perspectives: Epistemological and methodological reflections on small-scale multilingualism. A talk at the conference *Typology of small-scale multilingualism*, Lyon, 2019.

Makarova 2017
Makarova A. L., The discourse strategies of bilingual speakers of Macedonian, Aromanian and Albanian dialects in the Prespa region, *Proceedings of the 45th International Philological Conference, 2016. Advances in Social Science, Education and Humanities Research (ASSEHR)*, 122, 2017, 364–367.

Morozova 2019
Morozova M. S., Language contact in social context: Kinship terms and kinship relations of the Mrkovići in southern Montenegro, *Journal of Language Contact,* 12, 2019, 305 –343.

Needham 2013
Needham R., *Rethinking Marriage and Kinship*, Hoboken, 2013.

Nikolayeva 2014
Nikolayeva L., *Typology of kinship terms*, Frankfurt am Main, 2014.

Petrovici 1943
Petrovici E., Daco-slava, *Dacoromania*, 10 (2), 1943, 1–45.

Radan Uscatu 2014
  Radan Uscatu M.-R., *Botezul, nunta și funeraliile la carașoveni*, Timișoara, 2014.

Scurtu 1966
  Scurtu V., *Termenii de înrudire în limba română*, București, 1966.

Simu 1939
  Simu T., *Originea crașovenilor. Studiu istoric și etnografic*, Lugoj, 1939.

Singer, Harris 2016
  Singer R., Harris S., What practices and ideologies support small-scale multilingualism? A case study of Warruwi Community, northern Australia, *International Journal of the Sociology of Language*, 241, 2016, 163–208.

Sobolev et al. 2020
  Sobolev A. N., ed., *Between Separation and Symbiosis: Southeastern European Languages and Cultures in Contact*, Berlin, New York, 2020 (in print).

Szemerényi 1977
  Szemerényi O., *Studies in the kinship terminology of the Indo-european languages: with special reference to Indian, Iranian, Greek, and Latin*, Leiden, 1977.

Tukey 1962
  Tukey A., Kinship terminology in the Romance languages (Ph. D. Thesis, University of Michigan, 1962).

Urian 2014
  Urian T., Caractere și destine, Viața Românească, 3–4, 2014 (http://www.viataromaneasca.eu/revista/articol/1790/).

Vulpe 1986
  Vulpe M., Clasificarea distribuțională a terminilor de înrudire, *Anuar de lingvistică și istorie literară*, 31, 1986, 117–139.

Wilkins, Nash 2008
  Wilkins D., Nash D., The European 'discovery' of a multilingual Australia: The linguistic and ethnographic successes of a failed expedition, W. McGregor, ed., *Encountering aboriginal languages: Studies in the history of Australian linguistics*, Canberra, 2008, 485–507.

Бјелетић 1994
  Бјелетић М., Терминологија крвног сродства у српскохрватском језику, *Јужнословенски филолог*, 50, 1994, 199–207.

Бромлей 1963
  Бромлей Ю. В., ред., *История Югославии*, 1. Москва, 1963.

Гура 2012
  Гура А. В., *Брак и свадьба в славянской народной культуре: семантика и символика*. Москва, 2012.

Жугра 1998
  Жугра А. В., Албанские соционимы и система терминов родства, *Алгебра родства: Родство. Системы родства. Системы терминов родства*, 2, С.-Петербург, 1998, 167–186.

Козак 2017
  Козак В. В., Элементы романского происхождения в антропономастиконе глаголических надписей острова Крк, *Индоевропейское языкознание и классическая филология — XXI. Материалы чтений, посвященных памяти профессора И. М. Тронского*, С.-Петербург, 2017, 389–403.

Конёр 2020
  Конёр Д. В., Лексика свадебной обрядности в славянском и румынском идиомах карашевцев в исторической области Банат, (диссертация на соиск. степени канд. филологических наук, ИЛИ РАН, С.-Петербург, 2020).

Крстић 2010

Крстић А., Банат у средњем веку, М. Матицки, В. Јовић, ур., *Банат кроз векове*, Београд, 2010, 65–89.

Митровић 2004

Митровић М. С., Етничка слика Баната крајем 18. и почетком 19. века, *Истраживања*, 15, 2004, 125–134.

Морозова, Русаков 2018

Морозова М. С., Русаков А. Ю., Черногорско-албанское языковое пограничье: в поисках «сбалансированного языкового контакта», *Slověne*, 7/2, 2018, 258–302.

Павковић 2009

Павковић Н. Ф., *Банатско село. Друштвене и културне промене*, Нови Сад, 2009.

Попов 1995–2014

Попов В. А., отв. ред., *Алгебра родства: родство, системы родства, системы терминов родства*, С.-Петербург, 1995–2014.

Радан 2006

Радан М., Из свадбене лексике Карашевака, Г. П. Клепикова, А. А. Плотникова, отв. ред., *Исследования по славянской диалектологии,* 12: *Ареальные аспекты изучения славянской лексики*, Москва, 2006, 64–75.

Радан Ускату 2016

Радан Ускату М.-Р., Сличности у свадбеном обичају Карашевака и румунских Алмажана — доказ о карашевско-алмашком суживоту у прошлости, *Исходишта*, 2, 2016, 199–214.

Соболев 2013

Соболев А. Н., *Основы лингвокультурной антропогеографии Балканского полуострова*, München, С.-Петербург, 2013.

―――― 2017

Соболев А. Н., Языки симбиотических сообществ Западных Балкан: греческий и албанский в краине Химара, Албания, *Вестник СПбГУ. Язык и литература*, 14 (3), 2017, 420–442.

Соболев et al. 2018

Соболев А. Н., Кисилиер М. Л., Козак В. В., Конёр Д. В., Макарова А. Л., Морозова М. С., Русаков А. Ю., Южнославянские диалекты в симбиотических сообществах Балкан. Доклад на XVI Международном съезде славистов. Белград, 19–27 августа 2018 г., *Acta linguistica petropolitana*, 14 (2), 2018, 685–746.

Толстой 1982

Толстой Н. И., Из грамматики славянских обрядов, Σημειωτική. *Труды по знаковым системам. 15: Типология культуры и взаимное воздействие культур* (= Учёные записки Тартуского государственного университета = Acta et Commentationes Universitatis Tartuensis, 576), Тарту, 1982, 57–71.

Трубачев 1959

Трубачев О. Н., *История славянских терминов родства и некоторых древнейших терминов общественного строя*, Москва, 1959.

Узенёва 2010

Узенёва Е. С., *Болгарская свадьба: этнолингвистическое исследование*, Москва, 2010.

Хедешан, Голант 2007

Хедешан О., Голант Н. Г., Карнавал в румынском Банате: полевые исследования в Молдова–Ноуэ, *Антропологический форум*, 2007, 300–311.

References

Aikhenvald A. Y., Grammars in Contact: A Cross-Linguistic Perspective, A. Y. Aikhenvald, R. M. W. Dixon, eds., *Grammars in Contact: a Cross-Linguistic Typology*, Oxford, 2007, 1–66.

Barth F., Introduction, Barth F., ed., *Ethnic Groups and Boundaries: The Social Organization of Cultural Difference*, Bergen, 1969, 9–38.

Bjeletić M., Terminologija krvnog srodstva u srpskohrvatskom jeziku, *Južnoslovenski filolog*, 50, 1994, 199–207.

Brandl M. M., Walsh M., Speakers of many tongues: Toward understanding multilingualism among Aboriginal Australians, *International Journal of the Sociology of Language*, 36, 1982, 71–81.

Bromley Y. V., ed., *Istoriia Iugoslavii*, 1, Moscow, 1963.

Buzărnescu Ş., Pribac S., Sursele istorico-antropologice ale interculturalităţii interactive din Banat, R. Poledna, F. Ruegg, F. C. Rus, coord., *Interculturalitate. Cercetări şi perspective româneşti*, Cluj-Napoca, 2002, 164–177.

Clark R., The Polynesian Outliers as a locus of language contact, T. Dutton, D. T. Tryon, eds., *Language Contact and Change in the Austronesian World*, Berlin, New York, 1994, 109–140.

Clewing L., Schmitt J. O., eds., *Geschichte Südosteuropas: Vom frühen Mittelalter bis zur Gegenwart (Kulturgeschichte)*, Regensburg, 2011.

Coetsem F., van, *Loan phonology and the two transfer types in language contact*, Dordrecht, 1988.

Di Carlo P., Multilingualism, Affiliation, and Spiritual Insecurity: From Phenomena to Processes in Language Documentation, S. Mandana, ed., *African language documentation: New data, methods and approaches*, 2016, 71–104.

François A., The dynamics of linguistic diversity: Egalitarian multilingualism and power imbalance among northern Vanuatu languages, *International Journal of the Sociology of Language*, 214, 2012, 85–110.

Friedman V. A., Joseph B. D., Reassessing sprachbunds: A view from the Balkans, R. Hickey, ed., *The Cambridge Handbook of Areal Linguistics*, Cambridge, 2017, 55–87.

Givón T., *Bio-Linguistics: the Santa Barbara lectures*, Philadelphia, PA, 2002.

Grant A., *The Oxford Handbook of language contact*, New York, 2020.

Gura A. V., *Brak i svad'ba v slavianskoi narodnoi kul'ture: semantika i simvolika*, Moscow, 2012.

Haspelmath M., Lexical borrowing: Concepts and issues, M. Haspelmath, U. Tadmor, eds., *Loanwords in the World's Languages: A Comparative Handbook*, Berlin, 2009, 35–54.

Hedesan O., Golant N. G., Carnival in the Romanian Banat: Field research in Moldova-Nouă, *Forum for Anthropology and Culture*, 2007, 300–311.

Hurezan P., Colta E. R., ed., *Interetnicitate în Europa Centrală şi de Est. Lucrările Simpozionului Internaţional Interdisciplinar*, Arad, 2002.

Jourdan C., Linguistic paths to urban self in postcolonial Solomon Islands, M. Makihara, B. B. Schieffelin, eds., *Consequences of Contact*, Oxford, 2007, 30–48.

Konior D. V., Text of the Krashovani traditional wedding in the light of Romano-Slavic contact in the Balkans, *Romanoslavica*, 54 (3), 2018, 102–122 (in print).

Kozak V. V., Elements of Romance origin in the anthroponymy of the Glagolitic inscriptions of the island Krk, *Indo-European linguistics and classical philology – XXI. Materialy chtenii, posviashchennykh pamiati professora I. M. Tronskogo*, St. Petersburg, 2017, 389–403.

Krstić A., Banat u srednjem veku, M. Maticki, V. Jović, ur., *Banat kroz vekove*, Beograd, 2010, 65–89.

Lehman R., *Symbiosis and ambivalence: Poles and Jews in a small Galician town*, New York, Oxford, 2001.

Lüpke F., Multiple perspectives: Epistemological and methodological reflections on small-scale multilingualism. A talk at the conference *Typology of small-scale multilingualism*, Lyon, 2019.

Lüpke F., Uncovering Small-Scale Multilingualism, *Critical Multilingualism Studies*, 4 (2), 2016, 35–74.

Makarova A. L., The discourse strategies of bilingual speakers of Macedonian, Aromanian and Albanian dialects in the Prespa region, *Proceedings of the 45th International Philological Conference*, *2016. Advances in Social Science, Education and Humanities Research (ASSEHR)*, 122, 2017, 364–367.

Mitrović M. S., Etnička slika Banata krajem 18. i početkom 19. veka, *Istraživanja*, 15, 2004, 125–134.

Morozova M. S., Language contact in social context: Kinship terms and kinship relations of the Mrkovići in southern Montenegro, *Journal of Language Contact*, 12, 2019, 305–343.

Morozova M. S., Rusakov A. Yu., Montenegrin-Albanian Border: In Search of "Balanced Language Contact", *Slověne*, 7 (2), 2018, 258–302.

Needham R., *Rethinking Marriage and Kinship*, Hoboken, 2013.

Nikolayeva L., *Typology of kinship terms*, Frankfurt am Main, 2014.

Pavković N. F., *Banatsko selo. Društvene i kulturne promene*, Novi Sad, 2009.

Petrovici E., Daco-slava, *Dacoromania*, 10 (2), 1943, 1–45.

Popov V. A., ed., *Algebra rodstva: Rodstvo. Sistemy rodstva. Sistemy terminov rodstva*, St. Petersburg, 1995–2014.

Radan M., Iz svadbene leksike Karaševaka, G. P. Klepikova, A. A. Plotnikova, eds., *Issledovaniia po slavianskoi dialektologii*, 12: *Areal'nye aspekty izucheniia slavianskoi leksiki*, Moscow, 2006, 64–75.

Radan Uscatu M.-R., *Botezul, nunta și funeraliile la carașoveni*, Timișoara, 2014.

Radan Uskatu M.-R., Sličnosti u svadbenom običaju Karaševaka i rumunskih Almažana—dokaz o karaševsko-almaškom suživotu u prošlosti, *Ishodišta*, 2, 2016, 199–214.

Scurtu V., *Termenii de înrudire în limba română*, București, 1966.

Simu T., *Originea crașovenilor. Studiu istoric și etnografic*, Lugoj, 1939.

Singer R., Harris S., What practices and ideologies support small-scale multilingualism? A case study of Warruwi Community, northern Australia, *International Journal of the Sociology of Language*, 241, 2016, 163–208.

Sobolev A. N., ed., *Between Separation and Symbiosis: Southeastern European Languages and Cultures in Contact*, Berlin, New York, 2020 (in print).

Sobolev A. N., Kisilier M. L., Kozak V. V., Koner D. V., Makarova A. L., Morozova M. S., Rusakov A. Yu., South-Slavic dialects in the symbiotic societies of the Balkan. Doklad na XVI Mezhdunarodnom s″ezde slavistov. Belgrad, 19–27 avgusta 2018 g., *Acta linguistica petropolitana*, 14 (2), 2018, 685–746.

Sobolev A. N., Languages in the Western Balkan symbiotic societies: Greek and Albanian in himara, Albania, *Vestnik of Saint Petersburg University. Language and Literature*, 14 (3), 2017, 420–442.

Sobolev A. N., *Osnovy lingvokul'turnoi antropogeografii Balkanskogo poluostrova,* 1, München, St. Petersburg, 2013.

Szemerényi O., *Studies in the kinship terminology of the Indo-european languages: with special reference to Indian, Iranian, Greek, and Latin*, Leiden, 1977.

Tolstoy N. I., On the «Grammar» of Slavic Rites, *Sēmeiōtikē. Works on Semiotics*, 15: *Tipologiia kul'tury. Vzaimnoe vozdeistvie kul'tur* (= Acta et Commentationes Universitatis Tartuensis, 576), Tartu, 1982, 57–71.

Trubachev O. N., *Istoriia slavianskikh terminov rodstva i nekotorykh drevneishikh terminov obshchestvennogo stroia*, Moscow, 1959.

Tukey A., Kinship terminology in the Romance languages (Ph. D. Thesis, University of Michigan, 1962).

Uzeneva E. S., *Bolgarskaia svad'ba: etnolingvisticheskoe issledovanie*, Moscow, 2010.

Vulpe M., Clasificarea distribuțională a terminilor de înrudire, *Anuar de lingvistică și istorie literară*, 31, 1986, 117–139.

Wilkins D., Nash D., The European 'discovery' of a multilingual Australia: The linguistic and ethnographic successes of a failed expedition, W. McGregor, ed., *Encountering aboriginal languages: Studies in the history of Australian linguistics*, Canberra, 2008, 485–507.

Zhugra A. V., Albanskie sotsionimy i sistema terminov rodstva, *Algebra rodstva: Rodstvo. Sistemy rodstva. Sistemy terminov rodstva*, 2, St. Petersburg, 1998, 167–186.

Дарья Владимировна Конёр, кандидат филологических наук
младший научный сотрудник
Отдела сравнительно-исторического изучения индоевропейских языков и ареальных исследований
Института лингвистических исследований РАН
199053 С.-Петербург, Тучков пер., 9
Россия / Russia
dsuetina@yandex.ru