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Romani, a New Indo-Aryan language spoken about thousand years outside India, is a typical contact language; it has been shaped by the influence of genetically and typologically different languages. Many of its features are mixed (some of them inherited, others adopted) and appear on all language levels, but chiefly upon the lexical and semantic levels.

0.1. Romani is a NIA language already spoken for one thousand years outside India. As for its typological features, it is a contact language which is formed by the influence of genetically and typologically different languages. Many of its features are mixed; some of them are genetic or inherited (Indian) and some others are adopted from other languages during the periods of Roma migration through Asia and Europe. These contact-features appear on all language levels, but the lexical, as well as semantic levels, are particularly significant.

0.2. Dealing with some Romani lexical and onomastic phenomena concerning human beings, individuals and their relations inside the family, clan, ethnus and caste, in Indian terms jāti, we will not consider them by particular dialects, but as a common Romani phenomenon, since they occur in more or less all dialects in a similar way.

We have divided the naming units concerning human beings and social groups into several classes.

The first class includes terms and naming units concerning family members and relatives, which can be original or inherited from the Indian stage of Romani history. An important layer of this onomasiologic system consists of loan terms from contact languages (Persian, Turkish, Greek, Slavic etc.) There are also terms (monolexemic and polylexemic units) coined in Romani after terminological models in the contact languages.

The second class consists of names of Roma individuals (anthroponyms) which are interesting from the sociolinguistic viewpoint. A mimicry of the surrounding society and language is apparent. The Roma’s first names and surnames are mostly adopted from the contact and environment people. On the other hand, there is a Roma’s segregation from the gadže’s communities. Hence there are (nick)names current only inside the Roma community and family.
The third class includes naming units designating social groups distinguished by their genetic origin and profession.

A) Ethnonyms and gentonyms (names by genetic features), which are either original i.e. inherited from the Indian stage (Roma, Dom, Sinti, Džat etc.) or adopted from the contact languages and peoples: Athinganos, Cigan, Zigeuner, Gypsy, Gitano etc. Some of them are considered to be *abusive appellatives* (e.g. Cigan). This is, of course, connected with the social status of the Roma people in different European states.

B) Socionyms and professionyms are adopted according to the Roma’s social position, lifestyle, ‘caste’ and profession. Such names are e.g. Gurbets (nomadic Roma), Arli, Jerli (settled Roma), Kalderaš (‘kettle-repairers’), Lovars (‘horse-traders’, ‘chanters’) etc.

0.3. In this paper we deal only with one segment of this onomastic system: with kinship terminology. We describe the structure of this system with respect to the origin of different types of onomastic units and the history of particular terms.

The Roma’s family system has many common features with the Indian one. For thousands of years the joint family system has been typical for India and it is still preserved today. Most Roma communities in Europe also live in such families, where more than one brother lives together with wives, children, parents, uncles etc. The similarity is apparent not only in structure of the family and in the regulations by which its distinct members are governed, but also in the terminology. There are many *naming units* of Indian origin preserved in Romani, besides the *new naming units* coined in the manner typical for the Indian Linguistic Area.

This kind of terminology is a very stable part of the language and, judging by IE terminology, it is of long historic duration. All IE language groups contain the same corpus of terms. Romani, as a migrating language, did not preserve the system to that extent. There are only a few terms belonging to the oldest lexical layer.

The second layer consists of Indian nouns developed in Romani as terms by significant semantic shift.

A newer and very extensive layer is that of relative-denoting-terms borrowed from different contact languages: Persian, Turkish, Greek, Slavic, Hungarian etc.

The last onomasiologic type presents monolexemic and polylexemic onomastic units *coined* in Romani after Indian or after European language manners.

1.0. Terms from the oldest stage, genetic (inherited) lexical layer (Indic terms)

The original PIE terms like *pater/ pitar/ πατήρ* (father), *mater/ mātār, μήτηρ* (mother), *duhitar/ θεγατήρ* (daughter), *svasar/ soror* (sister) etc. which occur in many IE languages are not present in Romani.

1.1. The oldest terms denoting relatives in Romani are those derived from the Old and Middle Indian terms: *phral < bhrātar* (brother), *phen* (sister), *bori* (daughter-in-law), *džamutro < jāmātār* (daughter’s husband), *sastro < śvašura* (father-in-law), *sasvi/sasuj < śvaśirū* (mother-in-law).
1.1.1. Phral is a directly derived noun from the Skt. bhṛṭar (nom. bhṛṭā). During the development the following derivative phonological changes were performed:

A) Voiced root sounds (sonants) lost their voicedness: [bh] > [ph]. This change is typical for the West Indic language Panjabi and some adjacent dialects, where bhṛṣ (pronounced pṛṣ is developed from bhṛṭā.

B) Weakening and cerebralization of the dental consonant [t] between two vowels. This change arose in Prakrits, where [d] and [t] became sometimes [l] or [l], e.g. Sātvāvahāna > Sālavāhāna. Similar changes occurred during the development of Skt. to devel (Rom).

C) Weakening and elision of the final vowel [ā]: [ā] > [a] > [0], like in devatā > dev(ve)l.

1.1.2. Phen arose in the similar way. From Skt. bhūgini by the weakening and disappearance of [g] arose bhūini and after elision of the final [ŋ] and by metathesis of the root aspirated labial [bh] arose Hindi bāhin, bāhan. In western NIA, e.g. Panjabi and Lahnda, the metathesis did not take place, but only voiced aspirated [bh] became unvoiced and unaspirated. Instead of the aspiration a shift of tone took place. Thus Panjabi bhain (pronounced p′ein) arose. In Romani despiration did not take place and thus the noun phen arose.¹

1.1.3. Bori developed from Skt. past passive participle of the verb vah- (‘to lead’, ‘to carry away’, ‘to bear’) > vodha/udha. The feminine form of this participle is vodhi (‘carried [away]’; of course carried to the bride-groom’s home). The Indic voiced cerebral consonants as a rule give in Romani [r̥]. A change [v] > [b] is not unusual in NIA. Other lexemes denoting ‘bride’ and ‘daughter-in-law’ are vadhi in Skt., vaḥulī in Prakrits and vadhi in Skt. and Hindi. Here the etymological relation with the root vah- is also evident. The nouns: vivāha (‘marriage’, ‘wedding’) in Skt. and vivāḥ (‘marriage’, ‘wedding’, ‘lit. ‘carrying away’) in Hindi which consists of the prefix vi- (‘away, out’) and the strengthened stem vāha are also connected with this verb root. This is the basis of the Romani bijav (‘wedding’). Here the change [v] > [b] also took place. The changes occurred in the following order: vivāḥ > (elision of the intervocalic [v]) vīāḥ > vyāḥ > byāḥ > (glide) > byav > biyav.

1.1.4. Džamutro (‘son-in-law’) corresponds to the Skt. and Hindi jāmātā (jāmātā). Hindi also has a variant form jāmā and Persian loan-word dāmād. The noun jāmātā developed from the verb root *jam- which means ‘to marry sb.’ and the suffix -tar (Romani variant is -tro).

The noun jāmātā is not related to the root jan-/gen- ‘to generate’, ‘to produce’, since there is a stronger argument for *jam-. It is paralleled in Greek ἱματζίβρος (‘son-in-law’) < γαμέω/γαμω (‘to marry’) and no hypothetical historical change of Latin gener < *gemer can serve as an argument for the verb root jan-. Admittedly, the Greek form has an inserted consonant [θ], but this is a usual

¹ See also phral in 1.1.1.

² This is one more example for the change of the occlusive cerebral [t] to liquid consonant [l]. Cf. devatā > devel (1.1.1.), bhṛṭar > phral (1.1.1.) and yuvatā > džuvli (1.2.4.).
phenomenon accompanying labial nasal [ν]. Instead of expected γαμρός or γαμερός we have there γαμβρός. Maybe the Latin term gener really originates from the verb gigno (?) and it designates the ‘genitor’ or ‘parent’, an ‘agent engaged in the generative/production process’, or the two verb roots (jan- and hypothetical *jam- ‘to marry’) had been contaminated.

The Greek γαμέω γαμώ also means ‘to have sexual intercourse’, ‘to copulate’ and has a parallel verb in Skt. yabh- (‘to have sexual intercourse’, ‘to copulate’) with its variants jahb-/jambh- and derived noun jambhana (‘sexual intercourse’, ‘copulation’, a variant of yabhana). From this *jāmbhātar could be developed (?)

1.1.5. Sastro – ‘father-in-law’ is etymologically connected with Skt. śvaśuṣa from the oldest form *śvasuṣa. The term belongs to the oldest stage of PIE. We suppose its original meaning to be ‘housholder’, ‘pater familias’. Thus we have Latin socer, Greek ἐκποτή, Slavic svekr (Russ. - свекор, Serb. свекар, Slovak svokor), Lith. šėšuras, Germ. sweher, Schwäher. This compound noun arose from: sva- (‘own’, cf. Lat. ‘suus’, Gk. ἐ- from *sve-) + śuṣa (‘hero’, ‘man’; ‘master’, ‘housholder’, which corresponds to the Greek κύρος [from κύρως – ‘decisive power’]). The consonant [t] in Romani sastro is only to simulate the other agent-nouns in Indic, like kartar (‘agent’), śastar (‘ruler’) or kinship nouns mātar (‘mother’) and pītar (‘father’). In other Indic languages the corresponding terms are sasura in Prakrits, sasur in Hindi, sasro in Gujarati, sāsrāś in Marathi etc.  

1.1.6. Śvaśrūh – ‘mother-in-law’ is only the female counterpart of the śvaśuṣa. Greek parallel is ἐκποτή, Latin socrus and Slavic svekr (Russ. свекро, Serb. свекра, Slovak svokra). Skt. śvaśrūh developed in Prakrit sussū and in Hindi sās. Romani terms sasvi, sasuj, both being developed from Skt. śvaś- > sas-. To the older suffix -(u) a new NIA and Romani suffix -(i) has been attached. This vowel caused the previous vowel [u] to become the consonant [v]: sasu-i > sasvi, or after the vowel [u] it itself changed into consonant [j]: sasu-i > sasuj. 

1.2. The terms denoting persons according to age (raklo, rakli, čhavo, čhaj) as well as to life-style and caste-origin (rom, romni, das, dasni, gadžo, gadži etc.) are derived from nouns of the middle Indian stage.

By semantic shift and specialization over time these common nouns became special relative-terms instead of the related lost ones.

1.2.1. The terms raklo and rakli (‘boy’ and ‘girl’, sometimes used instead of ‘son’ and ‘daughter’ or non-Roma children) recall formally and semantically the Hindi homologous nouns laṛkā and laṛkī. They are of the same origin, from the Old Indian lāḍākā or lāḍikā (‘boy’, ‘servant’, ‘slave’). This is connected with the verb root lāḍ-, lal- (‘to play’, ‘to sport’). In Hindi the noun is developed from the modified root laṛ- (the cerebral [d] is developed in the cerebral of the new quality – [ṛ]) and the substantivizer suffix kā (masc.) and ki (fem.). The Romani variants are younger, since there is evident deformation of the original noun: laṛa-kā > rak-l-o. Three kinds of changes are apparent: a) change of the syllable order, b) decerebralization of r (r > r), and c) masc. gender marker [-o] instead of [ā] in Hindi.
1.2.2. Romani terms denoting ‘son’ and ‘daughter’ of Roma parents are not typical OIE relative naming units, but MIA and NIA nouns with the common meaning ‘child’, i.e. ‘boy’ (Łhavo) and ‘girl’ (Łhaj) are used instead. There are also Hindi, Panjabi, Bengali and other NIA appellatives of similar origin. Thus in Hindi we have betā/beti< Skt. baṭu/vatu (‘boy, lad’), Prakrit bīṭā. Nouns bacci (‘male child, boy’) and baccī (‘female child, girl’) developed from the Sanskrit vataś ‘calf, young animal’, through Prakrit baccā. From the social point of view it is interesting that the Łhavo and Łhaj denote only Roma children. This semantic shift and specialization is very important, since it reflects the Indian caste-like-differentiation inside the Roma communities.

1.2.3. The etymology of Łhavo (‘male child’) is rather vague. Some authors (e.g. Turner, Boretzky etc.) connect it with the Prakrit chāva (‘young animal’), Pali cūpa and sūva (‘child, boy’) and with Hindi chāvā, chāvrā. Marvari sāv, Nepali chāva. Bihari chāvā and Asami sāv, sāvā all of the same meaning. These nouns are evidently derived from the Sanskrit verb – s, su- (sūte, sauti) – ‘to give birth’. Forms in sāv- are derived from the quoted verb root, but if the lexemes in chāv were derived from it too, how to explain the reason for the great phonologic shift – palatalization of the sibilant [s] > [ch]?

1.2.4. The same principles of semantic shift and specialization concern the terms for husband and wife, developed from nouns man and woman, and from nouns designating Roma and non-Roma persons. The main distinction is between terms of Roma husband/wife (rom/romni) and non-Roma husband and wife (gadžo/gadži, das, dasni, džuvli).

The term gadžo designates any person of non-Romani origin, but it is used especially to distinguish ‘husband of non-Roma wife’ (gadži) from Roma husband. Its feminine counterpart gadži denotes ‘gadžo’s wife’.

Most authors of Romani etymological dictionaries have said nothing of the etymology of gadžo, e.g. Calvet and Turner. Others try to derive it from MIA word denoting ‘house’, ‘household’ etc., e.g. Boretzky derives gadžo < ai. gārya, mi. *gajja-? nach sa. < gaya ‘Haus(halt)’.

We consider the noun gadžo to be developed from the Indic compound noun grāmaja < grāma ‘a village’ (Hindi gāv, Romani gav) + morpheme -ja (at the end of the compound nouns denoting a person according to his birth, from jan-, jāyate ‘to be born’). The morph -o is a typical marker of Romani and some other West NIA masculine nouns. The gadžo is probably inherited from MIA [Skt. grāmaja > grāja > gāvaja > gāja > gadžo]. The noun grāmaja really does occur in Old Indian, as Boethlingk has shown, also quoting its synonyms grāmya and

5 BORETZKY, op. cit., p. 316.
6 BÖHTLINGK, Otto und ROTH, Rudolph (1855-1875), Sanskrit-Wörterbuch, p. 2/857.
7 BÖHTLINGK, op. cit., p. 869.
grämäna. In Boethlingk’s Dictionary⁶ we find: grämäja (grämä + ja), adj. im Dorfe geboren, auf bebautem Boden gewachsen, also:⁷ grämaya = grämäna = grämë jätah = grämabhavo janah = a) im Dorfe u.s.w. im Gebräuch seiend, dort entstanden, dort bereitet b) im Dorfe lebend, Dorfbewohner, in Dörfern, unter Menschen lebend, von Menschen gezogen, kultiviert, c) im Dorfe gestattet, auf die im Dorfe erlaubte Geschlechtslust gerichtet.

1.2.5. The terms das m, dasni f, džuvli f, denoting non-Roma ‘husband’ and ‘wife’ do not occur in the northern Romani dialects (Lovary, Slovak etc.) We have found them in Gurbet, Arli and Kalderä dialects in the Balkans (see Uhlik’s and Boretzky’s dictionaries).

The origin of the appellative das should be searched in Old Indic dásá, dasyu ‘servant’, ‘slave’. During the time of language contacts its meaning was significantly shifted to any non-Roma persons, or rather to those who belong to the ruling population in the related period and region. It designates subordinate people!

The term dasni (‘non-Roma wife’) is only a female counterpart of the term das.

As for the noun džuvli, it developed from Skt. yuvat· (‘young woman’) by means of the palatalization: [y] > [j] and by the mentioned cerebralization: [t] > [ʈ] and its change in the liquid consonant: [ʈ] > [l]. (See also the change bhrätä > phral in the paragraph 1.1.1. and vahuliŒ in 1.1.3.)

1.2.6. The reason why only čhavo, čhaj and rom, romni designate Romani, and raklo, rakli, gadžo, gadži non-Roma ‘son’, ‘daughter’, ‘husband’ and ‘wife’, is not obvious. It is fixed more or less by accident. There is only an ethno-social, but no etymological or historical reason to ascribe one term to the Roma and the other to the non-Roma person. Nevertheless we find several cases, e.g. in Lovari and Kalderari, when the word raklo is used for Roma children, esp. in overt address: Mro rakloro! (‘My boy’), the same as Miri gadži! (‘My wife’).

1.3. Several relative appellatives are also inherited from the oldest stage of emigration from India, i.e. from their dwelling in Persia.

1.3.1. ‘Mother’ – daj (dej, de) originates in the OIA verb root dhe-/dhai- (dhayati- ‘to suck’) and it has parallels in New Persian day ‘mother’. In other New Iranian languages it designates either ‘mother’ or ‘nurse’. The ‘mother’ is its primary meaning. From this is derived also the appellative dayo/dayi (‘mother’s brother’).

Etymologically dhayati is related to OSlav. dojiti, Russ. òóumь, Lot. dët - ‘to suck milk from the breast’. Also Armenian diem means ‘I drink milk from the breast’. The same word occurs in Kurdish – dæ and in Ossetian – dejin, dejun. Also the Hindi dâi (‘nurse’, ‘midwife’) is of Persian origin, as well as many other words.

1.3.2. Dad (‘father’, the vocative case sounds: dade! dado!) can also be classified as an Iranian word, because it occurs there, but generally its origin seems to be vague and rather of the Lallwort (or ‘baby’s babble’) origin. As a Lallwort it sounds similar in many languages of the world. To this class belong many relative appellatives, e.g. Czech tâta (‘daddy’), máma (‘mammy’), dëda (‘grandpa’), babà (‘grandma, granny’), also in Sanskrit t âta (Eng. ‘daddy’). It is most
obviously similar to the Iranian appellative dād or dōd and hence we suppose that it is borrowed from there, rather than from Hindi. In Hindi dādā denotes ‘father’s father’, whereas Bengali dōdā means ‘elder brother’. (Compare also Slav. děda, děd ‘grandfather’ and Russ. d’ad’ ďedja = ‘uncle’).

1.3.3. Some other terms are connected etymologically with the terms in NIA, e.g. mami (‘grandmother’), kak, kako (‘uncle, father’s brother’), bibi (‘aunt’) correspond to the Hindi appellatives: māmā, kākā, bibī (‘woman, wife’) of the same meaning too.

These terms are sometimes marked as loan words (see also below) by the loan-morph-marker, e.g. nānus (grandfather), cf. Hindi nānā.

1.3.4. Also rom (‘Rom’, ‘man’) and romni (‘Rom woman’, ‘woman’) are of Indian origin. As has been mentioned many times by other authors, their ‘ancestor noun’ designated an Indian caste Doma. The two nouns in Romani are also used as terms for ‘husband’ and ‘wife’.

2.0. The second and the largest group includes loan-words from different contact languages. These denote: ‘grandfather’, ‘grandmother’, ‘grandson’, ‘granddaughter’, as well as other relatives. It is an interesting phenomenon that Roma have forgotten their original Indic appellatives denoting ‘grandfather’, ‘grandmother’, ‘grandson’ etc. and adopted terms from contact languages. Why have Roma, as a constantly migrating people, leading nomadic life, in their joint families, lost these most significant appellatives?

Some of these terms are borrowed nouns from Greek, other from Rumanian, Hungarian, Slavic or other contact languages. In this paper we deal mainly with the Roma dialects in the Balkans (Arlı, Gürbet, Kalderar and other Vlax dialects) as well as with the dialects in Czechia and Slovakia (Ungrika, Lovary, Servika or Slovak). In these dialects the loan terms occur as follows. Often, esp. in northern dialects (Slovak Servika, Ungrika, Vlaxika etc.) loan-words end in -os, -as, -is, -us. These distinctive morphs are neither of Romani nor of Indian origin. They serve to mark a loan-word as a foreign element. Morphs of original Indian/Romani provenance serve to ‘assimilate’ loan-words, to make them similar to the Romani words by adding a NIA and Romani marker -o for masc. and -i for fem., etc. They belong to the Indian morphematic system.

The mentioned ‘distinctive’ morphs -os, -us, -as, -is are probably of Greek origin. A very interesting phenomenon is that in the Balkanic Romani dialects they occur very rarely, but are far more frequent in Hungarian, Slovak, Czech Romani and other northern groups. This fact can be explained as follows: In the vicinity of the Greek language it was clear what was Greek and what was Romani. There was no need to stress this difference by any marker. But now (in Slovak, Hungarian, Lovari and other northern Romani dialects) in the new contact environment, Greek suffixes are felt as foreign ones and thus serve as markers of words of foreign origin.

These borrowings are analysed here as a phenomenon, not by their distribution in the particular dialects. Our aim is to show the ability of Romani dialects to adopt different types of foreign terms of this kind.
Romani appellatives borrowed from non-Indic languages:

2.1. South Slavic: prababa (‘grandmother’), kumos, kumo (‘godfather’), tетka (‘aunt’), ujkus (‘mother’s brother’).

The *kumos* is from the South Slavic *kum*, which is a corrupted form of the originally Latin *commater* (‘mother by baptism, spiritual mother, godmother’) or *comparator* (‘father by baptism, spiritual father, godfather’). The word was corrupted in the Balkanic Vulgar Latin dialect and adopted in other languages as *κουμπαρος* (in Modern Greek) < comparator, *komo* < commater in Pannonian and West Slavic, as well as in some South Slavic dialects (kunpar, kumpar < comparator).

The *ujkus* is from South Slavic ‘ujak’. Cf. with the loan term *ujcus* (read: ujt-sus) from WSlav. (Slovak) ‘ujec’.

The term *krestòakos* is borrowed probably from Serbian or Slovak. It means ‘godchild boy’ and it is derived from the verb *krstiti/krestiti* (‘to baptize’).

It is not clear whether the originally Romance *familija* (‘family’) came directly from Rumanian or if it was mediated by a Slavic language. Similarly *pristašis* (‘son-in-law’, living in his wife’s parents’ household), Slavic by origin, seems to be mediated by Rumanian.

*Murš* (‘male’), used to denote ‘a male child’, is probably an amalgamated form from Slavic *muž* (‘man, male’) and Indic/Romani *manuš* (of the same meaning).


Mainly Slavic vocative forms in -o of the noun ‘mother’: *mamo!* (matko!, mamičko!) are borrowed, whereas in other cases the Romani *daj* is used.

2.3. Hungarian also brought some important relative terms into some Romani dialects: *bañas* (‘uncle’) < Hung. ‘bácsi’, *nena* (‘aunt’) < Hung. ‘nénő’, *čalad* (‘family’ < Hung. ‘család’ < Slav. čelaď, *fäjta* (‘clan, family, sort’) < Hung. ‘fajta’.

Also *apo!* is a Slavic-like-vocative of the borrowed appellative *apa* (‘father’) from Hungarian.

2.4. In our Central European Romani dialects only a few nouns of this kind have been adopted from Greek: *papus, papo, papici* < Gr. παππούς ‘grandfather’, *kirvo* (‘godfather’) < Gr. κύριος, kirvi (‘godmother’).

This is clearly a word of the Greek origin. We consider that it developed from the Greek *kyrios* only by the assimilation of ending suffix Romani/Indic -o instead of Greek -os and by glide of -rio > *ryo > rvo. V. Černý in his article⁸ says that it had also been mediated by an Armenian loan-word from Greek – *kiwro*
(denoting non-Armenians – Kurds, Turks etc.). He explains the development of i(w from [y] (labial vowel [u]) and by metathesis of the liquids [w] and [r]: kiwro > kirvo. Nevertheless Černý does not exclude that kirvo in Armenian may also be a loan-word mediated by Romani.

The term papus is taken either in its Greek form or it is assimilated by the Romani marker -o, e.g. papo.

Although the godfather does not belong among relatives, his social role in the traditional family, including the Roma’s family, is very important. Apart from this noun borrowed from Greek, there are also other loan terms, e.g. the Latin one mediated by South Slavic, i.e. kum, and adopted and assimilated as kumo(s) etc.

2.5. From Rumanian cumnat (‘wife’s brother, husband’s sister’), cumnata (‘wife’s sister, husband’s sister’) arose kumnato/kunato and kunata/kumnata.

2.6. Loan terms from Turkish also occur, e.g. la(li) (‘aunt’) and hanamiko ‘daughter-in-law’s parents/relatives’, which has different forms in different dialects: anamiko, hanamik, anamik, hanamico, chenamik. Its female counterpart hanamika is rarer.

Some authors (e.g. Boretzky) explain the noun xanamik (‘daughter-in-law’s brother or relative’) as a loan-word from Armenian xınan, but we consider it to be borrowed from Tur. hanım - ‘lady’ and hanımık, which is derived from hanım and the Tur. suffix -ık. Hanımık means in Turkish ‘the status of a Lady, the behaviour of a Lady’ and ‘a Lady’s or wife’s relatives’. The same borrowed word hanumluk also occurs in some Balkan languages (Serb., Bulg., Alb.).

3.0. The third group includes words and onomastic units coined in Romani from different indigenous or loan-words, after the Indian model or after some contact language model.

3.1. Terms coined in accordance with the Indian manner of naming units:

In NIA as well as in Romani there are no special terms to express paired relative nouns like ‘parents’, ‘brother and sister’. Romani onomastic units consist of more than one noun. They are polylexemic and strongly recall the Indian ones: (e)daj (o) dād (‘parents’, lit. ‘mother and father’). The related Hindi naming units seem as follows: mā-bāp or mātā-pitā and Bengali ones: mā-bābā, mātā-pitā.

‘Brothers and sisters’- phrala-phae(ña is rather more similar to the Indian ‘compound’ form bhāi-bahin in Hindi, bhāi-bon in Bengali, bhārā-bhāin (p’rā-p’en) in Panjabi etc.

Other syntagmas recalling Indian naming units: bari phen – ‘eldest (first born) sister’, boro phral – ‘eldest (first born) brother’ etc. are significant from the point of view of the traditional family life style. (Cf. Hindi bāri bhāi and bari bahin, with the same signification in family relations). They suggest the importance of the elder family members and the value of interpersonal relations in the traditional societies.

3.2. Many terms are coined after European models, monolexemic, as well as polylexemic or syntagmatic, naming units. They are calques or translated loan-words from the contact languages.

The syntagmas dujto phral, aver phral, dujevlastengero phral (‘cousin, uncle’s brother’) and dujto phen, aver phen, dujevlastengeri phen are coined perhaps after some Slavic model, cf. Russ. ‘dvojurodný brat’ (двоуродный брат) and ‘dvojurodnaja sestra’ (двоуродная сестра), where the relation is defined by the attribute ‘other’, or ‘not direct’ (related to ‘brother’ or ‘sister’).

In the same manner ‘stepfather’ and ‘stepmother’ in Servika and Ungrika Romani are named: moštovno9 dad and moštovno daj (‘present/current father and/or mother’), after Hung. most [read mošt] – ‘now, nowadays’ + adjectivizer suffix -ovno (Slav. -ovn- + Romani -o) + Rom. dad, daj. Other synonymous designations of ‘godfather’ and ‘godmother’ are syntagmas (krestno dad/daj) of the Slavic origin: Slav. krest (‘baptism’) + Slav.-Romani -o + Rom. dad, daj.

Dead parents are designated as čoro/neboštîcko dad/daj < Rom. čoro (‘poor’) or Slovak and Czech neboštík (‘deceased person’) + Rom. dad/daj.

Adjective terno10 (lit. ‘young male’) and terno (lit. ‘young female’) are used as Romani terms denoting ‘bride’ and ‘bridegroom’. They seem to be calqued after the related terms in some Balkan languages, e.g. in Serb. we have also mlada (‘young female’) as a term for ‘bride’.

The term terno bori is very interesting. We can consider it to be coined according to the Slavonic and Balkan term denoting the ‘young daughter-in-law’, but the status of young wife (several months or even years in the new home) is similar in Indian society, as well as in every traditional society.

3.3. Other onomastic units are also formed syntagmatically, i.e. from the basic relative terms with certain attributes, which determine them:

• Phuri baba (‘great grandmother’), phuro papus, phuro bapus (‘great grandfather’) < Rom. ‘old’ + Slav. ‘grandmother’/’grandfather’.
• Cikne/ churde11 ěhave (‘little children’) < Rom. ‘small, little/tiny’ + Rom. ‘children’.

These attributes are often possessive adjectives, or rather the genitive case of the ‘relative’ terms: ěhavengere ěhave (‘grandchildren’), le ěhaskero ěhavo (‘son’s son’), le ěhaskeri ěhaj (‘son’s daughter’), le ěhakero ěhavo (‘daughter’s son’), le ěhakeri ěhaj (‘daughter’s daughter’), romnjako phral (‘wife’s brother’), pejako ěhavo/raklo (‘sister’s son/boy’), pejaæi ěhaj/rakli (‘sister’s daughter’, sister’s girl’).12

• Morphologically, and after non-Indian manner are formed the naming units prapapus and dujore.

---

9 Moštovno is not from Hung. második (‘other, second’), but just from most (‘now’).
10 The adj. terno corresponds to Sanskrit adj. taruöa (‘young’).
11 Cf. Skt. kṣudra – ‘little, tiny’.
12 The last three units are from Romani dialects in the Balkans, the others are from Servika, i.e. from the Slovak Romani.
Prapapus is a combination of morphemes, genetically different – Slav. pra- (‘before’) + Gk. papus (‘grandfather’). The term dujore (pl. of the number duj – ‘two’), expressing ‘twins’, seems to be calqued after Slovak ‘dvojíčky’ (‘twins’).

4. CONCLUSION

The Romani onomastic units are based on the following historical layers and linguistic principles of development:

1. There are inherited terms from the Indian stage, slightly modified in Romani (phen, džamutro etc.)
2. Generated terms from IA (MIA) by semantic shift and specialization: rom, romni, gadžo, gadži, raklo, čhavo etc.
3. Borrowed terms from contact languages, either entirely adopted by assimilative markers (e.g. suffix -o m.sg.) or adopted with marking of their foreign origin – by distinction markers – e.g. Gk. suffix -os, -is etc.).
4. Coined onomastic units in Romani after models of its own (and Indian) onomastic units, or after contact language models.
5. Even in a single dialect we find many synonymous expressions denoting the same individuals within the family system. Often one of them may be ‘pure’ Romani and the other borrowed or calqued syntagma. We cannot say that the Romani terminology is a poor one. If the source of terms is not Indic, then there are plenty of loan-words. The Romani lexicon and onomasiologic system seems to be very flexible and productive one. This fact indicates to what extent it is a typical contact language.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviations</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alb.</td>
<td>Albanian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ai.</td>
<td>altindisch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bulg.</td>
<td>Bulgarian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eng.</td>
<td>English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fem.</td>
<td>feminine gender</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gk.</td>
<td>Greek</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germ.</td>
<td>German</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hung.</td>
<td>Hungarian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IA</td>
<td>Indo-Aryan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IE</td>
<td>Indo-European</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lat.</td>
<td>Latin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lith.</td>
<td>Lithuanian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lot.</td>
<td>Latvian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m(asc.)</td>
<td>masculine gender</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mi.</td>
<td>mittelindisch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MIA</td>
<td>Middle Indo-Aryan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NIA</td>
<td>New Indo-Aryan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OIE</td>
<td>Old Indo-Aryan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OSlav.</td>
<td>Old Slavic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PIE</td>
<td>Proto Indo-European</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rom.</td>
<td>Romani</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russ.</td>
<td>Russian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Serb.</td>
<td>Serbian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skt. (sa.)</td>
<td>Sanskrit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slav.</td>
<td>Slavic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tur.</td>
<td>Turkish</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>