Semantics of Hawrami Kinship Terms

Abbasi Bistoon[1], Amer Gheitury[2], Kerstin Kazzazi[3]

Abstract

The present study aims at exploring kinship terms and the different ways in which they are used to refer to and address relatives and non-relatives in *Hawrami*, an Iranian language spoken in Paveh, a border city in Kermanshah province. The relevant linguistic and cultural data are obtained primarily by one of the researchers as a native speaker of the dialect and through field works and interviews with native speakers. In addition to analyzing consanguineal and affinal terms, and words for step-relatives, some space is also devoted to discuss pragmatic aspects of the words, particularly in contexts where the terms are used to address relatives as well as non-relatives. Considering the fact that the authors came across no serious study of Hawrami kinship terminology, the present study might be one of the first preliminary steps to a better understanding of the cultural and anthropological aspects of this Iranian dialect.

Keywords: Kinship Terms; Consanguineal; Affinal; *Hawrami*; Paveh.

1 . Instructor English Literature, Razi University, Kermanshah   ba20200@yahoo.com
2 . Associate Department of English Literature, Faculty of Humanities, University of Razi, Kermanshah. Iran
     amer@razi.ac.ir
3 . Eichstätt University, Germany   kerstin.kazzazi@yahoo.com

1. Introduction

The study of kinship terms has probably attracted most interest within anthropological linguistics (Foley, 1997: 131) as the priviledged or "the basic discipline of the subject" (Fox, 1967: 10) which is "at the heart of the inventing" of anthropology (Trautmann 2001: 268). It is important since it deals with matters of life and death, identity and personhood, honor and shame, control of property, and succession to positions of authority (Good, 2002: 469). The very significance of studying kinship terminology is well-explained by Trautmann, who believes that it "has uncovered an order of facts that is of the first significance for the understanding of human social life" (2001: 269).

In Anthropological Linguistics, particularly in kinship studies, semantics has a great role in exploring the way kinship as a system is represented in language and in the mind of native speakers of a language. To conduct research into kinship concepts, scholars of the field have applied and developed different methods of analysis including Lexical Fields theory (e.g. Foley, 1997), Componential Analysis (developed by Goodenough, 1956 and Lounsbury, 1956), Emic-Etic Model

(Harris, 1968), Transformational-Generative model (Lounsbury, 1964, 1965), etc. The present study, nevertheless, as a descriptive study following no particular theoretical framework, aims mainly at describing Hawrami kinship terms and the different ways in which they are used to refer to and address relatives and non-relatives

In this study we have investigated the kinship system of Hawrami, that is to say, "the way natives classify their kin" (Foley, 1997: 131) and the terms they use to refer to their relatives. Furthermore, a brief account of the pragmatic aspects of the terms, where they are used to refer to relatives for which there are originally no kinship terms and where they are used to address relatives and non-relatives as a means of respect and endearment, will also be presented. Although the descriptions made in the present study are not grounded in theory, they might be significant both in respect of the data they provide on a non-European language, which could be used to further enhance anthropological theories, as well as for documenting a rapidly changing dialect and its semantic system of kinship terms. Hawrami is spoken in a mountainous area between eastern and southern

Kurdistan known as Hawraman, with approximately one hundred thousand speakers. It has three major dialects, called Lahoni, Takhti, and Zhawaroyi, and a fourth dialect, P way na, spoken in Paveh, the key town in Hawraman. It is traditionally believed that Hawrami, like other dialects spoken in the vast Kurdish-speaking area in the western Iranian Provinces, is a dialect of Kurdish. However, the branching of Kurdish dialects and sub-dialects are not clear yet, and the exact status of Hawrami among other Kurdish dialects has been remained a matter of controversy. It is worth mentioning that not all scholars consider Hawrami as being a Kurdish language (see MacKenzie, 1961b: 73; Gunter, 2003: 58 and 124; Haig, 2004: 9-10). It has sometimes been considered to be the same as Gurani (Gunter 2003: 58), and sometimes one of its dialects (MacKenzie 1966: 4).

The primary repertoire of the kin words was obtained by one of the authors, who as a native Hawrami speaker relied on his own competence of the dialect. However, aiming at more validity and avoiding possible errors and misconceptions, we carried out some informal interviews with native speakers in Paveh. This was significant particularly when the use of the terms in various contexts was concerned. For instance, if the use of a kin word to address a relative in a formal situation is appropriate, it depends on the consent of the members of the language community; naturally the interpretation of one member might not represent social consent. We tried to choose most of our interviewees from the older generation, as they are often less influenced by Persian than the educated youth who are in close contact with Persian as the language of administration, the media, and education, though, some were young. The results of the interviews indicated no major differences between the old and younger generations' use of kinship terms in so far as consonguineal relations were concerned. Still, the youth were less familiar with affinal terms and words for step-relatives. In addition, there was a general consent among all speakers interviewed in the recognition of native and non-native kin words, though each speaker, depending on age and education, preferred native or non-native terms to address others. Whereas older speakers used native kinship terms as address forms, the youth preferred Persian loan terms like 'sir' and *x nim* 'lady'.

What we have considered as Hawrami kinship terms excludes descriptive phrases, which consist of two or more of the kinship terms, but are not yet lexicalized as a single word. Such expressions define the kin relations by joining the existing kin words in possessive or *Izafe* constructions (see MacKenzie 1961a, 1966; Holmberg and Odden 2004b, 2005; Karimi 2007; Abasi and Gheitury 2012) in which two nouns are combined, the first being the possessed noun, which takes an Izafe marker ending (– or –w), and the second noun the possessor, which takes a case marker ending (– or –y). So, the term *žana-w l lo-y* 'mother's brother's wife', a descriptive expression, has not been listed as a single kinship term, but *l lo žan* 'mother's brother's wife' has. It should be noted that descriptive phrases are used very often for two main purposes: on the one hand, for referring to relatives for whom there is no single label, e.g. *š -w dede* 'father's and mother's sister's husband'; and on the other, for giving more details on gender or side (paternal/maternal) of those kin whose labels do not include such information, e.g. *kur- m mo-y* 'father's brother's son', which supplies the gender specification absent in *m moz* 'father's brother's child'.

To define Hawrami kinship terms, we will use three features pertaining to kinship nomenclature including generation, sex, and side. These are just a small portion of the many features posited for the domain (for more features see for example: Murdock 1949), but being more common features, they will suffice for our purposes. The feature "generation" has to do with the generational distance between a given relative and ego, and "sex" pertains to the biological gender of a relative, while "side" suggests that a given relative links with mother or father.

Although the society of Paveh (in Hawrami P wa), much like other traditional societies in developing countries, is about to lose numerous aspects of the traditionalist kinship culture, it has preserved many cultural elements in comparison with other Kurdish-speaking societies in eastern Kurdistan. Although traditional kinship terms are less in use than they were some decades ago, these terms and relations are, however, preserved even in the memory of the younger generation, who are not much interested in their use in formal situations. Likewise, *kinship* remains an important concept and a major link between individuals in the Kurdish-

speaking society in general and the Hawrami-speaking community in particular. The individual is still defined and identified in the network of her/his kinship relations with others. One acquires her/his importance and social status from the social status of the network where she/he belongs. Terms like *hoz, xeł,* and *teyfa* 'tribe', used not infrequently, truly indicate the significance of kinship ties within the society.

In the following, firstly, we introduce and define consanguineal kinship terms in a generational order in section 2. This is followed, in section 3, by a description of affinal kinship terms, and in section 4 by terms for step-relatives. In section 5, we will put forward another subclass of Hawrami kinship terms, that is, collective kinship terms which present kinship relations in several groups. At the end, we will shortly account for the pragmatic aspects of the terms as they are used in various contexts.

2. Consanguineal Kinship Terms

Explaining the consanguineal kinship terms according to generation might be carried out in a descending order, beginning with parents' grandparents' generation and ending in the grandchildren of one's children. As we observe below, Hawrami kin words are categorized into different groups on the basis of seven different generations: three above ego's generation, three below, and ego's own generation.

Three generations above ego:

b w gawra	father's father's father, father's mother's father, mother's father's father, mother's mother's father
d d gawre	father's father's mother, father's mother's mother, mother's father's mother, mother's mother's mother

These two terms consist of two elements, but they are considered as single, lexicalized terms by all Hawrami speakers. The first part, *b w* and *d d* , are the terms referring to relatives of the next generation, i.e. 'grandfather' and 'grandmother'. The second parts of the terms above *gawra* and *gawre* are respectively the masculine and feminine forms of an adjective which means 'great', 'grand', or 'big'. So the terms literally mean 'grand grandfather' and 'grand grand mother'. In this

5

generation there is no distinction in "side"(paternal or maternal) between the

One generation above ego:

Two generations above ego:

b w	father's father, mother's father
d d	father's mother, mother's mother

As mentioned before, these two terms mean 'grandfather' and 'grandmother', respectively. To distinguish "side"

terms, but only in "sex".

descriptive expressions such as *b ba-w b ba-y* 'father's father' and *b ba-w ad -y* 'mother's father' are used.

One generation above ego:

b ba	father
ad	mother
l lo	mother's brother
m mo	father's brother
dede	father's sister, mother's sister

The terms of this generation show distinction in "side" (between *l lo* and *m mo*), and "sex" as well. In this generation, descriptive expressions are used, more than others, instead of the term

dede, the "side" of which is not clear in itself. *w łe b ba-y* 'father's sister' and *w łe ad -y* 'mother's sister' both may substitute for *dede* for more clarity.

Ego's generation:

bir	brother
w łe	sister
l loz	mother's brother's child
m moz	father's brother's child
dedaz	mother's sister's child, father's sister's child

In this generation, like in the previous one, the distinction in "side" differentiates just the two terms *l loz* and *m moz* . But

the "sex" distinction is more restricted, being inherent only to the two terms *bir* and *w łe*. As a general rule in the domain of

Hawrami kinship vocabulary, all kinship terms made by the ending *–z* have no distinction in "sex". Here, the use of descriptive expressions is more to determine the "sex" of relative than their "side". Expressions like *kur- m mo-y* 'uncle's (father's brother) son' or *kin e dede* 'aunt's daughter' indicates the gender of cousins. Albeit the cousins which fall in the class *dedaz ,* as their "side" is not clear, can be described by expressions that distinguish both their "sex" and "side" simultaneously, as in *kin e w łe b ba-y* 'father's sister's daughter'. The ending *–z* and its reduplication *–z z* are very productive in constructing kinship terms. It has its root from the infinitive *z y,* which

means 'to bear' and 'to breed', so, *-z* means 'born of…', and *–z z* means 'born of born of…'

The two terms *k ka* and *d de*, with a high frequency in the language beside their other various uses, can refer to *bir* and *w łe*, respectively. But these terms, in addition to "sex", which is obvious from their forms and referents (*k ka* is masculine and *d de* feminine), contain another meaning component pertaining to age, as they only refer to those brothers and sisters who are older than ego. It should be noted that these terms have this component in all their usages.

One generation below ego:

kur	son
kin e	daughter
bir z	brother's child
w raz	sister's child
l loz z	mother's brother's grandchild
m moz z	father's brother's grandchild
dedaz z	mother's sister's grandchild, father's sister's grandchild

This generation shows "sex" distinction only between *kur* and *kin e*, and shows "side" distinction only between *l loz z* and *m moz z .* As the terms *bir z* and *w raz* do not determine the "sex" of the

relative, just like other terms made by *–z* , descriptive expressions like *kur- bir -y* 'brother's son' or *kin e bir -y* 'brother's daughter' may be used. In contrast, the two terms *zowro* and *roła,* which both mean

'child', can be used to refer to both *kur* and *kin e* without "sex" distinction. Originally,

Two generations below ego:

kuraz	son's child
kin az	daughter's child
bir z z	brother's child's child
w raz z	sister's child's child

As the term *roła* can be used instead of *kur* and *kin e*, the term *rołaz*, although very rarely, can substitute for *kuraz* and *kin az*. But *zowro*, despite its denotational meaning being identical to that of *roła* and despite its ability to substitute for *kur* and *kin e*, cannot be used in a term like *zowroz* *[1], behaving like *rołaz*. In this generation no distinction in "sex" can be observed.

Three generations below ego:

kuraz z	son's child's child
kin az z	daughter's child's child

This generation contains just two terms without "sex" or "side" distinction. And just like *roła* and *rołaz* discussed for the previous generations, the term *rołaz z*, with an infrequent use by older speakers,

roła is an addressaterm that incidentally functions as a kinship term.

can substitute for both terms of this generation.

3. **Affinal Kinship Terms** In this section, too, we follow the generational order to introduce affinal kinship terms. Unlike consanguineal terms which comprise seven generations, three generations above ego, three below ego, and ego's own generation, this kin group only contains three generations, one generation in each side and ego's generation, as follows.

---

1. The asterisk * indicates un-acceptable forms.

One generation above ego:

has ra	husband's father, wife's father (father-in-law)
hasirwa	husband's mother, wife's mother (mother-in-law)

l lo žan	mother's brother's wife
m mo žan	father's brother's wife

has ra and *hasirwa* are morphologically unanalyzable (at least synchronically), but *l lo žan* and *m mo žan* are united bimorphemic terms which consist of *l lo* or *m mo* and a common noun *žan* which is used in three different senses, as 'adult female', 'married woman', and as 'wife'. It is interesting that the term *žan* is present in Ego's generation:

several kinship terms whereas *pya* 'man' is not. In this generation, a gap is felt, namely the lack of terms for labelling mother's sister's husband and father's sister's husband, whereas mother's brother's wife and father's brother's wife are labeled.

š	husband
žan	wife
žan bir	wife's brother
žan w	wife's sister
hewar	husband's brother
sete	husband's sister
hewar žan	husband's brother's wife
ham zam	wife's sister's husband
bira žan	brother's wife
hawo	husband's wife (used when a man has experienced more than one marriage simultaneously

As discussed in the introduction, descriptive expressions in the form of Izafe constructions may be used instead of single kinship terms. Some kinship terms

obviously have been constructed from their counterpart descriptive expressions. A native Hawrami describes *žan bir*, for instance, as *bir -w žan-e* literally 'brother

9

of wife' which has lost its Izafe, and case markers and its ingredients have been inverted. Also, other similar terms are made *b r žan* as *žana-w bir -y*.

One generation below ego:

zam	daughter's husband (son in law)
weywa	son's wife (daughter in law)
setaz	husband's sister's child
hewaraz	husband's brother's child

It should be noted that *zam* 'son in law' also means 'bridegroom' and similarly *weywa* 'daughter in law' means 'bride'. This generation, too, has a gap in the lack of terms to label 'wife's sister's children' and 'wife's brother's children', whereas those of the husband are labeled.

4. Step Kinship Terms

All the terms discussed so far refer to "real" relations who are called *haq d d* in Hawrami, such as *bir y haq d d* 'real brother' or *l loy haq d d* 'real mother's brother'. *haq d d* is a single nativized term consisting of two loan words, *haq* 'right' from Arabic and *d d* 'justice' from Persian. Referring to step relations, elderly speakers use the two main terms *ad y* 'maternal' and *b bay* 'paternal' (e.g. *bir y ad y* 'step

and described similarly: *žan w* as *w łe žan-e* (here *w łe* has been contracted into *w*), *hewar žan* as *žana-w hewar-* , and described similarly.

brother from same mother') and their derivations such as *ad -jy* 'from a step mother' which are made by adding *–jy* which means 'separate, discrete', or by a combination of both *–jy* and *–z* in *b ba jy z* 'from a step father'. Younger speakers mostly use the Persian loans *tan* and *n tan* with a wider applicability than native terms to distinguish between "real" and "step" relations respectively (see Gheitury et al. 2010: 542).

Other than referring expressions discussed so far, some single kin terms are used to refer to step relations as follows:

Two generations above ego:
The main kin words for step relatives are:

zir[1]-b w	step father's father, step mother's father

---

1. '*zir-*' in other contexts means 'unfruitful, inelastic and arid'

10

zir-d d	step father's mother, step mother's father
b w py ra	step father
b w žan	step mother
zir-m mo	step father's brother
zir-l lo	step mother's brother
zir-dede	step father's sister, step mother's sister
Hanaz	husband's child
Kołabas	wife's child

Another noticeable point about step kinship terms is the lack of terms to refer to relatives in the ego's own generation. So step brother, sister, and cousins have no single term to refer to. In case one wants to emphasize the kind of relation between her/him and her/his siblings as being step or real, as indicated earlier, she/he uses expressions consisting of terms like *ad y*, *ad jy*, *b bay*, etc. for the step siblings. However, the kind of relation with siblings is not of as great importance as compared to that with uncles or aunts. Traditionally, step parents, step uncles and step aunts have been believed to be somewhat cruel and unfriendly, but this does not apply to step siblings. So, there seems to be little difference between step and real siblings at the level of personal relationship, as opposed to the relationship with step

uncles, for example. Interestingly, as regards the two kinds of step uncles and aunts one may have, i.e. step siblings of parents vs. siblings of step parents, as indicated before, the first group have no label, whereas the second have. This fact also shows that for siblings it does not matter whether they are real or step, as even step siblings of parents obviously have no different relationship to ego than parents' real siblings because they are associated with real kin, whereas the relationship with the real siblings of step parents is less close because both parent and sibling belong to the set of step kin.

5. Collective Kinship Terms

Apart from kin words discussed so far, some collective kin terms also exist which refer to kin groups rather than single relatives. Such terms (at least some of them) are observed in nearly all Kurdish dialects (see for example Gheitury et al. 2010: 538). This issue is reflected in the literature and folklore of the Kurds. For instance, *b w n*, the common and most used collective kin term, very frequently occurs in lyrics and folkloric poetry as an address term conveying deep endearment.

11

b w n	parents, grandparents, and great-grandparents
has r n	wife's or husband's father, mother, brothers, and sisters
l lw n (x łw n)	mother's brothers and their children and grandchildren
m mw n	father's brothers and their children and grandchildren
deda-w-dedaz	father's and mother's sisters and their children and grandchildren
bir -w-bir z	brothers and their children and grandchildren
w ra-w-w raz	sisters and their children and grandchildren
kur- -kuraz	sons and their children and grandchildren
kin a-w-kin az	daughters and their children and grandchildren

What motivate us to consider all such constructions as single kinship terms are their morphological as well as syntactic characteristics. Regarding the first four terms, the ending - *n* as a plural marker only occurs with nouns in the accusative and genitive cases (see Holmberg & Odden 2004a), in the nominative case nouns take - *e* as a plural marker, so - *n* is more than a simple plural marker in this context, as *b w n, has r n, l lw n,* and *m mwan* in the nominative case have - *n*. These four terms can even take the plural marker –*e* after their - *n* like *b w n-e,* whereas two plural markers never co-occur in other contexts.

The five last terms of this group have a different form in that they constitute a coordination of two kin terms by a mediating conjunction (or *w,* depending on context). But we believe that we are permitted to consider such coordinations as single kin terms as they show some deviance from ordinary coordinations which take place in other contexts. In an ordinary coordination, the two terms *dede* and *kin e* should keep their original form and feminine marker –*e,* but here the -*e* has changed to -*a*; also, the term *w łe* in this context has changed its form to *w ra*- whereas in an ordinary coordination it should participate as *w łe*. Beside these morphological features a syntactic one strongly differentiates them from typical coordinations, that is, unlike coordinated constituents these forms can occur in sentences with singular verbs and singular adjectives as in: *bir -w-bir z -w b st n- man* 'Bistoon's brothers and/or their children and/or grand children "has" come',

in which the verb *man* 'has come' is third person singular, or *b st n kur- -kuraz -y l-iš han* 'Bistoon has good sons and grand children, in which both the adjective *l* 'good' and the verb *han* 'has' are singular *¹*. If such constituents behaved like typical coordinations then *man* should be *mene*, *l* shoud be *le*, and *han* should be *hane*. To sum up so far, based on morphological and syntactic differences they have with ordinary plural words and coordinations, we conclude that all these nine expressions should be regarded as single terms in the domain of kinship vocabulary.

6. Pragmatic Aspects

A considerable pragmatic use of kinship terms is their applicability as "address terms/forms". Richards and Schmidt define address form or address term as "the word or words used to address somebody in speech or writing" (2002: 11). They also believe that "the way in which people address one another usually depends on their age, sex, social group, and personal relationship" (Ibid). In the following, by

---

1. It should be noted that Hawrami, like many Kurdish dialects, has retained a kind of "split ergativity" in past perfect. So, in sentences like above example, the transitive verb should agree with the object in number and gender (see. Holmberg and Odden 2004a; Haig 1998, 2004).

describing the use of Hawrami kinship terms as address terms generation by generation, we aim to show the relationship between those factors and the use of address forms.

Among all kinship terms which have introduced so far, it is only consanguineal terms, three affinal terms, and one collective term that function as address terms, step terms not doing so at all. Nonetheless, not all the terms listed as consanguineal kinship terms are used as address terms. As a general principle, all morphologically complex (poly-morphemic) consanguineal terms which consist of a simple (mono-morphemic) kinship term and an additional morpheme are not used as address terms. So, the terms which were introduced for three generations above ego, *b w gawra* 'great grandfather' and *d d gawre* 'great grandmother', and all the terms ended in –*z* and –*z z* do not function as address terms at all.

b w 'grandfather' and *d d* 'grandmother' are used to address grandfather and grandmother and also great grandfather and great grandmother respectively. *b ba* 'father' is used to address father and *ad* 'mother' to address mother. These two terms, when followed by

a proper noun, are mostly also used to address grandfather and grandmother, as in *b ba al* which means 'grandfather Ali' and *ad ism* which means 'grandmother Isma'. In such cases the term *b ba* could be reduced to *b* to function in the same manner, as in *b -birz ,* which means 'grandfather Birzu'. *b ba* is very rarely used to address non-relatives who are older than the speaker; this mainly happens in situations of challenge, protest, and dissatisfaction, as in *p sa niyan b ba gy n* 'that is not the case, dear father'. Nonetheless in addressing non-relatives and relatives who are younger than the speaker, *b ba*, mostly in the form of *b ba-kam* 'my father', is frequently used and implies endearment. *ad* , unlike *b ba*, may be used widely to address non-relatives as well as relatives, either older or younger than the speaker, for older addressees it takes the two forms *ad* and *ad -kem* 'my mother' and implies respect, and for younger addressees it comes only in the form *ad -kem* and implies endearment. An interesting point about the use of the address term *b ba-kam* is that, despite the masculinity of the term, it is frequently used to address female addressees as well, for example one may address his/her daughter as *b ba-kam*,

but vice versa is not the case, as a male addressee could not be addressed by the term *ad -kem* nor by any other feminine address terms.

The terms *l lo* and *m mo,* besides being used for mother's brother and father's brother, respectively, are also used to address a wide variety of relatives and non-relatives. *l lo* is used to address the speaker's own mother's brother, her/his mother's mother's brother, her/his father's mother's brother, and also her/his male cousins. Apart from that, all unfamiliar men who are older than the speaker may be addressed by *l lo*. *m mo* behaves just like *l lo,* except that in addressing unfamiliar persons it has less frequency than *l lo*. *dede* is not very often used to address mother's or father's sister, it is more frequently the form by which non-relatives or unfamiliar women older than the speaker are addressed. All three forms discussed here imply respect for elderly addressees, a factor which is judged to be pragmatically important in the society in question.

No one addresses her/his brother by *bir* in ordinary situations. *bir* by itself is used only to address someone, even female addressees, in the cases of dissatisfaction or protest, as in *eš m bir ?* 'What do you

say, brother?', whereas, in the form *bir - kam*, it occurs very frequently to address male persons of the same age or younger than the speaker, respectfully and sincerely. It also may imply endearment, and if so, it may be used to address females too. The term *bir -ła* is used to address male relatives or nonrelatives. *w łe* has three differences to *bira:* first, infrequently however, it can be used to address the sister; second, it can occur by itself in both ordinary and dissatisfaction situations, so both the forms *w łe* and *w la-kem* may be used to convey respect in address; and third, despite the existence of morphologically parallell *bir -kam*, *w ła-kem* does not imply endearment. As mentioned before, the two terms *k ka* and *d de* are used to refer to older brothers and sisters respectively. But these terms may be used for address as well, and they are the most frequent address terms in Hawrami, as any addressee who is older than the speaker can be addressed by *k ka* (male) or *d de* (female) respectfully.

Unlike all consanguineal kinship terms which function as address terms, the term *kur* could not be used per se in its original form. For addressing someone, it changes and takes the form of *kura* in cases of dissatisfaction or wonder, or takes possessive suffixes, as in *kur-im* or *kur-aka-m* 'my son', to convey endearment. It also may be used to address female addressees. *kin e* may be used to address, infrequently in its original form in ordinary situations, with a possessive suffix for endearment, and in a contracted form *kin* for conveying dissatisfaction and wonder. All the terms *kur-im*, *kur-aka-m*, *kin ce*, and *kin -ake-m* are used to address son and daughter and all younger-than-the-speaker addressees, whereas *kura*, *kin e*, and *kin* can be used to address any addressee of any age, but they are somewhat impolite forms. Another term which is used not infrequently for addressing is the term *roła*. It may imply deep endearment for younger addressees or may imply humiliation for anyone, context-dependently.

The three affinal kinship terms which are used as address terms are *l lo žan*, *m mo žan*, and *bir žan*. These terms lose their final - in this function. They can also be used to address non-relative women to convey respect, *l lo žan* and *m mo žan* for older and *bir žan* for younger addressees. Finally, *b w n*, as indicated in the section on collective kinship terms, is used as an address term to show endearment. To

function as an address term it usually takes a possessive ending like *b w n-im* or *b w n-aka-m* 'my *b w n*'. It is mostly used to address younger addressees, especially the addresser's own children, nieces, or nephews.

1. Conclusion

The present study was aimed at exploring kinship terms and the different ways in which they are used to refer to and address relatives and non-relatives in Hawrami. The use of these terms by native speaker might be considered to reveal interesting aspects of a traditional society like Hawrami. As Mesthrie observes, "Aspects of social structure may be reflected in specialized semantic fields within a language. In studies of kinship patterns within a society, for example, anthropologists have long found the terminology used by native speakers to be a vital key to interpretations of the system" (Mesthrie, 1990:335). So, as the "analysis of the Native terminology used by someone to refer to kin categories" is a way to approach "the basic structure underlying a kinship system" (Foley, 1997: 134-5) and "kinship is not neatly separable from other aspects of social organization" (Ibid: 147), the study of kinship

terminology digs into the core of the social life of a given society. The system of kinship nomenclature reflects the system of kinship relations in a way the members of a society see it or have seen it earlier. The possiblity of dividing a kinship system nomenclature into some subsystems, of labellling or not labellling certain kin relations, and the simplicity/complexity of the terms, all evidence social facts which affect social life. Nonetheless, "societal change may involve corresponding restructurings of a semantic field" (Mesthrie, 1990: 335), and bearing in mind that, in such cases, linguistic change follows and also takes place more slowly than social change, the contemporary nomenclature probably reflects a previous system. Some of our findings make this claim plausible.

Among 63 kinship terms we have listed, 27 belong to the consanguineal sub-system, 18 to the affinal, 9 to the collective, and 9 to the step system. Besides, in this Hawrami-speaking traditional society, consanguineal relations are regarded as more important than affinal relations based on an opinion which discriminates between spouse's relatives and ego's relatives. More terms (27 against 18) and more generation to be comprised (7 against 3)

bear witness to this view.

A considerable issue that the data entails has to do with the gender of ego which varies regarding some terms. In total there are 13 terms, 11 affinal and 2 step terms, for which the gender of ego is significant (see below). 8 of these terms (all affinal) which belong to ego's generation have exact congruity, as every term with a male ego has a counterpart with a female ego. We ignore the term *hawo* 'husband's wife', because this could not have any counterpart as polyandry does not exist in the mentioned society. The two step terms and the two remaining affinals belong to one generation below ego. Steps, in addition, have the same congruity but affinals do not.

So, 5 terms have male ego and 7 terms have female ego. Besides, the terms with female are simpler than those with male ego. In agreement with Enfield et al., we assume that "basic cognitive categories are labeled by formally less complex terms" (2006: 140), a hypothesis which has been put forward in studies on color terminology and the taxonomy of different semantic fields, too. The immediate conclusion drawn from these facts could be that there is a slight difference in men's and women's attitudes toward spouse's relatives- a fact albeit often enveloped by humorous remarks.

Kinship terms with male ego		Kinship terms with female ego	
		Ego's generation	
žan	Wife	*š*	husband
žan bir	wife's brother	*sete*	husband's sister
žan w	wife's sister	*hewar*	husband's brother
ham zam	wife's sister's husband	*hewar žan*	husband's brother's wife
		hawo	husband's wife
		One generation below ego	
		setaz	husband's sister's child
		hewaraz	husband's brother's child
koɫabas	wife's child	*hanaz*	husband's child

Regarding the step terms, the lack of any term to refer to relatives in ego's own generation, more elaboration in upper generations, and the negative connotation of the prefix *–zir* 'unfruitful, inflexible, and arid', which makes most step terms, indicate the (negative) importance or discomfort of having step parents, uncles or aunts, for example. This fact is reflected in typical conversations, as *b w žan* 'step mother' has became the symbol of cruelty and injustice. The existence and frequency of step relationships are affected by demographic factors such as polygamy and re-marriage after the spouse's death or divorce. But nowadays its frequency has diminished over the past decades. As the main cause, polygamy, despite its justifiability according to Islamic tradition, has lost its legitimation among the new generations, and its residues in the older generations are disappearing. Also, remarrying due to spouse's death has been radically reduced due to decreases in mortality rates and longevity increase. As the origin of step relationships, only remarrying after divorce has remained, though, it also has changed in nature. Today divorces, due to the birth rate decrease and the current delay of first child birth, do not

yield step relations after second marriage as much as those in past did. As a result, the use of step kinship terms has become very restricted and almost abandoned (except *b w py ra* and *b w žan*). These terms have only been preserved in the memory of elderly speakers for rare and incidental usage.

Finally, the collective sub-system including 9 relatively frequent terms which sub-divide the whole kinship system and refer to kin groups instead of individual relatives, evidence the still retained significance of kinship networks in the society in which the traditional concept of kinship has remained powerful and effective among and over other social relationships. In this classification all affinal relatives, by just one term *has r n* against the subtle elaboration of consanguineal terms, are separated (if not isolated) indicating their lesser importance in the kinship network. However, with such precision prevalent in the system, it seems somewhat unexpected that there is no separation of paternal and maternal aunts, just like in consanguineal and step terms, whereas uncles are separated.

References

[1] Abasi, B. & Gheitury, A., (2012). Semantics of Hawrami Body Part Terms. *Iran and the Caucasus*: *16*.

[2] Enfield, N. J., Majid, A., & Staden, M. v. (2006). Cross-linguistic categorization of the body: Introduction. *Language Sciences , 28*, 137-147.

[3] Foley, W. A., (1997). *Anthropological Linguistics: An Introduction.* Oxford: Blackwell.

[4] Fox, R., (1967). *Kinship and Marriage: An Anthropological perspective* (Cambridge University Press ed.). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

[5] Gheitury, A., Yasami, H., & Kazzazi, K., (2010). A Note on Kalhori Kinship Terms. *Iranian Studies , 43*(4), 533 -547.

[6] Good, A., (2002). Kinship. In A. Barnard, & J. Spencer (Eds.), *Encyclopedia of Social and Cultural Anthropology* (pp. 469-480). London & New York: Routledge.

[7] Gunter, M. M., (2003). *The A to Z of the Kurds.* Lanham: Scarecrow Press, Inc.

[8] Gunter, M. M., (2004). *Historical Dictionary of the Kurds.* Lanham, Maryland, and Oxford: The Scarecrow Press.

[9] Goodenough, W. H., (1956). Componential Analysis and the Study of Meaning. *Language , 32* (1), 195-216.

[1] Haig, G., (1998). On the Interaction of Morphological and Syntactic Ergativity: Lessons from Kurdish. *Lingua , 105*, 149-173.

[2] Haig, G. L. (2004). *Alignment in Kurdish: a diachronic perspective.* Unpublished Habilitationsschrift: Philosophische Fakultät der Christian-Albrechts-Universität zu Kiel.

[3] Harris, M. 1968. The Rise of Anthropological Theory. New York: Cromwell.

[4] Holmberg, A., & Odden, D. (2004a). Ergativity and Role-Marking in Hawrami. *First International Conference on Aspects of Iranian Linguistics.* Leipzig: University of Leipzig & Max Plank Institute of Evolutionary Anthropology.

[5] Holmberg, A., & Odden, D. (2004b). The Izafe and NP Structure in Hawrami. *Durham Working Papers in Linguistics , 10*, 77-93.

[6] Holmberg, A., & Odden, D. (2005). The Noun Phrase in Hawrami. *First International Conference on Aspects of Iranian Linguistics.* Leipzig: Max Plank Institute.

[7] Karimi, Y., (2007). Kurdish Ezafe construction: Implications for DP structure. *Lingua , 117*, 2159–2177.

[8] Lounsbury, F. G., (1956). A semantic analysis of the Pawnee kinship usage. *Language , 32*, 158-194.

[9] Lounsbury, F. G., (1964), "A Formal Account of the Crow- and Omaha-Type Kinship Terminologies", in Ward H. Goodenough (ed.), *Explorations in Cultural Anthropology: Essays in Honor of George Peter Murdock*, New York: McGraw-Hill, Pp. 351–393.

[10] Lounsbury, F. G., (1965), Another View of the Trobriand Kinship Categories. American Anthropologist, 67: 142–185.

[11] MacKenzie, D. N., (1961a). *Kurdish Dialect Studies* (Vol. 1). London: Oxford University Press.

[12] MacKenzie, D. N., (1961b). The Origins of Kurdish. *Transactions of the Philological Society , 60*(1), 68-86.

[13] MacKenzie, D. N., (1966). *The Dialect of Awroman (Hawraman_i Luhon).* Kobenhavn: The Royal Danish Academy of Science and Letters.

[14] Mesthrie, R., (1990). The Linguistic Reflex of Social Change: Caste and Kinship Terms among People of Indian Descent in Natal, South Africa. *Anthropological Linguistics , 32*(3-4), 335-353.

[15] Murdock, G. P., (1949). *Social Structure.* New York: The Macmillan Company.

[16] Richards, J. C., & Schmidt, R., (2002). *Longman Dictionary of Language Teaching and Applied Linguistics* (3 ed.). London: Pearson Education.

[17] Trautmann, T. R., (2001). The whole history of kinship terminology in three chapters : Before.

[18] Morgan, Morgan, and after Morgan. *Anthropological Theory , 1*(2), 268–287.

Appendix

Phonetic Symbols:

1 Consonants

	vcls stop	vcls affric	vcls fric	vcd stop	vcd affric	vcd fric	nasal
bilabial	*p*			*b*			*m*
labiodental			*f*			*v*	
alveolar	*t*		*s*	*d*		*z*	*n*
alveopalatal			*š*		*j*	*ž*	
velar	*k*		*x*	*g*			
uvular	*q*						
laryngeal			*h*				

2 Liquids and Glids

liquids			*r*	alveolar trill			
	l	alveolar lateral			*ł*	velarized lateral	
glids	*w*	labiovelar			*y*	palatal	

3 vowels

			tense	high
	i	*u*	lax	
e		*o*		mid
a				low

front, unrounded   central, unrounded   back, rounded

معنی شناسی واژگان خویشاوندی هورامی

بیستون عباسی¹، عامر قیطوری²، کرستین کزازی³

مطالعه حاضر به بررسی واژگان خویشاوندی هورامی به عنوان یکی از گویش‌های ایرانی که در پاوه در استان کرمانشاه بدان تکلم می شود می پردازد. داده های زبانی و فرهنگی مرتبط با این تحقیق عمدتا به وسیله یکی از محققین که خود گویشور بومی هورامی است و از طریق کار میدانی و مصاحبه با گویشوران بومی گردآوری شده است. علاوه بر تحلیل اصطلاحات نسبی و سببی و واژگان ناتنی، بخشی از این تحقیق به بررسی مسائل کاربرد شناختی واژه ها، به ویژه هنگامی که برای خطاب به کار می روند، می پردازد. با توجه به این حقیقت که واژگان خویشاوندی این گویش پیش از این موضوع مطالعات زبانشناختی و انسلن شناختی نبوده است، مطالعه حاضر می توان گام کوچکی باشد در جهت آشنایی بیشتر با جنبه‌های زبانشناختی و انسان شناختی این گویش ایرانی.

کلید واژگان: واژگان خویشاوندی، نسبی، سببی، هورامی، پاوه.

۱. مربی، گروه زبان و ادبیات انگلیسی، دانشگاه رازی، کرمانشاه

۲. دانشیار، گروه زبان و ادبیات انگلیسی، دانشگاه رازی، کرمانشاه

۳. استاد دانشگاه Eichstätt آلمان