The Scientific Journal of Cihan University – Slemani **PP: 48-64**
Volume (4), Issue (1), June 2020
ISSN 2520-7377 (Online), ISSN 2520-5102 (Print)

A Componential Analysis of Kinship Terms in Central Kurdish

Twana Saadi Hamid[1], Bestoon Hassan Ahmed[2]

English Department, College of Languages, University of Sulaimani, Sulaimani, Iraq[1]

Kurdish Department, College of Basic Education, University of Sulaimani, Sulaimani, Iraq[2]

Email: twana.hamid@univsul.edu.iq[1]

Abstract:

This paper addresses the semantic field of kinship terms in Central Kurdish (CK henceforth). The study uses data of Basic (blood) relations and Non-basic (marriage) relations. It tries to test whether CK kinship terms can be explained through the use of semantic features. It also tries to find out what kind of features are employed to compare and contrast different dimensions of kinship terms. Kinship terms in other varieties of Kurdish such as Kalhori and Hawrami have been studied. However, to the best of our knowledge, no study has looked into the kinship terms in the Central dialect of Kurdish. Moreover, no study has combined and compared both basic and non-basic kinship terms. This study found that kinship terms in CK lend themselves to componential analysis in a clear way. That is, semantic features can explain the relation between both basic and non-basic kinship terms. The semantic features that are employed for depicting basic kinship terms are Generation, Sex, Lineality and Direction of Kinship. The same four features are used for non-basic kinship terms with another feature known as New Marriage. Another finding of the study is that basic kinship terms, in contrast to non-basic kinship terms, can be used as terms of address.

الملخص:

تتناول هذا البحث المجال الدلالي لمصطلحات القرابة بالكردية الوسطى. تستخدم الدراسة بيانات العلاقات الأساسية (الدم) والعلاقات غير الأساسية (الزواج). يحاول البحث اختبار ما إذا كان يمكن شرح مصطلحات صلة الكرديه الوسطى من خلال استخدام السمات الدلالية. تحاول أيضًا معرفة نوع الميزات المستخدمة لمقارنة وتباين الأبعاد المختلفة لشروط القرابة. تمت دراسة شروط القرابة في أنواع أخرى من اللهجات الكردية الأخرى مثل كلهورى و هورامى. ومع ذلك ، على حد علمنا ، لم تنظر أي دراسة في مصطلحات القرابة باللهجة المركزية للغة الكردية. علاوة على ذلك ، لم تجمع أي دراسة بين شروط القرابة الأساسية وغير الأساسية وقارنتها. وجدت هذه الدراسة أن شروط القرابة في الكرديه الوسطى تتناسب مع تحليل الميزات الدلاليه بطريقة واضحة. ألملامح الدلالية التي تُستخدم لتصوير مصطلحات القرابة الأساسية هي الجيل والجنس والسلاله واتجاه القرابة. يتم استخدام نفس الميزات الأربعة لشروط القرابة غير الأساسية مع ميزة أخرى تعرف باسم الزواج الجديد. استنتاج آخر من الدراسة هو أن مصطلحات القرابة الأساسية ، على النقيض من مصطلحات القرابة غير الأساسية ، يمكن استخدامها كمصطلحات العنوان عندما نخاطب شخص.

پوختە:

ئەم توێژینەوە لە کێڵگەی واتایی زاراوەکانی خزمایەتی لە زاری کوردی ناوەراستدا دەکۆڵێتەوە، داتاکان هەردوو پەیوەندی خزمایەتی خوێن و ژن و ژنخوازی دەگرێتەوە. توێژینەوەکە هەوڵدەدات وەڵامی ئەو پرسیارە بداتەوە، کە ئایا دەکریت زاراوەکانی خزمایەتی لە رێگەی نیشانە واتاییەکانەوە روون بکرێنەوە و بەراورد بکرێن. هەروەها هەوڵدەدات ئەو نیشانە واتاییانە، کە بەکاردێن بۆ بەراوردکردنی رەهەندە جیاوازەکانی خزمایەتی بدۆزیتەوە. لێکۆڵینەوە لە زاراوەکانی خزمایەتی لە زارو شێوە زارەکانی دیکەی زمانی کوردی وەك کەلهوری و هەورامی کراوە، بەڵام ئەوەندەی ئەم لێکۆڵینەوەیە ئاگادار بیت هیچ توێژینەوەیەك لە زاراوەکانی خزمایەتی لە زاری کرمانجی ناوەڕاستی نەکۆڵیوەتەوە. زیاد لەوەش، هیچ توێژینەوەیەك بەراوردی پەیوەندی خزمایەتی خوێن و ژن و ژنخوازی لە زمانی کوردیدا نەکردوە. ئەنجامەکانی ئەم توێژینەوە دەریدەخات کە زاراوەکانی

DOI: http://dx.doi.org/10.25098/4.1.25

The Scientific Journal of Cihan University – Slemani **PP: 48-64**
Volume (4), Issue (1), June 2020
ISSN 2520-7377 (Online), ISSN 2520-5102 (Print)

خزمایەتی بە رووڕی لەلایەن نیشانە واتاییەکانەوە روون دەکرێنەوە. بە واتایەکی دیکە، نیشانە واتاییەکان دەتوانن پەیوەندیەکانی نێوان خزمایەتی خوێن لەگەڵ ژنو ژنخوازی روون بکەنەوە. ئەو نیشانە واتاییانەی کە بەکاردێن بۆ رووڕنکردنەوەی پەیوەندی خزمایەتی خوێن، بریتین لە (نەوە، توخم، باوان و ئاراستەی خزمایەتی). هەمان چوار نیشانەی واتایی بەکاردێن بۆناساندنی زاراوەکانی خزمایەتی لە ڕێی ژن و ژنخوازیەوە، بەلام دەبێت نیشانەیەکی دیکەشی بۆ زیاد بکەین، کە ئەویش هاوسەرگیری نوێیە. دەرەنجامێکی دیکەی توێژینەوەکە ئەوەیە کە زاراوەکانی خزمایەتی خوێن، بە پێچەوانەی زاراوەکانی خزمایەتی ژن و ژنخوازی، بەکار دەهێنرێن بۆ بانگ کردن.

Introduction:

The study of kinship terms started systematically at the beginning of the 20th century. It started to attract the anthropologists' interest before the linguists. It also attracted descriptive linguists' interest when scholars such as Boas and Sapir, as part of their general interest in exploring the American vernacular languages started studying kinship terms (Boas 1919). Since then, kinship terms as an outlet to the culture and the structure of the family has been investigated in other ways such as logical, mathematical, and other non-formal approaches. Although limited in its lexical application, componential analysis as a formal approach has been one of the most widely applied approaches amongst linguists. Durbin (1972) describes componential analysis as the most widespread linguistic model used among anthropologists.

It has been established in semantics literature that kinship terms form a separate semantic group. This proposition is based on the fact that in the meaning of all the units of kinship terms, at least one semantic feature is common and serves as the basis for the comparison of their meanings. Moreover, the two terms are different since they are different in at least one semantic feature. The kinship terms form a unified independent group to the exclusion of other groups including terms that denote relationships such as friend, colleague, comrade, classmate and so on.

There is an implicit claim that kinship terms are linguistically universal. In other words, they form an independent group in every language. This proposition is based on the fact that in the meaning of kinship terms, and in fact of all other separate groups, there is at least one semantic feature common for all units of the group and serves as the basis for the comparison of their meaning. The group is known as semantic field. Likewise, two units of the same group should be different in at least one of the semantic features. Otherwise, they would not be two different entities. In other words, two terms are distinct since there is one feature that separates them.

The semantic features for the field of kinship terms are chosen on the basis of opposition between members of the group from one hand, and words not entering into this group but forming with them a more general semantic system (Kuznecov 2009). Words of the type *friend, comrade, colleague, classmate, co-worker, fellow-traveller,* signify non-cognate relationships between people. The explicit choice of semantic features used to describe kinship terms exhaustively and consistently insure that this group is limited to consanguineous (blood) or affinal (marriage) relationships.

As Wallace and Atkins (1960) observe, Componential Analysis better defines the meaning of terms according to the conceptual criteria than does mere kin-type listing and has been successfully applied primarily to definitive meaning. Although componential analysis has been used with other semantic fields, but it best suits analysis of kinship terms. Since they are limited in number and

have clear denotations[1]. Cross-linguistically, there are certain semantic features that are common for analysing kinship terms. Features that are relevant in CK are: **sex** as in *bawk* 'father'; day 'mother'. **generation** as in: *bapeer* 'grandfather'; *bawk* and *kwr* 'son'. **Lineals** are persons who are ancestors or descendants of ego. So father and son are lineals whilst brother and uncle are colineals. CK also distinguishes the **parental side** of the kinsmen. *Mam* 'uncle from father's side' is different from *xal* 'uncle from mother's side'. However, with *pur*, 'aunt', the parental side is not identified. *Pur* can be father's or mother's sister.

For generation differences in CK, five generations are needed which may be labelled G1, G2, G3, G4, G5. Then grandfather is G1, father, uncle G2, brother, cousin G3, son, niece G4 and grandson, granddaughter G5. In this system, the 'ego' the person for whom the relationships hold is G3. There is no specific term for generations other than the five generations mentioned. Rarely relations higher or lower than the generations mentioned exist. In that case, paraphrastic terminologies will be employed. So, for the great grandfather the term *bapeery bawkm* is used which means my father's grandfather.

Each language has its own kinship terms which reflects its culture. Further, the meaning of kinship terms reflects the relationship among kins in a particular society. Different languages employ different features or combination of features to describe kinship terms and their relations. Whilst English uses sex, generation and lineality, CK uses sex, generation, lineality and parental side to describe basic kinship terms. Even the way they combine features differ. Whilst in *braza* 'offspring of my brother', it is shown that the child belongs to my brother not my sister and the sex of the child is not expressed. For *purza* 'cousin' neither the sex nor the parental side is identified. In the English word 'nephew', the sex of the child is expressed but it is not shown whether he is my brother's or sister's son.

Although kinship terms are widely studied cross-linguistically, including other varieties of Kurdish with relatively fewer speakers such as Kalhori (Gheitury et al 2010) and Hawrami (Bistoon et al 2013). So far, as far as we are aware, no study has looked into the kinship terms in CK. An explicit componential analysis gives a clear picture of the kinship system in any language. Further it has not been investigated what kind of features need to be employed to capture the relation between basic and non-basic kinship terms. In this paper, we present a componential analysis of basic and non-basic kinship terms in CK. The study also tests the hypothesis that semantic feature analysis can better explain kinship terms and their relations to each other.

2. The Semantic Field of Kinship Terms

The mental store of the vocabulary of any language, known as lexicon, includes all the lexical items of that language. The mental lexicon of the native speakers of any language also stores formulaic expressions such as idioms, proverbs, phrasal verbs and clichés in a ready-made form. The lexicon should also include the derived words (both complex and compound words) when their meaning is unpredictable from their components.

[1] As a reviewer of an earlier version notes, Componential Analysis are used mostly with noun class incontrast to other word classes such as verbs, adjectives and adverbs.

DOI: http://dx.doi.org/10.25098/4.1.25

The Scientific Journal of Cihan University – Slemani **PP: 48-64**
Volume (4), Issue (1), June 2020
ISSN 2520-7377 (Online), ISSN 2520-5102 (Print)

However, the mental lexicon is not a listing of words as in a publishing dictionary. Rather, the parsimonious principle of language warrants the acquisition of the first language to be as easy and natural as possible. In doing so, the lexical items are simultaneously in a number of relations with another lexical items which is known as lexical relation. Trier (1934 cited in Lyons 1977:252), who is regarded among the early linguists to introduce semantic field, states that the vocabulary of any language as an integrated system of lexemes interrelated in meaning. Individual items hold a part-whole relation to lexical fields which is similar to the relationship between lexical items and the entirety of vocabulary. Trier puts it in this way "Fields are living realities intermediate between individual words and the totality of vocabulary." This is particularly true for kinship terms. As Murry (2006: p.307) states, kin terms are not a set of unrelated labels tagged to objects, rather they are little systems of mathematics and logic each of whose constituent structure depends on the logical structure of the whole.

The vocabulary of any language is in constant flux: old items drop out, new terms come in, and the internal relations among the set changes (ibid). This latter proposition has an interesting impact on the topic at issue in this paper since the decay, coinage and change of vocabulary and their sense can have critical consequences on the communal principles advocated in kinship terms. The addition of (Ms) as a term of address to a neutral (not relevant whether married or unmarried) female is an example in English language. Similarly, in CK, the use of *barez* 'honourable' is recently added to formally address an unknown person to replace the now defunct term of addressing unknown male older person *xala* 'uncle' and unknown female older person *pwr* 'auntie'.

The vast vocabulary store of a language can be conceived of as composed around a number of meaning areas. Some of the meaning areas can be large such as 'philosophy' or 'emotion', others smaller and more sharply described such as 'kinship' or 'colour'. As Lyons (1977:261) notes, field theory tends to view words only paradigmatically (e.g. the relation of each kinship to other kinship terms) ignoring syntagmatic aspects, i.e. how words combine with other words. There are a number of different types of lexical relations. The lexical relations include: homonymy, polysemy, synonymy, antonymy, hyponymy and meronymy. One effect of lexical fields is that lexical relations are more common between lexemes of the same field. Thus *qutabi* 'student' and *xwendkar* 'student' are synonyms as both of them are within the field of education.

The distribution of words within fields is not as clear-cut as the previous paragraph might suggest. It is equally known to linguists and non-linguists that one word can have more than one meaning known as homonymy (1) (when the senses are unrelated) and polysemy (2) (when the senses are related) as shown below:

1.

i.	bir 'well'	vs	bir 'thought'
ii.	tal 'bitter'	vs	tal 'string'

2.

i.	sar 'head'	vs	sar 'lid'
ii.	qach 'leg of human'	vs	qach 'leg of table'

The examples above, though apparently simple, have their own problems. It is not clear, for example, whether two meanings are the same or different to determine the number of senses a phonological form has. Another problem of multi-sense words is to decide whether a meaning is literal or transferred known as metaphor. Cross-linguistically, body parts are known to be used metaphorically as in hand of the clock; foot of the mountain; eye of the needle in English and the examples in (2) above for Kurdish. There is another problem when a word has more than one meaning. It is not clear whether this is an example of homonymy (several words with the same shape) or polysemy (one word with several meaning). (for a detailed discussion of this topic see Palmers 1976:65).

The opacity of meaning has consequences for lexicographers and dictionary designers whether to include a lexeme with more than one sense as one dictionary entry or two. Consider the Kurdish word *run* 'clear' and/or 'light' in the following sentences:

3. chayaka runa. 'The tea is light'.
4. babataka runa. 'The topic is clear.'

It is not clear whether to include the related meanings of *run* in sentences (3 and 4) above as homonyms and hence two dictionary entries or polysemy and hence one dictionary entry. A cloud of confusion enshrines semantic field in terms of what it means and the terminology used around it. Thus, the overlapping of lexical relation meaning has direct consequences on semantic field. Collocative meaning where the meaning is derived from the context is not relevant here.

Semantic field, as another important organization of the lexicon, is defined as a group of lexemes which belong to a particular activity or area of specialist knowledge such as the terms in cooking, sailing or the vocabulary used by doctors, coal miners or mountain climbers (Saeed 1997:63). The semantic field of different areas is not, by any means, meant to be equally large or small, i.e. having equal number of words. As noted above, the semantic field of philosophy, for instance, is much bigger than the semantic field of kinship.

Saeed also includes within semantic field the jargons used in different areas such as phoneme in linguistics and gigabyte in computer science. Nevertheless, the terminology used by professionals is classified within the domain of register. Scientific, religious and formal English, according to Crystal (2003:393), are registers of language defined according to its use in social situations. In other words, the set of features of a particular type of linguistic activity is different from another one. Journalese, for instance, when engage in speech or written communication with each other is different from that in which sermons are delivered.

The confusion surrounding semantic fields can also be terminological. The term semantic field is sometimes supplanted by lexical field to refer to a conceptual area. (Cruse 2006:161). Yet, conceptual field and semantic fields cannot be used interchangeably as they are not the same; they are two different terms with different content. As Lyons (1977:253 et seq.) explains, conceptual field refers to the concepts in the mind of the speakers in abstraction to the lexical items that refer to that concept in any particular language. The colour continuum, regardless to the terms used in different languages to denote them, is a good example of differences in the lexical structure of different language-systems. The substance of colour continuum is the conceptual field whereas how

DOI: http://dx.doi.org/10.25098/4.1.25

The Scientific Journal of Cihan University – Slemani **PP: 48-64**
Volume (4), Issue (1), June 2020
ISSN 2520-7377 (Online), ISSN 2520-5102 (Print)

different languages articulate that colour continuum by using lexical items is an example of semantic field. Considered as a continuum, the substance of colour and its psycho-physical reality, is the area or field that is conceptual.

Semantic field, as defined by Mathews (2007:360), is a distinct part of the lexicon with a general concept that include other terms. An example is the semantic field of colour that includes words such as black, red and other colours. This definition is very much identical to hyponymy which is the relation between two lexical units in which the meaning of the first is included within the other. Another example is the field of kinship which has family relations such as father, mother, brother, sister as they are co-hyponyms of kinship. Relevant to this paper is the semantic field of kinship that include the family relations and how they are depicted in CK. The way kinship terms are engraved serves to reflect the mentality of CK speakers and their view on family relations. However, kinship terms are best approached in terms of componential analysis (also known as semantic features) which will be dealt with in the next section. Kinship terms can be divided into Basic (consanguineous or blood) and Non-basic (affinal or marriage) kinship terms.

2.1. CK Basic Kinship Terms

CK has 18 common basic kinship terms. There are nine basic kinship terms from which almost all other basic and most non-basic kinship terms are morphologically and semantically derived. They are the words for (father, mother, father's brother, mother's brother). The first nine terms of Table 1 below are the roots of other kinship terms. For example, the word *bapeer* 'grandfather' is derived from *bawk* 'father'. Morphologically, the prefix ba is derived from the first part of *bawk.* Semantically, *bapeer* means, an old father. The same is true for *dapeer* 'grandmother' which morphologically consists of *da* which is the first syllable of mother and *peer* which means old. Similarly, *kwreza* 'grandson' and *kicheza* 'granddaughter', can be thought of as combination of offspring of son and daughter respectively.

There are two other relevant points concerning the basic kinship terms. First, there are some basic kinship terms that are homonyms, i.e. they have broad meaning. Kins such as *kwr* and *kich* and *mindal* which mean son, daughter and offspring respectively. They also mean boy, girl and child in the meantime. Second, In CK, nouns are not marked for gender. In other words, there are not morphological markers that distinguish between male and female nouns. As is clearly shown in the examples below, male and female kin terms have morphologically similar structure.

Table 1. Basic kin words in CK with their denotative meaning

Basic Kinship Terms	**Meaning**
Bawk	father
Dayk	mother
Kwr	son
Kich	daughter
Bira	brother

Xwshk	sister
Mam	father's brother
Xal	mother's brother
Pwr	aunt
Bapeer	grandfather
Dapeer	grandmother
Kwraza	son's child
Kichaza	offspring of daughter
Braza	offspring of brother
Xwshkaza	offspring of sister
Amoza	paternal uncle's child
Xaloza	maternal uncle's child
Pwrza	offspring of aunt

As can easily be observed, most of the CK kinship terms above cannot render literal translation with their English counterparts. Grandson in English refers to son's son or daughter's son; its nearest counterpart in CK *kwraza* refers to child of son. So, in English the gender of the referent is identified whilst in CK the gender of the referent's father or mother is identified. The same is true for granddaughter, nephew and niece. Some terms in English have a broader sense. In English cousin refers to: father's brother's son, father's brother's daughter, mother's brother's son, mother's brother's daughter, father's sister's son, father's sister's daughter, mother's sister's son, mother's sister's daughter. In CK those relationships are expressed in three different terms: *amoza, xaloza* and *pwrza*. Those relationships can be best explained through the semantic features of sex, generation, lineality and parental side. On the other hand, CK kinship terminology, similar to English, does not distinguish between maternal and paternal grandparents. It does distinguish between father's and mother's brothers, and between their children. Father's sisters and mother's sisters, however, are categorized together, as are their children.

2.2 CK Non-Basic Kinship Terms

Non-basic kinship terms designate relationships by marriage. A major and noticeable difference between basic and non-basic kinship terms in CK is in using them as terms of address. Basic (consanguinal) kinship terms are used as terms of address and as vocatives. However, using non-basic (affinal) kinship terms for address is uncommon and not heard of. Prasithrathsint (2001) claims that in Thai and most languages non-basic kinship terms are compound words. However, this claim is not necessarily true in CK. Consider terms such as *bwk* 'daughter in law' *zawa* 'son in law' *xasw* 'mother in law' and *xazwr* 'father in law' they are all morphologically simple words. Apart from the four dimensions of basic kinship terms of (sex, generation, lineality and parental side), the

DOI: http://dx.doi.org/10.25098/4.1.25

The Scientific Journal of Cihan University – Slemani **PP: 48-64**
Volume (4), Issue (1), June 2020
ISSN 2520-7377 (Online), ISSN 2520-5102 (Print)

sematic feature of new marriage is needed to capture the differences and relationships of non-basic kinship terms.

Table 2. non-basic kinship terms with their denotative meaning

Non-Basic Kinship Terms	**Meaning**
Merd	husband
Zhin	wife
Xazwr	father in law
Xasw	mother in law
Bwk	daughter in law
Zawa	son in law
Bawazhn	step mother
Bawapyara	step father
Bra zhin	sister in law
Zhin bra	brother in law
Mamo zhin	father's brother's wife
Xalo zhin	mother's brother's wife
Zir bra	step brother
Zir xwshk	step sister
Dish	husband's sister
Shw bra	husband's brother
Hawya	husband's other wife

3. Componential Analysis (aka Semantic Features)

Some semanticists (Katz and Fodor 1963:187) hypothesise that words are not the smallest semantic units; but in their turn, words are built up of smaller components (called semantic markers) of meaning which are combined to form different words. They also argue that the semantic markers are the means by which we can decompose the meaning of one sense of a lexical item into its atomic concepts. This kind of analysis is called Componential Analysis (CA henceforth). In the same vein, Palmer (1976:85) states that distinct elements of meaning which form the total meaning of a word can be seen in terms of components.

CA can have three distinct, but related functions. First, they might be used to capture lexical relations, i.e. how features explain the relation between senses such as homonymy, polysemy,

incompatibility. The second justification for CA is that they have roles to play outside semantics_ in morphology and syntax. Third, CA form part of our psychological architecture by providing us with a unique view of conceptual structure. Since the first function, capturing lexical relations, is relevant to this study, it will be pursued further to explain the distinct meanings kinship terms acquire in literal contexts. The second and third functions have no bearing on this study and therefore they will not be examined (see Pinker and Levin 1991:5 for the second function and Jackendoff 1987:122 for the third function).

Kinship words, in their literal sense, can be approached in terms of semantic components. Common examples are words such as *pyaw* 'man'; *zhin* 'woman'; *raban* 'bachelor'; a*zab* 'spinster'; *kur* 'boy'; and *kich* 'girl' have been viewed as composed of components as shown below in (5_7). Note that in the dictionary, *raban* and *azab*, can be used for males and females. However, in everyday language, *raban* is used only for males and *azab* is used only for females. (see Sharafkandy 1990:355)

5.

i. pyaw	[+MALE]	[+ADULT]	[+MARRIED]	[+HUMAN]
ii. zhin	[+FEMALE]	[+ADULT]	[+MARRIED]	[+HUMAN]

6.

i. raban	[+MALE]	[+ADULT]	[+UNMARRIED]	[+HUMAN]
ii. a*zab*	[+FEMALE]	[+ADULT]	[+UNMARRIED]	[+HUMAN]

7.

i. *kur*	[+MALE]	[+YOUNG]	[+UNMARRIED]	[+HUMAN]
ii. *kich*	[+FEMALE]	[+YOUNG]	[+UNMARRIED]	[+HUMAN]

Through the semantic components above, economic characterization of the lexical items can be captured. The items in (5–7) above, are co-hyponyms of the hypernym [HUMAN]. In the meantime, the components also show that the list of words are incompatible in one of the components. The difference between *(i) and (ii) items are* in sex [MALE] and [FEMALE] whereas (5) and (6) are incompatible in marital status and the difference between (5) and (6) from one side and (7) is in biological maturity.

CA is not only used to restate the relation between lexical items. As Palmer (1976:88) states, it can also be used to bring out the logical relations that are associated with them. Thus, since *pyaw* 'man' is (+MALE) and *dwgyan* 'pregnant' is (-MALE), we can rule out **pyawi dwgyan*. Similarly, CA has bearings on semantic processes such as entailment. By marking *kwr* as (+MALE), (+HUMAN), (-ADULT) and *mnal* 'child' as (±male), (+HUMAN), (-ADULT). We can establish that:

8. dw kwr lawe bwn. 'There were two boys.'
   Entails
9. dw mnal lawe bwn. 'There were two children.'

DOI: http://dx.doi.org/10.25098/4.1.25

The underlying assumption of CA is that it is possible to take any word alone and assume its meaning from a set of features. As Katz and Fodor (1963:186) state, semantic components are the means by which we can decompose the meaning of one sense of a lexical item into its atomic concepts. Although Atomicism has multiple meaning and can be interpreted to mean different things, it is also used here to mean individual and separate existence of the semantic components.

The decomposition of lexical meaning into its atomic components brought about controversies in the field of semantic components. Russell (1940 cited in Lyons 1995: p. 85) states that atoms can be understood at least to mean two different things. First, it is used to mean the basic vocabulary of a language. These vocabularies have conditions of atomicity which means their meaning should be logically and psychologically independent of the meaning of other expressions. To Russell, the basic words are learnt without its being necessary to have previously learnt any other words. However, this position is untenable for obvious reasons. Every lexical item belongs to a number of classes. Dog or cat belongs to class of animals and one should also know the meaning of the classes to understand the meaning of the atoms. Another counter-example is from the field of colours. The concept of 'redness' is relative to another colours. In other words, the red colour has a certain place within the colour spectrum.

The second meaning of atomicism, which is relevant to this paper, is the separate and independent existence of semantic components. This meaning, however, is not hassle free. At first sight, it contrasts with structuralism which emphasizes the interdependence of entities. Structuralism, in essence, stresses that entities have no existence independent of structure that is imposed upon them. As Lyons (1995:107) explains, one has to make a distinction of whether the meaning of words is logically and epistemologically independent from each other or from the relation between components of meaning. He states that:

> "What really counts is whether the atoms of meaning into which the meanings of words are analysed, or factorized, are thought of as being logically and epistemologically independent of one another, […sic] all the words in the same semantic field are definable in terms of the structural relations that they contrast with one another, and they will see componential analysis as a means of describing these relations."

The above quotation is used to underpin the fact that atomicism is not incompatible with structuralism. It asserts that both blocks of semanticists–those who believe in the independent meaning of words and those who do not–emphasize that languages are relational structures which constitutes the essence of structuralism in linguistics.

So, the semantic features are the building blocks of word meaning and they are the components that set apart the meaning of one word from another.

3.1 Componential Analysis of Basic Kinship Terms

Distinctive semantic features should capture the difference between the meaning of items within the same semantic field. Consider the relevant semantic features for terms in the same semantic field, can those features make a distinction between at least two items in the same field? To find out the relevant semantic features in CK, we shall investigate sense relations between the following pairs of kinship terms.

10. Bawk—kwr
11. bawk—kwreza
12. bawk—bapeer
13. bawk—mam
14. dayk—pur
15. kur—braza
16. bawk—dayk
17. bra—xwshk
18. kwr—kich
19. mam—xal
20. amoza—xaloza
21. kwraza—kicheza

In the pairs of words above, any two words are different by at least one semantic feature. The first three pairs (10-12) are different in the generation to which the relative belongs. The feature 'seniority by generation' can be used to distinguish them. To give specific features for each generation, we use (G1) for two generations above ego, (G2) for one generation above ego, (G3) for ego's own generation, (G4) for one generation below ego and (G5) for two generations below ego.

In the examples (13-15), the degree of collateral kinship (CK) is the relevant semantic feature. The left examples indicate lineal kinship which means in the direct line of the descent. i.e. direct ancestors or descendants of ego represented by [+L]. Whilst the terms on left, are non-lineal which means descended from a common ancestor but from a different line and are represented by [-L]. As for examples (16-18), the semantic feature 'sex' (S) is chosen to tell the difference between them.

As Kuznecov (2009:9) observes, the above features, (Generation, Lineality and Sex) suffice to capture relationship between kinship terms in English, French and Spanish. However, they cannot account for all the basic kinship terms in CK. The semantic features of Generation, Lineality and Sex cannot capture the difference between (19-21) examples above since both terms in the pair *mam–xal*, for instance, are: G2, -L, +M. This demonstrates that another semantic feature is needed without which it is impossible to define the meaning of the lexical items. CK requires a feature to show the direction through which the kinship relation is signified: kinship on the father's side; kinship on the mother's side or kinship on the son's or daughter's side. So, the feature 'Direction of Kinship' (DK) can realise the difference between *mam* and *xal*. For the parental side, [+P] represents parental side and [-P] represents maternal side.

So, the features used to explain the difference between *mam* and *xal*, *amoza* and *xaloza*, *kwreza* and *kicheza* are as follows:

22.

Mam: G2, +M, -L, +P

Xal: G2, +M, -L, -P

DOI: http://dx.doi.org/10.25098/4.1.25

The Scientific Journal of Cihan University – Slemani **PP: 48-64**
Volume (4), Issue (1), June 2020
ISSN 2520-7377 (Online), ISSN 2520-5102 (Print)

23. Amoza: G3, ±M, -L, +P

    Xaloza: G3, ±M, -L, -P

24. Kwreza: G5, ±M, +L, +P

    Kicheza: G5, ±M, +L, -P

However, the (22-24) examples does not mean that the feature parental side is needed to semantically describe all the basic kinship terms in CK.

Following is the basic kinship terms in CK along with their semantic components for each term. Notice that all the redundant (irrelevant) features are removed from the list.

Table 3. Semantic features of Basic kinship terms

Bawk	[G2, +M, +L]
Dayk	[G 2, -M, +L]
Kwr	[G 4, +M,+L]
Kich	[G 4,-M,+L]
Bira	[G 3, +M, +L]
Xwshk	[G 3, -M, +L]
Bapeer	[G1, +M, +L]
Dapeer	[G1, -M, +L]
Braza	[G 4, ±M, -L, +P]
Xwshkaza	[G 4, ±M, -L,-P]
Pwr	[G 2, -M,-L]
Pwrza	[G 3, ±M, -L]

Another way to depict the entire system of semantic features of kinship terms in CK is through using a table which presents the system in a four- dimensional way as in Table 4.

The Scientific Journal of Cihan University – Slemani **PP: 48-64**
Volume (4), Issue (1), June 2020
ISSN 2520-7377 (Online), ISSN 2520-5102 (Print)

Table 4. CK Basic Kinship terms

	+L		-L					
	+M	-M	+M		-M	±M		
	+P		+ P	±P			±P	+P
G 1	bape er	dape er		bape er	dape er			
G 2	bawk	dayk	m a	xal	pur			
G 3	ego		bi ra		xwsh ik	xal oz	pur za	amo za
G 4	kwr	kich						
G 5	kwre za	kiche za						

Thus, as the examples above show, the four semantic features of Generation, Sex, Parental Side and the Direction of Kinship suffice to define the basic kinship terms in CK.

3.2 Componential Analysis of Non-Basic Kinship Terms

Non-basic kinship terms are terms designated by marriage. These terms are not used as address terms. If we consider EGO as the centre in the analysis of the non-basic relationships, we can see that CK requires five semantic features to differentiate the non-basic kinship terms. Four of them are the same as those used for describing basic kinship terms. Namely, Generation, Lineality, Sex, and Direction of kinship. Note that for linearity, a couple (EGO and his/her spouse) are regarded as one. This means that husband's father (father in law) is +L. The other feature which is specific for non-basic terms is New Marriage. This indicates some kin that is the result of a new marriage. The new marriage can be of EGO himself/herself or one of his/her kins. The symbol [+NM] is used in this paper to denote a kin resulting from a new marriage. The [+NM] feature is not needed to distinguish one non-basic kinship term from another. However, it is required to differentiate between basic and non-basic kins.

DOI: http://dx.doi.org/10.25098/4.1.25

The Scientific Journal of Cihan University – Slemani **PP: 48-64**
Volume (4), Issue (1), June 2020
ISSN 2520-7377 (Online), ISSN 2520-5102 (Print)

Table 5. CK non-basic kinship terms along with their semantic features.

Merd[2]	[G3, +M, +L,+P]	Bra zhin	[G3, -M, -L,-P,]
Zhin[3]	[G3, -M, +L, +P]	Zhin bra	[G3, +M, -L,-P]
Xazwr	[G2, +M, +L, +P]	Mamo zhin	[G2, -M, -L,-P]
Xasw	[G2, -M, +L, +P]	Xalo zhin	[G2, -M, -L,-P]
Bwk	[G2, +M, +L, -P]	Zir bra	[G3, +M, +P, +NM]
Zawa	[G4, +M, -L, -P]	Zir xwshk	[G3, -M, +P ,+NM]
Bawazhn	[G2, -M, -L, -P,+NM]	Dish	[G3, -M, +L, -P]
Bawapyara	[G2, +M, -L, -P +NM]	Shw bra	[G3, +M, +L, -P]
		Hawya	[G3, -M, -L, -P, +NM]

It is remarkable many of the non-basic kinship terms are similar to the basic ones. Non-basic kinship terms are not complicated in CK as the language does not employ some features. Semantic features such as age, sex of the speaker are not employed in CK. For instance, age of the speaker is not relevant. The term brazhin 'sister-in-law' for example, is used whether she is younger or older than the speaker. The same is true for the age of the speaker. A father-in-law is the spouse's father whether the speaker is male or female. It is not uncommon to use collectively when a kin is used to refer to a group rather than a single relative. The term *bwk* 'daughter in law' can be used to signify a lady who is married to a family. Another example for collective term is to use his/her in-laws to refer to the entire family to whom someone is married. In this case the term *mala xazwran* 'in laws' is used.

[2] For *Merd* and *Zhin*, sometimes euphemistically the term *hawser* 'spouse' is used.

[3] Zhin has a broad sense in CK, it is a polysemic word. It may mean wife and woman.

The Scientific Journal of Cihan University – Slemani **PP: 48-64**
Volume (4), Issue (1), June 2020
ISSN 2520-7377 (Online), ISSN 2520-5102 (Print)

The semantic components of non-basic kinship terms can be displayed in the form of a table as shown in table below.

Table 6. non-basic Kinship terms

Generation	Parental side	+L		-L		
		+M	-M	+M		-M
G2	+p	Xazwr	Xasw	+NM	Bawa pyare	bawazhin
G3	+p	Merd	Zhin	+NM	Zir bra	Zir xwshik
	-P			Zhin bra		Dish
				Shw bira		Bra zhin
						Hawya
G4	-P			Zawa		Bwk

The five contrastive semantic features depicted in Table 6 above completely exhaust the sense content of non-basic kinship terms in CK. Culturally, there is a noticeable difference between the bondage of basic and non-basic relations. Terms such as *bawazhin* 'step mother' has a negative connotation. Even a term such as *zawa* 'son in law' is discouraged. As Gheitury et al (2010) observe, in other varieties of Kurdish such as Kalhori, the use of non-basic (affinal) terms might signify disrespect and hatred. Addressing the father's wife as bawazhin is an example. The same is true for CK. Although recently due to the decrease of second marriages in Kurdish community, bawazhin 'step mother' is not common.

DOI: http://dx.doi.org/10.25098/4.1.25

4. Conclusions

The present study found out that componential analysis can describe and contrast the meaning of kinship terms in CK. This include basic (consanguineous (blood) and non-basic affinal (marriage) relationships. Basic kinship terms in CK contrast in four dimensions: generation, sex, lineality and direction of kinship. Whereas non-basic kinship terms use New Marriage and all the four features of basic terms. The study also found out that basic kinship terms are used as terms of address. It is common to vocatively use *mama* or *pwre*. However, non-basic kinship terms are never used vocatively to address the referent. This implies the importance of blood relation amongst the CK speakers.

For the sake of exposition, when we compare CK kin terms with those of a widely-studied language like English, we have found out that the meaning of some terms in CK are narrower than its corresponding term in English. Cousin, for instance, stands for *amoza*, *xaloza*, and *pwrza* in CK. This is because, in contrast to English, the direction of the kin is a relevant feature in CK. The basic terms are not gender-specific in CK since the terms are used regardless of the sex of the referent. In other words, gender in CK is not marked or lexicalised.

References

Bistoon, A., A. Gheitury and K. Kazzazi. 2013. 'Semantics of Hawrami Kinship Terms'. *International Journal of humanities*. 20 (4): (1-21).

Boas, F. 1919. 'Kinship Terms of Kutenai Indians'. *American Anthropologist*, 21(1): (98–101).

Cruse, A. 2006. *A Glossary of Semantics and Pragmatics*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.

Crystal, D. 2003. *The Cambridge encyclopedia of the English language*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Durbin, M. A. 1972. 'Linguistic Models in Anthropology'. *Annual Review of Anthropology*. 1: 388.

Gheitury, A., H. Yasami, K. Kazzazi. 2010. 'A Note on Kalhori kinship terms'. *Iranian Studies*.. 43 (4): 533-547.

Jackendoff, R. 1987. *Consciousness and the computational mind*. Cambridge: The MIT Press.

Katz, J. J., and J. A. Fodor. 1963. 'The structure of a semantic theory'. *Language*. 39(2): (170-210).

Kuznecov, A. 2009. 'On the Typology of the Semantic field of Kinship terms'. Linguistics. 12(125): 5-14.

Lyons, J. 1977. *Semantics* (Vol. 2). Cambridge: Cambridge university press.

Lyons, J. 1995. *Linguistic semantics: An introduction*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Matthews, P. H. 2000. *Oxford Concise Dictionary of Linguistics*. Shanghai: Shanghai Foreign Language Education Press.

Murray, L. 2006. 'Experimental-Formal Analysis of Kinship'. Ethnology 45(4): 305-330.

Palmer, F. R. 1976. *Semantics*. Cambridge: Cambridge university Press.

Pinker, S. and Levin, B. 1992. Lexical and conceptual semantics. Oxford: Blackwell publishing.

Prasithrathsint, A. 2001. 'A componential analysis of kinship terms in Thai'. *Essays in Tai Linguistics*. 261-275.

Saeed, J. I. 1997. *Semantics.* Oxford: Blackwell Publishing.

Sharafkandi, Abdul-rahman. 1990. *Hambana Borina*.Tehran: Surush Publications.

Wallace, A. and J. Atkins. 1960. 'The Meaning of Kinship Terms'. American Anthropologist, 62(1): (58-80).

DOI: http://dx.doi.org/10.25098/4.1.25