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Abstract

Within the wider framework of the hypothesis of the genetic affiliation of the Burushaski language with Indo-European an etymology is proposed for two kinship terms. Burushaski --skir ‘father-in-law’ is derived from Indo-European *súkuros ‘father-in-law’ and Burushaski --skus ‘mother-in-law’ from Indo-European *súkrúh.s ‘mother-in-law’. The etymological analysis and the Burushaski evidence strengthens the position of Indo-Europeanists who have derived Indo-European *súkůu(H)ros from *súč- ‘one’s own’ + *kuhros ‘powerful’ (: ‘experienced man, man with authority, master, lord’), and the word for ‘mother-in-law’ from that of the ‘father-in-law’.

1. Introduction and previous studies

The Burushaski language, still considered to be a language isolate, is spoken by around 90,000 people (Berger 1990: 567) in the Karakoram area in North-West Pakistan. There are three very closely related
dialects: Hunza and Nager with minimal differences, and the Yasin dialect, which exhibits differential traits, but is still mutually intelligible with the former two.

The earliest, mostly sketchy, material for Burushaski is from the mid to late 19th century (e.g. Cunningham 1854, Hayward 1871, Biddulph 1880, Leitner 1889). The limited dialectal differentiation and the lack of older attestations make the internal historical reconstruction extremely difficult.


Very important in establishing aspects of the historical phonology and morphology of Burushaski and its internal reconstruction is Berger’s (2008) posthumously published synthesis.

In our work, we have correlated Burushaski with Indo-European, outside of Indic and Iranian, and in our etymological analyses we have uncovered consistent and systematic lexical, phonological and most importantly, extensive and fundamental grammatical correspondences (the latter are outlined in Čašule 2003b: 69–79 and greatly expanded in Čašule 2012b). On the basis of the analysis of over 550 etymologies and the highly significant correspondences in over 80 mostly grammatical but also derivational morphemes (the nominal case endings, the nominal plural endings, verbal prefixes, suffixes and endings, the complete non-finite system, all of the adjectival suffixes, the entire system of demonstratives,
personal pronouns, postpositions, adverbs, etc.) (Čašule 2003b), we conclude that Burushaski displays characteristics of a language which could have had an early relationship or contact in its history with the Southern (Aegean) branch of Indo-European on the one hand and especially with the North-Western Indo-European group on the other (see esp. Čašule 2004), on the possible correlation with Phrygian). The Burushaski phonological system, internal variation and phonological correspondences with Indo-European are outlined and systematised in Čašule (2003b: 24–42), or Čašule (2004: 55–67) (2010). The correspondences (over 70 of them) in the core vocabulary of names of body parts and functions can be found in Čašule (2003a).

In Čašule (2003b), we provide an in-depth analysis of the Burushaski laryngeals and their consistent and direct correspondence with the Indo-European laryngeals. For a recent appraisal and support of this evidence, see Alonso de la Fuente (2006).

We find a close correlation of the Burushaski numeral system with Indo-European in Čašule (2009b). In an extensive analysis and comparison of Burushaski’s shepherd vocabulary with Indo-European (Čašule 2009a), we concluded that almost in its entirety it is autochthonous Indo-European – we identified 32 pastoral terms of Indo-European (non-Indo-Iranian) origin in Burushaski, ten of which find direct correspondences with the substratal (Thracian?) shepherd vocabulary in Albanian, Romanian and Aromanian.

In Čašule (2012b) we show that the entire Burushaski system of personal pronouns and demonstrative pronouns and adverbs can be correlated closely with Indo-European. This close correlation, together with the extensive grammatical correspondences in the nominal and verbal systems (given as an addendum), advances significantly the hypothesis of the genetic affiliation of Burushaski with Indo-European. The article includes a comprehensive discussion of the Burushaski-Indo-European phonological and lexical correspondences. It proposes that Burushaski is an Indo-European language which at some stage of its development was in contact with an agglutinative system.

The correlations between Burushaski and substratal and archaic Modern Macedonian and Balkan Slavic vocabulary are discussed in Čašule (2012a). Hamp, in the review of this article (p.3) based on our full body of evidence, states his support for our position: “Burushaski is at bottom Indo-European [itals Eric Hamp] – more correctly in
relation to Indo-European or Indo-Hittite, maybe (needs more proof) IB[ur]" and further conjectures: "I have wondered if Burushaski is a creolized derivative; now I ask (Čašule 2009a) is it a shepherd creole? (as in ancient Britain)." Compare this proposition with our tentative conclusion that Burushaski might be "a language that has been transformed typologically at some stage of its development through language contact" (Čašule 2010: 70).

Čašule (2010) is a comprehensive analysis of the systematic phonological (and derivational) correspondences involving the mostly core Burushaski vocabulary which contain the reflexes of the Indo-European gutturals (the velars, labiovelars and palatovelars). This monograph provides a synthesis of the mounting evidence that indicates that Burushaski is a North-Western Indo-European language, i.e. concludes that Burushaski shows the greatest number of correlations with the Ancient Balkan languages (Phrygian, Thracian, Ancient Macedonian) and Albanian, on the one hand, and with Balto-Slavic and Germanic on the other.

Most relevant to the present paper is Čašule (2012c), where we look at ~30 Burushaski kinship terms that can be derived directly from Indo-European and are not borrowings from Old Indian, the neighbouring Indo-Aryan or the Iranian languages.

In this etymological note we analyse specifically the Indo-European origin of Burushaski -skir ‘father-in-law’ and -skus ‘mother-in-law’.

2. Etymological analysis of Burushaski -skir ‘father-in-law’ and -skus ‘mother-in-law’

We reproduce for easier reference Berger’s (1998 I: 13) table of the phonological system of Hz Ng Burushaski, which is valid for the Yasin dialect as well (Ys Bur does not have the phoneme čh – see also Tiffou-Pesot (1989: 7–9):

1 “The double hyphens indicate the lengthened strong grade of the pronominal possessive prefix, e.g. móo-skir ‘her father-in-law’.” (Tikkanen 2001: 479).
A fourth category, labelled z individually conceived objects’ subdivided in m (masc.) and f (fem.); ‘father’s sister; mother’s brother’s wife’ (perhaps corresponding to IE father’ (B 460) < IE úyás ‘mother, aunt on mother’s side’ (B 286) (< IE ‘mother’, pl. is added mainly to words denoting relations (B I: 48), e.g. máma ‘mother’, pl. mámačaro (B 277) (< IE *m-h-em-?), –mi pl. –mičaro ‘mother, aunt on mother’s side’ (B 286) (< IE *méh-tēr ‘mother’), –yás ‘sister-in-law’, pl. –yásčaro and –yástaro (B 474), Bur –úy and – ú pl. –úyčaro and –účaro ‘father; father’s brother; in pl. forefathers’ (B 460) < IE *h₂éuh₂-, *h₂éuh₂jios ‘father’s father, ancestor on father’s side’, –ńgo pl. –ńgočaro ‘uncle’ (B 306), –ńco pl. –ńnčaro ‘father’s sister; mother’s brother’s wife’ (perhaps corresponding to IE

Notes: 1. All five vowels can be long. 2. Retroflex consonants are marked with an underdot. 3. w and y are allophones of u and i. 4. č = ts in Lorimer and e in Tiffou-Pesot (1989). 5. ǧ = γ is a voiced fricative velar /γ/. See Čašule (2010) on the extensive variation of ǧ and g. 6. ñ = [ŋ] or [ŋ] [ŋk]. 7. γ is a retroflex. 8. A hyphen before a word indicates that it is used only with the pron. prefixes. For the internal variation and alternations in Burushaski, see Čašule (2010: 5–11,14–19) (2003b: 24–29).

Let us consider first Bur --skir, pl. --skindaro, Ng pl. --skirišo ‘father-in-law, wife’s father or wife’s father’s brother or husband’s father’ (B 381) (L 26, pl. –askindaro, Ng pl. –askirińč also ‘any male relation by marriage’), Ys pl. --skirstaru and --skirišu (BYs 175).

The Nager x pl. --skirišo and the x pl. ending -išo in general can be re-analysed as *-iš-yo, with -iš- being the Indo-European animate nom. pl. ending -es i.e. Bur *--skiriš+yo < *skires+yo with *-yo correlatable with the Indo-European relational adjectival suffix –jo ‘of, or belonging to’ (Wat 103). The Ys pl. --skirstaru also provides evidence for an old --s- from the singular form. The Hz Ng pl. --skindaro can be derived from *skir-tar-o by dissimilation.

The Burushaski h(x) pl. suffix -taro with the variant form –čaro is added mainly to words denoting relations (B I: 48), e.g. máma ‘mother’, pl. mámačaro (B 277) (< IE *m-h-em-?), –mi pl. –mičaro ‘mother, aunt on mother’s side’ (B 286) (< IE *méh-tēr ‘mother’), –yás ‘sister-in-law’, pl. –yásčaro and –yástaro (B 474), Bur –úy and – ú pl. –úyčaro and –účaro ‘father; father’s brother; in pl. forefathers’ (B 460) < IE *h₂éuh₂-, *h₂éuh₂jios ‘father’s father, ancestor on father’s side’, –ńgo pl. –ńgočaro ‘uncle’ (B 306), –ńco pl. –ńnčaro ‘father’s sister; mother’s brother’s wife’ (perhaps corresponding to IE

2 Burushaski nouns are traditionally grouped in four classes: - h-class ‘human beings’, subdivided in m (masc.) and f (fem.); - x-class ‘non-human animate beings and individually conceived objects’; - y-class ‘amorphous substances and abstract ideas’. A fourth category, labelled z-form is used for counting (see Berger 1998:1, 33–39).
\*h\_i\text{en}_h\_t\_er- ‘husband’s brother’s wife’ (M-A 210), bapó ‘grandfather, father’ pl. bapó\_caro (also ‘prince’) (B 37) (from baba+pater\?). This suffix -taro is most likely the IE suffix \*t-\text{er}, considered by Benveniste (1973: 171) the classifier of the lexical class of kinship terms, found in \*mèh\_t\_er ‘mother’, \*ph\_t\_er ‘father’, etc. In Burushaski, through re-analysis it was understood as part of a plural formation (-\_tar-o > -taro : -čaro) or was simply lost in the singular. For an extensive discussion of the Burushaski plural noun forms and the retention in the plural of phonemes and morphemes which have been lost in the singular, see Čašule (2012b).

Both Lorimer and Berger suggest a derivation from ? + hir ‘man’ (in L 203, also hìr). Note the alternation u : i common in front of r, l (Berger 2008: 2.10): Ys pl. hurí and huríkia, Hz Ng hiríski : Ys huríski ‘pertaining to men, man’s’ (B 200).

Compare with IE *su\_é\_r̂u\_s ‘father-in-law’ : NWels chwegrwn, Lat socer, OEng swēor all ‘father-in-law’, Lith šē\_suras ‘husband’s father’, OChSl svekrů ‘husband’s father’ [one of the “kentum” words in Sl], Alb vje\_hërr ‘father-in-law’, Gk hekurós ‘wife’s father’, Av x\_\text{a}sura- ‘father-in-law’, Skt śvā\_śura ‘father-in-law’ (M-A 215, who cite Szemerényi’s suggestion (not widely accepted) of a deeper etymology from IE *su\_ -own + *k\_\text{or}- ‘head’ = ‘head of the joint family’) (W-I-S 672-675, also Arm skesrair ‘father-in-law’, skesowr’ ‘mother-in-law’).

The alternation in Bur of i :u in front of l, r (Berger 2008: 2.10), together with the Yasin forms, point to an older form *skur- < *sē\_kuros *su\_é\_r̂u\_s. There would have been an apocope of the first element, after the shift of the accent onto the pronominal possessive prefixes. Compare for example with Bur dēnkus < *dē\_ne\_kus or daltá\_śko < *daltá\_śiko (see Berger 2008: 11.12).

The etymology of Bur hir (L also hìr), Hz pl. hiri , Ng pl. hirikanč, Ys pl. hurí and huríkia (*hur < *kur-) ‘man, male’, also hirkuş ‘manliness, valour’, parallels some of the Indo-European interpretations. The –ik- (< *i-kō\?)? morpheme in the Ng and Ys

\footnote{1 We correlate the Bur suffix –ko, also –kus, e.g. datā ‘autumn’, datá\_ko adj. ‘autumn-’, datú\_kus ‘autumn season’ (B I: 207); Bur phūk ‘a small speck of any substance, a particle’, phūko adj. ‘small, tiny’ (B 334) < IE *pau\_kos ‘little, few; small’ (M-A 200) with the IE suffix –ko, secondary suffix, forming adjectives : Ved sindhu\_ka- ‘from Sindh’, Gk Libu\_kós ‘Libyan’ (Fortson 121). The Bur suffix –ko has also been resegmented as a plural morpheme. A suffix –ka has been proposed for...}
plurals, as well as the fact that hir is not used with pronominal prefixes, may indicate an adjectival origin.

The plural form in –i would be a remnant of the IE pronominal plural *-oi, as in Gk the-oι ‘gods’, OChSl rab-i ‘slaves’, Lith vyr-ai, OIr fir ‘men’ (< *gir- oι), TochB yakvi ‘horses’ (Fortson 2004: 115). For a full discussion and derivation of all the Burushaski noun plurals from Indo-European, see Čašule (2012b: 8.1).

We are inclined to seek a correlation with IE *kouhiros ~ *kuhıros ‘powerful’: OIr cōraid ‘heroes’, Wels cawr ‘giant’, Gk kōiros ‘having power, like a lord or master with full authority’ (Liddell-Scott 1968: 1013), Av sūra ‘hero’, OInd śávīra- ‘strong’, śūra- ‘hero’ (M-A 448). Note the precise formal correlation with Gk kuriakós ‘lordly, of the lord’.

Under one interpretation by Berneker, cited in Skok (1974 III:370), this Indo-European stem is a candidate for the second component in *sūkéuros, accepted e.g. by Golab (1992:85, ex. [55] and [56], with the semantics of ‘lord of the opposite moiety’, after Machek 1935: 487), also Schwarz ( q. in W-I-S 2008: 673). See also Čašule (1998: 42–43).

Consider in this respect Bur kurpá ‘older, experienced man, elder’ (B 248), which in all likelihood retains the original stem kur-. The element -pá could be the demonstrative adverbial suffix with the meaning of ‘side, direction’ (B 309), as in hirúmpa ‘sharp edge of knife’ < hirúm ‘sharp’. Perhaps here also Bur kuriáp–mán- ‘to hold out, to overpower’ (B 247) (L 237).


4 Note other examples of periphrastic verbal constructions with a suffixal element –ap: Bur qhaḍáp–mán- ‘fall in a hole’ and qhuḍópo ‘pitfall, trap’ (B 349). The form kuriáp could be a compound word where the second component –ap would be < IE *h2ap- < IE *h2ep- ‘take, reach’ (Wat 4) (thus with sem. of ‘take power = overpower’), which is represented in Bur hapa–t- ‘take (a child) upon one’s shoulders, or take in one’s arms’ (B 190) (for a different etymological possibility for this word, see Čašule 2003b: 58). In this respect, note čhilíŋapa man- ‘(water) flow downwards, suddenly drain away’ (B 77) [‘take a flow’] (in B the component –apa- with ?, also Berger 2008: 138) < d–čhiλ–gu- ‘make watery’ (B 384) (čhil ‘water’ (B 76), du–súlgu- ‘become watery’ (B 384), an original Burushaski stem from IE *súc- *sul- ‘to wet, moisten; flow; fluid, liquid’ (Mann 1984–1987: 1334) or čaráp–t- ‘to cut down, cut off’ (B 85–86) : čhariå ‘slice, section’ (B 97).
For IE ŭ > Bur k, h, e.g. —IE *ū(ǝ)nid- ‘nit, louse egg’ (M-A 357) : Bur kháandas ‘a tick’ (B 251); —IE *kerēgos ‘horned’, *ker-, *kerh₂(s) ‘horn’ (IEW 574): Bur karēelo ‘ram’ (B 242), kīro NH ‘sheep’ (B 245), Ys kāro ‘Ovis Poli’ (LYs 152), kāru ‘ibex’ (BYs 157); —IE *keu-₁ ‘to light, burn’ (IEW 594–7), with a –k- formant as in IE *keuk- ‘shine, glow; burn’: Bur du-úkikin- ‘become lit’, d--kukin-, d--skukin-, d--skukun- ‘light up’ (B 254) (from zero-grade); —IE *keudh- ‘to hide’, *keudh- ‘hide’ and *(s)keu(h)̓- ‘cover, wrap’ (M-A 134, 268) : Bur du-khaṭ- / d-'kaṭ- ‘be stopped, closed; get caught’, d-śkaṭ- : d-śkhaṭ- ‘stop, prevent, block’ (B 253), related by B to du-khāći- ‘enclose’ and --kači- ‘keep s-body enclosed’; —IE *kēr-h, k- ‘branch’ (< *ker- ‘to grow’ (“focus on growth of plants”)) e.g. TochB kārk- ‘sprout’, TochA kārke, TochB karāk ‘branch’ (M-A 249) : Bur karkōs ‘young sapling; stem of flower, just sprouted’ (B 242). See the detailed exemplification in Čašule (2010: 40–50).

Especially in this example, but also in a very small number of other cases it appears that Bur h- may originate from k- (Edelman-Klimov 1970: 25, 29) (Morgenstierne 1945: 74) (Čašule 2009a). It is curious that the Albanian -h- reflex < IE -k in vjeheřër ‘father-in-law’ has also been difficult to explain and etymologists have had to resort to a metathesised stem *geskuros (see the discussion and analysis in Huld 1984: 130–131).

Furthermore, the Bur h- < k- could have been influenced perhaps by e.g. Ys –yūhar ‘husband, married man’ (Hz Ng -úyar) (B 460) which we derive from IE *euillezrōs ‘man, husband’ (M-A 202) (Čašule 2003b: 32-33). It could even be the case that hir is a metathesized form, i.e. from *ihros > *hiros > *hiro > hir.

The h- in hir could be a result of dissimilation k – k > h – k, i.e. from an older form *ku'ir-ik-o, contained in the plural forms hirikanć and hurikia or in the derivatives hirkuš and Hz Ng hiriski : Ys huriski.

Consider further such examples: Bur huk ‘dog’ (B 203) which is related to Ys kuküres, Hz Ng guķūres ‘puppy’ (L 173) Sh Guresi kukūr [T 3329] (B 159); Bur Ys hesk, Hz Ng hisk ‘comb, loom, wrist’ (B 200) < *kes-kō and this from IE *kes- ‘to comb, scratch, itch’: e.g. Hitt kiss- ~ kisā(i)- ‘to comb’, kiske/a ‘comb’, Luw kiš ‘to comb’, Lith kasa ‘braid’, OChSl česati ‘to scratch, to comb’, etc. (IEW 585-586); possibly also Bur harkum ‘ox-like’ < har sg. and pl.,
Hz Ng double pl. haró, Ys pl. harióó, harió ‘ox (male), bullock (used for ploughing)’ (L 194) (B 191), which would be from IE *keraunos ‘horned’, *kér-,*kérh₂(s) ‘horn’ (see above and cp. with PSI *körva ‘cow’), especially under the influence of Bur hárki ‘cultivating, ploughing and sowing; cultivation’ (B 194), which we derive from IE *härh₃i̯e/o ‘to plough’ (M-A 434) : Bur har-' ‘to plough’ (BYs 150) + a –ki formant.

It may turn out in the final analysis that Bur hirúm ‘sharp (of a knife); (of a man) swift, gutsy, sharp’ (L 203: ‘smart, active, sharp’) does not derive from hir ‘man’ (B 200), as suggested tentatively by Berger, but rather from IE *köhr₃- ‘sharp’, e.g. Arm sur ‘sharp’ (M-A 510), i.e. *köhr₃-ųₙ₉₃ (diss.) > *köhr₃-ųₙ₉₅ > *köhr₃-ünk₉₃ (diss.) > *köhr₃-ünk₉₅ > *höhr-um > *höur-um > hirum, where once again historically there would have been a k – k > h – k dissimilation at play.

We should consider moreover whether the h- might be a consequence of contact with some Indo-Aryan language, where š > h in intervocalic position, like Kshm hihuro, or Panj sahurā, Sind sahuro, Sinh suhuru, all: ‘father-in-law’ (T 12753). There are several important points that rule out such a direct loanword. Firstly, it is not found in such a form in the neighbouring Indo-Aryan languages like Shina or Khowar. Furthermore, the Burushaski morpheme –s- is distinctly segmented and seen as a prefix and is productive in a number of its kinship terms. The presence of –k- in the Burushaski term and the direction of change h < k, as well as the forms with k-, like Bur kurpā or kuriáp which preserve the original meaning, all argue strongly for an independent development in Burushaski. Most importantly, Burushaski uniquely has the noun hir ‘man’ as a separate word, whereas the other cited Indo-Aryan languages continue only the word for ‘father-in-law’ (and from OInd šúra- ‘hero’ (T 12569), e.g. we have Panj sur, surā, Sinh suru adj. and n. with initial s-). Furthermore, it would be unusual for a language to borrow its basic words for ‘man’ and ‘woman’. The Burushaski plural morphology also points to an original Indo-European form.

5 We derive the Bur adj. suffix –um, older –ū (Cunn matung, Berger (284): matúm ‘black’), from the IE adj. compound suffix *-enko,*-enko-, OEng. Eng suffix –ing < Grmc *-inga-, *-unga- (Wat 36). Bur -um, is also a participial ending, as in the Burushaski “static participle”, e.g. étum ‘done’, manúm ‘become’, a development analogous to the Germanic one (Cașule 2003b: 79).
Berger considers these Burushaski kinship terms autochthonous. He (Berger 1998) gives a very careful account of words that may be of Indo-Aryan (including “Sanskritisms”) or Iranian origin in Burushaski. His methodology in this respect, apart from his own fieldwork and of others, like Lorimer, Morgenstierne etc, is to look up and check very carefully against the index to Turner’s (1966) *A Comparative Dictionary of the Indo-Aryan Languages*. Wherever there is a match, regardless whether the word is found in Shina, Khowar or anywhere in Indo-Aryan, Berger indicates the lemma number in Turner. Interestingly, 45 Indo-Aryan stems indicated by Berger are not found in Shina or Khowar, but appear in Burushaski and could be in some cases an overlap. Cases like these raise a serious methodological question. After all, if Burushaski is an Indo-European language, it cannot be always radically different from Indo-Aryan, and more importantly, the found correspondences need to be systematic at all levels as well.

Burushaski **--skus** ‘mother-in-law (on both sides)’, pl. **--skušinanč**, Ng pl. **--skuso** (L 27) (B 381), together with **gęeskus**², Hz also **gęesgus** ‘widow, widower’ (other forms: **guyūus, giūus, Ys gōsgus**) (B 152) derives from Bur **gus**, pl. **gušinanč**, Ng **gušianč** ‘woman (married); female (of animals)’, **gus huk** ‘a bitch’ (L 174–175) (B 162). It is tempting to seek a (banal?) correlation with Bur – **guš** ‘woman’s privy parts, pudendum muliebre’ (L 188) (B 182) [(Tikkanen p.c., suggests the latter could be related to Ys –**khūs** ‘anus’ (BYs 159)], and thus ultimately from IE **kutsös** ‘anus, p. muliebre’, e.g. Gk (Hesychius) **kūsós** ‘anus, p. muliebre’ and from **kutsnós > Lat cunnus** ‘p. muliebre’, NPers **kun** ‘same’ (M-A 507) (Čašule 2003a: 42). The possibility of it being an Indo-Aryan loanword or most likely some kind of blend cannot be ruled out altogether, cp. with Pers, U and Panj **kus** ‘vulva’.

²Berger leaves the first element unexplained. We suggest that **gee**- in the sense of ‘taken away’, derives from the Bur Ys verb **gee**- ‘steal’, from which we also have Ys **geen**, Hz Ng **gien, gīnso** ‘thief’ (B 175-176) which we derive from IE **g(h)e(h)1-** ‘to take, catch, grab’ (Buck 1949: 747) (Ilić-Svitić 1976: 225), IE **gū-, *gọga-** ‘hand; to grab’ (IEW 403-404) : Lith **gąunu, gąuti** ‘get, obtain’; Lett **gūnu, gūt** ‘grab, catch, try to get’; Av **agana** ‘gain, profit’; **gav(a)’hand’, Gk **gajo** ‘hand’, which we can correlate (with the verbal suffix --**n-**) with Bur **d--gun-** ‘to make people seize, lay hold of’, given by Berger together with **du-ôn-**, Ng **do-ôn-** ‘to seize, lay hold of, catch, arrest, grasp, hold on to’ (with the loss of --**g**- after the pronominal prefixes) (B 456).
Our preferred interpretation is to derive the Burushaski term from the reconstructed Indo-European stem for ‘mother-in-law’: *suekr̥us: Lat socius ‘mother-in-law’, OEng sweger ‘spouse’s mother’, OChSl swekry ‘husband’s mother’, Arm skesur ‘husband’s mother’, NPers xusrū ‘father-in-law, mother-in-law’ (M-A 386). Since the kr- consonant group is not found as a rule in Burushaski, the change could have been: *suekr̥us > *sakrus > *skrus or *skurs > -skus. In this case, gus could have been a secondary form (a derivative). Indicative in this respect is the above mentioned –gus ‘p. muliebre’ (B 182) which has a plural form with –r-: –gurañ, and where –s- could go back to –rs-. For –r-[s] > -s, see e.g. Berger’s derivation of gaš < *i-garṣ ‘price’ (B 150) or maltās ‘butter’ (B 276) from *maltar-(ṣ) (the phonological process is explained in Berger 2008:3.26). This could also explain the –ṣ- in the plural forms gušīṅanē, Ng gušanē ‘women’ or in the adjective gušiski. For the alternation –ṣ- : -ś- see Berger (2008: 3.28–3.29).

For the change k-, k̂- > g-, note e.g. Bur gārē- (part. nukārē(in) Hz Ng ‘run, gallop; run away, run off’ and --skarē- ‘make gallop, make s.o. flee; make pour down; settle a quarrel’ (B 141), from IE *kers- ‘run’ (M-A 491) (see the examples and discussion of this k- : > g- alternation/change in Berger 2008: 3.11 and Čašule 2010: 14–15).

Tikkanen (2001) has suggested that the Burushaski form for ‘mother-in-law’ is the basic one. He derives Bur --skus < *gūs-gus ‘woman-woman’ in order to explain the initial –s- and proposes that the form for ‘father-in-law’ was modelled according to the form for ‘mother-in-law’, thus --skir < -ūs ‘wife’ + hir ‘the man, i.e. the father of the wife’ (Berger 2008: 141 accepts this interpretation). This is a weak etymological and somewhat difficult formal and semantic explanation. Semantically, --skus refers not only to ‘mother-in-law on the wife’s side’ but also to ‘mother-in-law on the husband’s side’ just as --skir indicates both ‘wife’s father, wife’s father’s brother’ and ‘husband’s father’, as well as ‘any male relation by marriage’ which would preclude the ‘woman-woman’ interpretation. Furthermore it would be an isolated structural and derivational example, and the aphaeresis of the root initial -u- would be difficult to explain.
There is a possibility that Bur ǵéniš ‘queen, Mir’s wife, rani’ also ‘gold’ (B 175) continues the closest generic Indo-European word for ‘woman’ *gʷénh₂ (gen. *gʷénh₂-s) (M-A 648) (W-I-S 178, give (with ?) also the stem *gʷen-il₁-). There is a direct correspondence of these words the mother of the other spouse’, with developments from IE reflex. The prefix *su- (Fortson 130) (M-A 455: *séye (acc.) ‘-self’) or *su(u)-o- ‘one’s own’ (“widespread and old in IE”) e.g. Av hva- ~ hava- ‘one’s own’, Olnd svá ‘one’s own’, TochA šři ‘one’s own’, Lat sé ‘him-/her-/itself’, (poss. adj suus), OChSl se-’self’, OPruss sien ‘self’, Lett sevi-‘-self’, OHG sih, Goth sik ‘him-/her-/itself’ etc. and *sů- ‘joint family’.

There are a number of Burushaski kinship terms that contain IE *sē- or *se- (< *seue), which reinforces strongly this etymological analysis. We note Bur Ys salén, also selén (BYs 175) ‘husband’s sisters and daughters’, correlated tentatively by B (378) to silajín ‘female relation, related women-folk’ (L 314). Consider also -sildir ‘father of a spouse with reference to the father of the other spouse’ (the second component derived by Berger (2008:3.31) with an inorganic –d- < hir) and -sīlugus ‘mother of a spouse with reference to the mother of the other spouse’, with gūs ‘woman’ as the second component (B 379). There is a direct correspondence of these words with developments from IE reflex. *sue-lo-, *sue-lijon or *sue-lih₁₂-o-, ‘Schwäger, die Schwestern zu Frauen haben’ as in ON sviår ‘husbands of two sisters’, Gk aelioi ‘brothers-in-law whose wives are sisters’ (IEW 1046) (M-A 85 “word of north-west and centre of IE

7 Other examples of IE: *sūr- > Bur s-s; IE *sūrh₂K₃ ‘watch over, be concerned about’ (M-A 636) > Bur sarké ‘visible, place from which one can watch’ (B 376), IE *sūt-, *sul- ‘to wet, moisten, flow; liquid, fluid, moisture, sap’ (IEW 912-3) > Bur ȅh₂l ‘water’ (B 77), d-sil- ‘make wet, water intensively’ (B 384).
world”). The Burushaski vocalism in these derivations suggests origin both from *se- (in salén, selén) or *sę- (< *seüe (M-A2 417) (in silajín, -sildir and -silgus). From IE *sue-lijon > *saliyin > *saliyin (and by metathesis) > Bur silajín is a complete and direct correlation.\footnote{For the change (alternation) y > : j in Burushaski note e.g. Ys yóţes : Hz Ng jótis (B 228), Ys jaţá, Hz Ng -yaţá (B 470) or Ys ten-jó < *ten-yo, dan-jó < *dan-yó (Berger 2008: 4.15), etc.}

A connection with OInd syála ‘wife’s brother’ (T 13871) (< IE *śjó(u)ros ‘wife’s brother’) (M-A 84) has to be excluded both on semantic and phonological grounds.

It is very likely that Bur –ságun pl. –ságundaro and –ságuyo ‘nephew, niece, child of brother or sister’ (L 306: “originally applied only to sister’s children”) (B 371-372), (Yasin also ‘grandson’ (BYs 174) also contains the morpheme sa-. The second component would then be correlatable with an o-grade of IE * génh₁-, (also *guna-, *gnē-, *gnō-, *gōnh₁-, *gānh₁-) in words for ‘beget; bear; produce; be born’ (IEW 373) (Wat 26), also represented in Burushaski. Compare esp. with IE * génh₁-tōr ‘father, procreator’ (Lat genitor ‘procreator’, Gk genétōr, OInd janitār ‘same’ (M-A 195), or with IE * génh₂-ti- : Celt-Iber kentis m. and f. ‘child; son’ (W-I-S 140) or IE * génh₂-ō- : e.g. Lat –gnus in privignus ‘stepson’ (W-I-S 139). The full correspondence between the Bur –ságundaro (pl.) with IE * génh₁-tōr or rather with *sųę- + * génh₁-tōr is remarkable. Moreover, note most directly the precise correlation between Gk gōnos ‘sperm, semen; child, procreation’ and Bur ḡunó, Ys ḡonó ‘seed (not of cereals); sperm, semen’ (in Sh ḡunóo) (B 180), Ng gono (L 186), to which Berger relates also ḡunóν ‘newly obtained land, in which only grass will be sown’ (B 180). There is also Bur du-ḡun- ‘ripen, to mature’ and d-šqun-, (Ys d-šqon-) ‘cause to mature (of sun, of people); have an idea, give a stimulus, make a suggestion’ (B 179), which Berger also links tentatively with Bur ḡunó above. (See Čaşule 2010a: ex. [102].)

Consider further the first element in Bur sukúin ‘kinsman, blood-relation (descended from a common ancestor); near relation, such as cousin’ (B 384) [-kuin is the denomin suffix for derivation of names of professions (B I: 19.13)], which we derive from IE *s(u)u-o- ‘one’s own’ or from *sųę- ‘joint family’ (M-A 455).

There is also Bur Ys ses, Hz Ng sis sg. and pl. ‘people, folk; person, man’ (B 380), which we can also derive from IE *sųę- (also
*se-), in Burushaski from IE *ṣű́-s. The same line of semantic derivation as ours has been applied in the analysis of Alb gjysh ‘grandfather’, by Liukkonen (1993: 58) who derives it from IE *sauṣiṣa and relates it to Lith sāvas ‘own’. Other scholars have derived the Albanian word together with Skt sūṣā ‘progenitor’ or ‘paternal grandmother’ from IE *seuh- ‘bear, beget’ (Orel 140) (M-A 238: ?? *suh,sos- ‘grandfather’). From this last stem we have in Burushaski súas, súyas, dusúas, dusúyas vt. ‘to bring; take, fetch; procure; to buy’, also d-ċ-, Ng abs. d-ču- ‘bringen lassen; to carry a load’ (B 383) (Will 103).

3. Conclusion

A very strong case can be made for the autochthonous Indo-European origin of the Burushaski kinship term -skir ‘father-in-law’ from IE *sűékuros ‘father-in-law’. As a secondary derivative -skus ‘mother-in-law’ is based on the same derivational pattern and is most likely from IE *sűékruh-,s ‘mother-in-law’ (with loss of -r- after k). An origin from IE *sće- ‘one’s own’ + *kutsōs ‘pudendum muliebre’ > ‘woman’, for the latter term would be much less plausible.

The etymological analysis and the Burushaski evidence strengthens the position of Indo-Europeanists who have derived Indo-European *sűék(H)ros from *sće- ‘one’s own’ + *kuh,ros ‘powerful’ (‘experienced man, man with authority, master, lord’), and the word for ‘mother-in-law’ from that of the ‘father-in-law’.

Even though Parkin (1987b: 163) suggests that the Burushaski terms for ‘father-in-law’ and ‘mother-in-law’ may be “new coinings”, taking into account the Indo-European antiquity of the terms, we consider them rather remnants from an original asymmetric non-prescriptive kinship terminology, characteristic of Indo-European.

The coherence of the analysed Burushaski kinship terms and the preservation of the original Indo-European kinship terminology advance further the position that the Burushaski language is genetically related to Indo-European.
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