William Jervis Jones

German Kinship Terms
(750—1500)

Studia Linguistica Germanica

Herausgegeben
von
Stefan Sonderegger

27

Walter de Gruyter · Berlin · New York
1990

William Jervis Jones

German Kinship Terms (750–1500)

Documentation and Analysis

Walter de Gruyter · Berlin · New York
1990

gedruckt auf säurefreiem Papier
(alterungsbeständig — pH 7, neutral)

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

Jones, William Jervis, 1941-
German kinship terms, 750-1500 : documentation and analysis / William Jervis Jones.
p. cm, – (Studia linguistica germanica ; 27)
Includes bibliograhical references.
ISBN 0-89925-573-6 (U.S.)
1. German language–Old High German, 750-1500–Lexicology.
2. German language–Middle High German, 1050-1500–Lexicology.
3. German language–Old High German, 750-1050–Semantics.
4. German language–Middle High German, 1050-1500–Semantics.
5. Kinship–Terminology. I. Title. II. Series.
PF3961.J66 1990
437'.01–dc20

CIP-Titelaufnahme der Deutschen Bibliothek

Jones, William Jervis:
German Kinship terms (750 - 1500) ; documentation and analysis / William Jervis Jones. — Berlin ; New York : de Gruyter, 1990
(Studia linguistica Germanica ; 27)
ISBN 3-11-012023-2
NE: GT

Printed in Germany
Druck: Werner Hildebrand, Berlin
Buchbinderische Verarbeitung: Lüderitz & Bauer, Berlin

οἵη περ φύλλων γενεή, τοίη δὲ καὶ ἀνδρῶν.
φύλλα τὰ μέν τ' ἄνεμος χαμάδις χέει, ἄλλα δέ θ' ὕλη
τηλεθόωσα φύει, ἔαρος δ' ἐπιγίγνεται ὥρη·
ὣς ἀνδρῶν γενεὴ ἡ μὲν φύει ἡ δ' ἀπολήγει.

Homer, Iliad, VI, 146-49

PREFACE

A study of this kind owes much, perhaps most, to the resonance of a scholarly environment. Remarkably, such resonances are still to be heard, despite the political, financial and administrative noise that has now so destructively invaded the grove of British academe. I pay tribute, therefore, firstly to the traditions of enquiry within which I feel myself to be working, the tangible and less tangible values derived from teachers, colleagues, and pupils over many years; and then secondly to a number of scholars who have given more specific help and support in the course of my work.

At several stages, I was able to draw on expert advice generously given by Dr Leslie Seiffert (University of Oxford), who has been studying the kinship terms of medieval German for some years in a variety of contexts. I have noted particular cases of indebtedness along the way. My work has further benefited from information and opinions given by three of my former pupils, Dr Felicity J. Rash (Westfield College, University of London), Miss Susan J. Baxter (Westfield College, University of London), and Dr Jonathan West (Trinity College Dublin, and the University of Newcastle upon Tyne).

Among other colleagues who have given me valued advice and support at various times, I would mention Dr Rosemary N. Combridge (Queen Mary College, University of London), Dr John L. Flood (Institute of Germanic Studies, University of London), Dr J. A. Hall (Westfield College, University of London), Dr Timothy R. Jackson (Trinity College Dublin), Dr Eva Leitzke (University of Munich), Mr Timothy McFarland (University College London), Dr David R. McLintock (University of London), Dr Dagmar Neuendorff (University of Oulu, Finland), Dr Kurt Ostberg (University of London), Mr W. James Simpson (Westfield College, University of London), Herr Alfred Wollmann (Universities of Munich and Eichstätt), and Dr David N. Yeandle (King's College London).

I wish to thank Professor Dr Oskar Reichmann (Universität Heidelberg) for valuable information on entries in the *Frühneuhochdeutsches Wörterbuch*, also Professor Dr Klaus Grubmüller (Westfälische Wilhelms-Universität Münster) and Dr Hans-Jürgen Stahl (Universität Würzburg) for providing me with advance copies of sections from the new edition of the *Vocabularius Ex quo*. To Professor Dr Heinz Wenzel (Berlin) and

Professor Dr Stefan Sonderegger (Zürich) I am much indebted for their acceptance of my work into the series *Studia Linguistica Germanica.*

I am grateful to the staff of many libraries, in particular the Caroline Skeel Library, Westfield College (Librarian: Mr Brian Murphy), and the Institute of Germanic Studies, University of London (Librarian: Mr William Abbey). Typesetting the work by means of TEX, I received much support from the staff of the Computer Unit, Westfield College. The diagrams were drawn by Mr Jules Greenwall, using Harvard Graphics.

Some years ago, the study was financially assisted by a grant from the British Academy, gratitude for which I here belatedly record.

There is another context, which has long fostered this work. To my own family, immediate and extended, there is much that is owing, much that must be remembered. And so I dedicate this book to my own kin: those who are still with me, those whom I have lost, and those whom I have yet to meet.

William J. Jones
Westfield College, University of London
July 1989

CONTENTS

LIST OF DIAGRAMS

1. INTRODUCTION

1.1. Kinship, society and language

On kinship terminologies there has developed a remarkable and extensive scholarly literature pertaining to a range of languages, past and present. The systems themselves vary greatly, and linguists as well as anthropologists have approached them from a multiplicity of different angles.[1] The Proto-Indo-European kinship set with all its ramifications and uncertainties has engaged the attention of many scholars, with major contributions extending from Berthold Delbrück (1890) to Oswald Szemerényi (1977),[2] but ever since the pioneering work of Lewis H. Morgan (1871) horizons have broadened to embrace many languages far removed from the Indo-European group, notably in Asia and North America, and later Africa and Australasia,[3] with methodological deepening and enrichment, as systems came to light which contravened and relativised traditional Eurocentric expectations.[4]

The impulses here were seldom purely linguistic. Kinship terminologies lay at an interface between language studies and social anthropology, constituting 'a social and semantic field' (Maranda 1974: 12). For many, indeed (as still Nogle 1974: 26), linguistics was 'a discipline within anthropology', the means of breaking a verbal code which could be expected to give access to the essential socio-cultural patterns. Words thus became 'the royal road to the unlocking of kinship systems' (Fox 1967: 240). This downgrading of the linguistic discipline is perhaps strongest in the work of B. Malinowski, who for his part remained sceptical of the role linguists could play. 'Words grow out of life, and kinship words are nothing else but counters or labels for social relations' (Malinowski 1930: 28f.). Perceptions such as these carried risks for both disciplines — for anthropologists, because a terminology can never be expected to reflect every

---

[1] For an overview, see Bohannan 1963: 54ff., Hammel ed. 1965, and Schneider 1972. For a select subject bibliography, see for example Luong 1984: 311ff.

[2] For a searching review of Szemerényi, see Friedrich 1980.

[3] For a re-evaluation of Morgan's work, see Eggan 1972.

[4] On the methodology of kinship studies see Nogle 1974, Barnard-Good 1984.

facet of kinship (Fox 1967: 243); and for linguists, because language as a system must be accorded its own history, its own inertia and momentum. At many points, in consequence, the 'reflectionist' assumption — that a kinship terminology mirrors objective social reality — can be sampled in various degrees of dilution. As early as 1909, A. L. Kroeber had warned that 'to connect the institutions and the terms causally can rarely be anything but hazardous' (27). In a later, more conciliatory article, he reflected on 'the once-prevalent abuse of seeing in kinship systems chiefly instruments for reconstructing systems of social structure', and cited instead the analogy of dress and the human body: 'One normally expects a considerable degree of fit; but it would be dogmatic and futile to say that body conformation "determines" dress, or that dress "reflects" the body' (Kroeber 1936: 339). Reviewing the situation in 1929, Robert H. Lowie felt that the correlation between social custom and nomenclature was 'far from perfect, but fairly high', adding that 'there will always be residual phenomena resisting interpretation on any but linguistic lines' (89).

Caveats and reservations of this kind are carried through into later studies. In 1941, A. R. Radcliffe-Brown judiciously described the nomenclature as 'an intrinsic part of a kinship system, just as it is also, of course, an intrinsic part of language' (61). He added that the relations between the nomenclature and the rest of the system were 'relations within an ordered whole'. Claude Lévi-Strauss argued in 1945 that kinship does not find its sole expression in a nomenclature; that the *système des appellations* will be found to map irregularly, not onto objective reality, but onto an equally arbitrary *système des attitudes*; and that both systems are amenable to structuralist analysis. Ward H. Goodenough, for his part, regarded as axiomatic 'some kind of functional relationship between social roles and the terminology of social classification' (1956: 120).[5] Similarly, Robert McKinley (1971) has moved beyond both the reflectionist and the autonomist positions, by referring to this inherent reciprocity: 'society acts on terminology, and terminology acts back on society' (245). We may thus expect kinship nomenclatures at times to be conditioned (either as synchronic systems or in their diachronic development) by extralinguistic factors, at other times to work and develop autonomously, at others again to condition thought and perception — operating neither entirely passively, nor *in vacuo*, but sometimes also as agents. Hitherto, the primary function that has been recognised here is 'a general function of ordering and classifying the various kin relationships' (228). For Leslie White (1939: 567), this classificatory function seems to have stood alone: 'A kinship term is a mechanism whose function is the classification

[5] See also Service 1960: 75; Gates 1971: 2; Oppitz 1975: 108f.

of relatives'. A related simplificatory function was highlighted by Marc Swartz (1960: 393): for him, kinship words condition behaviour, and 'this not only simplifies the individual's relations with his relatives but also tends to homogenize behavior throughout the society'. The move to a dynamic, instrumental view of kinship terms is perhaps strongest with Maurice Bloch (1971: 80): 'Kinship terms do not denote kinship roles; rather they are part of the process of defining a role relation between speaker and hearer [...]'. Lawrence Elwayne Nogle (1974: 49) asserted two functions, classification and role-designation. But for perhaps the fullest, as well as the most rhetorical, of statements we must go back to M. E. Opler's exhortations (1937: 210):

> Let us grant that kinship terms are significant labels often. Let us agree that they become overlaid with meaning and feeling tones for the relationships they imply. Let us admit that they are often the symbols and reminders of duty and specific obligation. Let us point out that among some people verbal classifications which reflect relationship and obligations may loom most important and may be worked out with rare completeness. But above all let us recognize that terminology is but one way of many, *a* way in which recognized social relationships may be represented.

Most scholars, certainly, have taken kinship as 'a cultural rather than a biological fact' (Malinowski 1930: 24), implying not only raw genealogy but also networks of fostering, adoption, godparenthood, fictive and presumptive kinship, role-playing, and a host of metaphorical extensions (Wallace-Atkins 1960: 58ff.; Barnard-Good 1984: 37ff.). At times, indeed, the genealogical component has appeared swamped or displaced, with some scholars seriously questioning its relevance to kinship systems (cf. Hammel ed. 1965: 3; Maranda 1974), and others just as staunchly defending it (Lounsbury 1964a: 381; Scheffler-Lounsbury 1971: 71).[6] Terminologically, the difference of viewpoint has led some (for example Lowie 1929, Barnard-Good 1984: 37ff.) to write of 'relationship terminologies' rather than of kinship. But in linguistic work, genealogical connexions offer a valuable and relatively objective point of reference, which it would be a pity to lose, so that, whilst recognising the interplay of other networks, linguists have tended to remain genealogists.[7]

---

[6] For an intermediate position, see for instance Swartz 1960.

[7] See the comment of Hammel (ed. 1965: 7): 'So far, genealogically based analyses of kinship terminologies have provided the clearest and most elegant solutions'. Lounsbury (1969: 26) would 'take the genealogical criteria as essential for the primary senses, as well as for all of the non-metaphoric expanded senses'. Casson (1975a: 229) focuses rather on the 'social meaning' communicated by the actual use

Whether we adopt the wider or the narrower definition of kinship, there is a distinction to be made between psychological reality, as perceived by the individual member of the society, and social-structural reality, as it appears to the external observer (Nogle 1974: 40ff.; cf. also Duby 1973: 267f.). In accounting for the objective data, analysts have gravitated towards the latter concern, but it seems that functionally the former deserves greater emphasis, elusive though the subject may be in the field.[8]

Viewed objectively or subjectively, a kinship terminology is highly selective in what it reflects and what it does not: 'every kinship nomenclature embodies only a part of the actually existing biological structure [...] it seizes upon certain elements of the biological organisation and ignores others in constructing a socially experienced world' (Davis-Warner 1937: 298). Even the largest and richest of known kinship sets (which run to some 35 terms in certain Amerindian languages, as against approximately 21 in modern English) can only sparsely populate the multidimensional matrices formed by the interaction of biological-genealogical criteria. Since Kroeber (1909) we have been taught to look for an extensive range of circumstances which may, or may not, be reflected as dimensions in a terminology: the lineal/collateral and consanguineal/affinal distinctions; relative and absolute sex of Ego and Alter; position of Alter in the ascending, descending, or equivalent generation; relative seniority within the generation, or outside it; sex of connecting relative; whether connecting relative is alive or dead; relative age of Ego and Alter.[9] Heuristically, fieldworkers are advised, for example, to watch for the possible reciprocity or part-reciprocity of the terms; to allow for metaphorical as well as literal usage; to consider the possibility of two or more different but co-existent genealogical links; and to distinguish between a term's use for reference, and for address — the former being traditionally preferred by linguistic analysts for its apparent objectivity and precision, though functionally the

---

of kin terms. The problem of delimiting intrinsic linguistic information, as against extraneous situational data, in this field is referred to by Kuznecov (1974: 6f.) in his contrastive typological study of kinship terms in English, Danish, French and Spanish.

[8] Wallace and Atkins (1960) examined some analytical problems within the componential approach and concluded (79) that in kinship 'the degree of psychological reality achieved in ethnographic reporting is not only uneven but on the average probably rather low'. They commented: 'A problem for research [...] must be to develop techniques for stating and identifying those definitions which are most proximate to psychological reality' (78).

[9] See further Nogle 1974: 19. Greenberg (1966: 110) assumed universality for only three of Kroeber's categories, namely generation, the consanguineal/affinal distinction, and sex of relative; see also Sprengel 1977.

latter may be more prominent and significant in day-to-day behaviour, and arguably also more prone to experimentation and change.[10]

These widespread (though only in part demonstrably universal) categories, dimensions and domains interact to form matrices which map in many distinctive ways onto the terms of a given kinship set. Typologies abound. At the simplest level of analysis, which has also proved problematic, Davis and Warner (1937: 301f.) identified 'isolating' terminologies in which each relative is designated by a distinct term, and 'classificatory' terminologies in which a single term spans a range of major categories. With finer differentiation, a typology of kinship terminologies has achieved currency, based partly on the terminological differentiation of siblings, parents' siblings, and cousins (parallel and cross), and of patrilateral and matrilateral kin, and partly on the presence or absence of skewing (the use of the same term across two adjacent generations, in a way that is asymmetrical with respect to side).[11]

These typologies have in turn been considered in the context of social structures, social and linguistic evolution, and the historical-genetic relationships holding between societies and between their languages. The prospects are intriguing, the methodological problems daunting. Lewis H. Morgan's use of kinship terms as clues to the earlier state of the system has been under attack since the early years of this century. 'Conjectural history' of this kind was the object of a stern critique by Radcliffe-Brown (1952: 49ff.). As Bush commented (1970: 82): 'A reconstruction of the history of a kinship term is precarious in itself, but even more perilous is the attempt to deduce the former existence of social institutions from

---

[10] See also Hogbin 1963: 50; Barnard-Good 1984: 40; Luong 1984: 291ff. Taboo factors may also operate here (Lowie 1929), with kinship terms providing a useful strategy for avoiding the use of personal names. On the 'etiquette of address', see Kipp 1984: 914, who comments that 'a person's choice of either personal name, teknonym, or kinship term reflects a gradient of increasing respect. One uses kin terms in address even more imperatively than in reference'. Cf. also Murdock 1949: 98: 'Terms of reference are normally more specific in their application than terms of address. [...] Furthermore, terms of address tend to reveal more duplication and overlapping than do terms of reference. [...] For these reasons, terms of reference are much more useful in kinship analysis [...]'. Luong 1984: 295, on the other hand, finds the distinction 'of highly questionable analytical value' in his own studies of Vietnamese kinship terms. Methodologically, Barnard and Good (1984: 39ff.) observe that terms of reference and address may differ 'both in the genealogical range over which they are applied, and in their assignation of terms to particular relatives'. On the theory of address, with some reference to kin terms, see Braun 1988.

[11] Lowie (1929) distinguished four types, generational, lineal, bifurcate merging, and bifurcate collateral. For further details, see for example Greenberg 1966: 107ff.; Dyen-Aberle 1974: 429ff. (glossary of terms); Barnard-Good 1984: 61ff.

kinship designations'. Friedrich (1966: 31f.) observed more hopefully that, although 'there is no perfect fit between social experience and language', nevertheless 'fundamental changes in any basic social institution should be reflected within a generation or two by correspondingly fundamental changes in the semantic system'. The causality is far from strict (see Eggan 1937: 49), and although the phenomenon of the time-lag is generally recognised (Bush 1970: 83; Dole 1972: 157), its duration is impossible to predict. Edmonson (1957: 408ff.) was no doubt right to conclude that 'various systems change at markedly different rates'. Exploring specifically linguistic causes of lexical change in this field, Gates (1971: 2) usefully identified three possibilities: contact with other languages (including semantic loans), structural pressures within the system of kinship terminology, and structural pressures within the language as a whole (for instance, compounding tendencies).

It remains to note that, in linguistics proper, much pioneering work in componential and generative theory and notation, for example, has proceeded (sometimes with inconclusive or even contradictory results), using kinship terminologies as an accommodating and apparently convenient, but in reality quite complex, basis.[12] In this spirit, Greenberg devoted a substantial section of his classic paper (1966) to the formal semantic universals of kinship terminology. Semantic universals arguably imply cultural universals, which may themselves be hotly debatable.[13] Disconcertingly, too, the very power of componential and generative analyses can lead to further ambiguity, as witnessed by John Lyons's observation (1977: 333) that notably in kinship studies 'several equally plausible analyses' may emerge. Thus, if universality is a problem, so too is (even relative) psychological reality. At the same time, there have been positive gains

[12] Malinowski (1930: 19) was already contemptuous of 'the bastard algebra of kinship'. For a spirited critique of kinship studies, see Keesing 1972. Kronenfeld 1976: 915 assessed more positively the potential contribution of kinship terminology to general semantics. See also the comments of Seiffert 1974: 349. In a seminal article, Romney and D'Andrade (1964) examined the cognitive psychological basis for the application of componential theory to kin terms. Another early classic paper using a componential approach was Goodenough 1956. Leech (1974: 247ff.) offered a predicational-componential analysis of basic English kin terms, and suggested how rules of implication might be used 'in deriving the socially institutionalized superstructure of kinship from a core of biologically founded relations'. As a bridge between the universal and culturally relative aspects of kinship semantics, Leech proposed various rules of implication. Some concise proposals for a generative approach to American kinship terms were made by Bock 1968. Casson (1975b: 326) emphasised the value of componential analysis for generative work. For an automated formal approach, see Kronenfeld 1976.

[13] Leech (1974: 262) favours here the adoption of a 'weak universalist' position.

from more formal approaches to the question, with generalisations captured, notationally and conceptually, which would otherwise have eluded the analyst.[14]

1.2. Kinship terms in German

The enquirer into medieval and post-medieval German kinship terms has been only indirectly served by this activity. Social historians have on the whole had other, better, means of tracing kinship structures and perceptions in medieval and early modern German society, and for their part linguists have tended not to see pressing reasons here for evading the ethnocentric fallacy by adopting a radically new approach and a sophisticated kinship algebra. Thanks to the common Indo-European word stock and, more particularly in later periods, the shared Classical heritage, they have probably felt that they were dealing in medieval German with lexical kinship structures not far removed in kind from those familiar to us in the languages of modern Europe. This may be illusory; certainly, distinctions need to be observed, basic textual documentation provided, and interpretations ventured, and in these respects historians of the German language have some distance to go. For Old High German and Middle High German kinship terms we still await a full and satisfactory treatment, and, despite some notable work, the urgency mounts amidst the seemingly chaotic changes of the late medieval and early modern periods.

A brief review of the state of the question may serve to define both the range and the limitations of existing work on German kinship terms. Among the earliest in the field was Wilhelm Deecke (1870), whose rather popularising monograph is now of general interest only. Lewis H. Morgan, in his monumental work on *Systems of Consanguinity*, appears to have been disturbingly misinformed on some historical aspects of the German terms (1871: 33f.). An informal outline of the history of German kin terms is given in an unsigned article (Christian Meyer?) of 1891. The broadest survey of German terms to date is probably still that of Wilhelm Schoof (1900), who traces the lexemes from Indo-European through the medieval and early modern periods to the late 19th-century dialects. Generally, however, Schoof's article is not sufficiently thorough, and it stands in

[14] An outline of the formal analysis of kinship terms is contained in Nogle 1974: 20f.; for a practical application of componential, generative, and other formal approaches, see 60ff. For discussion of appropriate notations and their theoretical basis, see also Hammel 1965 and Lamb 1965.

need of much revision. Inevitably, some of the Indo-European etymologies and the Germanic assumptions are now questionable. The medieval period is thinly documented; the post-medieval period receives better coverage, with the author relying partly on Grimm *Deutsches Wörterbuch*. Schoof's dialectal information provides a useful historical record, though the survey is somewhat wide-meshed, and his sources are mainly secondhand; there are no maps. Overall, the work makes several unsubstantiated *ad hoc* assumptions regarding the causality of change.[15]

Over the years, there have been occasional attempts to place German kinship terms in an interlingual context. A comparison of German and Latin terms was used by Leo Weisgerber (1953: 59ff.) in support of his theory of language 'als Kraft geistigen Gestaltens'. Building on rather unsafe lexical foundations, Munro Edmonson (1957) examined some 31 European and American kinship systems, including that of modern German, with passing reference to medieval German. In a dissertation of 1956, Robert Thomas Anderson attempted to reconstruct in broad historical outline the evolution of kinship patterns and terminologies in a range of European languages, using a minimum of textual documentation for German. The conclusions reached will be considered in section 5.1, by which time a good deal of evidence will have been found to amplify, qualify, and in some respects contradict, Anderson's findings.

Work done in this field by German dialectologists has been fragmentary, though in parts distinguished. In his dissertation on the dialect of Basel in the Late Middle Ages (1953), Ernst Erhard Müller devoted a valuable chapter to 'Verwandtschaftsbeziehungen' (178ff.). From archival material of the period 1420-1644, Müller was able to document closely for this location the evolving senses of several kinship terms, including *mâc, vriunt, muome, base, œheim* and *veter*. His findings point up the need for similar studies in other centres of the period, with the aim of extending our knowledge of the geographical distribution of kinship reference patterns. From the modern end, too, dialectological coverage is sparse. The northwestern margin of the High German area was mapped by Winand Roukens in a study of Dutch word-geography (1937: II, maps 63 *Tante*, 64 *Muhme*, 65 *Onkel*). In a lexical study of 1939, Alois Kreller mapped and briefly discussed a few kinship terms as used in the former German-speaking enclave of the Schönhengst, which was evacuated in 1945. Claus-Jürgen Hutterer reported in 1963 on forms of *Muhme* and *Vetter* in German dialects of Central Hungary (199, 206; see also map 35 for *Großmutter*

[15] Can we be certain, for example, that 'Ersatzgebrauch' (the reciprocal use of the identical kinship term) was a specifically Germanic feature? And what can we know of 'die Gemütlichkeit altgermanischen Familienlebens' (259)?

and *Großvater*). Johannes Weidlein cited and discussed some kin terms (1963-64) in 'Donauschwäbisch'. The published volumes of the *Deutscher Wortatlas* contain only a few modern dialect maps which bear upon our subject (VI, maps 1-6 *Schwiegervater, -mutter, -sohn, -tochter*, XXI, maps 3-4 *Großvater, -mutter*). They have received detailed treatment in Friedhelm Debus (1958a and 1958b), largely from the synchronic standpoint of modern dialect geography, though attention is also given to the principles which underlie the historical replacement of the older, opaque simplexes with new, motivated compounds.[16] Devoted also to affinal terms is a section of Gilbert A. R. de Smet's essay (1986: 72-79) with maps based upon Early New High German lexicographical sources.

The *Sprachatlas der deutschen Schweiz* offers a more comprehensive set of maps, covering local equivalents for 'uncle', 'aunt', 'nephew', 'niece', 'cousin of either sex', and others (SDS IV, 131ff.) with some commentary. Regionally specific, too, is Oskar Grunow's dissertation of 1966, which traces the history of a wide range of kin terms and their reflexes in modern Bavaro-Austrian dialects. The work brings together a quantity of historical documentation from secondary lexical sources, but offers little that is new from primary texts. As we shall see, Grunow's reliance on the standard dictionaries leads him to make premature assumptions about the chronology and the sequence of semantic changes in this field. The interest of the dissertation lies less in the etymological and historical sections than in the portions dealing with word-geography, for which Grunow used important material from the *Dialektatlas Österreichs und seiner Nachbarländer*.

Data on specific terms can be gleaned from the fuller dialect dictionaries, for instance the *Schweizerisches Idiotikon*, the *Schwäbisches Wörterbuch* (Fischer-Pfleiderer 1904-39), and the *Wörterbuch der bairischen Mundarten in Österreich* (Kranzmayer et al. 1963-).

Of particular value to the language historian is Robert Bjerke's contrastive study of older German and Norwegian kinship terms (1969). Bjerke's approach is essentially synchronic-systemic, though 'the sparseness of the material discourages the application of a strict componential analysis' (1). On the German side, the study is based upon 564 of the 13th-century deeds in Friedrich Wilhelm's *Corpus der altdeutschen Originalurkunden*. Excerption of these provided Bjerke with loci for no less than

[16] A more recent commentator has pointed out the historical inadequacy of Debus's study, and argued that modern maps of the DWA-type cannot be reliably interpreted in a retrospective sense: 'Das Kartenbild erlaubt eine Diagnose auf einem fortgeschrittenen Stand der Entwicklung, mehr im Hinblick auf das Kommende als auf das Gewesene. [...] Daraus ergibt sich, daß die Wortgeschichte eigentlich nur vorwärtsschreitend erhellt werden kann, daß von historischen Zuständen selbst auszugehen ist' (Müller 1979: 122).

60 different terms, 14 of them single occurrences in this corpus. From these Bjerke concludes that 'the language of the documents illustrates a system and its terminology in flux' (54); he finds the German system more complex and fluid than the Norwegian. The German material is itself surprisingly elusive. Discussion of some key terms, for example, is hampered by lack of data: thus, *muome* occurs only three times in Bjerke's documents, *base* and *ane* not at all, and although *ôheim* is found on 16 occasions, its sense is determinable only in one, Middle Low Frankish, deed. The choice of legal, rather than poetic, documentation was made partly for reasons of objectivity, because one might expect 'honesty and descriptive accuracy' (1) in such material.[17] Be that as it may, record linkage is always a problem, and a knowledge of the underlying relationships generally hard to come by. Bjerke's use of the Isenburg-Freytag genealogical tables introduces the risk of circularity if, as is quite possible during this early period, they occasionally draw their information on the less well-known families from these same legal documents. We may sometimes feel uneasy, too, about the use of surnames or other circumstantial evidence to establish relationships (16), or to infer male or female linkage. Bjerke advances the hypothesis, and repeats it with increasing vigour as the work progresses, that relative age was relevant to the selection of certain terms (for example, that *ôheim* denoted an older male relative and *neve* a younger one); but in fact we lack the chronological data which alone could prove or disprove this contention (52, 54, 64), and we shall later be bringing forward evidence for an early reciprocal use of each of these terms, which would run counter to Bjerke's suggestion.[18] The tantalising sparseness of hard semantic data in his corpus means, on the one hand, that an overall system or diasystem of legal usage can only in part be reconstructed, and, on the other, that regional variation within High German scarcely emerges at all, particularly as the High German sources themselves are predominantly Upper German in provenance. These reservations aside, Bjerke's study is to be welcomed as an original and incisive modern contribution to the subject. It seems to have been in fact the first major attempt since Benecke-Müller-Zarncke, Grimm *Deutsches Wörterbuch*, Lexer, and the *Deutsches Rechtswörterbuch* to adduce new primary material from the medieval texts in this field. With some adjustments, Bjerke's method could quite profitably be extended to the remaining 3,000 German deeds from the 13th century in Friedrich Wilhelm's collection, as well as to documents of the 14th and 15th centuries.

---

[17] Cf. also Blochwitz 1965: 11.

[18] The observation is also found, without explicit data, in Petzsch 1913: 47, with reference to correspondence between princes in the 14th and 15th centuries.

With regard to the *Corpus*, the deficit is now being remedied by the appearance of the *Wörterbuch der mittelhochdeutschen Urkundensprache*, the earlier parts of which became available when the present work was close to publication. Linguists as well as historians will look forward keenly to the completion of this important project.

There is some selective reference to kinship in Werner Hoffmann's discerning study of Middle High German semantics (1974: 46ff.). Drawing on an unpublished paper by Gerd Vossmerbäumer (1971), Gerd Fritz gave brief attention in 1974 to kinship terms in a volume designed primarily for the learner. Embedded in Oswald Szemerényi's magisterial and comprehensive survey (1977) is material of direct relevance to medieval German, but much of it derivative.

An important work is that of Ernst Erhard Müller (1979) (reviewed, for example, by Erben in 1981 and Helmig in 1982; see also Hildebrandt 1984: 366), which ranges more widely than his earlier dissertation. The product of many years of collecting, Müller's thoughtful and revealing study focuses primarily on *Großvater, -mutter, Enkel, Schwiegervater, -mutter, -sohn, -tochter,* and their regional equivalents, which are examined with copious data from the medieval and early modern periods. There is some passing attention also to collateral terms. Relying largely on legal texts, Müller is able to document, and in some cases to map, the extent of regionally restricted terminological sub-systems, giving 'eine ausgeprägte landschaftliche Variantik mit beträchtlichen Unterschieden' (15). With good reason, Müller urges extreme caution in the evaluation of lexical and literary attestations in historical word-geography (147f.). But it might be added that legal sources, too, have their attendant risks: legal 'Fachsprache' can be expected by turns to archaise, to apply overspecific designations, to employ one polysemous word in a specific sense, and to avoid another if there is danger of ambiguity. Only in the total picture, in the accumulation and confrontation of data of all kinds, can the historical word-geographer hope to negotiate such pitfalls. Müller's relatively informal and very readable study is to be welcomed, not least as a valuable contribution to this end.

The article by Karl Bertau (1983: 190-240) on kinship in Wolfram's *Parzival* came to hand only after the relevant portions of the present study were substantially written. Bertau's study is of literary and sociological interest, and offers some challenging generalisations about behavioural aspects of the Œdipal triangle, siblings, the avunculate, and patterns of fostering. It is based upon a close examination of the kinship terminology, which we shall later find to be somewhat inaccurate and lacking in rigour — with implications for the validity of Bertau's statistics, for certain portions of his genealogical tree (236f.), and for his lexico-semantic

generalisations. The article confines itself to the evidence of *Parzival* and, occasionally, *Titurel*, and there is no attempt to draw in the copious lexical material of *Willehalm*, nor to place Wolfram's usage in its contemporary context.

Analogous in overall approach, though more detailed and accurate in content, is the monograph of Elisabeth Schmid (1986), which sets Wolfram's kinship structures in the context of other French and German Grail romances, and on this basis offers a kind of literary anthropology. There is some illuminating comment on the terminology, but the work is not intended primarily as a linguistic study, and it draws, in fact, a number of somewhat insecure conclusions about Wolfram's kinship terms, details of which will emerge in section 2, below.

The standard historical dictionaries present us with a situation that is all too familiar. Helpful documentation — though for our purposes sometimes rather late — is available in some of the relevant entries in Grimm *Deutsches Wörterbuch*. For certain terms, copious examples from early legal sources are to hand in the *Deutsches Rechtswörterbuch*. For the Middle High German period generally, the failings of our standard dictionaries (Benecke-Müller-Zarncke and Lexer), now more than a century old, are acutely to be felt.[19] Graver still, until recently, was the absence of an Early New High German dictionary. Under the editorship of Robert R. Anderson, Ulrich Goebel and Oskar Reichmann, the *Frühneuhochdeutsches Wörterbuch* promises to provide an altogether firmer basis for work in this field. Material from it was of some assistance during the later stages of the present investigation.[20]

Past lexicographical deficiencies have had repercussions in a study of German kin terms by Germán Ruipérez (1984). Ruipérez attempts to trace, onomasiologically and semasiologically, the German terms for 'aunt', 'uncle', 'niece', 'nephew' and 'grandchild' from the 10th to the 20th century. The evidence is taken ('aus arbeitsökonomischen Erwägungen' (14)) from dictionaries — the standard dictionaries of Old High German and Middle High German, various dictionaries and glossaries of the Early New High German period, and a selection of more recent historical and synchronic lexica, including Frisch, Adelung and Grimm. Reliance on these works proves to have been a false economy. There was apparently no fresh excerption of new texts, and sources for the period before 1500 are especially thin. The consequences for Ruipérez's chronology can only be described as disastrous. Thus, for *Muhme*, Ruipérez (47) attests

---

[19] On the state of Middle High German lexicography, see Menge 1985: 1149f. For interesting new initiatives, see Gärtner 1986, Bachofer 1987, Bachofer (ed.) 1988.

[20] For a report on this major initiative, see Reichmann 1987.

the sense 'mother's sister's daughter' from 1522, and 'father's brother's daughter' from 1739. Our own excerptions will show that these senses can be attested from ca. 1400 and ca. 1450 respectively, and that in addition the sense 'mother's brother's daughter' is documented from the 14th century, if not earlier. Ruipérez dates *Oheim* in the sense 'father's brother' from the mid 17th century, using the example from Andreas Gryphius in Grimm *Deutsches Wörterbuch* (74); according to our sources this sense is present already in the 14th century, and perhaps earlier. Generally, Ruipérez's work has more than its share of inaccuracies and oversights. On the transference of French *tante, oncle, nièce* and *neveu*, for example, there is no reference to Richard Brunt's important work on Franco-German loans of the period (Brunt 1983: 390f., 398, 474f.). All of this has a cumulative effect when Ruipérez presents 'verschiedene Synopsen, [...] die eine präzise semantische Entwicklung jedes Lexems mit einer annähernden Genauigkeit von etwa +/− 50 Jahren veranschaulichen' (145). The German system was not, as Ruipérez claims, 'bis zur Mitte des 16. Jh. eindeutig ambilateral' (146); as we shall clearly see later, 'side' was already being neutralised from the 14th and 15th centuries, or earlier. Again, the extension of consanguineal terms to affinal relatives in the collateral line is not primarily a 19th-century development (139f.), but can be demonstrated much earlier. In turn, the chronological imprecision of Ruipérez's work must cast serious doubt on his (in any case somewhat speculative) attempts in Part II to correlate these structural developments with socio-economic change.[21]

1.3. Scope and method of the present study

The need remains for a study of medieval and early modern German kinship terms that is at once wide-ranging and thorough-going. It must be admitted that the subject is one of unusual intricacy, but overall the impression is of a patchwork still far from complete. A full modern study of the subject, proceeding from a fresh excerption of texts, would ideally offer a more reliable assessment of the meaning of individual occurrences, together with clearer insight into semantic structures and the mechanisms of change. With this, we could hope to discover answers, or more exact answers, to a range of questions. By what stages, for example, did the inherited kinship set develop towards polysemy? What types of semantic shift predominate? Can causal chains be identified? What differences

[21] The work has been briefly and too leniently reviewed by Kristina Franke (1989).

existed between dialects, and how closely do they match the dialect differences of the 19th and 20th centuries? Did the poets of the Classical Middle High German period foster a 'cultivated' kinship terminology which was in some ways neater and more closely defined than that of their predecessors or successors, or even of their humbler contemporaries (cf. Hoffmann 1974: 46f.)? How far did this literary model hold prescriptive sway over the ensuing centuries of social and linguistic evolution? How close is the correlation between linguistic and social change in the later Middle Ages? How strong was the continuum of medieval religious usage, or the regulative effect of legal terminology (cf. Blochwitz 1965: 30f.; Erben 1972: 380f.), or the influence of the Latin kinship model from Old High German times through into the Age of Humanism? Can we, in fact, posit two or more contemporaneous systems, for instance a folk taxonomy of fuzzy sets, and a more rigid system of oppositions, which could be triggered by situational (for example, legal) conditions, or by means of contextual signals? And what other pragmatic considerations governed the selection of kin terms?

The fullest lexical documentation will eventually be required, to bring these and other interdisciplinary questions to a focus, and to secure results which will be of interest and value to historians and literary specialists, as well as linguists.

As a contribution to this field of study, we adopt here a triple approach:

(1) an examination of a chronologically central system, namely the synchronic, indeed idiolectal, kinship set of Wolfram von Eschenbach (early 13th century);

(2) a contrastive study of the confrontation between Latin and German kinship terms in medieval glosses and glossaries, both early and late;

(3) a diachronic (and in part diatopic) exploration of selected terms, from earliest times to 1500 and in some cases beyond, based on more than 280 source texts.

In this way, the strictly text-internal evidence of Wolfram's usage (section 2) and the specialised data of the glosses and glossaries (section 3) will be drawn together within the larger context of chronological, and in some aspects regional, variation (section 4). Conclusions, with suggestions for further research, will be offered in section 5.

2. A SYNCHRONIC VIEW

2.0. Kinship terms in Wolfram von Eschenbach

In this section, we explore a system that is the reflex of a single poetic mind, as documented in the poems of Wolfram von Eschenbach, which belong to the early years of the 13th century, and (with the exception of the *Titurel* fragments) have come down to us in a sound textual tradition of early date.[1] Underlying Wolfram's narrative works is a set of genealogical structures of remarkable extent, elaborated with great care across the entire span of his *œuvre*, and serving a range of artistic purposes.[2] *Parzival*, in particular, is dominated by the hero's very extensive matrilateral and patrilateral kindred, and by two other major structures.

Our procedure will test all, and call into question several, of the kinship links hitherto assumed to exist in Wolfram's works, with implications for the literary critic; but it will also transpire that the linguistic evidence to be elicited by a close reading of these texts is itself of cardinal importance

---

[1] The principal manuscripts of *Parzival* and *Willehalm* take us back to the second quarter or third of the 13th century. On the dating of *Parzival* D, see now Schneider 1987 and the facsimile edition by Schirok.

[2] The study of Elisabeth Schmid (1986) became available after this section was substantially completed, but reference is made to it as necessary below. The work, which spans French and German Grail romances, is primarily of literary and sociological interest, but contains a helpful list of kinship terms in Wolfram's *Parzival* and *Titurel* with some discussion, together with a genealogical table (174f.) that is clearer and more extensive than any yet seen. Its few drafting errors appear now to have been corrected in some copies of this edition. The table makes a number of assumptions which, though not improbable, cannot be unambiguously demonstrated from the texts. A similar objection can be made to the list of terms (179ff.), which assumes uniformly for *muome, base, œheim* and *veter* their primary senses, even when these cannot be confirmed textually. For the linguist, at least, a more sceptical approach is desirable. And whilst the author is able to demonstrate that Wolfram's kinship system is 'matrilateral ausgeprägt' (189), her semantic assessment of *niftel* and *neve* is not entirely even-handed, and is therefore in need of some modification. Similar reservations may be felt about her claims (1980: 39) that *neve* and *veter* can serve in Middle High German to distinguish between maternal and paternal relatives, and that the terms for 'Onkel' and 'Neffe' were interchangeable.

in this corner of Middle High German semantics. The conventions used in the presentation of the material are largely self-explanatory.[3]

Empirically, the historical semanticist reconstructs past synchronic systems by deducing specific referential use from context, and then by clustering these 'senses' to chart sense-spectra and ultimately the overall 'lexical meaning' for the words in question. It should perhaps be emphasised here that identification of sense in context is being used as a heuristic device to this end; no analogous underlying psycholinguistic perception is necessarily to be assumed. Thus, the statement that *muome* in P. 140,22 has the sense 'mother's sister' carries of itself no implication that the poet necessarily had so precise a meaning in mind when using the term. Only later, by summation of all the loci for the word (or word-field) within the corpus, can the range of lexical meaning be determined.

With Wolfram, the linguist is favoured by a fortunate conjunction of circumstances. The poet freely employs a relatively large set of terms, which overwhelmingly denote consanguineal relationships lying within three generations of Ego.[4] Our semantic interpretation of these loci is aided by the richness of Wolfram's genealogical weft, and by his tendency to concatenate the more elementary terms, either in order to fill vacant slots in the system (for example *muomen sun*) or to create transparent synonyms for existing terms (*muoter swester, swester suon*). Generally, he weaves into his texts a helpful degree of redundancy and self-corroboration by re-stating certain links in a variety of ways.[5] Textually, too, we are on

---

[3] In this section and later, the sequence *cf.* ... normally introduces evidence as to the exact nature of the genealogical link, which is typically separate from the attestation itself, and often requires the conflation of data from several parts of the text. Relationships are stated in the form Ego ⇒ Alter. Titles of Wolfram's works are abbreviated as necessary to P. (*Parzival*), W. (*Willehalm*), and T. (*Titurel*).

[4] The terms *erbe* and *ganerbe* are sometimes considered with kinship terms, but in view of their marginal status in this regard they have been ignored in what follows.

[5] Krawutschke (1978: 133) notes a similar tendency in the *Prose Lancelot* and interprets it as 'terminologische Unsicherheit oder vielleicht auch Unbefangenheit'; but the feature is a widespread one and is partly rooted in the desire for stylistic variety. On the analytic and periphrastic modes of reference, see Müller 1979: 78 and 115, note 34. Examples from Wolfram's work include the following: *iur swester suon* (P. 726,10); *bruoder tohter* (W. 80,10); *sîner tohter man* (P. 66,9); *der Baligans tohter man* [*nam* G] (W. 428,9); *sîner* (etc.) *muomen su(o)n* (P. 39,13; 51,5; 64,22; 74,28; 80,25); *der was muomen sun Vivians* [*siner mvmen* γ] (W. 381,8); *ir mannes muomen suon* (P. 48,3); *mîner* (etc.) *muomen kint* (P. 48,13; 65,25; 249,23); *mîner muomen man* (P. 50,2); *sîner muoter muomen tohter* (P. 328,22); *Artûses basen sun* (P. 145,11); *miner basen sun* (W. 255,9); *diner basen tohter* (W. 350,3); *mîner basen bruoder suon* (P. 406,15); *Josweizes basen tohter sun* (W. 389,14); *miner kinde œheimes sun* (W. 349,11); *mînes vetern sun* (P. 412,6).

firm ground: in *Parzival* and *Willehalm* there are few cruces that affect the reading of kinship words, and most of these are obvious misreadings (occasionally *vater* for *veter*, or *swester* for *sweher*), although in *Titurel* the position is significantly worse.

2.1. Superordinate terms

We begin at the highest level of generality, with the superordinate terms of the field. The outermost orbits of Wolfram's kinship system are occupied by the term *mâc*, which appears at times to shade into *vriunt*. Each will be considered in turn, with some passing attention to a third term, *sippe*.

2.1.1. *mâc*

In *Parzival*, *mâc* is used in particular of the following relationships, in all of which Alter is male:

Gawan ⇒ Artus 'mother's brother' (651,1, cf. 66,9ff.);

Vridebrant ⇒ Isenhart 'first cousin' (?) (see 2.4.3, below) (58,10);

Kaylet ⇒ Galoes 'mother's sister's son' (?) (see 2.4.1, below) (91,25);

Kingrimursel ⇒ Kingrisin (either 'father's brother' or 'father's brother's son', see section 2.4.4, below) (324,11; 419,27);

Vergulaht ⇒ Kingrimursel (either 'father's brother's son' or 'father's father's brother's son', see section 2.4.4, below) (412,21).

More remotely, *mâc* denotes the following relationships and is thus at least as extensive as *neve*:

Gawan ⇒ Galoes and Gahmuret (586,14) (perhaps also Ither and Ilinot; for Galoes and Gahmuret, the sense is 'mother's father's father's brother's son's son's son');

Gawan ⇒ Parzival (586,14; 680,19; 758,11) ('mother's father's father's brother's son's son's son's son');

Gawan ⇒ Feirefiz (758,11) ('mother's father's father's brother's son's son's son's son').

On other occasions, the exact relationship is left open (e.g. 51,4; 156,3). In *Titurel* the rather problematic linkage between Schoette and Mahaude

(see section 2.4.1) has the important consequence of drawing Schionatulander and Gahmuret together as *mâge* (T. 75,3; 88,3 *liebester mach* G, *næhster* I), the relationship probably being that of first cousins (cf. also *nahe(n) gemâge* T. 95,2). *Mâc* is applied in *Willehalm* to the sister's son (68,1, cf. 69,19), probably also (see 2.4.4) to the *veter*, the *basen sun* (254,17ff., cf. 255,7ff.), and the father's *neve* (254,25-28, cf. 346,26). At W. 389,14ff. Josweiz is described as the *mâc* of Ehmereiz, who is Josweiz's *basen tohter sun*. By implication, Wolfram excludes brothers from the term's field of reference: *mîn mâge ode mîn bruoder* (P. 364,7).[6] In *Willehalm*, indeed, fathers as well as brothers are specified independently of *mâge* (269,9; 285,1f.; 293,6; 299,7ff.), likewise sons (260,4; 373,13), and children of both sexes (263,5; 441,23). Gyburc's formulation *Du vater und ander mine mage* (217,1; *ander* α, om. β) is not necessarily a counterexample, since pleonastic *ander* is very well attested from Old High German onwards.[7]

By an interesting semantic extension in P. 520,3, Malcreatiure is described as *der wūrze unt der sterne mâc*. Just as Wolfram's kinship structures and the corresponding terminology form a continuum which extends upwards to the Divine, so here the tenuously human Malcreatiure and his sister Cundrie are in turn explicitly related to the seemingly inert, but in reality potent, world of the inanimate. Yet nowhere in Wolfram's poems is *mâc* demonstrably used to denote human relationships other than those of blood; whatever the possibilities for metaphorical extension of *mâc*, the affinal relatives stand apart.[8] At W. 455,13, in fact, Willehalm expressly denies that Charles (his sister's husband's father) is his *mâc*, adding that *dehein sin sippe an mir lac*, and similarly Gyburc uses the phrase *mine*

---

[6] Cf. also *mâge und bruoder* (P. 701,22); *al mine mage und mine bruoder* (W. 453,17).

[7] Examples in Bruder Hermann, *Iolande* ed. Meier, 91-94; Behaghel 1923-32: I, 450; Trübner 1939-57 s.v.; Nellmann 1973: 117 and note 162. The pleonasm did not always commend itself to copyists; see, for example, the variants to Hartmann, *Iwein* 4817 and 8142, Gottfried, *Tristan* ed. Marold-Schröder, 18990, and Wolfram, *Willehalm* 231,9; 267,27; 318,30; 335,1; *Parzival* 652,19 *ors unt ander kleit* [*Phandelose* G]. Collocation with *mâge* is not uncommon, e.g. *Kudrun* 1543,3 *ze anndern seinen magen*; *Gesamtabenteuer* II, 422, 432f. *wîp unt kint* [...] *und ander rîche mâge*. More obscure in meaning is the expression *ander hant* (e.g. Walther 124,6); see with caution Grimm *Deutsches Wörterbuch* I, 310; also section 4.1.2, below.

[8] Gandiluz is described, together with the other pages, as Gawan's *mâc* (P. 430,6; cf. also 432,27), but it would be rash to suppose that Wolfram is here thinking of the very distant link which passes from Gawan to Gandiluz via Parzival, Condwiramurs and Gurnemanz, still less of the textually somewhat insecure link through Gandin, Schoette and Mahaude, which can be deduced only from *Titurel*. In P. 430 and 432, Wolfram may equally well have had in mind some closer, unstated relationship between Gawan and Gandiluz.

mage to refer specifically to her own, rather than Willehalm's, kin (254,17; 255,3).[9]

2.1.2. *vriunt*

As far as Wolfram is concerned, the word *vriunt* lies still on the margin of our subject. Commonly denoting 'lover',[10] *friunt* is also regularly used in *Parzival* between persons unrelated (Parzival ⇒ Iwanet 158,18; the narrator ⇒ Parzival 144,4),[11] and between persons unaware of their kinship (Ither ⇒ Parzival 146,13; 147,1). Parzival and Gawan exchange the term in Book VI (331,25; 332,9), though it is not clear whether at this stage they know that they are relatives. In Book XIV the narrator imputes to Parzival (who by now knows that he is Gawan's *neve*, cf. 689,24) the motive of fighting *für friundes nôt* on Gawan's behalf (706,23). The general sense 'friend' emerges clearly from 90,3 (Kaylet to Hardiz: *daz ir mich zeinem friwende nemt*) and from the formula *friunt und vîent* (339,8),[12] whilst in P. 765,28f. (*Feirefîz Anschevîn* | *was dâ ze guoten friunden komn*) the grouping evidently comprises Feirefiz's kinsfolk, and others unrelated to him. The grey region between kinship and friendship is explored further in *Willehalm*. Rennewart is regularly the *vriunt* of the margrave, who is in fact his brother-in-law though neither is aware of the relationship (e.g. 200,26; 225,10; 269,20). Gyburc herself addresses her brother in this way (292,3), already half-suspecting that he is *uz ir geslehte erborn* (291,28f.). More general uses are also found (e.g. 268,1). Overall there is no basis for assuming a lexical shift or extension to 'kinsman' in Wolfram's works.

---

[9] That the term *sippe* was not invariably thus restricted is suggested by W. 12,9ff.: *si waren im* [Terramer] *sippe* [*gesipp* γ] *al geliche,* | *Willelm der lobes riche* | *und Tybalt, Arabeln man* (the relationship being in each case that of son-in-law). Also relevant, on the other hand, is the speech of Bernart von Brubant (W. 260,14ff.): *die andern sibene, ir ieslich* | *von arde mine mage sint;* | *der ahte ist für war min kint* — which, if it is not simply pleonastic, suggests that *mâcschaft* was already becoming a more nebulous concept, extending beyond the *art* and therefore requiring more precise definition in line 15.

[10] e.g. P. 26,25; 27,14; 28,3; 99,30; W. 9,18 (*mannes* VKaWoE, *wilhelmes* W); 93,22; 102,11; T. 59,1; Songs 1,3, etc.; also *friuntschaft* 'love relationship' P. 271,5; 811,6.

[11] Cf. also P. 338,8. T. 132,4 is analogous if we reject the G-variant *frŏde* and accept the textual conjecture *friunde* which is derived from the *Jüngerer Titurel* (Heinzle 1972: 182). On narratorial *vriunt*, see Grimm 1866b: 268 (footnote) and Nellmann 1973: 149; close contemporary examples include Gottfried, *Tristan* 4977, and Ulrich von Zatzikhoven, *Lanzelet* 3142, 3374 and 4256.

[12] This antithesis is more frequent in *Willehalm*, e.g. 104,28; 109,12f.; 236,7f.; 273,30; 319,29; 365,13f.; 391,8; 421,4.

2.2. Non-collateral terms

Of Wolfram's kinship terms, we pass rapidly over the following designations for relatives within the nuclear family: *wîp, man, muoter, vater, swester, bruoder, tohter, sun, kint.*[13] Whatever semantic complexities these primary kin terms exhibit in other respects, they were not found to raise problems of genealogical interpretation within his work. *Vater* is occasionally broadened to 'father-in-law' (Gyburc ⇒ Heimrich, W. 278,15). An extended sense is also apparent with *sun*: Terramer regards both Halzebier (Terramer's *neve*, 341,4) and Synagun (Halzebier's *swester sun*, 294,23f.) as *liebehalp min sun* (347,30).

Unproblematic, too, are the words connoting bereavement: *wit(e)we*, applied specifically only to Orgeluse (P. 673,1) and Herzeloyde (T. 35,1), and *weise*, which both Condwiramurs (P. 194,19) and Sigune (T. 61,4) apply to themselves, though *weise* is more typically used metaphorically (P. 167,9; 335,8; 782,17; W. 102,27) with either negative or (strikingly) positive value.

Next, we turn to the designations for the grandparents. As a masculine noun, *an(e)* is used to denote Gandin by his grandchildren Feirefiz (P. 56,6), Vergulaht (420,8) and Parzival (498,26f.); in addition, Titurel is Herzeloyde's *an* (P. 501,23), and, by an ingenious genealogical linkage that emerges only in the later poem *Titurel*, Gurnemanz is presented as Schionatulander's *ane* (T. 41,2). In four of these cases the sense is 'father's father', whilst in P. 420,8 it is 'mother's father'. There is a parallel feminine use: Arnive is *ane* both to Itonje (P. 710,19) and to Gawan (P. 763,5; 764,9); similarly Irmenschart is Alyze's *an* in W. 157,26 (cf. 156,9). This gives us the constant sense 'mother's mother'. All these links are firmly corroborated elsewhere in the respective works.

The reciprocal term *eninkel* does not occur in Wolfram's works, nor is there any trace of East Frankish and Hessian *diechter*.[14]

Absent, also, are three of the Middle High German terms denoting relatives by marriage: *eidem* 'son-in-law', *snu(o)r* 'daughter-in-law', and *swiger* 'mother-in-law'.[15] Only two affinal terms are occasionally found,

---

[13] For a reasonably full list of loci, see Bertau 1983: 194ff.

[14] On the distribution of *eninkel*, see Müller 1979: 80ff. and 85, map 9; on the extent of *diechter* from the 14th century, see Müller 1979: 86ff., 88, map 10, and 115, note 50; also Erben 1981: 177f. It is possible that Wolfram avoided both designations because his own dialect lay close to the *eninkel/diechter* boundary.

[15] For *eidem*, Wolfram uses the combination *sîner tohter man* (P. 66,9) and the periphrasis *der Baligans tohter man* [*nam* G] (W. 428,9); on this, see Müller 1979: