

Morphology and Cultural Interpretation of Baigani Kinship Terminology: A Comparative Study with Hindi and Marathi

Niteenkumar Janbaji Ramteke¹

T. V. Kattimani²

Ranju Hasini Sahoo³

ABSTRACT

Baigani is one of the endangered languages of the Baiga community, a PVTG of Central India. In this paper, an attempt is made to explore the structure and content of kinship terms among the Baiga tribe and to identify similarities with the Indo-Aryan languages, namely, standard Hindi and Marathi. Kinship terminology has been a topic of interest for both Linguistics and Anthropology. Based on the ethnographic field work of the 23 Baiga villages of Pushparajgarh block of Annuppur district of Madhya Pradesh, and applying the tools and techniques of questionnaire and semi-structured interview, observation, and transcription, the present interdisciplinary paper found out some interesting results about the cultural Interpretation of the morphology of the Baigani language, which has bridged the gap between Linguistics and Anthropology. The morphology of the Baiga language supported the Anthropological analysis of its classificatory and descriptive Kinship terminology, corroborating earlier research that, like Tamil Kallar and the Dravidian communities of South India, bilateral cross-cousin marriage practices are prevalent in the Baiga community.

Keywords: Baigani, Ethnographic, Consanguineous, Cross-cousin marriage, Morphology, Linguistic Anthropology, NEP-2020

Author Details:

1. Niteenkumar Janbaji Ramteke is Assistant Professor (CHB), Marathi Bhasha Vidyapeeth, Amravati, Email: ramtekenishi@gmail.com
2. T. V. Kattimani is Former Vice-Chancellor, Indira Gandhi National Tribal University, Amarkantak, Email: tvkattimani@gmail.com
3. Ranju Hasini Sahoo (Corresponding Author) is Professor, Department of Sociology and Social Anthropology, Indira Gandhi National Tribal University, Amarkantak, Email: ranju.sahoo@igntu.ac.in



Suggested Citation:

Ramteke, N. J., Kattimani, T. V. & Sahoo, R. H. (2026). Morphology and Cultural Interpretation of Baigani Kinship Terminology: A Comparative Study with Hindi and Marathi, *Journal of Studies in Dynamics and Change (JSDC)*, 13(1), 47-61.

DOI: [www. https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.22121656](https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.22121656)

Published on: 01 January 2026

I. INTRODUCTION

Kinship is a method of acknowledging a relationship, a social bond initiated by genetic or blood ties, as well as a marriage relationship. Kinship ties are fundamental to every society worldwide. Family is the point of departure for studying Kinship.

The biological and Kinship interface was the focal point of research on kinship systems by Anthropologists such as Fox (1967), Holy (1996), and Scheffler (2001; in Shapiro, 2018), while the cultural and kinship analogy has been emphasized by Schneider (1984; Tejpur University, 2026, p. 5) and Jaede et al. (2016). Fox (1967) asserted that the biological basis of mating, gestation, and parenthood, the basic facts of life, are the explanations for understanding the kinship system. Holy (1996) explained that both nature (procreation) and nurture (social substance) factors, as well as the cultural interpretation of biology, are crucial for shedding light on kinship systems. Scheffler (2001; Jones 2018) extended the explanation of extensionism, based on his major work of 1970-1980, in which he argued that kinship systems are cognitive explanations rooted in biological realities.

Schneider (2014) revolutionized the study of kinship by refuting the biological-kinship interface and explaining kinship relations, identity, and meaning through the lens of culture and symbol, leading to a paradigm shift in kinship studies from structural-functionalism to symbolic, interpretative, and post-structuralist thought. Jaede et al. (2016) emphasized that kinship is a cultural strategy for addressing survival issues, grounded in an evolved trait. They explained the social and biological realms of kinship form: a kind of asymptote, scarcely touching one another in normal times, but both do lock horns in times of deep social crises, when the symbolic or material basis of the group's survival is challenged. Further, they provided a rationale for backing a strong ethnographic explanation of kinship in a given context, then integrated a biological or neo-evolutionary explanation, necessitating a convincing rationale. It urges a comprehension of the limits of methods and perspectives employed in the Anthropology of Kinship.

Theoretical Explanations of Kinship Study

Kinship or relatedness through descent or alliance theories is a too-simplistic approach for understanding the kinship system. Levi Strauss (1969), a pioneer of structural linguistics, developed the alliance theory of Kinship, emphasizing the necessity of the incest taboo and exogamous rules, a view later elaborated by Dumont (1968), who focused on the distinction between kin and affines (in-laws). However, the alliance theory of Lévi-Strauss (1969) was criticized by Leach (1954), who highlighted the connections among Kinship, Marriage, and property. Thus, Leach (1954), in his path-breaking empirical work on irrigation-based communities in the village 'Pul Eliya' in the North Central Province of Ceylon, underscored how the ties of Kinship and Marriage are related to property rights and land-use practices. In contrast, descent theorists, and Structural Functionalist Radcliffe-Brown (1950,2015), Evans Pritchard (1940), and Fortes (1969) emphasized rights and obligations based on the descent system, working of descent group (lineage and

clan) to maintain social order, and importance of descent rule and lineage to define the social structure and organization of corporate life, respectively.

Radcliffe-Brown (1950, 2015) explained Kinship as a system of social relations that is dynamic, regulated by social usages, norms, etiquette, and mutual obligations. He observed that kinship terms are like 'signposts to interpersonal conduct,' with connotations and ramifications for rights and duties.

From the ground-breaking ethnographic work 'The Nuer' by Pritchard (1940) stemmed the key concept of the segmentary lineage system, a form of decentralized and egalitarian social organization.

Credit goes to the renowned anthropologist Meyer Fortes (1969), who defined the scope of kinship studies by illustrating several key, foundational concepts. His explanation of the dual domain structure of familial (personal/domestic) and the political (public) is complementary. It pertains to a kinship institution, which is autonomous, operating on its own intrinsic logic as a 'Rule of Amity' governed by altruism and the spirit of solidarity, not as a by-product of economic needs.

II. REVIEW OF LITERATURE

Every language has its own kinship terms or terms of address that indicate some relations. All these terms are purely based on relations. While terms of address are used to address someone who may be a relative, kinship terms refer to a specific relationship. For instance, we use 'mummy' when speaking to mother and 'mother' when speaking about her. The kinship terms are based on biological connection, and a distinction is made between relatives of descent and relatives of marriage.

Murdock (1949) explained the interaction between kinship terminology and kinship behaviour, as reflected in the mode of use. Further, he classified kinship terminology into two categories – terms of reference and terms of address. Bonvillian (2000), who is well known for her studies in ethno linguistic and linguistic anthropology, highlighted the importance of the function of address terms based on her empirical data of Mohawk community, a Northern Iroquoian nation, which explains the crucial role of address terms not as labels but for their embeddedness in the social structure, thereby reflecting the social hierarchy, relationship, social cohesion and cultural norms. In a nutshell, she concluded that address terms serve as an interface between language and society, providing a panoramic view of society and culture.

It is Lewis Morgan (1877) who pioneered the path-breaking study on Kinship terminology, asserting that it is kinship terminology, the vocabulary of differentiation and classification of relatives, which makes people understand the biological relationship through their marriage practices. Thus, he classified kin terms into two categories: classificatory and descriptive. A Classificatory kinship term is when collateral kin is referred to using the same kinship terminology as lineal kin. Descriptive kinship terms distinguish between lineal and collateral kin.

Marriage rules help in understanding kinship studies, thereby providing a better understanding of kinship terminology. Rivers (1914; 2012 and 2014) endeavoured

to shed light on the cause-and-effect relationship between symmetrical cross-cousin marriage (direct exchange) and bifurcate-merging kinship terminology.

The pioneering Anthropologists who have asserted the importance of interfamilial alliance, solidarity, and social structure through prescriptive and preferential Marriage, including cross-cousin marriage, are Claude Lévi-Strauss (1949, 1969), Needham (2011), Homans, and Schneider (1955). Fox (1986), in his seminal work, reiterated the strength of solidarity by explaining cross-cousin marriage as a socially constructed practice.

Cross-cousin marriage is a prescriptive rule of Marriage that is mandatory, both socially and traditionally, and a strict rule requiring marriage to a particular kin. It may be matrilineal, patrilineal, or bilateral. The Kachin of Burma (Leach, 1954) are known for matrilineal cross-cousin marriage. In contrast, the Gond tribes of Madhya Pradesh and Odisha, the Oran, the Koya, the Didayi, the Ho, and the Kolha of Odisha, and the Kuki tribes of Manipur practice patrilineal cross-cousin marriage (Karve, 1953; Oberai, 1994; Trautman, 1981; Kumar & Lobo, 2022).

Anthropological research found the prevalence of cross-cousin marriage among the PVTGs of the Jenukuruba and Kadar communities of Karnataka and Cochin, respectively (Mutharayappa, 1993; Ehrenfels, 1952; Iyer, 1939). Thus, from the study by Mutharayappa (1993), it is evident that 77 percent of Jenukuruba marriages are consanguineous, with the practice of cross-cousin marriage and maternal-uncle-niece marital relationships prevalent. Likewise, the seminal ethnographic works by Iyer (1939) and Ehrenfels (1952) found that the Preference for cross-cousin marriage and the kinship terminology of Kadar are significantly associated.

Goodenough (1956) bridged the study of linguistics and Anthropology through his componential analysis of kinship terminologies of American Yankees and Chuukese (formerly Tuke), illustrating the breaking down of kin terms into binary categories, providing clarity on gender, generation, and linearity. Goodenough's seminal work on componential analysis explained kinship terms as semantic components or features that distinguish different relations. Thus, adopting the principle of Structural Linguistics to Anthropology, his seminal work on componential analysis in kinship opened the door for the new subfield of Ethnoscience or Cognitive Anthropology. His expedition, along with his student Ann Chowning, to conduct fieldwork among the Lakalai of New Britain Island (Papua New Guinea) in 1954, helped him primarily document the social organization and Kinship of the community.

Basilki (2017) applied participant and non-participant observation to categorize kinship addresses in Likpakpaln into agnatic, matrilineal, and affinal forms.

Jones (2010) and Gray et al. (2020) elucidated the significant role of regions and geographical areas in shaping and reshaping kinship terminology. Going a step further, Stepanova (2020) expounded on the paramount role of the cultural and social environment in shaping the linguistic organization of kinship terms and the uniqueness of the social structure (in Kanwal et al., 2025).

The blood relationship continues generation after generation. All ascendants and descendants of an individual are kin, related through blood. Family, lineage, and clan are consanguineal kin groups. The blood relation is present before marriage. Again, through reproduction, blood relation is transmitted through marriage, marriage within a kinship structure. Tylor (1889) coined the term 'Teknonymy' and contributed to morphology, though not in the biological sense, through comparative analysis and the structural development of institutions.

Kinship is important in all cultures and in all human interactions. Kinship is important to Anthropology because it is the study of human behaviour, and human behaviour is variable. According to Lamb (1965), to fully understand the nature of kinship systems, it is necessary to understand which linguistic elements they are and what linguistic relationships they have. Thus, applying stratificational grammar, Lamb analysed how kin relationships are linguistically encoded and structured across the culture. Having the kinship terminology of any language is a natural meeting point for the disciplines of Anthropology and Linguistics.

Karve (1953, p.148) provides a comparative analysis of four cultural zones in India, namely the Northern, South, Eastern, and Central zones, with reference to linguistics, caste, and family organization. According to Karve, "Maharashtra is an area where Sanskritic northern traits (Languages spoken are Gujarati, Rajasthani, Himachali, and Hindi) and the Dravidian southern traits (mix of Sanskritic languages) can be seen, showing the dominance of the former. Therefore, the kinship structure in Maharashtra is slightly different from both the southern and northern zones."

Morphology is the branch of Linguistics that is concerned with the relation between meaning and form, within words and between words. Morphology literally means 'the study of form' – in particular, the forms of words. Morphology (Linguistics) is the study of the structure and content of word forms (Fasold & Connor-Linton, 2006, p.59).

Knowledge of morphology is essential for understanding how the human brain processes language. It helps in developing new methods for language learning and has applications in Artificial Intelligence. Words are the fundamental building blocks of language.

"Even the tongue the Baiga now speak is not their own, for there seems to be no doubt but the Chhattisgarhi speech which they carried with them from the plains to their vastness in the hills, and that mixture of Dravidian Gondi with Indo-Aryan Hindi and Marathi which is known as Baigani ..." (Elwin, 2007, p.xxi). From her research, Abbi (2001) concluded that with longer contact between languages, assimilation occurs, resulting in the loss of genetic stock. She highlighted that a 50 percent loss of Munda and Dravidian languages in Jharkhand is due to the assimilation of Indo Aryan languages. Sreenathan (2001), while working as a researcher at the Anthropological Survey of India, conducted fieldwork among the nomadic Nigrito hunter-gatherers of the Andaman Islands, who possess strong kinship ties and ecological knowledge. He contributed to the foundational documentation of the phonology and grammar of the Jarawa language, a member of the Ongan language family.

The Baiga kinship system is of the usual classificatory type. However, because they speak a dialect of Hindi and, in consequence, use some of the customary Hindi words for their relations, this is not immediately apparent. The Baiga attitude, however, is entirely 'classificatory'; he regards everyone whom his own father would regard as a brother as his father, all the women whom his father might marry are his mothers, and so on (Elwin, 2007, p.178). Fuch (1960) explained that symmetrical exchange is the rule in cross-cousin marriage among the Baiga community.

Baiga, like the Yanomamo tribes (Lizot, 1985, 2001), the Tamil, and the Tamil Kallar (Dumont, 1968; 1885) practice bilaterally cross-cousin marriage. Since the era of Elwin and Fuch, from 1939 to 1960, respectively, the bilateral cross-cousin marriage of the Baiga community has been studied from cultural, genetic, and linguistics perspectives.

Sharma and Dwivedi (2006) highlighted the prevalence of bilateral consanguineous marriages, with 50% matrilateral and 50% patrilateral. Soni (2015) mentions the levirate Marriage among the Baiga, where a man has the right to marry his elder brother's widow, but not vice versa. A man cannot marry his younger brother's widow. The Baiga have sororal polygyny, where a man can remarry his wife's younger sister, if allowed by his wife, and then she is known as 'Chhotaki'.

Significance of the Study

The ethnolinguistics study of Baigani kinship terminology will fill the research gap and contribute to the knowledge domain. Documenting the Baigani kinship terminology is a step toward preserving the endangered language and identity of the tribe. As NEP 2020 emphasizes education in the mother tongue in the Early Childhood Care and Education (ECCE) program and Primary education, the study will foster education for the PVTG tribe, at least in ECCE.

III. METHODOLOGY

The paper sheds light on the morphology and cultural aspect of the kinship terminology of the Baigani language of the Baiga tribe, one of India's 75 PVTGs.

"Particularly Vulnerable Tribal Groups (PVTGs) are a category of tribal communities, most socio-economically disadvantaged among Scheduled Tribes, who have a pre-agricultural level of technology, low literacy, declining or stagnant population, and a subsistence-level economy (Ministry of Tribal Affairs, 2014)

The total population of the Baiga Tribe in India is 552495 (Census, 2011). They inhabit the states of Madhya Pradesh, Chhattisgarh, Jharkhand, and Uttar Pradesh. Their habitat is in the forest, and they are close to nature.

The study's universe is the Pusparajgarh block of the Anupur district, where the Baiga community lives across 65 villages, with 1585 households and a total population of 7782 (Baiga Development Agency, 2015). However, data were collected

from 23 villages with 1140 households and a total population of 4760, using a purposive sampling method. The study is conducted using a qualitative and ethnographic approach. The tools and techniques of data collection include a semi-structured interview schedule, non-participant and participant observation, FGDs, and transcription methods.

IV. ANALYSIS AND FINDINGS

Classificatory and Descriptive Kinship Terminology of the Baigani Language in the Context of Consanguinity

Table-1 presents the comparison of kinship terms used Baigani language in the context of Consanguinity, with the corresponding terms used in standard Hindi and Marathi languages.

In a Consanguineous kinship, Masculine gender represents the suffix /a/ and Feminine gender represents suffix /i:/. In Baigani language /dadi:/ kinship term is used for grandfather (father side) but in standard Hindi, this kinship term is used for grandmother (father side). In Baigani language /ad̪i:/ kinship term is used for grandmother (father side) but in the standard Marathi /ad̪i:/ is used for the grandmother (father and mother both side).

In the same way /nana/ kinship term is used for grandfather (Mother side) and /nani:/ term is used for grandmother (mother side). /nana/ & /nani:/ both the kinship terms are used in the standard Hindi language as grandfather (Mother side) and grandmother (Mother side) respectively.

/baba/ the kinship term for 'father' is common to both the Baigani and standard Marathi languages.

/d̪ai:/ kinship term is used for mother in Baigani but in Marathi /d̪ai:/ term is used for that woman who assists and provides support for easy delivery of the child through her traditional skill.

In Baigani language /kaku:/ represents the father's younger brother and /kaki:/ Father's younger brother's wife. Here we can say that /u:/ represents the Masculine gender and /i:/ represents Feminine gender. In a standard Marathi language /kaku:/ kinship term is used for only Father's younger brother's wife.

/mama/ and /mami:/ both the kinship terms are used for Mother's brother and Mother's brother's wife respectively in Baigani language these terms are also used in standard Hindi & standard Marathi language for the mentioned kin members. 'mama' is a consanguineous kinship term as it is a blood relationship but 'mami' is an affinal kinship term, based on marital relationship.

/nan/ & /b̪əŋka/ both the terms are adjectives which are used before the kinship term to show the age difference.

The linguistics analysis of the kinship terminology 'baba' for father and father's brother and 'd̪ai' for mother and mother's sister corroborates the findings of

Rivers'(1914) who concludes that symmetrical cross cousin marriage (parallel cross cousin marriage) system often results in bifurcate merging terminologies ,where a father and father's brother are called by the same term , so also the use of same kinship term for mother and mother's sister that distinguish them from cross relatives. Thus, applying cause – effect principles, Rivers concludes, the marriage rule (cause) directly dictates the specific terminology used in a society (effect),

Table-1: Baigani Kinship Terms in Context of Consanguinity

Gloss	Baigani Masculine & Feminine	Standard Hindi	Standard Marathi	Deletion of Masculine Gender Marker Baiga	Addition of Feminine Gender Marker Baiga
Grandfather (Father Side)	ɖaɖi:	ɖaɖa	adʒo:ba		
Grandmother (Father Side)	adʒi:	ɖaɖi:	adʒi:		
Grandfather (Mother Side)	nana	nana	adʒo:ba	a	i:
GrandMother (Mother Side)	nani:	nani:	adʒi:		
Father	baba	piṭa	baba		
Mother	ɖai:	mā	ai:		
Mother's brother's son	səŋgati	māmerabʰai:	mamebʰau		
Mother's brother's daughter	sāgo	māmeri: bəʃən	mamebəhi:ŋ		
Father's brother's son (elder)	bəɾkaɖau:	ʃʰɪɾa bhai:	tʃʊlɐt bhai:		
Father's brother's daughter (elder)	bəɾi: bai:	ʃʰɪɾi: bəʃən	tʃʊlɐt bəhi:ŋ		
Father's brother's son (younger)	nan ɖau:	ʃʰɪɾa bhai:	tʃʊlɐt bhai:		
Father's brother's daughter (younger)	nan bai:	ʃʰɪɾi: bəʃən	tʃʊlɐt bəhi:ŋ		
Mother's sister's son (elder)	bəɾkaɖau:	mə:sera bhai:	ma:vəsəbhai:		
Mother's sister's daughter (elder)	bəɾi: bai:	mə:seri: bəʃən	ma:vəsəbəhi:ŋ		
Mother's sister's son (younger)	nan ɖau:	mə:sera bhai:	ma:vəsəbhai:		
Mother's sister's daughter (younger)	nan bai:	mə:seri: bəʃən	ma:vəsəbəhi:ŋ		
Father's younger brother	kaku:	ʃʰaʃa	Kaka	u:	i:
Father's younger brother's wife	kaki:	ʃʰaʃi:	kaku:		
Father's elder brother	bəɾkababa	bəɾepiṭa	mothebaba		
Father's elder brother's wife	bəɾi:ɖai:	bəɾi: mā	mothi: ai:		
Mother's brother	mama	mama	mama	a	i:
Mother's brother's wife	mami:	mami:	mami:		
Father's sister	phua	phuphi:	a:tʃa		
Mother's elder sister	bəɾi: ɖai:	bəɾi: mə:si:	mothi: ai:		
Mother's younger sister	nan ɖai:	mə:si:	ma:vəi:		

Source: Empirical data based on field source

Descriptive Identifiers

/bəṛka ɖau:/ kinship term is used for Father's brother's son (elder) and Mother's sister's son (elder) /bəṛi: bai:/ kinship term is used for Father's brother's elder daughter and mother's sister's elder daughter /nan ɖau:/kinship term is used for Father's brother's younger son and Mother's sister's son (younger).

/nan bai:/ kinship term is used for Father's brother's younger daughter and Mother's sister's daughter (younger)

Thus, 'ɖai:' is the classificatory kinship term which is an address term for primary lineal kin - mother, secondary collateral kin for mother's sister, and tertiary collateral kin for father's brother's wife. Likewise, the classificatory kinship address term 'baba' is used for father, father's brother, and mother's sister's husband; the former is primary lineal kin, and the latter two terms are secondary and tertiary collateral kin, respectively. The former two kin members, 'ɖai:' and 'baba', are consanguineous kin. In contrast, the last two terms, 'ɖai:' and 'baba', for father's brother's wife and mother's sister's husband, respectively, are affinal kin through the marriage network.

Also, it is noticed that the same address term ' ɖau:' is used for primary kin brother, and tertiary collateral kin for father's brother's son, and for mother's sister's son, respectively. Likewise, the address term is 'bai:' for primary kin (sister) and for tertiary collateral kin (father's brother's daughter and mother's sister's daughter). These two classificatory terms distinguish the descriptive terms 'səṅgati' and ' sāgo' for mother's brother's son and mother's brother's daughter, respectively, signifying the distinction between parallel kin (treated as siblings) and cross-kin (potential spouse), which enforce marriage rules. Our empirical data also corroborates the finding that the cross-kin use a joking relationship.

Classificatory and Descriptive Kinship Terminology of the Baigani Language in the Context of Affinity

Here we can say that /a/ suffix is used as a masculine gender marker and /i:/ suffix is used as a feminine gender marker.

Here mama (səsura) & mami: (sasə) both the terms are used for Wife's father and Wife's mother respectively; same kinship terminology used in standard Hindi and standard Marathi. mama and mami (for in-laws) are both examples of classificatory kinship terms and are a fine example of cross-cousin marriage.

There is a significant difference in matrimonial norms between South Indian states and those in Central and North India regarding the permissibility of blood-related marriages. In most southern regions, the custom of cross-cousin marriage—specifically between the children of a maternal uncle and a paternal aunt—is prevalent. In such contexts, the terminology used for the 'husband's mother' and the 'wife's mother' clearly reflects the marriage codes inherent in the Indian social structure.

Dumont (1968), in his study among the Tamil Kallar, concluded that cross-cousinship is not just kinship but a system of alliance.

Karve (1953: 165) notes that “while 'sasra' originates from the Sanskrit 'Shvashura', the term mama (maternal uncle) is used for the husband's father in certain regions.” This survey confirms that usage and further observes that mama also refers to the wife's father. “Further, she observes that while the term 'sasū' (mother-in-law) is of Sanskrit origin, the word 'mami'(maternal aunt) is used in certain regions to refer to the husband's mother. This survey confirms that usage and further reveals that 'mami' also refers to the wife's mother. Similarly, in parts of Maharashtra, a:tja (paternal aunt) serves as an alternative term for Sasu.”

Dhongde (2013: 75) refers to this concept using the kinship term sasra. The term sasra was found to be prevalent across almost all districts of Maharashtra.

/baba/ is addressed to father and /bai:/ is addressed to sister, both the kinship terms are used in Marathi.

Table-2 presents the comparison of kinship terms used Baigani language in the context of Affinity, with the corresponding terms used in standard Hindi and Marathi languages.

Table-2: Baigani Kinship Terms in Context of Affinity

Gloss	Baigani Masculine & Feminine	Standard Hindi	Standard Marathi	Deletion of Masculine Gender Marker Baiga	Addition of Feminine Gender Marker Baiga
Wife's father	mama & səsura	səsur	sasəra	a	i:
Wife's mother	mami: & sasə	sasə	sasu:		
Father's elder sister's husband	mama & səsura	p ^h up ^h a	mama	a	i:
Father's elder sister	mami: & sasə	bua	a:tja		
Mother's sister's husband	baba	mə:sa:	kaka & ma:vəsa:		
Father's elder brother's wife	bəɽi:ɖai:	bəɽi: mā	mothi: ai:		
Elder brother's wife	b ^h əvədzi:	bhabhi:	vəfiŋi:		
Younger brother's wife	b ^h ə.jə:və & bəfiu:	bhabhi:	b ^h əvədʒə		
Son's wife	putau: & bhaŋi:	bəfiu:	su:nə		
Wife's younger sister	noni:	sali:	mefiŋi:		

Source: Empirical data based on field source

Descriptive Identifiers

When some kinship terms are addressed before that some words are used on the basis of their age criteria that words are called adjective. In the Baigani language

some adjectives are used before the kinship terms like /bəḍka/, /nanə/, /bəṛi:/ etc. (Table-3).

Here we can say that /məḍʒ^{li}la/ and /məḍʒ^{li}li:/ both the kinship terms are used for middle. /a/ suffix used for masculine gender and /i:/suffix refers to feminine gender, here /a/ is replaced by /i:/ to denote the feminine gender.

/bua/ kinship term is used for father's sister and same concept is used in standard Hindi language.

/mama/ is a consanguineous kinship term, as it refers to a blood relationship, but mami is an affinal kinship term, based on a marital relationship.

Anthropological analysis of the address term 'mama' when is examined from the age based linguistics analysis of descriptive identifiers 'bəḍka:' for elder and 'nan' for younger, which has corroborated that the term 'mama' stands for wife's father and mother's brother, father's sister's husband, the three kin members fall under, secondary affinal kin, consanguineous secondary collateral kin and tertiary affinal collateral kin respectively is a classificatory kinship term that addresses a multitude of collateral kin under same term because the core principle of classificatory system is the merging of distinct relatives into a single category (<https://www.britannica.com/topic/kinship-terminology> 1/4). Further, it may be added that 'mama' is a term of respect, or a classificatory extension, rather than a structural identification.

Table-3: Examples of Adjectives used in Conjunction with Baigani Kinship Terms

Gloss	Kinship term	Adjective
Elder brother	bəḍka ḍau:	bəḍka
Elder sister	bəṛi: bai:	bəṛi:
Middle brother	məḍʒ ^{li} la ḍau:	məḍʒ ^{li} la
Middle sister	məḍʒ ^{li} li: bai:	məḍʒ ^{li} li:
Younger brother	nan ḍau:	Nan (Indeclinable)
Younger sister	nan bai:	nan
Gloss	Kinship term	
Father's elder brother	bəḍka baba	
Father's elder sister	bəṛi:p ^{ua}	
Father's younger sister	nan p ^{ua}	
Mother's elder sister	bəṛi: ḍai:	
Mother's younger sister	nandai:	

Source: Empirical data based on field source

V. CONCLUSION

Kinship terminology is a fascinating subject in Linguistic Anthropology, Sociolinguistics, and Anthropology. Kinship terms often play a significant role in

studying the culture and the ethno-linguistic factors that shape the social hierarchy of a specific community, shed light on how kinship terms of address and terms of reference are embedded in social structure. It is seen that the suffixes play a major role in the formation of kinship terms in the Baigani Language. Sometimes, kinship terminology similar to that of Hindi and Marathi is used in Baigani, and some of these suffixes are also found in the Indo-Aryan languages, i.e., Hindi & Marathi. More in-depth research is required on kinship terminology to shed further light on the nature of language and its analogy with culture. Linguistics data on Baigani Kinship terminology corroborated the earlier research of Rivers (1914; 2012, 2014) that explains how symmetrical cross-cousin marriage or Bilateral cross-cousin marriage system leads to bifurcate merging terminologies where a father and father's brother are addressed in the same kinship term, so also the address term for mother and mother's sister is the same, which distinguishes them from cross relatives. The analysis of kinship terminology corroborated earlier research on bilateral cross-cousin marriage among the Baiga community and warrants further research in Linguistic Anthropology. Furthermore, the present study paves the way for future research on Ethno Science (also known as New Ethnography, Ethno semantics and Ethno linguistics) and, Cognitive Anthropology (D'Andrade, 1995; Giovanni. 2018), which are interdisciplinary in nature that prioritize the native's point of view or emic perspective, meeting the aims of ethno scientists to understand how the natives classify their own world for interpretation of their experiences and guidance of their behaviour.

VI. ACKNOWLEDGEMENT AND OTHER DETAILS

The present paper is a part of the major ICSSR research project entitled "An interdisciplinary study of the Baiga: To develop a database to be used for inputs for sustainable development".

VII. REFERENCES

- Abbi, A. (2001). *A manual of linguistic fieldwork and structures of Indian languages*. Lincom Europa.
- Bennardo, G. (2018, July 17). Cultural models theory. *Anthropology News*. <https://doi.org/10.1111/AN.919>
- Bonvillain, N. (2000). *Language, culture and communication: The meaning of messages* (3rd ed.). Prentice Hall.
- Boruah, D. (2016). A morphological study of Baiga kinship terminology. *Language in India*, 16(8). <https://www.languageinindia.com/aug2016/deepabaigakinship1.pdf>-----pls
- Bsilki, A. K. (2017). A sociolinguistic analysis of kinship terms in Likpakpaln (Konkomba). *Ghana Journal of Linguistics*, 6(3), 33–58. <https://doi.org/10.4314/gil.v6i3.2>
- D'Andrade, R. (1995). *The development of cognitive anthropology*. Cambridge University Press.
- Deccan College (Deemed University), Pune, & Rajya Marathi Vikas Sanstha, Mumbai. (n.d.-a). *Ego's father's elder brother, ego's father's younger brother, ego's father's elder brother's wife, ego's father's younger brother's wife*. Survey of Dialects of Marathi Language. Retrieved August 23, 2026, from <https://sdml.ac.in/blog-Ego%20father%20elder%20brotherDhongde>, S. (2013). *Survey of dialects of Marathi language*. <http://sdml.ac.in>

- Deccan College (Deemed University), Pune, & Rajya Marathi Vikas Sanstha, Mumbai. (n.d.-b). *Husband's mother's brother*. Survey of Dialects of Marathi Language. Retrieved August 23, 2026, from <https://sdml.ac.in/blog-Husband%20mother%20brother> Dumont, L. (1968). Marriage alliance. In D. L. Sills (Ed.), *International encyclopedia of the social sciences* (Vol. 10, pp. 19–23). Macmillan & Free Press.
- Dumont, L. (1985). *Affinity as a value: Marriage alliance in South India*. University of Chicago Press.
- Elwin, V. (2007). *The Baiga* (J. H. Hutton, Foreword). Gyan Publishing House. (Original work published 1939).
- Ehrenfels, U. R. (1952). *Kadar of Cochin*. University of Madras.
- Evans-Pritchard, E. E. (1951). *Kinship and marriage among the Nuer*. Clarendon Press.
- Fasold, R. W., & Connor-Linton, J. (2006). *An introduction to language and linguistics*. Cambridge University Press.
- Fortes, M. (1969). *Kinship and the social order: The legacy of Lewis Henry Morgan*. Aldine Publishing Company.
- Fox, R. (1986). *Kinship and marriage: An anthropological perspective*. Cambridge University Press.
- Fuchs, S. (1960). *The Gond and Bhumia of eastern Mandla*. Asia Publishing House.
- Goodenough, W. H. (1956). Componential analysis and the study of meaning. *Language*, 32(1), 195–216. <https://doi.org/10.2307/410665>
- Gray, R. D., Jordan, F. M., & Greenhill, S. J. (2020). Universal semantic drivers of kinship terminology structure: Evidence from 176 societies. *Evolutionary Human Sciences*, 2, Article e42. <https://doi.org/10.1017/ehs.2020.41>
- Holy, L. (1996). *Anthropological perspectives on kinship*. Pluto Press.
- Homans, G. C., & Schneider, D. M. (1955). *Marriage, authority, and final causes: A study of unilateral cross-cousin marriage*. Free Press.
- Iyer, L. A. K. (1939). *The Travancore tribes and castes*. Government Press.
- Jaede, R., Munazir, S., & Talib, M. (2016). Kinship through the parallel lines: Probing the social and biological debate. *Journal of the Anthropological Society of Oxford*, 8(3), 452–473.
- Jones, D. (2010). Human kinship, from conceptual structure to grammar. *Behavioral and Brain Sciences*, 33(5), 367–368. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0140525X10000961>
- Jones, D. (2018). Kinship in mind: Three approaches. In W. Shapiro (Ed.), *Focality and extension in kinship: Essays in memory of Harold W. Scheffler* (pp. 343–367). ANU Press. <https://doi.org/10.22459/FEK.11.2018>
- Kanwal, T., Haroon, H., Khan, U. A., & Arif, M. (2025). Linguistic diversity in kinship terminology: A study of cultural evolution across regions. *Journal of Asian Studies*, 14(2).
- Karve, I. (1953). *Kinship organization in India*. Deccan College Postgraduate and Research Institute.
- Kumar, D., & Lobo, L. (2022). *Tribes of Western India: A comparative study of their social structure*. Routledge.
- Lamb, S. M. (1965). Kinship terminology and linguistic structure. *American Anthropologist*, 67(5, Part 2), 37–64.

- Leach, E. R. (1954). *Political systems of highland Burma: A study of Kachin social structure*. G. Bell and Sons.
- Lévi-Strauss, C. (1969). *The elementary structures of kinship* (J. H. Bell, J. R. von Sturmer, & R. Needham, Trans.). Beacon Press. (Original work published 1949)
- Lizot, J. (1985). *Tales of the Yanomami: Daily life in the Venezuelan forest*. Cambridge University Press.
- Lizot, J. (2004). *Encyclopedic dictionary of the Yanomami language*. Apostolic Vicariate of Puerto Ayacucho.
- Majumdar, A. (2018). Kurmali kinship terms and its morphology: An anthropo-linguistic study. *Jadavpur Journal of Languages and Linguistics*, 2(1). https://www.researchgate.net/publication/330875357_Kurmali_Kinship_Terms_and_Its_Morphology_An_Anthropo-linguistic_Study
- Morgan, L. H. (1877). *Ancient society*. Macmillan & Company.
- Murdock, G. P. (1949). *Social structure*. The Macmillan Company.
- Mutharayappa, R. (1993). Socio-cultural factors and marriage among Jenukuruba and Kadukuruba tribes of Karnataka. *Man in India*, 73(1), 17–27.
- Needham, R. (2011). *Rethinking kinship and marriage*. Routledge.
- Noyer, R. (n.d.). *Indo-European kinship* [PDF]. University of Pennsylvania. <https://www.ling.upenn.edu/~rnoyer/courses/51/PIEKinship.pdf>
- Noyer, R. (n.d.). *Proto-Indo-European language and society: Kinship terminology*. Retrieved August 23, 2026, from <https://www.ling.upenn.edu/~rnoyer/courses/51/PIEKinship.pdf>
- Radcliffe-Brown, A. R., & Forde, D. (Eds.). (1950). *African systems of kinship and marriage*. Oxford University Press.
- Rivers, W. H. R. (1914). *Kinship and social organization*. Constable & Co.
- Scheffler, H. (2001). *Filiation and affiliation*. Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9780429500428>
- Schneider, D. M. (1984). *A critique of the study of kinship*. University of Michigan Press.
- Schneider, D. M. (2004). What is kinship all about? In R. Parkin & L. Stone (Eds.), *Kinship and family: An anthropological reader* (pp. 257–274). Blackwell.
- Shapiro, W. (Ed.). (2018). *Focality and extension in kinship: Essays in memory of Harold W. Scheffler*. ANU Press.
- Sharma, A. N., & Dwivedi, P. (2006). Socio-demographic characteristics of the Baigas of Samnapur Block of Dindori District, Madhya Pradesh. *Anthropologist*, 8(3), 203–206.
- Sinha, P., Sarma, B., & Purkayastha, B. S. (2012). Kinship terms in Nepali language and its morphology. *International Journal of Computer Applications*, 58(9). <http://research.ijcaonline.org/volume58/number9/pxc3883546.pdf>
- Soni, A. (2015). *Baiga, a visual ethnography*. Indira Gandhi National Tribal University.
- Sreenathan, M. (2001). *The Jarawas: Language and culture*. Anthropological Survey of India.
- Stepanova, E. V. (2020). Kinship terminology and social structure: A comparative study. *Anthropological Journal of European Cultures*, 29(2), 123–145. <https://doi.org/10.16995/ajec.2020.123>
- Tezpur University. (2026). *Introduction to family and kinship* (MSO 102, Block II). <http://www.tezu.ernet.in>

- Trautmann, T. R. (1983). *Dravidian kinship*. Cambridge University Press.
- Trivedi, H. R. (1985). *The Mers of Saurashtra revisited and studied in the light of socio-cultural change and cross-cousin marriage*. Concept Publishing Company.
- Tylor, E. B. (1889). On a method of investigating the development of institutions; applied to laws of marriage and descent. *Journal of the Royal Anthropological Institute of Great Britain and Ireland*, 18, 245–272.
- Uberoi, P. (Ed.). (1994). *Family, kinship and marriage in India*. Oxford University Press.
- Vajda, E. (n.d.). *Semantics*. Linguistics 201: Introduction to Linguistics, Western Washington University.
<https://pandora.cii.wvu.edu/vajda/ling201/test3materials/semantics.htm>
- Vihman, M. M. (n.d.). *Working papers [PDF]*. Survey of California and Other Indian Languages, University of California, Berkeley.
<https://linguistics.berkeley.edu/~survey/documents/publications/Vihman.009.005-extract.pdf>