The areal factor in formation of kinship terminologies

XIII CONGRESS OF ANTHROPOLOGISTS AND ETHNOLOGISTS OF RUSSIA
Kazan, 2–6 July, 2019
Veronika Milanova and Jeremy Bradley (University of Vienna),
Sampsa Holopainen (University of Helsinki), András Czentnár (Eötvös Loránd University Budapest)

1. Main factors of cross-cultural and cross-linguistic similarities:

➢ genetic kinship (e.g., belonging to the same language family/group, etc.)

➢ typological tendencies (e.g., shared and innate aspects of the human experience)

➢ areal tendencies / contact phenomena

➢ (coincidence)

2. Similarities in kinship terminologies:

2.1. Similarities motivated by a common origin:

➢ Indo-European kinship terms < *Proto-Indo-European (PIE) kinship terms (e.g., Delbrück 1889, Szemerényi 1977, Milanova 2014: 16–52 and 2016)

➢ Uralic kinship terms < *Proto-Uralic (PU)[1] kinship terms (e.g., Sammallahti 1988; Aikio 2015; *UEW*)

➢ Turkic kinship terms < *Proto-Turkic (PT) kinship term (cf. Grønbech 1953)

If languages have split from each other recently, this factor is dominant. The bigger the time depth of the split, the less influential this factor becomes, especially if related language are separated geographically or subject to radically different contact situations (e.g., attested Uralic languages, see the discussion below).

2.2. Typological similarities:

2.2.1. Typological studies of kinship semantics in linguistics (studies of 'universals')

➢ no or very few universal concept (up to 8) associated with kinship (cf. Milanova 2017, Milanova & Holopainen & Bradley forthcoming p. 1–3 with references)

  o Swadesh and Sherzer (1971: 283): 'man' and 'woman'

  o The Leipzig-Jakarta List of basic vocabulary (Tadmor 2010: 68ff.): 'child'

  o Wierzbicka (2016: 410): 'mother', 'father', 'birth' ('born'), 'wife', 'husband', 'man', 'woman', and 'child' (= 'offspring').

➢ marginally there are also studies of nursery terms motivated by 'baby talk' (Jakobson 1960)

  o *papa*, *mama*, *baba*, *tata* …

  o but similarities in nursery terms can sometimes be explained by other factors including coincidence

---

[1] Traditionally Proto-Uralic (incl. Finno-Ugric and Samoyed) and Proto-Finno-Ugric (PFU) have been considered as separate entities (see for example *UEW*, Sammallahti 1988), but this traditional taxonomy is disputed (see especially Salminen 2002) and Proto-Uralic is often used in a more general sense to refer to both traditional Proto-Finno-Ugric and Proto-Uralic reconstructions (this is the practice of Aikio 2015 and Zhivlov 2014, among others).

2.2.2. Typological studies of kinship in socio-cultural anthropology (kinship studies) / attempts to formulate universal / global tendencies of how kinship terminologies are evolving through time:

2.2.2.1. "Kinship systems"

➢ old studies ("evolutionism"): descriptive vs. classificatory kinship systems (e.g., Morgan 1871), 6 types of cousin terminologies and 11 types of social systems (Murdock 1949: 223–224)

➢ recent study: 9 kinship systems (e.g., Parkin 2012, 2015) originating from Allen's "tetradic kinship system" (Allen 1986).

➢ this approach has recently been abandoned by some anthropologists ("Schneiderian turn") as these typologies were made on the basis of English and other dominant languages and suffer from severe Anglo-/Eurocentrism (cf. Milanova 2017 and forthcoming with references, esp. to Schneider 1972, 1984).

➢ both old and recent classifications are based on modes of combination of "primary kinship terms" (mother, father, parent, son, daughter, child, brother, sister, sibling, husband, wife, spouse), some of them can be considered tentatively universal only in the circumstances of modern Europe (cf. **2.2.1** above)

➢ Parkin (2012: 199): "...grand paradigms of change are less likely to be useful than **specific histories of change in limited regions of the world**… It also suggests that work in this area is more likely to give rise to **middle-range theories** ... not grand theories"

➢ Read (2007, 2013): typologies based on indigenous notions instead of European "primary kinship terms": 2 main types and a number of alternative types (based on ideas other than genealogy or age-gender differences):

  o The first type (≈ Morgan's "descriptive type") is based on vertical (genealogical) relationship between <child / son / daughter> (= offspring, not an age-grade) and <parent / mother /father> with the gender neutral Ego.

  o The second type (≈ Morgan's "classificatory type") is based on the notions <child>, <parent>, and <sibling>, in which analytical primacy is given to horizontal relationship (sibling relationship) rather than vertical, and gender marking (cf. also sex-age stratifications, Popov 1982). Such terminologies often have either relative age or relative gender distinction or a combination of both.

  o The types <u>cannot</u> be derived from one single origin!

2.2.2.2. Classifications of sibling terminologies

➢ deductive studies: Nerlove and Romney 1967, Kronenfeld 1974

➢ empirical studies: Murdock 1968, Marshall 1984, Dziebel 2008: 203–296

➢ Murdock (1968: 3–7) also noticed that geographical distribution of sibling terminologies is not random. It correlates either with language families or with areas of linguistic convergence.

➢ main sibling terminologies according to Murdock (1968: 3–4):

  Type A (The Kordofanian or Undifferentiated Sibling Type): "sibling" (1 or no sibling terms)

Type B (The Yoruba or Relative Age Type): "younger sibling" and "older sibling"

Type C (The Algonkian or Skewed Age Type): "older brother", "older sister", and "younger sibling"

Type D (The Dravidian or Age-Sex Type): "older brother", "older sister", "younger brother", "younger sister"

Type E (The European or Brother-Sister Type): "brother", "sister"

!!! fewer than 20% of the world's people apply this type "one more example of anthropology's destruction of ethnocentric illusions!" (ibid. p. 4)

Type F (The Melanesian or Relative Sex Type):

1. "sibling of the same sex as the Ego", "sibling of the opposite sex"
2. "sibling of the same sex", "brother (woman speaking)", and "sister (man speaking)"
3. "sibling of opposite sex", "brother (man speaking)", and "sister (woman speaking)"
4. "brother (man speaking)", "brother (woman speaking)", "sister (man speaking)", and "sister (woman speaking)"

Type G: (The Siouan or Complexly Differentiated Type): mixture of Type D and Type F (up to 8 terms)

➢ Murdock (1970) has a refined typology of sibling terminologies and a geographical distribution of terminologies also for grandparents, grandchildren, uncles and aunts, nephews and nieces, cross-cousins and siblings-in-laws.

2.3. Similarities motivated by language contact

➢ Areal / contact studies in linguistics exist (e.g., Dahl and Koptjevskaja-Tamm 2001) but there have been almost no systematic studies of kinship terms so far (numerous case studies for separate languages or language families but almost none for regions)

➢ Areal / contact studies in anthropology also exist (studies of *culture areas* begun by Kroeber and Wissler (Kroeber 1948 [1923]: 538–571; Wissler 1927: 891) but they are mostly concentrated on cultural traits (such as modes of economy, ritual, mythology)

➢ Murdock (1949: 191–196) doubted that social traits (forms of marriage, forms of family, types of clans, types of bilateral kin groups, types of moieties, rules of residence, rules of descent, and types of cousin terminology) can correlate with geography but in Murdock (1968, see also **2.2.2.2.** above) he admits that sibling terminologies show correlations with geography

➢ Murdock (1968, 1970) was a pilot study (and so has been Dziebel 2008: 203–296) embracing too much material and inviting for further more detailed research in specific regions of the world

➢ But we could not find any other examples of case studies for specific regions apart from *Siblingship in Oceania* (Marshall (ed). 1983, Marshall et al. 1984)

➢ however, it would be a desideratum to have more projects of this kind as this approach would be a diplomatic solution for the conflict between formal and cultural approach in kinship studies

- It should be noted that in Morgan (1871) "descriptive" and "classificatory" kinship terminologies were already grouped according to (linguo-)geographical principles:
  - descriptive terminologies can be found in IE, Semitic, "Uralian" (Finnish, Estonian, Hungarian, Turkish, and an ethno-religious group "Kuzabbashi/Kuzulbashi") languages thus a macro-area including most of Europe, Southwest Asia, and North Africa
  - classificatory are "Malayan, Turanian, Ganowánian" – macro-area including North America, South, East and Southeast Asia and Oceania.
- This geographical distribution of the two types can also be applied for Read's formulations (2007, 2013 see also **2.2.2.1.** above). Therefore, his 1st (parental) type is obviously characteristic for the "descriptive" macro-area and his 2nd (siblingship + parent) type for the "classificatory" macro-area, at least <u>as a tendency</u>.
- The border between the two macro-areas lies in Central Eurasia ➡ this region must have hybrid types of kinship terminologies
- Planned research project "Kinship and Affinity in Central Eurasia" (Milanova & Holopainen & Bradley 2018 and forthcoming)[2]

***

In the empirical part we would like to compare the roles of genealogical relatedness, linguistic contacts and typology for the content and structure of kinship terminologies, especially as regards the semantics of terms for children and siblings. For this purpose we collected the most basic terms[3] for consanguineal relatives for languages from the three language families under consideration. For the sake of brevity we did not include terms for non-primary collateral relatives for all languages in the tables. However, we mentioned "classificatory" meanings of the provided terms (if there is any). If no non-primary collateral relatives are mentioned, this means that the language follows a "descriptive" pattern.

---

[2] http://kinship.mari-language.com/
[3] We are aware of the fact that this kind of grouping ("genealogical grid" following the terminology in Schneider 1972) is not optimal and the terms quoted in this paper cannot fully correspond to the English term we are using for analysis. However, some meta-concepts are unavoidable for comparing material from different languages and the "basic" English terms are the simplest tool for this.

3. Genetic similarities in selected Uralic, Indo-European, and Turkic languages

(The items in bolds are reflexes of PIE, PU/PFU or PT forms respectively)

3.1. Indo-European

	Old Norse[4] (Germanic)	Lithuanian[5] (Baltic)	Bulgarian[6] (Slavic)	Tajik Persian[7] (Iranian)	Yaghnobi[8]
'mother'	**moðir** **eiða**[9]	**motina** **(móčia)** mama	**màyka** **màta, màter**	**modar**	ōča mōdar
'father'	**faðir** **atti**	tėvas tetis	baštà tàtko, tèti, tàti	**padar**	dōdō padar
'daughter'	**dottir**	**duktè/dukra**	**dъšteryà**	**duxtar** (also 'girl')	γayk duxtar
'son'	**sunr**	**sūnus**	**sin**	**pisar** (also 'boy')	**žūta** (also 'boy') **pul(l)a** 'child'
'sister'	**systir**	**sesuo**	**sestrà** kàka, dòda, dòtka, bùka, kàda 'older sister/cousin' (dial.)	**xohar** hamšira[10] apa 'older sister'	**xᵘōr** 'younger sister' ap(p)a 'older sister'
'brother'	**broðir**	**brolis**	**brat** bàtko 'older brother' bàka 'older (married) brother' (Voc.) **bràyno**, **bràlets** 'younger brother' (Voc.)	**barodar** dodar (younger) brother aka 'older brother' uka 'younger brother'	**vⁱrōt** 'younger brother' dōdar 'younger brother' bᵘrōdar akō, aka 'older brother'

3.1.1. Inherited terms (cf. *NIL* s.v.):

ON *moðir*, Lith. *motina* (*móčia*), Taj. (→ Yagh.) *modar*, Bulg. *màyka, màta, màter* < PIE *$méh_2ter$-/*$máh_2ter$-

ON *faðir*, Taj. (→ Yagh.) *padar* < PIE *$ph_2tér$-

ON *atti* < PIE (?) *$atta$-[11] (cf. Hittite *atta*-)

ON *dóttir* , Lith. *duktè/dukra*, Taj. (→ Yagh.) *duxtar*, Bulg. *dъšterjà* < PIE *$d^hug h_2tér$-

ON *sunr*, Lith. *sūnus*, Bulg. *sin* < PIE *$suHnu$-

Taj. *pisar*, Yagh. *pul(l)a* < PIE *$putlo$- (cf. Skt. *putrá*)

Yagh. *žūta* < PIE *$ĝṇh_1tó$- 'born' (cf. Pers. *zāde*)

ON *systir*, Lith. *sesuo*, Taj. *xohar*, Bulg. *sestrà*, Yagh. *xᵘōr* < PIE *$su̯ésor$-

ON *bróðir*, Lith. *brolis*, Taj. *barodar*, Bulg. *brat, bràyno, bràlets*, Yagh. *vⁱrōt* < PIE *$b^hréh_2ter$-

---

[4] Kroonen (2013), s.v.
[5] Parkin (2015: 210–211), Munck & Dapkunaite (2018)
[6] Kitanova (1999), s.v.
[7] Kalontarov (2008, 2009), s.v.
[8] Novák (2010 s.v., 2013: 174–176)
[9] cf. Goth. *äiti* 'id.' < Proto- Germanic *$aiþīn$- id. of debated origin.
[10] This is a Persian innovation (lit. 'the one who sucked the same milk'). It is usually used as a polite form of address in rural regions.
[11] The origin of *atta* in Germanic (cf. Goth *atti* 'id.') is not clear. It could be an inherited PIE word, the result of East European language contact (cf. the Turkic forms above and Rus. *otec* < *$att-i-kos$*, the origin of which is also debated), or an independent formation. It is also possible that more than one factor played a part in this case.

3.1.2. Structural similarities

➤ IE languages (as most likely PIE) have kinship terminologies of the first ("descriptive") type. The sibling terminologies are of type E. Some languages of the Indo-Iranian branch and Bulgarian show a tendency for type D but without an overall transformation into the "classificatory" type (relative age distinction here is an additional feature superimposed on a strongly "descriptive" base).

➤ IE languages spoken in contemporary Western and Central Europe tend to distinguish between age grades and kinship terms for children (like Eng. *girl* vs. *daughter*). The IE languages spoken in Asia tend to lose this distinction: Taj. *duxtar* 'daughter/girl'.

3.2. Uralic

	Finnish (Finnic)	Udmurt (Permic)[12]	Mari[13]	Hungarian (Ugric)
'mother'	*äiti*	*anay*	*aβa(y)*	**anya**
'father'	***isä***	*atay*	*ača(y)*	**apa**
'daughter'	*tytär*	***nil*** (also 'girl')	*üdŝr*	*lány, leány* (also 'girl')[14]
'son'	***poika***	***pi*** ('also boy')	***erγe***	***fiú***
'sister'	*sisar, sisko*	*apay, aka* (dial.) 'older sister/aunt' *suzer, surzi* (dial.) '(younger) sister' *tatay, tutay* '(older) sister'	*aka(y)* 'older sister/aunt' *šüžar* 'younger sister'	*néne* (dial.) 'older sister / aunt' *nővér* 'older sister' (originally 'sister')[15] *húg* 'younger sister'
'brother'	*veli*	*agay, abǯi* (dial.), *daday* (dial.), *ńuńu* (voc.) 'older brother/uncle' *vil* 'younger brother' *bečey* (dial.) 'older brother/uncle /grandfather' *brat*	***iza(y)*** 'older brother / uncle' *šol'o* 'younger brother'	*bátya* 'older brother / uncle' *fivér* 'brother'[16] *öcs* 'younger brother'[17]

3.2.1. Inherited terms (only a few proto-terms can be reconstructed):

➤ Fin. *poika*, Udm. *pi*, Hung. *fiú* < Proto-Finno-Ugric (PFU) **pojka* 'boy, son' (*UEW* № 785)

➤ Mari *erγe* 'son < PFU *irkä* 'man, son, boy' (Bereczki et at. 2013: 17)

➤ Hung. *apa* 'father' is derived from PU **appi* 'father-in-law' by *UEW* (№ 21, Fin. *appi* 'father-in-law'; better reconstructed as PU **ippi* by Sammallahti 1988: 536), but this is unlikely, as Hung. *ipa* 'father-in-law' is the regular reflex of this word, with Hu *i-* as the regular reflex of PU **i* in *-i-*

stems (= traditional *e*-stems). *apa* is considered a Proto-Ugric word by *MSzFE* (s.v.), but this is also uncertain, and the etymology of the word remains open.

➢ Hung. *anya* 'mother' < ? PU **ańi* 'wife of an older relative, ?mother' (*UEW* № 21); this is a disputed etymology, as both Hung. *ángy* 'des Gatten Schwester' and *anya* have been derived from this PU word, but Zhivlov (2014: 130) lists only *ángy* as a reflex of **ańi*

➢ Udmurt *ńi̯l* probably from Uralic **nejδi* (cognate to Finnish *neiti* 'girl, maiden'; *UEW* № 592), although various difficulties are involved in the reconstruction of this word (Sammallahti 1988: 539 does not mention the Udmurt word but connects Fin. *neiti* to PU **näxi* 'woman', which likewise involves numerous irregularities).

➢ Fin. *isä* 'father', Mari *iza(y)* 'older brother/uncle' < ? PU **ićä* 'father' (?), cf. Hung. *ős* 'ancestor'[18], *UEW* № 140, assumingly an ancient Indo-Iranian loanword (Proto-Indo-Iranian **Hi-Hić-* (> Old Indian *í̄ś*-m 'lord'), Tunkelo 1913: 118ff.; Bereczki et al. 2013: 26; Koivulehto 2016: 269ff., but Milanova & Holopainen & Bradley forthcoming (p. 9) finds it doubtful

3.2.2. Structural similarities:

➢ Although many Uralic languages have rather "classificatory" kinship terminologies and sibling terminologies of type D, we postulate that PU and earlier forms of Uralic had more "descriptive" terminologies without relative age distinction. This feature was borrowed from other languages of Central Eurasian linguistic continuum and influenced the whole structure of the eastern Uralic languages (see **4.1.1.** below)

➢ terms for children: most Uralic languages tend to combine kinship and non-kinship meaning in one term (Udm. *ńi̯l* 'daughter/girl')

---

[18] The vowel-reconstruction of the PU word is uncertain.

3.3. Turkic (Clauson 1972)

	Chuvash[19] (Oghur)	Tatar (Kipchak)[20]	Uzbek (Karluk)[21]	Turkish (Oghuz)
'mother'	***anne***	***äniy, ana***	***ona, oyi***	***ana, anne***
'father'	***atte***	***ätiy, ata***	***ota***, *padar*	***ata, baba***
'daughter/ girl'	***χĕr***	***qız***	***qiz***	***kız***
'son/boy'	***ïvăl***	***ul***	***o'ghil***	***oğul***
'sister'	***appa***, *akka*[22] 'older sister'[23] (cousin[24]); aunt' *jămăk* 'younger sister'[25]	***apa*** 'older sister (cousin[26]); aunt' *señel* 'younger sister'	***opa*** 'older sister / aunt' ***singil*** 'younger sister'	***abla***, ***bacı*** (coll.) 'older sister / aunt' ***kız kardeş*** 'female sibling'
'brother'	*pič́če*[27] 'older brother; (paternal) uncle'[28] ***šăllăm*** 'my younger brother'	*abí*, *abʒ́i* 'older brother (cousin); uncle; (also 'father')' *ene* 'younger brother' *bertuğan*[29] *tuğankay* (Voc.)	*aka* 'older brother/uncle'[30] ***uka*** 'younger brother'	***ağabey*** 'older brother / uncle'[31] ***erkek kardeş*** 'male sibling'[32]

3.3.1. Inherited terms and internal derivatives:

Chuv. *anne*, Turk. *ana, anne,* Tat. *äniy, ana*, Uzb. *ona* < Proto-Turkic (PT) **ana*

Chuv. *atte*, Turk. *ata*, Tat. *ätiy, ata*, Uzb. *ota* < PT **ata*

Turk. *baba* 'father' < PT **baba* 'father, grandfather'

Chuv. *χĕr*, Turk. *kız*, Tat. *qız*, Uzb. *qiz* < PT **kīz* 'girl, daughter'

Chuv. *ïvăl*, Turk. *oğul*, Tat. *ul*, Uzb. *o'ghil* < PT **oγil* 'boy, son'

Chuv. *appa* 'older sister', Turk. *abla* 'older sister', Tat. *apa*, Uzb. *opa* < PT **aba* 'a kind of relative'

Chuv. *šăllăm* 'my younger brother', Uzb. *singil* < PT **siŋil* 'younger sister'

Tat. *ene* 'younger brother' < PT **ini* 'younger brother', cf. Yakut *ini*

---

[19] Egorov 1964, Andreev et al. 1985 s.v.

[20] Asylgaraev et al. 2007 s.v.

[21] Magrufova 1981 s.v.

[22] It may be associated with Uzbek *aka* 'older brother'.

[23] also 'husband's older sister'

[24] Cousin terms can also be coined by adding the word *xurăntaš* (equivalent to Russian 'двоюродный').

[25] a Chuvash innovation with a debated etymology

[26] Cousin terms can also be coined by adding *tuğannan tuğan* (equivalent to Russian 'двоюродный').

[27] a Chuvash innovation with a debated etymology (cf. Egorov 1964: 163)

[28] In addition to terms equating one's own older siblings with one's parents' siblings, Chuvash has specific terms for uncles – *muč́i* (paternal), *kukka* (maternal), and also *kinemej* 'wife of father's or mother's older brother'.

[29] Innovation, < *ber* 'one + *tuğan* 'born'

[30] In addition to terms equating one's own older siblings with one's parents' siblings, Uzbek has specific terms for aunts – *amma* (paternal), *hola* (maternal) – and uncles – *amaki* (paternal), *tağo* (maternal. The first three terms are transparent borrowings from Arabic, probably via Persian.

[31] In addition to terms equating one's own older siblings with one's parents' siblings, Turkish has specific terms for aunts – *hala* (paternal), *teyze* (maternal) – and uncles – *amca* (paternal), *dayı* (maternal). The terms *hala* and *amca* are likely of Arabic origin.

[32] Although Old Turkic and several modern Turkic languages did or do have a specific word for 'younger sister' and 'younger brother', there is no such a term in present-day Turkish (Old Turkic *siŋil* 'younger sister', *ini* 'younger brother', Modern Uzbek *singil* 'younger sister', *uka* 'younger brother'). Periphrases are used instead: *küçük kız kardeş* (lit. 'small girl sibling'), *küçük erkek kardeş* (lit. 'small male sibling').

3.3.2. Structural similarities:

➤ Originally Turkic languages are likely to have had a special type of "classificatory" kinship terminology equating the (younger) representatives of the older generation with the older representatives of the younger generation (e.g., 'older brother = uncle/father's younger brother' etc., *Siberian generational* type as it is referred to in Dziebel 2008). Such a system seems to remain wide spread in Siberian languages which lie outside of the scope this paper (cf. Grønbech 1953, as it is also common in Mongolic languages, cf. Rykin 2011). Terms for siblings in Chuvash and Tatar also show this feature fairly well. Uzbek and Turkish have this equation in colloquial speech, but have also developed more "descriptive" features (4 terms for parents' siblings) very similar to those of their Semitic and Iranian neighbours. Azerbaijani Turkish (see below) has a "descriptive" kinship terminology without relative age distinction.

➤ Like Uralic languages Turkic languages combine both kinship and non-kinship meaning in terms for children.

4. Historical areas of linguistic convergences

4.1. Central Eurasia (extended 'Altaic' continuum):

➤ Volga-Kama Sprachbund

➤ Central Asian languages

➤ Siberian languages[33] (not in this paper)

4.1.1. Parallels in the Volga-Kama Sprachbund (cf. Bradley 2016: 7–12 with references)

	Tatar	Chuvash	Udmurt	Mari
'mother'	*äniy, ana*	*anne*	*anay*[34]	*aβa(y)*
'father'	*ätiy, ata*	*atte*	*atay*[34]	*aća(y)*
'daughter/girl'	*qïz*	*χĕr*	*nïl*	*üdɔ̂r*
'son'/'boy'	*ul*	*ïvăl*	*pi*	*erγe*
'older sister'	*apa* (also 'aunt')	*appa*, *akka* (also 'aunt')	*apay*[35], *aka* (dial.) (also 'aunt') *tatay, tutay* '(older) sister'	*aka(y)* (also 'aunt')
'(younger) sister'	*señel*	*jămăk*	*suzer, surzï* (dial.)	*šüžar*[36]
'older brother'[37]	*abí*, *abʑi*, *åga(y)* (dial.) (also 'uncle, and sometimes 'father')'	*pićće* (also 'uncle')	*agay*[38], *abʑï* (dial.), *daday* (dial.), *ńuńu* (voc.) (also 'uncle') *bećey* (dial.) 'older brother / uncle / grandfather'	*iza(y)* (also 'uncle')
'(younger) brother'	*ene bertuğan tuğankay* (Voc.)	*šăllăm* 'my younger brother'	*vïl* 'younger brother' *brat*[39]	*šol'o*[40]

---

[33] Ob-Ugric and Samoyed branches of Uralic and their Turkic, Tungusic and Ket neighbours

[34] Although term *an(n)-* 'mother' and *at(t)-* 'father' are attested throughout all of Eurasia and such parallels can often be viewed as a coincidence, we assume that Udmurt might have borrowed these terms from Turkic.

[35] see also Tajik and Uzbek examples as well as Mari *aβa(y)* and Farsi *apa* 'mother'

[36] The Udmurt term is borrowed from Proto-Indo-Iranian **swasar-* 'sister'; the Mari term is from Indo-European as well, but due to the vocalism cannot be from Proto-Indo-Iranian (Milanova & Holopainen & Bradley forthcoming, p. 5–6 with references). The meaning was specified as a result of contact with Turkic languages.

[37] Note also terms such as Mari *kugɔ̂za* 'parent's older brother' (< *kugu* 'big' + *iza* 'older brother') and Udmurt *badʑïmatay* 'father's older brother' (< *badʑïm* 'big' + *atay* 'father').

[38] see also Uzbek and Taj. *aka* and Turkish *ağabey* ← Mong. *aqa (aχa, aγa, aχai)* 'male relative older than Ego, but younger than Ego's parents') (Rykin 2011: 32ff.).

[39] a late borrowing from Russian

[40] Moisio & Saarinen (2008: 704)

Compare with contact-linguistically relevant languages (in historical perspective, ibid.):

	Hungarian	Bulgarian
'mother'	*anya*	*màyka* *màta, màter*
'father'	*apa*	*baštà* *tàtko, tèti, tàti*
'daughter/girl'	*lány, leány*	*dъšteryà* ('only daughter')
'son'/boy'	*fiú*	*sin*
'older sister'	*néne* (dial.) (also 'aunt') *nővér*	*kàka, dòda, dòtka, bùka, kàda* (dial.) (also 'cousin', 'aunt')
'(younger) sister'	*húg*	*sestrà*
'older brother'	*bátya*[41]	*bàtko* *bàka* 'older (married) brother'
'(younger) brother'	*fivér* 'brother' *öcs* 'younger brother'	*brat* *bràyno, bràlets* 'younger brother'

4.1.2. Central Asian languages:

	Yaghnobi[42]	Tajik	Uzbek
'mother'	*ōča* (← Uzbek) *mōdar*	*modar*	*ona, oyi*
'father'	*dōdō* (← Tajik) *padar* (← Tajik)	*padar,* *dōdō, dada*	*ota, padar* (← Tajik)
'daughter/girl'	*γayk* (← Pamir languages) *duxtar*	*duxtar*	*qiz*
'son/boy'	*žūta* *pul(l)a*	*pisar*	*oʻghil*
'older sister'	*ap(p)a*	*apa*	*opa*
'(younger) sister'	*xᵘōr*	*xohar* *hamšira*	*singil*
'older brother'	*akō, aka*	*aka*	*aka*
'(younger) brother'	*vⁱrōt* 'younger brother' *dōdar* 'younger brother' (← Tajik) *bᵘrōdar* (← Persian)[43]	*barodar* *dodar* '(younger) brother' *uka* 'younger brother'	*uka* 'younger brother'

4.2. Parallels in the Circum-Baltic Sprachbund (Dahl & Koptjevskaja-Tamm 2001)

	Finnish	Lithuanian	Old Norse
'mother'	*äiti* < Proto- Germanic **aiþīn-* id.	*motina (móčia)* *mama*	*moðir* *eiða*
'father'	*isä*	*tėvas* *tetis*	*faðir* *atti*
'daughter'	*tytär* < Proto-Baltic **dukter-* 'id.'	*duktė/dukra*	*dóttir*
'son'	*poika*	*sūnus*	*sunr*
'sister'	*sisar, sisko* < Proto-Baltic **sesor* 'id.'	*sesuo*	*systir*
'brother'	*veli* < Germanic[44]	*brolis*	*bróðir*

---

[41] from some Slavic language (*TESz* I / 260–261)

[42] Novák (2010 s.v., 2013: 174–176)

[43] also *bⁱrát, bⁱraťïška* (voc.) 'brother!' (a loanword from Russian)

[44] < *Proto-Germanic **sweljan-* 'wife's sister's husband' (> Old Norse (pl.) *svilar* 'id.') < PIE **sųeliHon-* 'id.'

4.3. languages of the Near East (West Asia)

	Persian (Farsi)[45]	Turkish	Arabic
'mother'	*mādar*	*ana*, *anne*[46]	*umm*
'father'	*pedar* *āqā* 'mister', (coll. 'father', cf. *agay* and *aka* 4.1. above) *bābā* (coll.)	*ata*, *baba*	*ab*
'daughter'/ 'girl'	*doxtar*	*kız*	*bint* *ibna*
'son / boy/ (child)'	*pesar* *aulāde* 'children/offspring'[47]	*oğul*	*ibn* *walad* / (pl.) *aulād*
'sister'	*xāhar* *ābji /bāji* '(older) sister' (voc.)[48] *hamšire*[49]	*abla*, *bacı* (coll.) 'older sister' (Azeri *bacı* 'sister') *kız kardeş* 'female sibling'	*uxt(u)*
'brother'	*barādar* *dādāš(i)* '(older) brother' (voc.)[50] *axaw-i* 'my brother'[51]	*ağabey* 'older brother'[52] *erkek kardeş* 'male sibling' (Azeri *q/gardaş* 'brother')	*ax(u)*

5. <u>Discussion and preliminary conclusions</u>

5.1. Structural features:

➢ Languages of Central Eurasia tend to have sibling terminologies of type D. In the north-eastern part of the area (Volga-Kama region, Siberia) general "classificatory" tendencies (Siberian generational equation) are stronger than in the south-western part (Central Asia, Iran, Turkey, Bulgaria, and Hungary). Especially in Iranian languages, relative age distinction is usually a superficial additional feature. This may be due to the closeness of the latter to Southwest Asia (Semitic languages), which is probably an epicentre of the "descriptive" macro-area.

➢ Languages of the Baltic region and the Near East are "descriptive" with sibling terminologies of type E regardless of their genetic affiliation.

➢ Languages of the Near East are the most "descriptive"; although Ottoman Turkic and (colloquial) Farsi have sibling terminology of type D, types E and A are more common in this region. Trends can also be observed towards type C, which might evolve further into type A, i.e. towards having as less variability as possible. Even languages that historically had relative age distinction may lose it (Azerbaijani Turkish). Ottoman Turkic also shows a tendency to eliminate absolute gender distinction and use only one sibling term, *kardeş*, as is typical of Semitic languages: Arabic *ux-t* 'sister' is not a separate word but a motion formation (feminine form) for *ax* 'brother'.

---

[45] Aliakbari & Toni 2008 and native speakers (p.c.)

[46] A native speaker of Azeri says that only *ana* is used in Azeri, *anne* is an exclusive Ottoman form.

[47] A more literary synonym for *bačče-hā* 'id.'

[48] A polite form of address to the oldest sister in the family.

[49] A native speaker of Farsi says that this form is less common in Farsi than *hamšira* in Tajik.

[50] a polite form of address to the oldest brother in the family (masculine variant for *bāji/ābji*)

[51] A polite form of address to unknown people in rural areas, a male equivalent to *hamšire*. It also has religious connotations.

[52] a compound of *ağa* 'lord'; 'older brother' (obsolete) and *bey* 'lord, gentleman'

> All languages under study apart from the languages of the Baltic region (and Western Europe in general) tend to have no specific terms for 'son' and 'daughter' but rather use words with combined meaning 'boy/son', 'girl/daughter'.

5.2. Lexical borrowings

The terms under study are conventionally believed to be the most stable kinship terms with a borrowability degree much lower than that of terms for non-primary collateral relatives, affinals, and spouses (cf. Milanova & Holopainen & Bradley 2018 and forthcoming). However, as the evidence above shows, lexical borrowing is not uncommon here either. The most stable term in all three language families turned out to be the term for 'son / boy / child'. Terms for other notions are transmitted especially often within areas of linguistic convergences. The importance of the areal factor is especially salient in Uralic, where comparatively little kinship terminology can be reconstructed, and where the exact realization of the kinship system is highly dependent on the historic contact situation of the individual languages and branches of the language family.

References:

Aikio, Ante. 2015. The Finnic 'secondary e-stems' and Proto-Uralic vocalism. *Journal de la Société Finno-Ougrienne* 95, 26–66.

Aliakbari, Mohammad; Toni, Arman. 2008. The Realization of Address Terms in Modern Persian in Iran: A Sociolinguistic Study. In: *Linguistik online* 35, 3/08.

Allen, Nicholas. 1986. Tetradic theory: an approach to kinship. *Journal of the Anthropological Society of Oxford* 17/2, 87-109.

Andreev, I. A.; Gorshkov, A.E.; Ivanov, A. I. et al. 1985. *Чувашско-русский словарь* [Chuvash-Russian dictionary]. Moscow: Russkiy yazik.

Asylgaraev, Sh. N.; Ganiev, F. A.; Zakiev, M. Z.; Minnullin, D. B.; Ramazanova, D. B. 2007. *Татарско-русский словарь* [Tatar-Russian dictionary]. Kazan: Institut yazika, literatury i iskusstva Ibragimova.

Bereczki, Gábor. 1988. Geschichte der wolgafinnischen Sprachen. In: Denis Sinor (ed). *The Uralic languages: description, history and foreign influences*. Handbuch der Orientalistik 8 = Handbook of Uralic studies 1. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 314–350.

Bereczki, Gábor, Eberhard Winkler, Klára Agyagási. 2013. *Etymologisches Wörterbuch des Tscheremissischen (Mari) – Der einheimische Wortschatz*. Veröffentlichungen der Societas Uralo-Altaica 86. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.

Bradley, Jeremy. 2016. *Mari converb constructions: productivity and regional variance* [manuscript of PhD thesis] Vienna: University of Vienna. [othes.univie.ac.at/43606/]

Clauson, Gerard. 1972. *An Etymological Dictionary of Pre-Thirteenth-Century Turkish*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Dahl, Östen; Koptjevskaja-Tamm, Maria (eds). 2001. *The Circum-Baltic Languages: Typology and Contact*. Vols. I-II. Amsterdam-Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company.

Delbrück, Berthold. 1889. *Die Indogermanischen Verwandtschaftsnamen. Ein Beitrag zur vergleichenden Altertumskunde*. Abhandlungen der philologisch-historischen Classe der Königlichen Sächsischen Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften XI/5, 381–606.

Dziebel, German V. 2008. *The Genius of Kinship. The phenomenon of Human Kinship and the Global Diversity of Kinship Terminologies*. Youngstown New York: Cambria Press.

Egorov, Vasliy G. 1964. *Этимологический словарь чувашского языка* [Etymological dictionary of the Chuvash language].Cheboksary: Chuvashskoye knizhnoye izdatel'stvo.

Grønbech, Kaare. 1953. "The Turkish System of Kinship." In: *Studia Orientalia Ioanni Pedersen*. Copenhagen: Einar Munksgaard, 124–129.

Grünthal, Riho. 2007. The Mordvinic languages between bush and tree: a historical reappraisal. In: Jussi Ylikoski ja Ante Aikio (doaimmahan). *Sámit, sánit, sátnehámit. Riepmočála Pekka Sammallahtii miessemánu 21. beaivve 2007*. Mémoires de la Société Finno-Ougrienne 253. Helsinki: Finno-Ugrian Society. 115–135.

Häkkinen, Kaisa. 1984. Wäre es schon an der Zeit, den Stammbaum zu fällen? *Ural-Altaische Jahrbücher, Neue Folge* 4, 1–24.

Jakobson, Roman. 1960. Why "mama" and "papa"? In: Bernard Kaplan et al. Perspectives in psychological theory: Essays in honor of Heinz Werner. New York: International University Press, 124–134

Kalontarov, Yakub I. 2007. *Новый русско-таджикский словарь*. [New Russian-Tajik dictionary]. Dushanbe.

---. 2008. *Новый таджикско-русский словарь*. [New Tajik-Russian dictionary].Dushanbe.

Kitanova, M. 1999. Материалы к словарю болгарских терминов родства. [Materials of the dictionary of Bulgarian kinship terms]. In: Svetlana M. Tolstaya (ed). *Категория родства в языке и культуре* [Category of kinship in language and culture]. Moscow: Indrik, 279–302.

Koivulehto, Jorma. 2016. *Verba vagantur. Jorma Koivulehto in memoriam*. Eds. Sampsa Holopainen, Petri Kallio & Janne Saarikivi. Mémoires de la Société Finno-Ougrienne 274. Helsinki: Finno-Ugrian Society.

Kroeber, Alfred L. 1939. *Cultural and natural areas of native North America*. (University of California Publications in American Archaeology and Ethnology 38.) Berkeley: University of California Press.

---. 1948 [1923]. *Anthropology: Race, Language, Culture, Psychology, Prehistory*. New York: Harcourt, Brace and Co.

Kronenfeld, D. B. 1974. Sibling typology: Beyond Nerlove and Romney. *American Ethnologist* 1(2), 489–506.

Kroonen, Guus. 2013. *Etymological dictionary of proto-Germanic*. Leiden: Brill.

Magrufova, Z. M. 1981. *Толковый словарь узбекцкого языка*. Москва: Издательство «Русский язык».

Marshall, Mac (ed). 1983. *Siblingship in Oceania. Studies in the Meaning of Kin Relations*. Lanham – New York – London: University Press of America.

---. 1984. Structural Patterns of Sibling Classification in Island Oceania: Implications for Culture History [and Comments and Replies]. *Current Anthropology* 25 (5),. 597–637.

Milanova, Veronika. 2014. *Proto-Indo-European kinship terms*. [Master thesis]. Vienna: University of Vienna: [othes.univie.ac.at/33960/]

---. 2016. (Proto-)Indo-European kinship terms in *-*ter* and (ancient) age-grade systems. Kin, clan and community – a symposium on Indo-European social institutions. University of Copenhagen, 17. May 2016 [handout]: [www.academia.edu/34436295/_Proto-_Indo-European_kinship_terms_in_-ter_and_ancient_age-grade_systems]

---. 2017. Patterns of derivation and semantic change in terms of social relations. [Presentation for the Summer school "Roots of Europe". University of Copenhagen, 26 July 2017]: [www.academia.edu/34436341/Patterns_of_derivation_and_semantic_change_in_terms_of_social_relations]

---. 2018. Праиндоевропейские термины родства на *-*ter* и возрастные степени. [Proto-Indo-European kinship terms in *-*ter* and age grades]. *Алгебра родства* [Kinship Algebra] 16, 9–36: [www.academia.edu/37391591/Proto-Indo-European_kinship_terms_in_-ter_and_age_grades_in_Russian_].

---. (forthcoming). Indo-European kinship terms as an interdisciplinary topic [Reconstruction of social realities – anthropological views and methodological considerations]. In: Benedicte Nielsen Whitehead & Birgit Anette Olsen (eds). *Kin, clan and community in prehistoric Europe*. Copenhagen: Museum Tusculanum Press: [www.univie.ac.at/maridict/misc/kinship/milanova_1.pdf].

Milanova, Veronika; Holopainen, Sampsa; Bradley, Jeremy. 2018. *Contact phenomena in IE kinship and social terms and beyond (a pilot study with special focus on the Iranian and Uralic languages in the context of Central Eurasia)*. [handout for the international colloquium on loanwords and substrata in Indo-European languages in Limoges, 4th–7th June 2018]: [www.univie.ac.at/maridict/misc/kinship/limoges.pdf, www.univie.ac.at/maridict/misc/kinship/limoges-table.pdf]

---. forthcoming. Contact phenomena in Indo-European kinship and social terms and beyond (a pilot study with special focus on the Iranian and Uralic languages in the context of Central Eurasia). In: Romain Garnier et al. *Proceedings of the International Colloquium on Loanwords and Substrata in Indo-European languages* (Limoges, France, 4th–7th June 2018), IBS. (submitted on 20.11.2018): [www.univie.ac.at/maridict/misc/kinship/limoges_paper_draft.pdf]

Moisio, Arto, Sirkka Saarinen. 2008. *Tscheremissisches Wörterbuch*. Lexica Societatis Fenno-Ugricae XXXII. Helsinki: Suomalais-Ugrilainen Seura.

Morgan, Lewis Henry. 1997 [1871]. *Systems of consanguinity and affinity of the human family*. Lincoln (NE) & London: University of Nebraska Press. Original publication: Smithsonian Contributions to Knowledge 17. Washington (DC): Smithsonian Institution.

de Munck, Victor C.; Dapkunaite, Ruta. 2018. The modern Lithuanian kinship system: a descriptive analysis of generational differences in reckoning the saliency of kin terms. *Journal of Baltic Studies* 49 (1), 63–86.

Murdock, George P. 1949. *Social structure.* New York: The MacMillan Company.

---. 1968. Patterns of Sibling Terminology. *Ethnology* 7 (1), 1–24.

---. 1970. Kin Term Patterns and Their Distribution. *Ethnology* 9 (2), 165-208.

MSzFE = Lakó, György (ed.) 1968–1981: *A magyar szókészlet finnugor elemei.* Budapest: Akadémiai Kiadó.

Nerlove, Sara; Romney; A. Kimball. 1967. Sibling terminology and cross-sex behavior. *American Anthropologist* 69, 179–187.

NIL = Wodtko, Dagmar S.; Irslinger, Britta; Schneider Carolin. 2008. *Nomina im Indogermanischen Lexikon*. Heidelberg: Universitätsverlag Winter.

Novák, Ľubomír. 2010. *Jaghnóbsko-český slovník s přehledem jaghnóbské gramatiky*. Praha: Univerzita Karlova v Praze, Filozofická fakulta.

---. 2013. Problem of Archaism and Innovation in the Eastern Iranian Languages (PhD thesis). Praha: Univerzita Karlova v Praze, Filozofická fakulta.

Parkin, Robert. 2012. Kinship as classification: Towards a paradigm of change. *Journal of the Anthropological Society of Oxford* 4 (2), 183–211: [https://anthro.web.ox.ac.uk/sites/default/files/anthro/documents/media/jaso4_2_2012_183_211.pdf]

---. 2015. Indo-European kinship terminologies in Europe: trajectories of change. *Journal of the Anthropological Society of Oxford* 7 (2), 205–233: [https://anthro.web.ox.ac.uk/sites/default/files/anthro/documents/media/jaso7_2_2015_205_233.pdf]

Popov, Vladimir A. 1982. Половозрастная стратификация в этносоциологических реконструкциях первобытности. *Советская этнография* 1982 (1), 68–79.

Read, Dwight W. 2007. Kinship Theory: A Paradigm Shift. *Ethnology* 46 (4), 329–364.

---. 2013. A New Approach to Forming a Typology of Kinship Terminology Systems: From Morgan and Murdock to the Present. *Structure and Dynamics* 6 (1), Permalink: https://escholarship.org/uc/item/0ss6j8sh

Riese, Timothy; Bradley, Jeremy; Guseva, Elena. 2014–. *Mari-English Dictionary*. Vienna: University of Vienna. [published online at dict.mari-language.com]

Rykin, Pavel. 2011. The system of kinship and affinity terms in the Middle Mongolian. *Acta Orientalia Academiae Scientiarum Hungaricae* 64 (1), 25–47.

Salminen, Tapani. 2002. Problems in the taxonomy of the Uralic languages in the light of modern comparative studies. *Лингвистический беспредел: сборник статей к 70-летию А. И. Кузнецовой.* Москва: Издательство Московского университета. 44–55. [http://www.helsinki.fi/~tasalmin/kuzn.html]

Sammallahti, Pekka. 1988. Historical phonology of the Uralic languages with a special reference to Samoyed, Ugric and Permic. In: Denis Sinor (ed). *The Uralic languages: description, history and foreign influences*. Handbuch der Orientalistik 8 = Handbook of Uralic studies 1. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 478–554.

Schneider, David Murray. 1984. *A critique of the study of kinship*. Ann Arbor (MI): University of Michigan Press.

---. 2004 [1972]. What is kinship all about? In: Robert Parkin & Linda Stone (eds.): *Kinship and Family. An anthropological reader*. Malden (MA): Blackwell, 257–274. Original publication: Priscilla Reining (ed.): *Kinship Studies in the Morgan centennial year*. Washington (DC): The Anthropological Society school

Swadesh, Morris (posthumous); Sherzer, Joel (ed). 1971. *The Origin and Diversification of Language*. London: Routledge and Kegan Pau

Szemerényi, Oswald. 1977. *Studies in the kinship terminology of the Indo-European languages.* Acta Iranica 1977. Leiden: Brill.

Szíj, Enikő. 1998. *Термины родства и свойства в удмуртском языке* [Kinship and affinity terms in the Udmurt language]. Budapest: Akadémiai Kiadó.

Tadmor, Uri. 2010. Loanwords in the world's languages: Findings and results. In: Martin Haspelmath & Uri Tadmor (eds). *Loanwords in the world's languages: a comparative handbook*. Berlin: de Gruyter Mouton, 55–75.

TESz I-III = Benkő Loránd et al. 1957, 1970, 1976. *A magyar nyelv történeti-etimológiai szótára*. Vols. I–III. Budapest: Akadémiai Kiadó.

Tunkelo E. A. 1913. Wortgeschichtliche Beiträge. *Finnisch-Ugrische Forschungen* 13, 74–119

UEW = Károly Rédei et al. 1988. *Uralisches Etymologisches Worterbuch*. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.

URD = Dushenkova T. R. et al. 2008. *Удмуртско-русский словарь* [Udmurt-Russian dictionary]. Izhevsk: RAN, UrO.

Wierzbicka, Anna. 2016. Back to 'Mother' and 'Father'. Overcoming the Eurocentrism of Kinship Studies through Eight Lexical Universals. *Current Anthropology* 57 (4), 408–29.

Wissler, Clark. 1927. The Culture-Area Concept in Social Anthropology. *American Journal of Sociology* 32 (6), 881-891.

Zhivlov, Mikhail. 2014. Studies in Uralic etymology III. *Journal of Language Relationship* 12, 113–14.