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1. Introduction

1.1. Terms of relatedness as a part of the basic vocabulary and their borrowability

- Kinship and social terms are assumed to be part of the basic vocabulary
- The definition of core/basic vocabulary is, however, rather vague (cf. Haspelmath 2008: 45-6 with
- So is the definition of semantic universals (Milanova 2017 with references to Schneider 1972, 1984, Sahlins 2013, and Wierzbicka 2016).

Doerfer (1988: 56ff.): Kerngrundwörter (= KGW, almost never borrowed/displaced by a
loanword) vs. Randgrundwörter (= RGW, can be borrowed/displaced by a loanword)

- (about body parts): KGW 1) have an important physical function (not in a biological sense but from
  the subjective point of view of the speakers); 2) notable and easily perceptible; 3) neither too
  specific nor too general (obscene and taboo words such as genitals are often displaced by
  loanwords, thus RGW)
- (about kinship terms): close relatives = KGW; distant relatives = RGW (culturally determined)
- e.g., German Vater, Mutter, Sohn, Tochter, Bruder, Schwester are inherited words (KGW) and
  Onkel (← Fr. oncle), Tante (← Fr. tante), Kousin (← Fr. cousin), Kousine (← Fr. cousine)

1.2. Circumstances of borrowing

1.2.1. Cultural vs. core borrowings (Myers-Scotton 2002: 239)

- cultural borrowings are words for new objects or concepts brought/ adopted by influential people
  (usually in order to fill lexical gaps in a language)
  - borrowing of personal names (as a matter of ideology, prestige or fashion) can be seen as a subtype
    of cultural borrowing
- core borrowings take place in bi(-/multi)lingual communities “when bilinguals introduce them as
  singly occurring codeswitching forms in the mixed constituents of their codeswitching”

1.2.2. Terms of relatedness can be borrowed in both ways:

- cultural borrowing of terms of relatedness is similar to borrowing of PN; it is more common for
  social terms (e.g., titles such as chef, khan)

\textsuperscript{1} This talk is part of two PhD theses in progress “Indo-Iranian loans in Uralic: a critical scrutiny of the substitution rules and
distribution criteria” by Sampsa Holopainen and “Indo-European kinship terms as a part of the linguistic worldview of the
Indo-Europeans: derivational patterns, semantics, and etymology (with a special focus on the Iranian branch)” by Veronika
Milanova. This handout, supplementary materials, and acknowledgements can be found at kinship.mari-language.com.
with kinship terms proper it is sometimes difficult to distinguish between cultural and core borrowing

as it is common for cultural borrowings kinship terms are often borrowed to fill in a lexical gap:

- e.g., Onkel was obviously borrowed as a cover term for Oheim ‘mother’s brother’ and Vetter ‘father’s brother’ (original meaning, now ‘cousin’, according to Duden)
- the Udmurt Bible uses a Russian word brat ‘brother’ because the modern Udmurt language has two different terms for ‘elder brother (also ‘uncle’) and ‘younger brother’ but no neutral word with this meaning (these terms are discussed in 4.2. and 4.3)

however, the fact that exactly vocative terms of relatedness/terms of address are borrowed especially easily (see example below) indicates that most of them are code-switching forms, which is more typical for core borrowings.

2. Kinship terms borrowed from Indo-Iranian into Uralic

The reconstruction of Proto-Uralic kinship terminology is more difficult than the reconstruction of the same category in Indo-European. Overall, the number of lexemes that can be reconstructed for PU in total is much lower than for PIE, and among the kinship terms in individual branches of Uralic there are many later loans from Indo-European and Turkic.


The loanwords presented below reflect several different layers of Indo-Iranian borrowings into Proto-Uralic and its various branches, starting from Proto-Indo-Iranian loans. There have been suggestions that some kinship terms were borrowed already from PIE to PU, but these etymologies are problematic (PU *orpa ‘orphan’ can be analyzed as an Indo-Iranian loan, see below; PU *käliw ‘in-law’ ← PIE *ǵlH- is probably a false etymology, stemming from the incorrect analysis of the IE word as an old -uH-stem; Simon 2018, cf. also Majer 2018 for the reconstruction of the IE word; Koivulehto’s (1991) etymology for West-Uralic *inši ‘human’ from PIE *ǵn̥h₁o- (cf. OI jā- ‘descendant’) has to be rejected because of a very unlikely sound substitution).

Some terms denoting kinship relations were borrowed from Alanian-type language into Hungarian and Permic and possibly into Ob-Ugric at a relatively late period (Helimski 2001; Korenchy 1972).

In addition to Indo-Iranian loans, various Germanic and Baltic kinship terms were borrowed into the westernmost Uralic branches Finnic and Saami, such as Fi veli ‘brother’ ← Germanic *sweljan
‘brother-in-law’ (LÄGLOS s.v. veli), Fi morsian ‘bride’ ← Baltic *marti ‘bride; daughter-in-law’ (Junntila 2015: 94).

2.1. Convincing etymologies

2.1.2 Hungarian asszony ‘lady, mistress, wife’ ( OHu Ahchyn, achfin)
← Alanian *(a)xšaina-, > Oss aefsin, aefsjne ‘mistress of the house’ (also ‘husband’s mother’, cf. ABAEv I/110; Cheung 2002: 157)
This is a well-established and convincing etymology (Munkácsi 1901; Joki 1973: 253; EWUng s.v. asszony; Róna-Tas & Berta 2011: 1331).

2.1.3. Mordvin E miřd’e, M miř’dä ‘man, husband’; Udmurt murt, Komí mort id. < PU *mertä
← PII *mṛta- ‘dead, mortal’ > OI mṛtá- ‘dead, mortal’ and amṛta- ‘immortal’, Av. amṛşa- ‘id.’ (cf. Gr. βροτός ‘mortal’) (NIL 489ff. with references)
PU *mertä is borrowed from PII *mṛta-² with *e_r as the substitution of *r (Koivulehto 1999: 229). Finnish marras (< PFi *martas) ‘dead’ is a parallel borrowing from the same Indo-Iranian word.

2.1.4. Mordvin E sazor ‘younger sister’; Ud suzer id., Ko sozor ‘knitting mistake’ < PU *sasarV
← PII *swasar- > OI svásar- ‘sister’
The Mordvin and Permic words for ‘younger sister’ regularly reflect *sasarV, clearly an old borrowing from PII *swasar- to PU (Korenchy 1972; Joki 1973; Rédei 1986; UEW s.v. *sasarV). The word was probably borrowed simply in the general meaning of ‘sister’, and the meaning ‘younger sister’ developed later through Turkic influence (cf. Udmurt apa(y) ‘elder sister’, a Turkic borrowing). Mari E sūžar, W šėžar ‘jüngere Schwester’ has been derived from the same proto-form (UEW connects it with a question-mark), but because of irregular vocalism it has to be a separate borrowing from some other branch of Indo-European, possibly from Baltic *sesor-, if it is not borrowed from Permic (Udmurt). It is well-known that the Baltic word for ‘sister’ was borrowed into Finnic (Fi sisar, Livonian sežār etc. reflect parallel borrowings according to Kallio 2017). Komi sozor shows a peculiar semantic development but is phonologically regular cognate of Udmurt suzar.

2 During the Limoges conference, Martin Kümmel noted that because of semantics it is unlikely that PII *mṛta-is the origin of PU *mertä (the meaning ‘mortal’ is not attested in the Old Indic or Avestan reflexes of *mṛta). Contrary to Koivulehto (1999a: 228–229), according to Kümmel OI martā- ‘mortal, human’ can reflect PIE e-grade, and in Kümmel’s view a Pre-II *merto- would be semantically and phonetically more plausible origin for the Uralic word.
2.1.5. Finnish *orpo, orpoi* ‘orphan’; Saami (N) *oarbis* ‘orphan; lonely and deserted’; Mordvin E *urus, uros, M uras* ‘orphan’; Hungarian *árva*; Khanty (V) *(jəŋk)-urwi* ‘orphan’

~ ? Fi *orpana* ‘cousin, relative’, *orvas* ‘relative’; SaN *oarbbinaččat* (pl.) ‘siblings’; MoE *urva, M urva* ‘wife’; Mari *eřže, W eřže* ‘young, new; young boy, child’

? < PU *orpV

← PII *(H)arbha* > OI árbha- ‘small, weak’

This is a certain Indo-European borrowing, usually assumed to be from Indo-Iranian. PU *o* from PII *a* is a frequent sound substitution. Reconstructing the PU forms is difficult because of various derivational suffixes in the modern forms; some of the formally and semantically divergent forms might result from later parallel borrowings from Iranian. Nirvi (1952) considers the Uralic words for ‘orphan’ and the ones denoting young relatives as etymologically distinct. Also UEW presents them as too different entries. The semantics of both *orpa ‘orphan’ and *orpana (?? ‘young relative’ can be derived from the Indo-Iranian original *arbha- ‘small, weak; young’ (EWAia I/119–120).

2.1.6. Hungarian *özvegy* ‘widow’, dial. *ögyvesz, ögyvedz*

← ? Alanian *widawa-či* (Cheung 2002: 192; < PII *HwidhawaH*) > Ossetic *idæz* id.

Munkácsi’s (1901) old etymology has not been accepted by most etymological dictionaries of Hungarian but is supported by Joki (1973) and Róna-Tas & Berta (2011: 1334). If the form *özvegy* of the literary language results from metathesis and the dialectal forms are more archaic, the etymology is likely. (Hungarian *ö* can be regularly explained from earlier *wi-.*

2.1.7. Komi *vergs* ‘husband’ (< derived from *ver* ‘man’)

← PII/PI *wiHra-* > OI *virá- ‘man’

The Komi word has a cognate in Udmurt *vor-goron* ‘man’ (Zhivlov 2010). The borrowing into Permic has to be relatively early because it predates the Permic vowel-shifts. The etymology was first presented by Munkácsi (1901) but in many etymological sources the Komi word is connected with Finnish *orja* ‘slave’, Udmurt *var* id. and their cognates in Uralic (UEW s.v. *orja*), which cannot be correct because of irregular vowel relations. It remains unclear whether Old Permic *ver* ‘slave, servant’ is etymologically connected with the modern Komi word.

2.1.8. Komi *zon* ‘son’ (< *zana*)

← Iranian *zana- (from PIE *ǵeh₁r-)*, > Oss *zeñæg* ‘son’

This is a relatively late Iranian borrowing from Iranian because of Komi z- (not found in inherited Pre-Permic vocabulary) and the vocalism (Lytkin 1999; Koivulehto 2001b).
2.2. Doubtful etymologies

2.2.1. Hungarian ara ‘bride; (OHu) brother of mother or sister’; Khanty (O) ordi, (Kaz.) worti ‘mother’s younger brother’; Mansi (L) ār, o år, LO ār ‘relative from mother’s or wife’s side’
← ? Alanian *awra- ~ *arwa- ‘brother’ > Oss rvad, ervād (< PI *brātar-)
Contrary to the claims by Korenchy (1972) these words cannot be regularly derived from a common Proto-Ugric form. Already Sköld (1925) considered this etymology uncertain because of phonological reasons. The Hungarian, Khanty and Mansi words might be parallel borrowings from Alanian.

2.2.2. Hungarian ember ‘man, human’
The word also has an Uralic etymology, it is usually considered an opaque compound with Uralic *emä ‘mother’ and *irkä ‘man’, but this etymology is far from satisfying. As Helimski remarks, it is not at all certain the Ossetic æmbal reflects this kind of composition. The etymology is not mentioned in the recent survey by Róna-Tas & Berta.

2.2.3. Hungarian húg ‘younger sister (hist. also ‘sister’ more generally)’
An old etymology (Munkácsi 1901), which has acquired much criticism (Joki 1973). Already Ásbóth (1905) noted that the problematic Hungarian suffix -g cannot be explained from the Iranian forms. The vowel ā in Hungarian is unexpected too. The Iranian etymology remains uncertain because of this, but there is no competing, convincing etymology for the Hungarian word. The etymology is mentioned as possible but uncertain by Helimski (2001).

2.2.4. Hungarian legény ‘young man’ (Munkácsi 438-9; Sköld 1925: 29; Helimski 2002; Róna-Tas & Berta 2011: 1333)
The Iranian etymology of the Hungarian word has been repeatedly doubted (cf. Joki 1973: 277-8) because of the possible Caucasian origin of the Ossetic word. In spite of this, the etymology is accepted in the recent survey of Róna-Tas & Berta, who argue that the Hu word reflects the compound læqwen. Sköld (1925) has attempted to derive leg from Iranian *wiryaka-. No competing etymology for the Hungarian word exists, and semantically the equation is faultless.
2.2.5. Mari E mariy, W marz ‘man, husband; Mari (ethnonym)’
← ? Iranian *marya-*, cf. OI márya- ‘young man’
This is an old etymology (Munkácsi 1901; Jacobsohn 1922) but because of Mari a (which cannot regularly reflect Pre-Mari *a*) this equation remains uncertain (Joki 1973: 280). The borrowing from Iranian should be very late (after the Proto-Mari period, so not earlier than ~ 1000 years ago) which is problematic because of chronology and the geographical extent of Proto-Mari.

2.2.6. Mansi (LU) pańt, (LO, So) pānt ‘the husband of older sister’
← ? Iranian *banda-* > OP bandaka- ‘liegeman’
The etymology (Munkácsi 1901) is semantically possible (a general meaning of ‘relative’ can have developed a more specific meaning in Mansi), but palatal ı is difficult to explain from the Iranian form (as noted by Korenchy 1972: 63). If the etymology is correct, the Mansi word is probably a relatively late Iranian loan.

2.3. Improbable etymologies

2.3.1. Udmurt ken, kenak ‘daughter-in-law’
← ? Iranian/Alanian cf. Oss. čon, kinzœ ‘bride, daughter-in-law’ (< PII *kan(H)iHan-)
While the Iranian etymology (Oranskij 1979: 43) is formally and semantically fitting, the Udmurt word also has a convincing Turkic etymology (← Chuvash kin ‘daughter-in-law’; Wichmann 1903: 71; DOERFER III/ 666) which seems more probable due to the intensive contacts between Chuvash and Udmurt. Udmurt ĥ often corresponds to Chuvash i in loanwords (Wichmann 1903).

2.3.2. Finnish isä ‘father’; Saami (Kld) g’iįį id. (SaN áhčči irregular); Mordvin M očä ‘father’s older brother’; Mari E iža, W œža ‘older brother; father’s younger brother’; Hungarian ős ‘ancestor’ (< ? OHu ifemucut ‘our father’); Mansi aś ‘mother’s father’ < ? PU *ičä
← ? PII *Hi-Hič- > OI ış- M ‘lord’
The etymology (Tunkelo 1913; Koivulehto 2001a) should be rejected: many of the Uralic forms are so irregular that it is impossible to derive them from PU. The possibility of parallel borrowings remains, but this seems also unlikely, as Uralic *č that the borrowing would have to be very early. The vocalism of the Hungarian word is irregular (also s < *č lacks convincing parallels), and the Mordvin form shows anomalous vocalism too.

Koivulehto has considered the Samoyedic word for ‘father’ (Tundra Nenets nǐše < PS *eyesă < PU/Pre-Sa *ţiyćă) a parallel borrowing from and Indo-Iranian form with full-grade diphthong *ai-, but this seems unlikely: the assumed form with full-grade is unattested in Indo-Iranian, and this would have probably given *a, not *a in Pre-Samoyedic. Furthermore, the Nganasan cognate (yase) is irregular and points to PS *yesă.
Finnic *isäntä* ‘master’, probably an opaque derivative of *isä* ‘father’, has also been considered an independent borrowing from the unattested participle PII *ičant* of this II root, but taken into account the problems with *ičä*, this is unconvincing too.

3. Inherited and borrowed terms in modern Iranian languages

3.1. Tendencies
(for selected inherited terms see table 1).

In general, Doerfer’s KGW vs. RGW hypothesis works, however almost each KGW in the table has a borrowed colloquial synonym or a few of them (see below), which can displace a literary term in the course of time (e.g., *bab* displaced an inherited term for father in Kurdish, Ossetic and Kurdish inherited term for daughter/girl was displaced by a Turkic word).

3.2. Most common Arabic/Semitic loanwords:

3.2.1. stylistically neutral terms:
- *ʕam* ‘father’s brother’ → Farsi, Dari *amu*, Tajik *amak*, Kurd. *amo*
- *ʕamma* ‘father’s sister’ → Farsi *amme*, Dari, Taj. *amma*
- *ḥāla* ‘mother’s sister’ → Farsi *ḥāle*, Dari *ḥāle*, Taj. *ḥola*
- *natije* ‘result’ → Farsi *natije* ‘great-grandchild’
- *فاروس* ‘bride/daughter-in-law’ → NP (all variants) *arus*
- *yatim* ‘orphan’, *ṣagir* ‘small’ → NP *yatim*, *ṣagir* ‘orphan’
- *insān* ‘human being, man’ → NP *ensān*

3.2.2. stylistically marked terms:
- *ولد* / (pl.) *wāledeyn* ‘genitor/ parent’ → NP (mostly in pl.) *wāledeyn* ‘parents’ (as a synonym of *pedar-o-mādār*)
- *اب* ‘father’ → NP *ab*- (used only in names and compounds such as *ābā-o-ajdād* ‘fathers and grandfathers > ancestors’), Bal. *abbā/abbō*

3.3. Some kinship term of Indic (or Dravidian) origin: (Kiselyova 1978: 53; Korn 2005: 301, fn. 92, 93, 94 with references)

---

3 The present collection and analysis of kinship and social terms is based on critical reading of secondary literature (Spooner 1966; Bateni 1973; Kiatnova 1999; Korn, 2005; Rykin 2011; Aliakbari and Toni; Ansari et al. 2015) and searching in synchronic and etymological dictionaries (ABAEV; DOERFER; HASSANDUST; Jafarov 1971; Kalontarov 2007, 2008; Kedaitene et at. 1977; Kiselyova and Mikolayčik 1978; Musaev 1998; Omar 2016). Involvement of native speakers has been minimal so far. More extensive and regular work with native speaker (e.g., guided interview) and other kind of empiric analysis is planned for the future.
4. Turkic and Mongolic influence on Iranian and Uralic kinship terminologies

4.1. Historical background

4.1.1. Three layers of Turkic/Mongolic loanwords in Iranian (cf. DOERFER I/2–5):

1) the oldest purely Turkic layer (approx. 9–13 c. CE, Karakhanid, Seljuq, early Old Ottoman)
2) mixed Turkic and Mongolic layer (13–14 c. Mongolian invasion under Genghis Khan and Timur)
3) the latest South Turkic layer (interaction between Azerbaijan Turkish and Persian of Iran, and Uzbek influence on the Tajik variant of Persian)

4.1.2. Turkic/Mongolic and Uralic

Archaeological evidence places the Volga Bulgars in the Volga-Kama region as early as the 8th century CE (Róna-Tas 1988: 761), putting them within proximity to Mari, Mordvinic, and Permic speaker communities, though it is ambiguous how quickly intense linguistic contact began (ibid: 769–771). Hungarian also has a layer of Bolgar influence, due to the historical migration of Hungarians through the region in question.

Though a modern descendant of Bolgar Turkic has survived – Chuvash – Bolgar Turkic was eventually supplanted by Kipchak Turkic as the dominant contact language in the region by means of the Tatarization of the Bulgars. Today, the dominant contact language of the region is Russian, though two Kipchak languages remain in wide usage in the Volga-Kama area: Tatar and Bashkir. In spite of the Mongol conquests of the 13th century, Mongol did not become a major contact language on Uralic languages.

It is important to note that while Bolgar influence affected the proto-languages of the Uralic phyla under consideration (Mari, Permic), later Kipchak influence occurred after these proto-languages had divided into their current languages and varieties and is not evenly spread over Mari and Permic languages and varieties. Kipchak influence is only strong in more eastern varieties of Mari, and within the Permic languages, only in Udmurt (and here especially in the southern varieties spoken in the immediate proximity of Tatarstan).
### 4.2. Turkic and Mongolic loanwords


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Turkic/Mongolic</th>
<th>Iranian</th>
<th>Uralic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>aqa (aya, aya, aya) ‘male relative older than Ego, but younger than Ego’s parents’</td>
<td>NP (all variants) aqa ‘mister’ (polite address), Farsi (col., voc.) also ‘father’, Dari (col., voc.) also ‘father/elder brother’</td>
<td>Udmurt agay ‘elder brother/uncle’ and Mari kaŋ-aŋa ‘wife’s elder brother’ (← Tatar)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turkish parallels: Turkish ağa ‘lord’; aşabey ‘elder brother’, Tatar aşat(y) ‘uncle, (in dialects) elder brother’</td>
<td>Chuvash akka ‘elder sister/aunt’</td>
<td>Turkish (dialect.) aba ‘elder sister/mother’; Tatar apa ‘elder sister’; Uzbek apa ‘elder sister’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NF ağa ‘elder sister, aunt’ (in Medieval sources) (← Seljuk); Taj. ağa ‘elder brother’ (← Uzbek, along with uka ‘younger brother’)</td>
<td>Turkish bacanak ‘wife’s sister’s husband’; Tatar (dialect.) bəcanak ‘id.’; Chuvash pușana ‘id.’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NP ağa ‘elder sister/aunt’ (in Medieval sources) (← Seljuk); Taj. ağa ‘elder brother’ (← Uzbek, along with uka ‘younger brother’)</td>
<td>Farsi āpa (dialect.) ‘mother’; Dari āpa (voc., col.) ‘elder sister’; Taj. apa (voc., col.) ‘elder sister’ (← Uzbek)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Indic attestation: Urdu āpā(Jān) (← NP, cf. Ansari et al. 2015: 119-20)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turkish, Azeri dayi ‘mother’s brother’ Uzbek tog a, toq ‘ay id.; Tatar dai ‘id.’</td>
<td>Turkish, Azeri dayi ‘mother’s brother’ Uzbek tog a, toq ‘ay id.; Tatar dai ‘id.’</td>
<td>Turkish, Azeri dayi ‘mother’s brother’ Uzbek tog a, toq ‘ay id.; Tatar dai ‘id.’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turkish yenge ‘brother’s wife, uncle’s wife’ Uzbek yanga ‘elder brother’s wife’ Tatar cinggäy ‘id.; Chuvash ipe ‘id.’</td>
<td>Turkish yenge ‘brother’s wife’, Udmurt (Beserman) eŋgey ‘aunt’</td>
<td>Turkish yenge ‘brother’s wife’, Udmurt (Beserman) eŋgey ‘aunt’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Azeri yezne ‘sister’s husband’</td>
<td>Dari, Taj. yaza ‘id.; Kurd. yezne ‘id.’</td>
<td>Azeri yezne ‘sister’s husband’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Turkish, Chuvash anne ‘mother’; Uzbek ona ‘id.’; Tatar āna ‘id.’ | NP āna ‘mother’ (in Medieval sources), Taj. ona ‘mother’ (← Uzbek), Oss. aŋa ‘mother’ |
| Turkish ata ‘father’; Tatar āna ‘id.; Uzbek ota ‘id.; Chuvash ate ‘id.’ | aţă ‘id.’ (in Medieval sources), Oss. aţa ‘id.’ | Turkish ata ‘father’; Tatar āna ‘id.; Uzbek ota ‘id.; Chuvash ate ‘id.’ |

| Turkish baba ‘grandfather’; Tatar bâbây(y) ‘id.’ | Voc., along with inherited pedar, etc.) NP bâbâ(i) ‘(grand)father’, Kurd., Oss. baba ‘id.; Bal. bâbâ ‘id.’ (the word can also mean ‘child’ < “father[’s child]”, cf. Korn 2005: 300, fn. 86) | Udmurt babay ‘grandfather’ |

---

4 DOERFER III/196 suggests that the word existed in two variants *tayai* and *tāvi* with a regular alternation of the long vowel and -aya- (< a’a) like in xān vs. xarān. Farsi and Tajik borrowed two different variants of this Turkic word.
4.3. Loan structures (South Asian influence)
Relative age distinction for siblings (which can be expanded to parents’ and spouses’ siblings) attested in some modern Iranian and Uralic languages (see 3.3. and 4.2) can be explained by the influence of languages (and cultures) of South and Southeast Asia (e.g., Dravidic) or languages that evolved in this region in the past (Turkic and Mongolic).

Lexical age distinction for siblings in some Semitic, Turkic, Mongolic, Uralic, and Indo-European languages

The relative age distinction is only attested in certain Uralic (Uralic) languages: Mordvin, Mari and Udmurt in Central Russia, and Hungarian in Central Europe, as well as in the Ob-Ugric and Samoyed languages spoken in Siberia. Ob-Ugric (Khanty and Mansi) and Samoyed languages also have the age distinction but the kinship term systems in these languages are very complicated and have not been explored by recent research. The Ob-Ugric systems might also show Turkic (Tatar) influence, although this is disputed (Karjalainen 1913, Nirvi 1952). The Saami languages in northern Fennoscandia show interesting distinction of younger and older aunt (mother’s side) and uncle
(father’s side) but no relative age distinction for brothers and sisters. In certain Finnic languages (Veps, Ludic, Olonetsian, Votic) specific terms for elder siblings have developed (Nirvi 1952), but this is clearly a late development and unconnected to the Turkic influence described above.

It has been assumed (Ahlqvist 1871) that the relative age distinction was present in PU already and is retained in certain languages, but it is more natural to assume that the distinction rose as a result of Turkic influence, as was pointed out by Setälä (1900) already. This is proved by the influx of Turkic loanwords in the field of kinship terms, such as Udmurt apa(y) ‘elder sister/aunt’, Mari aka(y) ‘elder sister/aunt’ (cf. the table above); with the adoption of Turkic terms with the age distinction, the earlier general words for ‘sister’ (Ud suzer, Mari šüžar) have developed a more specified meaning ‘younger sister’. Komi, which is closely related to Udmurt but not subject to comparable Turkic influence, lacks this distinction.

The origin of the Saami system remains a mystery, but it is interesting that Saami *muothā ‘mother’s younger sister’ is borrowed from Germanic *mōðō(n)- (an unattested derivation of *mōder- ‘mother’) according to Kümmel (2015).
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