

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)¹

Veronika Milanova (University of Vienna), Sampsa Holopainen (University of Helsinki),
Jeremy Bradley (University of Vienna)

*International Colloquium on Loanwords and Substrata in Indo-European languages
Limoges, 4th–7th June 2018*

Updated handout

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 references to Swadesh 1955, Hock and Joseph 1996: 257, Thomason 2001: 71–72).
- 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*)

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 following Proto-Uralic (incl. Proto-Finno-Ugric in the traditional sense of the word) are found in Sammallahti’s (1988) wordlist: **ańa* ‘sister-in-law’, **ekä* ‘uncle (paternal)’, **emä* ‘mother’, **ina* ‘mother-in-law’, **isä* ‘father’ (irregular, see below) **jppi* ‘father-in-law’, **käliw* ‘in-law’, **čečä* ‘uncle’, **koska* ‘aunt’, **mińä* ‘daughter-in-law’, **natiw* ‘in-law’, **orpa* ‘orphan, relative (?)’

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 **ǵnh₁o-* (cf. OI *já-* ‘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 Permian 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’ (Junttila 2015: 94).

2.1. Convincing etymologies

2.1.2 Hungarian *asszony* ‘lady, mistress, wife’ (OHu *Ahchyn, achfin*)

← Alanian **(a)χšaina-*, > Oss *æfsin, æfsijnæ* ‘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 *miřd’ü* ‘man, husband’; Udmurt *murt*, Komi *mort* id. < PU **mertä*

← PII **mřta-* ‘dead, mortal’ > OI *mřtá-* ‘dead, mortal’ and *amřta-* ‘immortal’, Av. *aməša-* ‘id.’ (cf. Gr. *βροτός* ‘mortal’) (NIL 489ff. with references)

PU **mertä* is borrowed from PII **mřta-*² with **er* 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 *süžar*, W *šəžar* ‘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 Permian (Udmurt). It is well-known that the Baltic word for ‘sister’ was borrowed into Finnic (Fi *sisar*, Livonian *sezār* 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 **mřta-* is the origin of PU **mertä* (the meaning ‘mortal’ is not attested in the Old Indic or Avestan reflexes of **mřta*). Contrary to Koivulehto (1999a: 228–229), according to Kümmel OI *marta-* ‘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) *oarbbis* ‘orphan; lonely and deserted’; Mordvin E *urus*, *uros*, M *urəs* ‘orphan’; Hungarian *árva*; Khanty (V) (*jəŋk-*)*urwi* ‘orphan’

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

? < PU **orpV*

← PII *(H)*arbha-* > OI *arbha-* ‘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 *veręs* ‘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 **génh₁-*), > Oss *zænæg* ‘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*, *oār*, LO *ār* ‘relative from mother’s or wife’s side’

← ? Alanian **awra-* ~ **arwa-* ‘brother’ > Oss *rvad*, *ærvadæ* (< 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’

← ? Iranian/Alanian **ham-bārya-* ‘Mitreiter, Mitkämpfer’, cf. Ossetic *æmbal* (Abaev 1965; Helimski 2001)

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)’

← ? Iranian/Alanian **hwahā-* ‘sister’, cf. Oss (Iron) *ho* (< PII **swasar-*, cf. Cheung 2002: 248-249)

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 *ú* 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)

← ? Iranian/Alanian **lākwen*, cf. Oss *læg* ‘man’, *læqwæn* ‘son’

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 *læqwæn*. Sköld (1925) has attempted to derive *læg* from Iranian **wiryaka-*. No competing etymology for the Hungarian word exists, and semantically the equation is faultless.

2.2.5. Mari E *mariy*, W *marə* ‘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) *pañt*, (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 *ñ* 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. *čənz*, *kinzæ* ‘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 *e* often corresponds to Chuvash *i* in loanwords (Wichmann 1903).

2.3.2. Finnish *isä* ‘father’; Saami (Kld) *q ʒʒ* id. (SaN *áhčči* irregular); Mordvin M *oćä* ‘father’s older brother’; Mari E *iza*, W *əzä* ‘older brother; father’s younger brother’; Hungarian *ős* ‘ancestor’ (< ? OHu *ifemucut* ‘our father’); Mansi *ās* ‘mother’s father’ < ? PU **iċü*

← ? PII **Hi-Hiċ-* > OI *īś-* 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 **ċ* that the borrowing would have to be very early. The vocalism of the Hungarian word is irregular (also *s* < **ċ* lacks convincing parallels), and the Mordvin form shows anomalous vocalism too.

Koivulehto has considered the Samoyedic word for ‘father’ (Tundra Nenets *nīše* < PS **eysä* < PU/Pre-Sa **äyċä*) 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 **ay*, not **äy* in Pre-Samoyedic. Furthermore, the Nganasan cognate (*yase*) is irregular and points to PS **yesä*.

Finnic *isäntä* ‘master’, probably an opaque derivative of *isä* ‘father’, has also been considered an independent borrowing from the unattested participle PII **icant-* of this II root, but taken into account the problems with **icä*, this is unconvincing too.

3. Inherited and borrowed terms in modern Iranian languages

3.1. Tendencies

(for selected inherited terms see table 1)³.

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:

- *šam-* ‘father’s brother’ → Farsi, Dari *amu*, Tajik *amak*, Kurd. *amo*
- *šamma-* ‘father’s sister’ → Farsi *amme*, Dari, Taj. *amma*
- *hāla-* ‘mother’s sister’ → Farsi *hāle*, Dari *hāle*, Taj. *hola*
- *natije* ‘result’ → Farsi *natije* ‘great-grandchild’
- *šarus* ‘bride/daughter-in-law’ → NP (all variants) *arus*
- *yatim* ‘orphan’, *sağir* ‘small’ → NP *yatim*, *sağir* ‘orphan’
- *insān* ‘human being, man’ → NP *ensān*
- (Hebrew) *adam* → NP *ādam*, Kurd. *ademī-zad*, Oss. *adæymag* ‘human being, man’

3.2.2. stylistically marked terms:

- *walad* / (pl.) *aulād* ‘child’ → Farsi, Dari, Bal. *aulāde/a* ‘children, offspring’, Taj. *awlod* ‘descendant, generation’
- *wālid* / (pl.) *wāledeyn* ‘genitor/ parent’ → NP (mostly in pl.) *wāledeyn* ‘parents’ (as a synonym of *pedar-o-mādar*)
- *ab-* ‘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 al. 1977; Kiselyova and Mikolayčik 1978; Musaeu 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.

Indic attestation	Iranian attestations
Urdu <i>lālā</i> ‘master, teacher of the master’s children, servant’	Dari <i>lālā</i> ‘id.’, <i>āgā-lālā</i> ‘elder brother’, Bal. <i>lālā, lālō</i> ‘brother’, Kurd. <i>lale, lalo</i> ‘mother’s brother’
Sindhi <i>dādō</i> ‘elder brother’, <i>dādī</i> ‘elder sister’, Urdu <i>dādā</i> ‘paternal grandfather, elder brother’	Dari <i>dādā</i> ‘elder sister’, Kurd. <i>dade</i> ‘elder sister, mother’, Bal. <i>dādā</i> ‘sister’ and <i>dādā</i> ‘grandfather’
Urdu, Hindi <i>kākā</i> ‘father’s brother’, Sindhi <i>čāčā</i> ‘id.’	Dari <i>kākā</i> ‘father’s brother’, Bal. <i>kākā, čāčā</i> ‘father’s brother, elder brother’, Kurd. <i>kake, kakīle</i> ‘elder brother’
Urdu <i>māmā/ māmū</i> ‘mother’s brother’	Dari <i>māmā(ji)</i> , Kurd. <i>mam, mamo</i> , Bal. <i>māmā</i> ‘id.’

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 Bolgars 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 Bolgars. 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 (Doerfer I/133-40, II/3-4, 91f., 231-33, III/196f., IV/206-7, Isanbaev 1989–1994, Bereczki 1992–1994, Räsänen 1923, Wichmann 1924, and further).

Turkic/Mongolic	Iranian	Uralic
<i>aqa</i> (<i>aḡa</i> , <i>aya</i> , <i>aḡai</i>) ‘male relative older than Ego, but younger than Ego’s parents’) (Rykin 2011: 32ff.). <u>Turkic parallels</u> : Turkish <i>aḡa</i> ‘lord’; <i>aḡabey</i> ‘elder brother’, Tatar <i>āga(y)</i> ‘uncle, (in dialects) elder brother’	NP (all variants) <i>aqa</i> ‘mister’ (polite address), Farsi (col., voc.) also ‘father’, Dari (col., voc.) also ‘father/elder brother’	Udmurt <i>agay</i> ‘elder brother/uncle’ and Mari <i>kajn-aga</i> ‘wife’s elder brother’) (← Tatar)
Chuvash <i>akka</i> ‘elder sister; aunt’	NP <i>aka</i> ‘elder sister, aunt’ (in Medieval sources) (← Seljuk); Taj. <i>aka</i> ‘elder brother’ (← Uzbek, along with <i>uka</i> ‘younger brother’)	Mari <i>aka(y)</i> ‘elder sister/aunt (younger than parent)’ and Udmurt (dial.) <i>aka</i> ‘elder sister, aunt’, Moksha <i>aka</i> ‘id.’ (← Chuvash)
Turkish (dial.) <i>aba</i> ‘elder sister; mother’; Tatar <i>āpa</i> ‘elder sister’; Uzbek <i>opa</i> ‘elder sister’	Farsi <i>āpa</i> (dial.) ‘mother’; Dari <i>āpa</i> (voc., col.) ‘elder sister’; Taj. <i>apa</i> (voc., col.) ‘elder sister’ (← Uzbek) <u>Indic attestation</u> : Urdu <i>āpā(jān)</i> (← NP, cf. Ansari et al. 2015: 119-20)	Udmurt <i>apa(y)</i> ‘elder sister/aunt’; Mari <i>aḡa(y)</i> ‘mother’; Mordvin <i>ava(y)</i> ‘mother’
Turkish <i>bacanak</i> ‘wife’s sister’s husband’; Tatar (dial.) <i>bācanaq</i> ‘id.’; Chuvash <i>pušana</i> ‘id.’	NP <i>bājenāq</i> ‘id.’ <u>Further IE parallels</u> : Bulgarian <i>bajanak</i> ‘id.’ (Kitanova 1999: 282)	Mari <i>posana</i> , Udm. <i>bušon(o)</i> ‘id.’ (← Chuvash)
Turkish, Azeri <i>dayi</i> ‘mother’s brother’ Uzbek <i>tog</i> ‘a, tog’ay ‘id.’; Tatar <i>dai</i> ‘id.’	Farsi <i>dāyi</i> (← Turkish) ‘id.’ Taj. <i>tago</i> (← Uzbek) ‘id.’ ⁴	-
Turkish <i>yenge</i> ‘brother’s wife, uncle’s wife’; Uzbek <i>yanga</i> ‘elder brother’s wife’; Tatar <i>ciḡāy</i> ‘id.’; Chuvash <i>iḡke</i> ‘id.’	Dari, Taj. <i>yanga</i> ‘brother’s wife’ (← Chagatai)	Mari <i>yeyga</i> ‘elder brother’s wife’, Udmurt (Beserman) <i>eḡey</i> ‘aunt’
Azeri <i>yezne</i> ‘sister’s husband’	Dari, Taj. <i>yāzna</i> ‘id.’, Kurd. <i>yezne</i> ‘id.’	Moksha <i>ezna</i> ‘elder sister’s husband’, Khanty <i>yesnä</i> ‘brother-in-law’
Turkish, Chuvash <i>anne</i> ‘mother’; Uzbek <i>ona</i> ‘id.’; Tatar <i>āna</i> ‘id.’	NP <i>āna</i> ‘mother’ (in Medieval sources), Taj. <i>ona</i> ‘mother’ (← Uzbek), Oss. <i>æna</i> ‘mother’	Udmurt <i>anay</i> ‘mother’ (← Tatar)
Turkish <i>ata</i> ‘father’; Tatar <i>āta</i> ‘id.’; Uzbek <i>ota</i> ‘id.’; Chuvash <i>ate</i> ‘id.’	<i>atā</i> ‘id.’ (in Medieval sources), Oss. <i>æda</i> ‘id.’	Mari <i>ača(y)</i> ‘id.’ (← ?Chuvash), Udmurt <i>atay</i> ‘id.’ (← Tatar)
Turkish <i>baba</i> ‘grandfather’; Tatar <i>bāba(y)</i> ‘id.’	Voc., along with inherited <i>pedar</i> , etc.) NP <i>bābā(i)</i> ‘(grand)father’, Kurd., Oss. <i>baba</i> ‘id.’, Bal. <i>bābā</i> ‘id.’ (the word can also mean ‘child’ < “father[’s child]”, cf. Korn 2005: 300, fn. 86)	Udmurt <i>babay</i> ‘grandfather’

⁴ DOERFER III/196 suggests that the word existed in two variants **taḡaj* and **tāyi* with a regular alternation of the long vowel and *-aḡa-* (< *a’a*) like in *xān* vs. *xayan*. 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



■ Has distinction ○ Had distinction ▲ No distinction

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 *šūžar*) 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 **muoθā* 'mother's younger sister' is borrowed from Germanic **mōþō(n)-* (an unattested derivation of **mōder-* 'mother') according to Kümmel (2015).

References:

- ABAEV = Abaev V.I. 1958-1989. *Istoriko-etimologičeskij slovar osetinskogo yazyka. (A historical-etymological dictionary of Ossetic)*. Vol. 1-5. Moscow & Leningrad.
- Абаев, В. И. 1965. К алано-венгерским лексическим связям. In: *Europa et Hungaria: Congressus ethnographicus in Hungaria*. Budapest. 517–537.
- Ahlqvist, August. 1871. *De vestfinska språkens kulturord. Ett lingvistiskt bidrag till Finnarnes äldsta kulturhistoria*. Helsingfors: SKS.
- Aliakbari, Mohammad; Toni, Arman. 2008. The Realization of Address Terms in Modern Persian in Iran: A Sociolinguistic Study. In: *Linguistic online* 35, 3/08.
- Ansari Zakia R.; Shabnam, Srushti; Priyadarshi, Brajesh. 2015. Kinship terms of Urdu in Mysore and Lucknow varieties: a comparative study. In: *Indian Linguistics* 76 (1-2), 113-130.
- Bateni, M.R. 1973. Kinship terms in Persian. In: *Anthropological linguistics* 15, 324-7.
- Bereczki, Gábor. 1992–1994. *Grundzüge der tscheremissischen Sprachgeschichte [I–II]*. Studia Uralo-Altica 34–35. Szeged: Universitas Szegediensis de Attila József Nominata.
- CPD = MacKenzie, D. N. 1986 [1971]. *A Concise Pahlavi Dictionary*. London: Oxford University Press.
- DOERFER = Doerfer, Gerhard. 1963-1975. *Türkische und mongolische Elemente im Neupersischen: unter besonderer Berücksichtigung älterer neupersischer Geschichtsquellen, vor allem der Mongolen- und Timuridenzeit*. Vol. 1-4. Wiesbaden: Steiner.
- . 1988. *Grundwort und Sprachmischung. Eine Untersuchung an Hand von Körperteilbezeichnungen*. Stuttgart: Franz Steiner Verlag Wiesbaden GmbH.
- HASSANDUST = Hassandust, Mohammad. 2015. *The etymological dictionary of Persian*. 5 Vols. Tehran: Academy of Persian Language and Literature.
- Helimski, Eugene. 2001. Zu den iranischen Lehnwörtern in Ungarischen. Manuscript of a presentation held in the symposium *Finno-Ugrians and Indo-Europeans: Linguistic and Literary Contacts*, November 22-24, 2001, Groningen/NL.
- Hock, Hans Henrich; Brian D. Joseph. 1996. *Language history, language change, and language relationship*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Haspelmath, Martin. 2008. Loanword typology: Steps toward a systematic cross-linguistic study of lexical borrowability. In: Stolz, Thomas; Bakker, Dik; Salas Palomo, Rosa (eds). *Aspects of Language Contact: New Theoretical, Methodological and Empirical Findings with Special Focus on Romancisation Processes (Empirical Approaches to Language Typology [EALT], Band 35)*. De Gruyter Mouton.

- Isanbaev, N. I. 1989–1994. *Mariysko-tyurkskie yazykovye kontakty* [I-II]. Yoshkar-Ola: Mariyskoe knizhnoe izdatel'stvo.
- Jafarov, J. M. (ed). 1971. *Deutsch-aserbaidshanisches Wörterbuch*. Baku: „Maarif“ Našriyyati.
- Joki, Aulis. 1973. *Uralier und Indogermanen*. MSFOU 151; Helsinki: Finno-Ugrian Society.
- Junttila, Santeri. 2015. *Tiedon kumuloituminen ja trendit lainasanatutkimuksessa. Kantasuomen balttilaislaineiden tutkimushistoria*. Doctoral dissertation; Helsinki.
- Kallio, Petri. 2017. Ensitavun diftongit kantasuomessa. Sampsa Holopainen & Janne Saarikivi (ed.): *Peri orthotētos etymōn. Uusiutuva uralilainen etymologia*. UH 11; Helsinki: Finno-Ugrian Society.
- Kalontarov, Ja. 2007. *Noviy russko-tajikskiy slovar'*. (New Russian-Tajik dictionary). Dušanbe. ----- 2008. *Noviy tajiksko-russkiy slovar'*. (New Tajik-Russian dictionary). Dušanbe.
- Karjalainen, K.F. 1913. Wie EGO im ostjakischen die verwandten benennt. *FUF* 13: 207–295.
- Kedaitene, E. I.; Mukriani, K.; Mitrokhina V.I. 1977. *Uchebniy russko-kurdskiy slovar*. Moscow: Russkiy yazyk.
- Kiselyova L. N.; Mikolayčik V. I. 1978. *Dari-russkiy slovar (Dari-Russian dictionary)*. Moscow: Russkiy yazyk.
- Kitanova, M. 1999. Materialy k slovaryu bolgarskih terminov rodstva (Materials of the dictionary of Bulgarian kinship terms). In: Tolstaya, S. M. *Kategoriya rodstva v yazyke i kulture (Category of kinship in language and culture)*. Moscow: Indrik, 279-302.
- Koivulehto, Jorma. 1991. *Uralische Evidenz für die Laryngealtheorie*. Wien: Verlag der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften. ----- 1999. Varhaiset indoeurooppalaiskontaktit: aika ja paikka lainasanojen valossa. Pohjan poliilla. Suomalaisten juuret nykytutkimuksen mukaan. Toimittanut Paul Fogelberg. Bidrag till kännedom av Finlands natur och folk 153; Helsinki: Suomen Tiedeseura, 207–236. ----- 2001a. Zum frühen iranischen und indoiranischen lexikalischen Einfluss auf das Finnisch-Ugrische. *Vidyārnāvandanam: essays in honour of Asko Parpola*. Eds. Klaus Karttunen & Petteri Koskikallio. *Studia Orientalia* 94; Helsinki: Finnish Oriental Society. 2001. 359–378 ----- 2001b. The earliest contacts between Indo-European and Uralic speakers in the light of lexical loans. *Early Contacts between Uralic and Indo-European: linguistic and archaeological considerations*. Eds. Christian Carpelan, Asko Parpola & Petteri Koskikallio. MSFOU 242; Helsinki: Suomalais-Ugrilainen Seura. 235–264.
- Korenchy, Éva. 1972: *Iranische Lehnwörter in den obugrischen Sprachen*. Budapest: Akadémiai Kiadó.
- Korn, Agnes. 2005: *Towards a Historical Grammar of Balochi*. Studies in Balochi Historical Phonology and Vocabulary. Wiesbaden: Dr. Ludwig Reichert Verlag.
- Kümmel, Martin. 2015: Die Schwestern der Eltern: Samische Evidenz für germanische Wortbildung? *Diachronie und Sprachvergleich*. Hrsg. Thomas Krisch & Stefan Niderreiter. Innsbrucker Beiträge zur Sprachwissenschaft.
- LÄGLOS = Kylstra, A. D. et al. 1991–2012: *Lexikon der älteren Germanischen Lehnwörter der ostseefinnischen*. Amsterdam – New York/Atlanta, GA: Rodopi.
- LIV² = Rix, Helmut (ed). 2001. *Lexikon der indogermanischen Verben*. (2nd edition). Wiesbaden: Reichert.
- Majer, Marek. 2018. Slavic *ljuby 'love' < *lewbh-ōs and the heterogeneity of the *-y, *-ъve inflectional class. Paper presented 5.4.2018 at 4. Indogermanische Forschungskolloquium, Zürich.
- Milanova, Veronika. 2017. Patterns of derivation and semantic change in terms of social relations. (A talk at the summer school “Roots of Europe”, University of Copenhagen, 26 July 2017).
- Musaev, O. İ. 1998. *Azerbajjani-English dictionary*. Baku: Azərbaycan Dövlət Diller İnst.
- Munkácsi, Bernát. 1901. *Árja és kaukázusi elemek a finn-magyar nyelvekben*. Budapest: MTA.
- Myers-Scotton, Carol. 2002. *Language contact: Bilingual encounters and grammatical outcomes*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Nirvi, R.E. 1952. *Synonyymitutkimuksia sukulaismistön alalta*. Helsinki: SKS.
- Omar, Feryad Fazil. 2016. *Deutsch-Kurdisches Wörterbuch: (Zentralkurdisch/Soranî)*. Berlin: Institut für Kurdische Studien.
- Räsänen, Martti. 1923. *Die tatarischen Lehnwörter im Tscheremissischen*. Mémoires de la Société Finno-Ougrienne L. Helsinki: Suomalais-Ugrilainen Seura.
- Róna-Tas, András. 1988. Turkic Influence on the Uralic Languages. In: Denis Sinor (ed.). *The Uralic languages: Description, History, and Foreign Influences*. Leiden: E. J. Brill. 742-780.
- Róna-Tas, András; Berta, Árpád. 2011: West Old Turkic. Turkic loanwords in Hungarian. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.
- Rykin, Pavel. 2011. The system of kinship and affinity terms in the Middle Mongolian. In: *Acta Orientalia Academiae Scientiarum Hungaricae* 64 (1), 25-47.
- Sahlins, Marchal. 2013. *What Kinship Is-And Is Not*. University of Chicago Press.
- Schneider David. 1972. What is Kinship All About? In: Priscilla Reining (ed). *Kinship Studies in the Morgan Centennial Year*. Washington D.C.: The Anthropological Society of Washington, 32-63. Reprinted in:

- Parkin, Robert; Stone, Linda (eds.) 2004. *Kinship and Family. An anthropological reader*. Malden, Mass.: Blackwell Publishing, 257-274.
- , 1984. *A Critique of the Study of Kinship*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.
- Setälä, E. N. 1900. I.N. Smirnow's Untersuchung über die Ostfinnen. *JSFOu* 17: 17–28.
- Simon, Zsolt. 2018. Vételmezett indoeurópai jövevényszavak az uráli és finnugor alapnyelvekben [Presentation, Institute of Linguistics, Hungarian Academy of Sciences, 27.3.2018]
- Sköld, Hannes. 1925. *Die ossetischen Lehnwörter im ungarischen*. Lund: Gleerup.
- Spooner, Brian. 1966. Iranian Kinship and Marriage. In: *Iran* 4, 51-59.
- Swadesh, Morris. 1955. Towards greater accuracy in lexicostatistic dating. In: *International Journal of American Linguistics* 21, 121–137.
- Thomason, Sarah G. 2001. *Language contact*. Washington, D.C.: Georgetown University Press.
- Tsabolov, Ruslan L. 2001–2010. *Etimologičeskiy slovar kurdsogo yazyka (Etymological dictionary of the Kurdish language)*. 2 Vols. Moscow: Vostochnaya literatura.
- Tunkelo E. A. 1913. Wortgeschichtliche beiträge. *FUF* 13:74–119.
- Wichmann, Yrjö. 1903. *Die tschuwassischen Lehnwörter in den permischen Sprachen*. MSFOu XXI. Helsinki: Suomalais-Ugrilainen Seura.
- Wichmann, Yrjö 1924. Etymologisches aus den permischen Sprachen, *FUF* XIV, pp. 29–63, Helsinki
- Wierzbicka, Anna. 2016. Back to 'Mother' and 'Father'. Overcoming the Eurocentrism of Kinship Studies through Eight Lexical Universals. In: *Current Anthropology* 57 (4), 408-29.
- Zhivlov, Mikhail. 2010. Studies in Uralic vocalism I. *Journal of Language Relationship* 4. 167–176