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ABSTRACT
It is suggested that PIE. *h₂we-h₂p- f. ‘pond, tank, pool, lake’, orig. ‘a reservoir of stagnant water’ (hence Old Indic vāpi- f. ‘any pond; an oblong reservoir of water, tank, pool, lake’, Pali vāpi- f. ‘pond’; Prakrit vāvi- f. ‘pond’; Old Church Slavic bāna f. ‘lake’, Ukrainian bāna f. ‘standing water; boggy place’; Slovenian vāpa f. ‘puddle’) represents a compound containing the Proto-Indo-European privative particle (prefix) *h₂we- ‘away, not’ and the term *h₂ep- ‘flowing water; water on the move’ (cf. Old Indic ap- f. ‘water’, Avestan āfš f. ‘water’; Tocharian AB āp ‘water, river’, Old Prussian ape f. ‘river’, Hittite ḫapaš c. ‘river’ and so on).
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1. On an archetype of Slavic *vapa ‘lake’

The Proto-Slavic appellative *vapa f. ‘lake’ is attested in old Slavic texts and exceptionally in modern dialects, cf. OChSl. bāna f. ‘lake / лίμνη, stagnant’ (Miklósich 1862–1865, 56), Russ.-ChSl. vàna f. ‘озеро, лужа’ (Vasmer 1986, 272), Ukr. vàna f. ‘a place with standing water; a boggy place’ (Mel’ničuk 1982, 329); OБulg. vàna f. ‘озеро, локва’, Bulg. dial. (Smoljansko) vàna f. ‘котловина, вдлъбнатина’ (Zaimov 2012, 184), Slovene vápa f. ‘puddle’. The Proto-Slavic lexeme *vapa appears unclear as far as word-formation and etymology are concerned. It has been suggested in literature that it was originally identical with the Old Church Slavic term vàna f. ‘colour’ (e.g. Petersson 1918, 79; Brückner 1927, 601), however, most linguists rejected the connection, regardless whether they assumed the descent of OChSl. and ORuss. vàna (and vàńь) f. ‘colour’ from a Greek source (cf. Gk. βαφή
f. ‘hardening of hot iron in water; dyeing; enameling), or negated the hypothesis of borrowing.

Etymologists (e.g. Vasmer 1986, 272) assume a number of words from other Indo-European languages to be cognate with PSl. *vapa, but the suggested connections are most of the time unconvincing, precipitous and arbitrary. Thus, it is worth to re-analyse the issue of the etymology and origin of PSl. *vapa f. ‘lake’. Reconsideration of the etymology of the word seems necessary also because the Balto-Slavic and Proto-Indo-European forms are reconstructed in a number of ways, which leaves a Slavicist with a dilemma which of the putative proto-forms to accept as convincing. For example, on the basis of the Slavic data Trautmann (1923, 342) reconstructs a Balto-Slavic (and late Indo-European) archetype *uāpā f. ‘standing water / stehendes Wasser’, and at the same time considers it definitely separate from the Balto-Slavic (or actually Baltic) archetype *apiā, *uplā f. ‘river / Fluß’ (Trautmann 1923, 11). Pokorny (1959, 1149) in the entry *uēp- ~ *uōp- ~ *up- ‘water / Wasser’ reconstructs the Indo-European archetype *uōpā for the OChSl. appellative ēana f. ‘lake / See’. The identical proto-form *uōpā is also proposed by other researchers (Delamarre 1984, 193; Zaimov 2012, 184), whereas Mann (1984–1987, 1493) suggests the Indo-European archetype *uāpā ‘pond, marsh’. Rejzek (2001, 699) and Borys (2005, 677) point to the Indo-European root *uēp- ‘(standing) water, marsh’. Pokorny considers the following to be cognate: OInd. vāpi- ‘oblong pond / länglicher Teich’, Lith. ūpė ‘river / Fluß’, OPrus. wupyan ‘cloud / Wolke’ as well as Hitt. uappu- ‘riverbank, wadi / Flußufer, Wadi’, separating these words (not entirely consistently in the case of the Baltic appellatives) from the descendants of Indo-European *ab- and *ap- ‘water, river / Wasser, Fluß’ (Pokorny 1959, 1 and 51–52).

Reconstructions incorporating the laryngeal theory, which dominate in the modern Indo-European linguistics, do not make the choice of the proto-form much easier since they take into account the lost laryngeal consonants, which are sometimes provided with numerical designations and have varied and unstandardised notation. Mallory and Adams (2006, 127) postulate the Proto-Indo-European proto-form *we-h,p- ‘body of water’, where the symbol w represents [u], and the grapheme h,p represents a laryngeal consonant with unclear colouring, possibly h₂ or h₃. The two researchers (possibly following J. Pokorny) add Hitt. wappu- ‘wadi, riverbank’ and Lith. ūpė f. ‘river’ to the Slavic and Indic material.

1 Many etymologists considered OChSl. and ORuss. ēana, ēńb f. ‘colour’ to be a loanword from Greek (e.g. Mikloshich 1862–1865, 56; Machek 1957, 555; Preobraženskij 1958, 64–65). More recently, more and more linguists believe the term (< PSl. *vapa, *vapa), as well as the word for ‘lime’ (PSl. *vapyno) to be native (e.g. Vasmer 1986, 272; Gluhak 1993, 662; Rejzek 2001, 699; Borys 2005, 677).

2 For the protolanguage reconstructed in a traditional (Neogrammarian) way, used in the dictionary by Julius Pokorny (1959). I use the label Indo-European (IE.), and for reconstructions including laryngeal phonemes I prefer the label Proto-Indo-European (PIE).
2. Proposed Indo-European cognates

Researchers generally do not doubt that PSl. *vapa f. ‘lake; standing water’ belongs to the ancient lexical layer (TRAUTMANN 1923, 42; VASMER 1986, 272), inherited from the Indo-European proto-language and they point to a number of possible corresponding words in several language groups:


c. Germanic, cf. OHG affa (MIKLOSICH 1862–1865, 56);

d. Anatolian, cf. Hitt. ḫappu- ‘riverbank, wadi’ (POKORNY 1959, 1149; MAYRHOFER 1976, 188 [with the question mark]; DELAMARRE 1984, 193; MALLORY – ADAMS 2006, 127);


The abovementioned correspondences vary in their worth as evidence depending on the treatment of the initial v- in the Proto-Slavic word: either it was prothetic and introduced in the Proto-Slavic age or it continued the consonant *u, inherited from the Indo-European protolanguage. Indeed, some of the quoted equivalents document the initial consonant and some do not. However, we can find a nearly exact semantic equivalent in Indic (OInd. vāpī- f. ‘pond’ etc.), which not only has a long vowel in the root, but also the initial consonant *u. These similarities allow us to make the assumption that the consonant *v- in the word *vapa was historically justified, and not a prothesis.

Furthermore, the Indic lexical material presents two separate, as it were opposed lexical bunches (ap- ‘water’ vs. vāpī- ‘pond’). Thus, I firmly believe that the putative cognates starting with u- or v- should be kept separate from other proposed equivalents, which have an initial vowel. The distinction is drawn and described in two subsequent sections of the article (3.–4.).

However, at this point, we must address the issue whether the Anatolian and Iranian equivalents proposed in literature which have different semantics should be taken into account in the analysis of the origin of OChSl. vana. In my opinion, these words cannot be considered cognate.

The Avestan word vafra- ‘snow’ and other Iranian words with similar semantics (e.g. MPers. vafr, NPers. bafr ‘snow’) should not be considered separately from the OInd. vapra- m. n. ‘rampart, earthwork, mound, hillock, mud wall, earth or bank raised as a wall or buttress or as the foundation of a building; a high river-bank, any
shore or bank’ (Monier-Williams 1999, 920). All these words come from the root *u-ep- ‘throw, pour’ (Pokorny 1959, 1149), cf. the OInd. verb vápati, which has among others the concrete meanings ‘to throw or heap up, dam up’ (Monier-Williams 1999, 919; Mayrhofer 1976, 144). In Old Indic the attested semantic variation can be brought to the original meaning ‘earthwork, mound’ (< ‘something heaped up’), and in the Iranian languages, used in harsher climate, the word vafra- started to mean ‘snow’ (possibly originally ‘snowdrift’) (Mayrhofer 1976, 145; Mayrhofer 1996, 505).

The Hitt. υαπpu- c. ‘riverbank’ as a putative cognate of OChSl. eana f. ‘lake’ seems very dubious because the preferred reconstruction *we-h₂p- ‘body of water’ assumes a laryngeal *h₂ or *h₃ (the consonant *h₁ giving *ē-colouring to the preceding vowel is impossible in the light of both Slavic and Hittite data). Since the other laryngeals (*h₂ and *h₃) are rendered in script as ū, assuming the regularity of sound correspondences one would expect to have the notation **uahpu-, and not υαppu-. The author of the newest etymological dictionary of Hittite A. Kloeckhorst does not mention the traditional explanation and firmly asserts that the Hitt. υαppu- c. ‘riverbank’ „has no good etymology” (Kloeckhorst 2008, 958). It appears, however, that the Hittite word should be considered together with the Indo-Iranian words discussed above (e.g. Avest. vafra- ‘snow’, OInd. vapra-), which are derived from the verbal root *u-ep- ‘throw, pour’ (cf. OInd. vápati) (Mayrhofer 1976, 145; Mayrhofer 1996, 505). It transpires that in Hittite, much like in Old Indic (cf. OInd. vapra- ‘a high river-bank, any shore or bank’), a riverbank was simply called an (earth) wall.

3. The Baltic words and their Indo-European equivalents

The Baltic words for ‘river’ are not easy to analyse and verify, mainly because of untypical sound correspondence (a- vs. u-) in the initial position, cf. OPrus. ape f. ‘river’ vs. Lith. ūpė f., Latv. upe f. ‘id.’. The equivalents outside the Baltic group, which are numerous (cf. OInd. ap- f. ‘water’, āpas n. ‘id.’; Avest. āfš f. ‘water’; Toch. AB āp ‘water, river’, Hitt. ḫapaš c. ‘river’, Lat. amnis m. ‘river’ (from *ap-ni- or *ab-ni-); OIr. ab f. ‘river’, MW. afon f. ‘river’ < Celt. *abōn or *abonā f.; cf. Mayrhofer 1956, 74-75; Mayrhofer 1992, 81; NIL 2008, 311-317), fairly consistently have the initial vowel *a- (< PIE. *h₂,e-). The above forms attest either a voiced labial *b (Anatolian, Italo-Celtic) or a voiceless labial *p (Indo-Iranian, Baltic). This variation is difficult to explain unless one assumes the voicing of the labial by an adjacent laryngeal, cf. IE. *pih₂- < PIE. *pi-ph₃- < *peh₃- ‘drink’.

While OPrus. ape can be easily derived from the proto-form *h₂ep- f. (or *h₂op-) ‘river, water; flowing water’, the East Baltic forms are difficult to link to the same archetype. Smoczyński (2007, 706) is decidedly against such a correspondence,
claiming that “the comparison of Lith. up- with Hitt. ḥa-pa-a, ḥa-ap-pa ‘towards the river’, Ved. ap- ‘water’ does not hold”³. On the other hand, it seems the East Baltic words for ‘river’ cannot be separated from their Old Prussian equivalent (cf. NIL 2008, 311–317). The unexpected vocalism of the root u-, attested in Lithuanian, Latvian and possibly Yatvingian⁴, should be explained by phonetic phenomena internal to the Baltic group, probably a sound process analogical to Cowgill’s law⁵.

4. The Indic lexical material and its significance for explaining the origin of the Proto-Slavic appellative

The sole certain cognate of PSl. *vapa f. ‘lake’ are the Old Indic words vāpī- f. ‘any pond; an oblong reservoir of water, tank, pool, lake’ and vāpi- f. ‘pond’, which gave rise to diminutive derivates vāpika-, vāpikā- f. ‘(small) pond’ (Monier-Williams 1999, 941). The Old Indic lexeme is opulently attested in both ancient and modern Indic languages: Pali vāpi- f. ‘pond’; Prakrit vávī- f. ‘pond’; Sindhi váñ f. ‘well’; Punjabi vā, bāñ f. ‘reservoir with steps down to water’; West Pahari bāñ, bāñ f. ‘pond, spring’, dial. bauñ f. ‘spring’; Kumaoni bāwali- f. ‘covered well, reservoir’; Bihari bāwli- ‘large well’; Awadhi bāvari- f. ‘id.’; Hindi bāwī-, bāñ- f. ‘large well’, also bāuli-, bāuri- ‘id.’, bāuri- f. ‘well with steps’; Marathi bāudi- f. ‘id.’; Gujarati vāñ f. ‘large well with steps’, dimin. vāvrī f. ‘small well’; OSinhala vapi, vavi, (6th cent.) veva, (10th cent.) vā, Sinhala vāv-a ‘pond’ (Turner 1966, 672; Mayrhofer 1976, 188; Mayrhofer 2001, 466).

The Indic lexical material is particularly rich and documents considerable popularity of the OInd. vāpi-. The correspondence between Indic and Slavic is unquestionable⁶ as all the words can be derived from an identical base of a similar meaning (OInd. vāp- = PSl. *vap-), despite the Indic and Slavic equivalents having different stems. The PSl. *vapa f. ‘lake’ cannot be analysed etymologically on the basis of Slavic vocabulary. It seems, however, that the Old Indic words can be explained both through internal analysis and by comparison outside of the group, which as I hope will allow us to reconstruct the Indo-European archetype and to establish its original meaning an

---

³ Smoczyński (2007, 706) prefers to derive the Lithuanian word for ‘river’ from the root *vep- ‘stand agape’, cf. also Lith. vĕpĕ ‘muzzle, mouth’ and suggests the semantic development along the following lines ‘muzzle’ > ‘mouth’ > ‘mouth of a river’ > ‘river’.

⁴ The Yatvingian term upa f. ‘river’ is attested in Zinov’s dictionary, which was called Pagan speeches of Narew (Zinkevičius 1992, 103, 120).

⁵ The American linguist Warren Crawford Cowgill (1929–1985) formulated the rule according to which the IE. *ō turns in Greek into *ŭ between a labial and a sonant (liquid or nasal) e.g. IE. *bhlōm n. ‘leaf’ > Gk. φύλλον n. ‘leaf’, Lat. fōlium n. ‘id.’; IE. *mōlā f. ‘tool for grinding’ > Gk. μύλη f. ‘quern; millstone’, Lat. mōla f. ‘millstone, mill’. The rule is known in historical comparative linguistics as Cowgill’s law.

⁶ See among others Boryś (2005, 677), s. v. wapno. A different (and controversial) opinion is voiced by Brückner (1927, 601): “Ind. wāpi, ‘pond’, similar by coincidence only”.

5. Are the Old Indic \textit{ap}– ‘water’ and \textit{vāpī}– ‘pond’ etymologically related?

The question posed in the title of the section is worth answering for two reasons. Firstly, the possibility of the theoretically possible link between these two Old Indic terms has not been considered by specialists so far. Secondly, a potential etymological affinity between OInd. \textit{ap}– f. ‘water’ and \textit{vāpī}– f. ‘pond’ may help establish a correct relation between OPrus. \textit{ape} f. ‘river’ and OChSl. \textit{eana} f. ‘lake’.

The foregoing discussion makes it clear that within the correspondences between Indic and Balto-Slavic we can distinguish two opposed pairs: (1) OInd. \textit{ap}– f. ‘water’ = OPrus. \textit{ape} f. ‘river’ and (2) OInd. \textit{vāpī}– f. ‘pond’ = OChSl. \textit{eana} f. ‘lake’.

There are two major discrepancies between the two lexical bunches. One concerns semantics and the other word-formation.

The original meaning of the first lexical bunch (e.g. OInd. \textit{ap}– f. ‘water’, OPrus. \textit{ape} f. ‘river’) was considered by English-speaking scholars, who concluded:

\begin{quote}
*\textit{h}eP- (the labial appears sometimes voiced, sometimes voiceless) is preserved as ‘river’ in a number of languages, more generally as ‘water’ in others [...] The combination of attested meanings suggests an original ‘living water’, i.e. ‘water on the move’ (Mallory – Adams 2006, 126).
\end{quote}

I definitely agree with their opinion that the original meaning of the archetype *\textit{h}eP- should be reconstructed as ‘flowing water, water on the move’.

The other lexical bunch including among others OInd. \textit{vāpī}– f. ‘pond’ and OChSl. \textit{eana} f. ‘lake’ had the meaning of ‘body of water, reservoir’. The researchers reconstruct the proto-form *\textit{weh}p– ‘body of water’ (Mallory – Adams 2006, 127), assuming the presence of two phonemes that appear also in the Proto-Indo-European appellative *\textit{h}eP- (whence OInd. \textit{ap}–, OPrus. \textit{ape}) described above, namely the laryngeal (*\textit{h}) and the labial (*\textit{p}). It can be therefore assumed that the OInd. \textit{vāpī}– f. ‘pond’ and OChSl. \textit{eana} f. ‘lake’ represented an earlier complex word including the Proto-Indo-European root *\textit{h}eP– ‘water, river’. The initial element *\textit{ue}– (or rather *\textit{h}e\textit{ue}-) may be treated as a privative or pejorative particle, which we find in numerous Indo-European languages, e.g. in the Indic group (the prefix \textit{va}– in Old Indic is an allomorph of \textit{ava}-). Indeed, every pond or lake is a body of standing water unlike a river or stream and so the Indo-European could quite easily use the formation

\begin{quote}
Cf. e.g. OInd. \textit{va-gāha}– m. ‘bathing, ablution’ (for \textit{ava-gāha}-), also \textit{va-gāhya}– adj. ‘having bathed or dipped into or entered’ (Monier-Williams 1999, 911).
\end{quote}
‘NOT-flowing water, water NOT on the move’ for a pond or lake.

If we accept the above analysis of the Old Indic word vāpī- f. ‘pond’, which can be easily derived from the archetype *h₂ue-h₂p-ih₂ f. ‘pond, lake, endorheic body of water’, then OChSl. āana f. ‘lake’ should be analogically derived from an alternative proto-form *h₂ue-h₂p-eh₂ (f.) and be related to the Baltic appellative for ‘river’ (OPrus. ape ‘river’) on the basis of a similar opposition to the one found in the Indic lexicon.

The relations between related semantic groups that we distinguished in the paper can be presented in the form of table 1.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language(s)</th>
<th>SEMANTEME no. 1</th>
<th>SEMANTEME no. 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>‘water on the move, flowing water’ &gt; ‘watercourse’ &gt; ‘water, river’</td>
<td>‘standing water’ &gt; ‘body of standing water’ &gt; ‘pond, lake’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proto-Indo-European (Indo-Hittite)</td>
<td>*h₂ep- ‘flowing water, water on the move; watercourse’</td>
<td>*h₂ue-h₂p- ‘standing water; body of water’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indo-European</td>
<td>*ap- f. ‘water, river’</td>
<td>*u₂ap- f. ‘pond, lake’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anatolian</td>
<td>Hitt. ḫap- c. ‘river’</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indic</td>
<td>OInd. ap- f. ‘water’</td>
<td>OInd. vāpī- f. ‘pond’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baltic</td>
<td>OPrus. ape f. ‘river’</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slavic</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>OChSl. āana f. ‘lake’, Russ.-Ch Sl. éána f. ‘озеро, лужа’, OBulg. āana f. ‘езеро, локва’ (&lt; PSl. *vapa)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

8 The term *h₂ep- ‘water on the move, flowing water’, used as a compound second member, usually appears in the zero-grade *h₂p-, see e.g. OInd. anūpá- m. ‘marshy place’, OInd. dvīpá- ‘island, peninsula, sandbank’, pratīpa- adj. ‘against the stream’, hence ‘adverse, contrary, opposite’, nīpā- adj. ‘situated low, deep’, m. ‘the foot of a mountain’ (MAYRHOFER 1956, 74–75; MAYRHOFER 1992, 74–75; 81–82; NIL 2008: 316; BICHLMIEIER 2013: 60–62). This type of derivation seems archaic and unproductive. There are some compounds with a full grade or even a lengthened (vṛddhi) one, e.g. OInd. an-apa- adj. ‘destitute of water’ (MONIER-WILLIAMS 1999, 25), Avestan an-āpa- adj. ‘waterless’, also ‘desert’, MPers. anāp ‘vine without water’, NPers. nāb adj. ‘without water; pure, unmixed (of vine)’ (RASTORGUEVA – ÉDEL ‘MAN 2000, 313).
6. The Proto-Indo-European particle *h₂eue- (*h₂eu-, *h₂ue-), its privative character and attestation in the Indo-European languages


The variant *u-e- (< PIE. *h₂ue-?) is found mostly in the Western Indo-European languages. For example, in Latin there is the prefix vē- (sometimes wrongly written down as vae-10), which retains a clear privative and pejorative meaning e.g. Lat. vē-cors adj. ‘reckless, stupid, mad’ (literally ‘not having a heart’) vs. Lat. cor, cordis n. ‘heart’; Lat. vē-grandis adj. ‘small, short, puny’ vs. Lat. grandis adj. ‘great, large’; Lat. vē-sanus adj. ‘insane’ vs. Lat. sanus adj. ‘healthy, sane’; Lat. vēscus adj. ‘malnourished’ vs. Lat. ēsca f. ‘food’ (Campos 1954, 41–48; Guiraud 1975, 80–87; Deroy 1983, 5–21; De Vaan 2008, 656–657). Sometimes the original meaning is lost as in Lat. vēscor (< ve- + ed- + -sk-o-r) ‘feed’ (originally ‘start to eat too little’) vs. Lat edō ‘eat’.

The prefix *ye- with a dominant privative meaning can also be traced in Italic languages e.g. Umbr. ve-purus adj. abl. pl. ‘(offerings) not intended for burning / non igneis’ (Buck 1905, 234; Untermann 2000, 826, 839–840), as well as in Celtic. In Brithonic we find e.g. the Old Welsh adjective guichir, guichr ‘uncontrollable, quick-tempered / effrenus’, Welsh gwicir ‘courageous, valiant / tapfer’, which can

9 It is possible to interpret PIE. *h₂eu ‘away from’ (cf. Beekes 1995, 220) as “an endless locative” (a remark of an anonymous reviewer).

10 One poorly explained issue is the vowel length in the Latin prefix vē- (while Celtic languages have vē-). Pokorny suggests a transfer of long vowel from Latin forms like vēscor, vēscus, where the short vowel of the prefix vē- contracted with the short vowel of the verb ēdō ‘eat’ (< PIE. *h₂ed-). The problem requires further in-depth investigation. De Vaan’s derivation (2008, 656–657) from the alleged form *s(w)ēd ‘per se’ > ‘away from’ is hardly possible phonologically. It is better to suggest after Niedermann (1899) that the lengthened vowel in the prefix vē- might be introduced on the basis of a model of Lat. vēhēmens > vēmens ‘who gets carried away’ > ‘mad’. In my opinion, Latin prefix vē- may represent PIE. *h₂uē or *h₂uēn, an instrumental sg. with the ending *-ē (or *-eh), e.g. Olnd. -ā, Avest. -ā, also -a, Myc. Gk. -ē, Phryg. -ā (e.g. NPhryg. ẓespa ‘by hand’ < *ghesr-ē instr. sg.).
be traced to the Celtic archetype *ūē-krid-s, which seems to correspond to Latin appellative vē-cors. The foregoing correspondence between Italic and Celtic allows us to reconstruct a potential Proto-Indo-European form *h₂uē-krid-s adj. ‘not having a heart’.

As it appears, the privative and pejorative particle *wē- was not confined to the languages in the West (Italo-Celtic, esp. Latin), but it was once present in much larger areas. We find residual cases of the particle also in the East (in Indo-Iranian), e.g. Old Indic (Sanskrit) has a rare preverb (prefix) va- co-existing with the basic variant ana- ‘off, away, down’ (see fn. 7).

The privative particle is also present in Greek e.g. ἵκστος adj. superlat. ‘slowest’ (< PIE. *h₂uē-h₂-k-istos), Gk. ἱκα adv. ‘slightly, a bit (of motion); gently; quietly; lightly’ vs. ὀκα adv. ‘fast, quickly’, cf. also Gk. ὀκός adj. ‘fast, quick’, OInd. āśū- adj. ‘fast’ (< PIE. *h₂o-h₂-kú-s) and OInd. ἱ- adv. ‘quickly, swiftly’ (< PIE. *h₂kú-s), OInd. aśva- m. ‘horse’ (< PIE. *h₂ekū-o-s m. ‘horse’, orig. ‘swift animal’). The particle in question has also left clear traces in Albanian, cf. Alb. vëshëtë adj. ‘difficult, hard’, which, according to renowned etymologists (MEYER 1891, 416; OREL 1998, 506), is derived from Alb. shtëtë adj. ‘weak’ with the addition of the prefix vë-.

It seems highly probable that the Balto-Slavic group had both variants of the prefix, that is *au- (< PIE. *h₂euy-) as well as *ve- (< PIE. *h₂uē-). In later development the prefixes could have transformed or fused with other elements as in OChSl. ʙaňa f. ‘lake / λίμνη, stagnum’. It seems that the privative and pejorative prefix *ve- (< PIE. *h₂uē-) can also be discerned in the Balto-Slavic name for ‘barrow, castrated male pig’, as discussed by Boryś in his etymological dictionary of Polish. The author claims: “on the basis of these words an uncertain Proto-Indo-European form *(u) ep(e)ro- ‘boar’, to which in Slavic (and Baltic) the suffix -o- would have been added (PSl. *veprь < *ēpr-ı̯ o-)” (BORYŚ 2005, 694). Indeed, among the Indo-European languages we notice cognate forms both with an initial *y- and without it (cf. BLAŽEK 2010, 85–94). It seems that this *y- (< *h₂u-) might represent a residual form of the particle *h₂euy-.

Below I include a table showing commonly known equivalents of the Slavic noun *veprь, providing in separate columns (1.) appellatives with the “prothesis” present and (2.) appellatives lacking the initial *u-. The quoted appellatives are accompanied by their basic meanings, registered in dictionaries. The comparison of the two lexical bunches is striking as we can see a fairly clear semantic opposition between the bunches (1.) and (2.). The words of the former refer to ‘NON-breeding male pig (young or castrated), barrow’, the words of the latter have the meaning

11 The initial phoneme *u- in the Baltic and Slavic term for ‘barrow’ appears a firm one. It may be hardly explained as a prothetic element (as e.g. Czech vejce, Slovak vaţce ‘egg’; Pol. jaje, jajo ‘id.’ < PSl. *oje < *h₂oijom, see SHEVELOV 1964, 243, 307) or a sandhi phenomenon. See also OIr. foir ‘barrow’ (< Celt. *wefris).
of ‘breeding male pig, wild boar’. It is then doubtless that the “prothesis” *u- has a privative meaning associated with it.

**Tab. 2: Terms for ‘barrow’ and ‘boar’ in the Indo-European languages**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Languages</th>
<th>1. Forms with *u-</th>
<th>2. Forms without *u-</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Baltic</td>
<td>Latv. vepris, vepris (m.) ‘barrow’; Lith. Samog. vèpris, vèprius (m.) ‘piglet’</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slavic</td>
<td>OChSl. вепрь, Pol. wieprz, Slovincian vjepř, Kash. v‘epř, Polabian vipěř ‘pig, male pig, castrated male pig’, USorb. wijapř, LSorb. (w)japś ‘young male pig, castrated male’, Cz. vepr ‘young pig’, Slovak vepor, veper ‘pig, wild pig’ &lt; Slavic *veprъ (m.) ‘barrow’, secondarily also ‘male wild pig, wild boar’ (Eastern and Southern)</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Celtic</td>
<td>OIr. for ‘barrow / kastrieter Eber, Borg’ (&lt; Celt. *wefris)</td>
<td>OIr. ner (m.) ‘breeding male pig, boar / Eber’ (&lt; Celt. *efros)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italic</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>Lat. aper (m.) ‘wild boar’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germanic</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>OE eofor ‘wild boar’, OHG ebur, Germ. Eber ‘wild boar’ (&lt; Germanic *eburaz)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paleo-Balkan</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>Thracian ἔβρος (m.) ‘billy-goat’ (&lt; *epros); probably also Gk. Aeol. ἐπέρος (m.) ‘ram’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indo-European</td>
<td>*ųepris, -iōs (m.) -i- or -iō- stem ‘NON-breeding male pig’</td>
<td>*epros (m.) -o- stem ‘breeding male pig’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>reconstruction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(traditional)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meaning (reconstructed on the basis of the lexical material)</td>
<td>‘barrow, castrated male pig’</td>
<td>‘wild boar; breeding male pig’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I would like to point to the great value of the Celtic material, which is often omitted or ignored in etymological research.

The Old Irish appellative ner ‘breeding male pig, boar / Eber’ (Pokorny 1959, 765) is usually derived from the Celtic archetype *nersos, and further from PIE. *h₃ner-
'man', thus assuming the original meaning 'male'. There is, however, a possibility that the initial n- was introduced to the word through a false decomposition (OIr. *ner < *n- *er < Celt. Goid. *ton efron acc. sg. < IE. *tom eprom acc. sg. < IE. *euros). In that case OIr. *ner could be linked to the Celtic proto-form *efros m. ‘wild boar, breeding male pig’ (< IE. *euros), which etymologically corresponds to both Lat. aper and Germ. Eber.

In a semantic and morphological opposition to the previous word (OIr. *ner ‘boar / Eber’) we find the Old Irish term *foir ‘castrated male pig, barrow / kastrierter Eber, Borg’, which derives from Celt. *wefris, and ultimately from IE. *wepris. OIr. *ner and *foir differ in three important ways: firstly, OIr. *ner does not show the presence of initial *u-; secondly, it has an -o- stem; thirdly, it refers to ‘breeding male pig, boar’. All the three features are also found in the Italic (e.g. Lat. aper) and Germanic (Germ. Eber) terminology.

On the other hand, the Old Irish appellative *foir possesses three different features: firstly, the word has an initial *u-; secondly, it has an -i- stem; thirdly, it means ‘castrated male pig’. It is plain that these three features are shared with the Baltic and Slavic terms (*v-; -i/o-stem; identical meaning).

If the etymological analysis of the two Old Irish appellatives is correct, one should assume that the simple form (without *u-) refers to a breeding male (cf. OIr. *ner < Celt. *efros) while the form with an initial *u- refers to a castrated male (cf. OIr. *foir < Celt. *wefris) that is NON-breeding. Thus, the Goidelic Celtic language, like Balto-Slavic, demonstrates residues of the privative particle *h₂ue-.

7. Conclusions

The Old Indic opposition (both in semantics and in word-formation) observed between the appellatives *ap- ‘water’ and *vāp-ī- f. ‘pond, body of water’ seems to correspond to the opposition of OPrus. *ape f. ‘river’ and PSl. *vapa f. ‘lake’. The correspondences between Indic and Balto-Slavic are striking enough to allow one to guess that the mutual relations go back to two separate though related archetypes: (1) PIE. *h₂ep- f. ‘river, water, any flowing water’ (whence after the loss the laryngeal *ap-) and (2) PIE. *h₂ue-h₂ep- (or *h₂ue-h₂ep) f. ‘pond, lake, any standing water’ (whence after the loss of the laryngeals *uāp-). The former archetype meaning ‘water on the move’ (MALLORY – ADAMS 2006, 126) was, in my opinion, the basis for the latter form, which was created through an addition of the privative particle *h₂ue-. Thus, the archetype *h₂ue-h₂ep- (or *h₂ue-h₂ep) originally meant ‘stagnant, standing water’ and already in Indo-European times started to mean ‘pond, lake, body of water’ (MALLORY – ADAMS 2006, 126).
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