Witczak, Krzysztof Tomasz

Flowing and stagnant water in Indo-European

Krzysztof Tomasz Witczak

FLOWING AND STAGNANT WATER IN INDO-EUROPEAN

Abstract

It is suggested that PIE. *$h_2$we-h_2p- f. 'pond, tank, pool, lake', orig. 'a reservoir of stagnant water' (hence Old Indic vāpī- f. 'any pond; an oblong reservoir of water, tank, pool, lake', Pali vāpi- f. 'pond'; Prakrit vāvī- f. 'pond'; Old Church Slavic вапа f. 'lake', Ukrainian вáпа f. 'standing water; boggy place'; Slovenian vápa f. 'puddle') represents a compound containing the Proto-Indo-European privative particle (prefix) *$h_2$we- 'away, not' and the term *$h_2$ep- '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).

Keywords

Indo-European; etymology; word-formation; hydrographic terminology.

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. вапа f. 'lake / λίμνη, stagnum' (Miklosich 1862–1865, 56), Russ.-ChSl. вáпа f. 'озеро, лужа' (Vasmer 1986, 272), Ukr. вáпа f. 'a place with standing water; a boggy place' (Mel'ničuk 1982, 329); OBulg. вапа f. 'езеро, локва', Bulg. dial. (Smoljansko) вапа 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 вáпа 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. вáпа (and вáпь) f. 'colour' from a Greek source (cf. Gk. βαφή

f. 'hardening of hot iron in water; dyeing; enameling), or negated the hypothesis of borrowing[1].

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[2], 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 *u̯āpā f. 'standing water / stehendes Wasser', and at the same time considers it definitely separate from the Balto-Slavic (or actually Baltic) archetype *api̯ā, *upi̯ā f. 'river / Fluß' (TRAUTMANN 1923, 11). POKORNY (1959, 1149) in the entry *u̯ep- ~ *u̯ŏp- ~ *up- 'water / Wasser' reconstructs the Indo-European archetype *u̯ōpā for the OChSl. appellative *в́апа* f. 'lake / See'. The identical proto-form *u̯ōpā is also proposed by other researchers (DELAMARRE 1984, 193; ZAIMOV 2012, 184), whereas MANN (1984–1987, 1493) suggests the Indo-European archetype *u̯āpā 'pond, marsh'. REJZEK (2001, 699) and BORYŚ (2005, 677) point to the Indo-European root *u̯ep- '(standing) water, marsh'. Pokorny considers the following to be cognate: OInd. *vāpī-* 'oblong pond / länglicher Teich', Lith. *ùpė* 'river / Fluß', OPrus. *wupyan* 'cloud / Wolke' as well as Hitt. *u̯appu-* '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_xp- 'body of water', where the symbol *w* represents [u̯], and the grapheme h_x represents a laryngeal consonant with unclear colouring, possibly h_2 or h_3. The two researchers (possibly following J. Pokorny) add Hitt. *wappu-* 'wadi, riverbank' and Lith. *ùpė* f. 'river' to the Slavic and Indic material.

---

1   Many etymologists considered OChSl. and ORuss. *в́ана*, *в́анъ* f. 'colour' to be a loanword from Greek (e.g. MIKLOSICH 1862–1865, 56; MACHEK 1957, 555; PREOBRAŽENSKIJ 1958, 64–65). More recently, more and more linguists believe the term (< PSl. *vapъ, *vapa), as well as the word for 'lime' (PSl. *vapьno) to be native (e.g. VASMER 1986, 272; GLUHAK 1993, 662; REJZEK 2001, 699; BORYŚ 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:

a. Indic, cf. OInd. *ap-* 'aqua' and *vāpī́-* 'lacus' (Miklosich 1862–1865, 56); OInd. *vāpī́-* f. 'oblong pond' (Trautmann 1923, 42; Pokorny 1959, 1149; Mayrhofer 1976, 188; Delamarre 1984, 193; Mann 1984–1987, 1493; Vasmer 1986, 272; Boryś 2005, 677; Mallory – Adams 2006, 127);

b. Baltic, cf. OPrus. *ape* f. 'river', Lith. *ùpė* f., Latv. *upe* f. 'id.' (Miklosich 1862–1865, 56; Vasmer 1986, 272; Delamarre 1984, 193; Boryś 2005, 677; Mallory – Adams 2006, 127); OPrus. *wupyan* 'cloud' (Pokorny 1959, 1149);

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

d. Anatolian, cf. Hitt. *u̯appu-* 'riverbank, wadi' (Pokorny 1959, 1149; Mayrhofer 1976, 188 [with the question mark]; Delamarre 1984, 193; Mallory – Adams 2006, 127);

e. Iranian, cf. Avest. *vafra-* 'snow' (not without doubts: Vasmer 1986, 272).

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 **u̯*, 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. *vāpī́-* f. 'pond' etc.), which not only has a long vowel in the root, but also the initial consonant **u̯*. 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. *vāp-* 'pond'). Thus, I firmly believe that the putative cognates starting with *u̯-* 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. *ѥana*. 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 *u̯ep- '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. *u̯appu-* c. 'riverbank' as a putative cognate of OChSl. *ɞana* f. 'lake' seems very dubious because the preferred reconstruction *we-h$_x$p- 'body of water' assumes a laryngeal *h$_2$ or *h$_3$ (the consonant *h$_1$ giving *ē-colouring to the preceding vowel is impossible in the light of both Slavic and Hittite data). Since the other laryngeals (*h$_2$ and *h$_3$) are rendered in script as *ḫ*, assuming the regularity of sound correspondences one would expect to have the notation **u̯aḫpu-*, and not *u̯appu-*. The author of the newest etymological dictionary of Hittite A. Kloeckhorst does not mention the traditional explanation and firmly asserts that the Hitt. *u̯appu-* 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 *u̯ep- '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. *ùpė* 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. *h$_2$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. *pib- < PIE. *pi-ph$_3$- < *peh$_3$- 'drink'.

While OPrus. *ape* can be easily derived from the proto-form *h$_2$ep- f. (or *h$_2$op-) '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. *ḫa-pa-a*, *ḫa-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 Yatvingian[4], should be explained by phonetic phenomena internal to the Baltic group, probably a sound process analogical to Cowgill's law[5].

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 *vāvī-* f. 'pond'; Sindhi *vāī* f. 'well'; Punjabi *vã̄*, *bã̄* f. 'reservoir with steps down to water'; West Pahari *bae*, *bā* f. 'pond, spring', dial. *bau* f. 'spring'; Kumaoni *bāwalī-* f. 'covered well, reservoir'; Bihari *bāwlī-* 'large well'; Awadhi *bāvarī-* f. 'id.'; Hindi *bāwī-*, *bāī-* f. 'large well', also *bāulī-*, *bāurī-* 'id.', *bāuṛī-* f. 'well with steps'; Marathi *bāuḍī-* f. 'id.'; Gujarati *vāv* f. 'large well with steps', dimin. *vāvṛī* f. 'small well'; OSinhala *vapi*, *vavi*, (6th cent.) *veva*, (10th cent.) *vã̄*, Sinhala *väv-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. *vāpī-*. The correspondence between Indic and Slavic is unquestionable[6] 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. *vėpė* '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. **ŏ* turns in Greek into **ŭ* between a labial and a sonant (liquid or nasal) e.g. IE. **bhóli̯om* n. 'leaf' > Gk. φύλλον n. 'leaf', Lat. *fŏlium* 'id.'; IE. **mŏlā* f. 'tool for grinding' > Gk. μύλη f. 'quern; millstone', Lat. *mŏla* 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. *wāpī*, 'pond', similar by coincidence only".

by the same token to understand the structure and origin of OChSl. *ɛana* f. 'lake'.

5. Are the Old Indic *ap-* 'water' and *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. *ap-* f. 'water' and *vāpī-* f. 'pond' may help establish a correct relation between OPrus. *ape* f. 'river' and OChSl. *ɛana* 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. *ap-* f. 'water' = OPrus. *ape* f. 'river' and (2) OInd. *vāpí-* f. 'pond' = OChSl. *ɛana* 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. *ap-* f. 'water', OPrus. *ape* f. 'river') was considered by English-speaking scholars, who concluded:

> *h_2eP-* (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).

I definitely agree with their opinion that the original meaning of the archetype *$h_2$ep-* should be reconstructed as 'flowing water, water on the move'.

The other lexical bunch including among others OInd. *vāpí-* f. 'pond' and OChSl. *ɛana* f. 'lake' had the meaning of 'body of water, reservoir'. The researchers reconstruct the proto-form *weh_xp-* 'body of water' (MALLORY – ADAMS 2006, 127), assuming the presence of two phonemes that appear also in the Proto-Indo-European appellative *$h_2$ep-* (whence OInd. *ap-*, OPrus. *ape*) described above, namely the laryngeal (*h) and the labial (*p). It can be therefore assumed that the OInd. *vāpí-* f. 'pond' and OChSl. *ɛana* f. 'lake' represented an earlier complex word including the Proto-Indo-European root *$h_2$ep-* 'water, river'. The initial element *$u̯e$-* (or rather *$h_2u̯e$-*) 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 *va-* in Old Indic is an allomorph of *ava-*[7]). 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

---

7   Cf. e.g. OInd. *va-gāha-* m. 'bathing, ablution' (for *ava-gāha-*), also *va-gāhya-* adj. 'having bathed or dipped into or entered' (MONIER-WILLIAMS 1999, 911).

h_2ue-h_2p- (or *h_2ue-h_2ep-*[8]) 'NOT-flowing water, water NOT on the move' for a pond or lake.

If we accept the above analysis of the Old Indic word *vāpí-* f. 'pond', which can be easily derived from the archetype *h_2ue-h_2p-ih_2* f. 'pond, lake, endorheic body of water', then OChSl. *вana* f. 'lake' should be analogically derived from an alternative proto-form *h_2ue-h_2p-eh_2* (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.

Tab. 1: *The semantic divergence of two related Indo-European terms*

Language(s)	SEMANTEME no. 1 'water on the move, flowing water' > 'watercourse' > 'water, river'	SEMANTEME no. 2 'standing water' > 'body of standing water' > 'pond, lake'
Proto-Indo-European (Indo-Hittite)	*h_2ep-* 'flowing water, water on the move; watercourse'	*h_2ue-h_2p-* 'standing water; body of water'
Indo-European	*ap-* f. 'water, river'	*$u\bar{a}p$-* f. 'pond, lake'
Anatolian	Hitt. *ḫap-* c. 'river'	----
Indic	OInd. *ap-* f. 'water'	OInd. *vāpī-* f. 'pond'
Baltic	OPrus. *ape* f. 'river'	----
Slavic	----	OChSl. *вana* f. 'lake', Russ.-Ch.Sl. *вána* f. 'озеро, лужа', OBulg. *вana* f. 'езеро, локва' (< PSl. *$vapa$*)

---

8   The term *h_2ep-* 'water on the move, flowing water', used as a compound second member, usually appears in the zero-grade *-h_2p-*, see e.g. OInd. *anūpá-* m. 'marshy place', OInd. *dvīpá-* 'island, peninsula, sandbank', *pratīpá-* adj. 'against the stream', hence 'adverse, contrary, opposite', *nīpa-* adj. 'situated low, deep', m. 'the foot of a mountain' (Mayrhofer 1956, 74–75; Mayrhofer 1992, 74–75; 81–82; NIL 2008: 316; Bichlmeier 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 *$h_2eu̯e$- (*$h_2eu̯$-, *$h_2u̯e$-), its privative character and attestation in the Indo-European languages

The Proto-Indo-European particle *$h_2eu̯e$- (attested as a preverb *ava*- in the Indo-Iranian group, cf. Hettrich – Casaretto – Schneider 2004 [2011], 84–125) has two shortened variants in other Indo-European languages *$h_2eu̯$- (whence after the loss of the laryngeal IE. *au*-) and *$h_2u̯e$- (whence after the loss of the laryngeal IE. *u̯e*-), cf. Brugmann (1911, 809–810); Pokorny (1959, 72–73); Mayrhofer (1992, 129); Rastorgueva – Édel'man (2000, 280–281); Blažek (2001, 19–20).

The Indo-European particle (later a prefix) *au*- (< PIE. *$h_2eu̯$-[9]) is mainly attested in the languages of Western and Central Europe cf. Lat. *au-ferō* 'lift, take off, withdraw', *au-fugiō* 'run away, escape', OChSl. *u-běžǫ* 'aufugio', Pol. *u-nosić* 'lift', *u-ciec* 'escape', OPrus. *au-mūsnan* 'washing', *au-lāut* 'die'. Quite often the particle keeps the privative meaning cf. PSl. *u-bogъ* adj. 'poor, deprived of wealth' vs. *bogatъ* adj. 'rich, wealthy'; OIr. *úalib* adj. 'tireless, incessant / rastlos' (< Celt. *au-libos); Latv. *au-manis* 'ridiculous, senseless / unsinnig' vs. PIE. *men*- 'think' (Pokorny 1959, 72).

The variant *u̯e*- (< PIE. *$h_2u̯e$-) 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 *u̯e*- 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 ignis' (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 *gwichr* 'courageous, valiant / tapfer', which can

---

9   It is possible to interpret PIE. *$h_2eu̯$ 'away from' (cf. Beekes 1995, 220) as "an endingless 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 *vĕ*-). Pokorny suggests a transfer of long vowel from Latin forms like *vēscor, vēscus*, where the short vowel of the prefix *vĕ*- contracted with the short vowel of the verb *ĕdō* 'eat' (< PIE. *h_1ed-). 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. *vĕhĕmēns > vēmēns* 'who gets carried away' > 'mad'. In my opinion, Latin prefix *vē*- may represent PIE. *$h_2u̯ē$ or *h_2ueh_1, an instrumental sg. with the ending *-ē (or *-eh_1), e.g. OInd. -ā, Avest. -ā, also -a, Myc. Gk. -e, Phryg. -ā (e.g. NPhryg. ζειρα 'by hand' < *ĝhesr-ē instr. sg.).

14

be traced to the Celtic archetype *$\mu\breve{e}$-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 *$h_2\mu e$-ḱṛd-s* adj. 'not having a heart'.

As it appears, the privative and pejorative particle *$w\breve{e}$-* 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 *ava-* 'off, away, down' (see fn. 7).

The privative particle is also present in Greek e.g. ἥκιστος adj. superlat. 'slowest' (< PIE. *$h_2\mu e$-h_1ḱ-istos*) vs. ὤκιστος adj. superlat. 'fastest' (< PIE. *h_3o-h_1ḱ-istos*), Gk. ἧκα adv. 'slightly, a bit (of motion); gently; quietly; lightly' vs. ὧκα adv. 'fast, quickly', cf. also Gk. ὠκύς adj. 'fast, quick', OInd. *āśú-* adj. 'fast' (< PIE. *h_3o-h_1ḱú-s*) and OInd. *śu-* adv. 'quickly, swiftly' (< PIE. *h_1ḱú-s*), OInd. *aśva-* m. 'horse' (< PIE. *$h_1eḱ\mu$-o-s* m. 'horse', orig. 'swift animal'). The particle in question has also left clear traces in Albanian, cf. Alb. *vështirë* adj. 'difficult, hard', which, according to renowned etymologists (Meyer 1891, 416; Orel 1998, 506), is derived from Alb. *shtirë* 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. *$h_2e\mu$-*) as well as *ve-* (< PIE. *$h_2\mu e$-*). In later development the prefixes could have transformed or fused with other elements as in OChSl. *ɛana* f. 'lake / λίμνη, stagnum'. It seems that the privative and pejorative prefix *ve-* (< PIE. *$h_2\mu e$-*) 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 *(μ)ep(e)ro-* 'boar', to which in Slavic (and Baltic) the suffix *-io-* would have been added (PSl. *veprь* < *μepr-io-*)" (Boryś 2005, 694). Indeed, among the Indo-European languages we notice cognate forms both with an initial *μ-* and without it (cf. Blažek 2010, 85–94)[11]. It seems that this *μ-* (< *$h_2\mu$-*) might represent a residual form of the particle *$h_2e\mu e$-*.

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 *μ-*. 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 *μ-* 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 *vajce* 'egg'; Pol. *jaje, jajo* 'id.' < PSl. *aje* < *$h_2\bar{o}\mu iom$*, 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" *u̯- has a privative meaning associated with it.

Tab. 2: Terms for 'barrow' and 'boar' in the Indo-European languages

Languages	1. Forms with *u̯-	2. Forms without *u̯-
Baltic	Latv. *vepris, veprs* (m.) 'barrow'; Lith. Samog. *vèpris, vèprius* (m.) 'piglet'	----
Slavic	OChSl. *вепрь*, Pol. *wieprz*, Slovincian *vjiepř*, Kash. *v'epř*, Polabian *vipěr* 'pig, male pig, castrated male pig', USorb. *wjapř*, LSorb. *(w)japś* 'young male pig, castrated male', Cz. *vepř* 'young pig', Slovak *vepor, veper* 'pig, wild pig' < Slavic **vepr'ъ* (m.) 'barrow', secondarily also 'male wild pig, wild boar' (Eastern and Southern)	----
Celtic	OIr. *foir* 'barrow / kastrierter Eber, Borg' (< Celt. **wefris*)	OIr. *ner* (m.) 'breeding male pig, boar / Eber' (< Celt. **efros*)
Italic	----	Lat. *aper* (m.) 'wild boar'
Germanic	----	OE *eofor* 'wild boar', OHG *ebur*, Germ. *Eber* 'wild boar' (< Germanic **eburaz*)
Paleo-Balkan	----	Thracian ἔβρος (m.) 'billy-goat' (< **epros*); probably also Gk. Aeol. ἔπερος (m.) 'ram'
Indo-European reconstruction (traditional)	**u̯epris, -ios* (m.) -*i*- or -*i̯o*- stem 'NON-breeding male pig'	**epros* (m.) -*o*- stem 'breeding male pig'
Meaning (reconstructed on the basis of the lexical material)	'barrow, castrated male pig'	'wild boar; breeding male pig'

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 **neros*, and further from PIE. **h₂ner-*

'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. **epros*). In that case OIr. *ner* could be linked to the Celtic proto-form **efros* m. 'wild boar, breeding male pig' (< IE. **epros*), 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 **u̯-*; 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 **u̯-*; 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/i̯o-* stem; identical meaning).

If the etymological analysis of the two Old Irish appellatives is correct, one should assume that the simple form (without **u̯-*) refers to a breeding male (cf. OIr. *ner* < Celt. **efros*) while the form with an initial **u̯-* 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 **h₂u̯e-*.

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. **h₂u̯e-h₂p-* (or **h₂u̯e-h₂ep-*) f. 'pond, lake, any standing water' (whence after the loss of the laryngeals **u̯āp-*). 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 **h₂u̯e-*. Thus, the archetype **h₂u̯e-h₂p-* (or **h₂u̯e-h₂ep-*) originally meant 'stagnant, standing water' and already in Indo-European times started to mean 'pond, lake, body of water' (Mallory – Adams 2006, 126).

REFERENCES

BEEKES, Robert P. S. 1995. *Comparative Indo-European Linguistics*. Amsterdam – Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company.

BICHLMEIER, Harald. 2013. Einige indogermanistische Anmerkungen zur mutmaßlichen Ableitungsgrundlage des Ortsnamens Leipzig: dem Flussnamen urgerm. *Lībō* bzw. dem Gebietsnamen urgerm. *Lībi̯a-* (mit einem Exkurs zum Namen der Rhön und einem Anhang mit weiteren Überlegungen zum Namen der Elbe). *Namenkundliche Informationen.* 101/102, 2013, pp. 49–75.

BLAŽEK, Václav. 2001. Indo-European Prepositions and Related Words. Internal Analysis and External Comparison. In: *Sborník Prací Filozofické fakulty brněské univerzity.* A 49, pp. 15–43.

BLAŽEK, Václav. 2010. Balto-Slavic *u̯epri̯o-* "boar". *Baltistica*. Vol. 45, № 1, s. 85–94.

BORYŚ, Wiesław. 2005. *Słownik etymologiczny języka polskiego*. Kraków: Wydawnictwo Literackie.

BRÜCKNER, Aleksander. 1927. *Słownik etymologiczny języka polskiego*. Kraków: Krakowska Spółka Wydawnicza (4th ed. in 1985 in Warszawa: Wiedza Powszechna).

BRUGMANN, Karl. 1911. *Grundriss der vergleichenden Grammatik der indogermanischen Sprachen*. B. II 2, Strassburg: Karl J. Trübner.

BUCK, von Carl D. 1905. *Elementarbuch der oskisch-umbrischen Dialekte*. Heidelberg: Carl Winter.

CAMPOS, Julio. 1954. "Vescus" y los compuestos de "vē-". *Helmantica*. 5, pp. 41–48.

DELAMARRE, Xavier. 1984. *Le vocabulaire indo-européen. Lexique étymologique thématique*. Paris: Librairie d'Amérique et d'Orient.

DEROY, Louis. 1983. Sur la valeur et origine du prefixe latin *vē-*. *L'Antiquité Classique.* 52, pp. 5–21.

GLUHAK, Alemko. 1993. *Hrvatski etimološki rječnik*. Zagreb: August Cesarec.

GUIRAUD, Charles. 1975. Les *mots latins a préfixe uē-*. *Revue des études anciennes.* 77, pp. 80–87.

HETTRICH, Heinrich – CASARETTO, Antje – SCHNEIDER, Carolin. 2004 [publ. 2011]. Syntax und Wortarten der Lokalpartikeln im R̥gveda IV. *Münchener Studien zur Sprachwissenschaft.* 64, pp. 17–130.

KLOEKHORST, Alwin. 2008. *Etymological Dictionary of the Hittite Inherited Lexicon*. Leiden-Boston: Brill.

MACHEK, Václav. 1957. *Etymologický slovník jazyka českého a slovenského*. Praha: Nakladatelství Československé Akademie Věd.

MALLORY, James P. – ADAMS, Douglas Q. 2006. *The Oxford Introduction to Proto-Indo-European and the Proto-Indo-European World*. New York: Oxford University Press.

MANN, Stuart E. 1984–1987. *An Indo-European Comparative Dictionary*. Hamburg: Helmut Buske Verlag.

MAYRHOFER, Manfred. 1956. *Kurzgefaßtes etymologisches Wörterbuch des Altindischen*. B. I (A–TH). Heidelberg: Carl Winter.

MAYRHOFER, Manfred. 1976. *Kurzgefaßtes etymologisches Wörterbuch des Altindischen*. B. III (Y–H. Nachträge und Berichtigungen). Heidelberg: Carl Winter.

MAYRHOFER, Manfred. 1992. *Etymologisches Wörterbuch des Altindoarischen*. B. I. Heidelberg: Carl Winter.

MAYRHOFER, Manfred. 1997. *Etymologisches Wörterbuch des Altindoarischen*. B. II. Heidelberg: Carl Winter.

MAYRHOFER, Manfred. 2001. *Etymologisches Wörterbuch des Altindoarischen*. B. III. Heidelberg: Carl Winter.

MEL'NIČUK, Oleksandr S., ed. 1982. *Étimologičnyj slovnyk ukrajins'koj movi*. T. I. (A–G). Kyjiv: Naukova Dumka.

MEYER, Gustav. 1891. *Etymologisches Wörterbuch der albanesischen Sprache*. Strassburg: Karl J. Trübner (reprinted in 1982 in Leipzig: Zentralantiquariat der DDR).

MIKLOSICH, Franz. 1862–1865. *Lexicon Palaeoslovenico-Graeco-Latinum*. Vindobonae: Guilelmus Braumueller.

MONIER-WILLIAMS, Monier. 1999. *A Sanskrit-English Dictionary*. Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass Publishers.

NIEDERMANN, Max. 1899. Studien zur Geschichte der lateinischen Wortbildung. *Indogermanische Forschungen*. 10, pp. 221–258.

NIL 2008 = WODTKO, Dagmar S. – IRSLINGER, Britta. – SCHNEIDER, Carolin. 2008. *Nomina im indogermanischen Lexikon*. Heidelberg: Carl Winter.

PETERSSON, Herbert. 1918. *Baltische und slavische Wortstudien*. Lund: C.W.K. Gleerup.

POKORNY, Julius. 1959. *Indogermanisches etymologisches Wörterbuch*. Bern-München: Francke Verlag.

PREOBRAŽENSKIJ, Aleksandr G. 1958. *Étimologičeskij slovar' russkogo jazyka*. Moskva: Gosudarstvennoje Izdatel'stvo Inostrannyx i Nacional'nyx Slovarej.

RASTORGUEVA, Vera S. – ÉDEL'MAN, Džoj I. 2000. *Étimologičeskij slovar' iranskix jazykov*. T. I. Moskva: Vostočnaja Literatura.

REJZEK, Jiří. 2001. *Český etymologický slovník*. Praha-Brno: Leda.

SMOCZYŃSKI, Wojciech. 2007. *Słownik etymologiczny języka litewskiego*. Wilno: UNiwersytet Wileński.

TRAUTMANN, Reinhold. 1923. *Baltisch-Slavisches Wörterbuch*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.

TURNER, Ralph L. 1966. *A Comparative Dictionary of the Indo-Aryan Languages*. London-New York-Toronto: Oxford University Press.

UNTERMANN, Jürgen. 2000. *Wörterbuch des Oskisch-Umbrischen*. Heidelberg: Winter.

VANN, Michiel de. 2008. *Etymological Dictionary of Latin and the Other Italic Languages*. Leiden–Boston: Brill.

VASMER, Maks. 1986. *Étimologičeskij slovar' russkogo jazyka*. T. I (A–D). Moskva: „Progress".

ZAIMOV, Jordan. 2012. *B"lgarski vodopis. Geografsko opisanie, stroež i proizxod na imenata*. T. I (A–J). Sofija: Faber.

ZINKEVIČIUS, Zigmas. 1992. A Polish-Yatvingian Vocabulary? In: BAŃCZEROWSKI, J., MAJEWICZ, A. F., STEFAŃSKI, W., eds. *Linguistic and Oriental Studies from Poznań*. Vol. 1. Poznań: Wydawnictwo UAM, pp. 99–133.

Krzysztof Tomasz Witczak

University of Łódź

Faculty of Philology

Dept. of Linguistics and Latin Studies

ul. Pomorska 171/173

PL-90-236 Łódź, Poland

ktw@uni.lodz.pl

krzysztof.tomasz.witczak@gmail.com