LEGE ARTIS

Language yesterday, today, tomorrow

Vol. VI. No 1 2021

SLAVIC AND GERMANIC REFLEXES OF PROTO-INDO-EUROPEAN ROOT *H_2UEH_1- 'WIND': A COMPARATIVE STUDY

Mikołaj Rychło*

Faculty of Languages, University of Gdansk, Poland

Bibliographic description: Rychło, M. (2021). Slavic and Germanic reflexes of Proto-Indo-European root *h_2ueh_1- 'wind': A comparative study. In *Lege artis. Language yesterday, today, tomorrow. The journal of University of SS Cyril and Methodius in Trnava*. Trnava: University of SS Cyril and Methodius in Trnava, 2021, VI (1), June 2021, p. 190-232. ISSN 2453-8035

Abstract: The aim of this paper is twofold: firstly, to clarify the morphological and phonological differences between Slavic **větrъ* and Germanic **windaz* (and their Polish and English reflexes); secondly, to explain their origin. In addition to outlining and comparing the strong and weak points of the etymologies offered so far, the article presents new arguments supporting the deducibility of **větrъ* from **vět-*, substantiated by the Kajkavian *zavet* / *zavetje* 'place sheltered from wind'.

Key words: etymology, Polish-English cognates, Slavic-Germanic cognates, diachronic word-formation, sound changes, Proto-Indo-European, Proto-Slavic, Proto-Germanic.

1. Introduction

The present paper investigates the etymology of Proto-Slavic (PSl.) **větrъ* and Proto-Germanic (PGmc) **windaz* and compares their evolution into modern Polish *wiatr* and modern English *wind.* The relationship between these Slavic and Germanic words is not clear. Are they cognates? Which morphological material can be considered inherited and which reflects distinct word formation processes? What morphological and phonological changes did the words undergo? What is their etymology? These are the main questions of the research in this article.

* I feel indebted to Prof. Krzysztof Tomasz Witczak and two anonymous reviewers for their insightful comments. Thanks are also due to Penny Shefton for proofreading the whole paper and to Tadeusz Z. Wolański for proofreading an earlier version of this article. For all the errors that still remain I alone am responsible.

The current paper is part of a bigger project which concentrates on the Indo-European heritage in modern Polish and English. Since the etymology of the words under scrutiny can be traced back to the period ancestral to the formation of individual Slavic and Germanic languages, it should work for both Polish and other Slavic languages, and likewise, not only for English, but also for other Germanic languages. Therefore, an attempt has been made to present the problem and the solution in the broader context: first of all, to clarify the Slavic etymology and the Germanic one (though this one is less controversial), and secondly, to move further back in time to inspect the common Proto-Indo-European legacy. Nevertheless, in order to account for the differences between Polish *wiatr* and English *wind*, some of the sound changes investigated are those which occurred only in the histories of these individual languages.

Section 2 introduces the material and methodology. The scope of the research includes reflexes of the PIE root *$*h_2u̯eh_1$-, which are presented in individual Indo-European languages. Section 3 analyses the origin of the Germanic and Slavic reflexes of the PIE root *$*h_2u̯eh_1$- from a morphological perspective. Since the structure of the Germanic words is relatively straightforward, the greatest challenge in this research is the Slavic etymology. The section offers an evaluation of a number of hypotheses with regard to the original word-formation processes behind the Proto-Slavic **větrъ*. Section 4 focuses on the sound changes responsible for the difference in the shape of the root between English *wind* and Polish *wiatr*. Among the problems raised here is the question of why all Germanic cognates point to the vowel **i* (which developed from **e*), whereas, outside Germanic languages, we find the evidence for long **ē*. Section 5 presents the conclusion by outlining the development of the words for 'wind' in two descending lines: the "Slavic" one leading from Proto-Indo-European to modern Polish, and the "Germanic" one leading from Proto-Indo-European to modern English.

 ISSN 2453-8035

2. Material and methodology

The following section concentrates on the material, i.e. the attestations of the analysed words in individual languages, and on the methodology. After a brief juxtaposition of the representative cognates for the derivational base, i.e. the verb meaning 'to blow' (in Section 2.1), PGmc **windaz* will be supported with cognates in various Germanic languages (in Section 2.2); subsequently (in Section 2.3), the formation represented by PSl. **větrъ* will be similarly presented within the Baltic-Slavic context. Each of the subsections ends with a list of proto-forms accompanied by references. Section 2.4 outlines the methodology.

2.1 Evidence for the derivational base of PSl. *větrъ *and PGmc* *windaz

Polish *wiatr* as well as English *wind* can be shown to have developed from PSl. **větrъ* and PGmc **windaz*, respectively. They both can be analysed as nouns formed from the verb meaning 'to blow', which performed a motivating role for the derivatives. Therefore, the following section concentrates on the attestations of this verb.

Within Germanic, the verb in question is attested as in Gothic *waian*, Old English *wāwan*, Old Frisian *wāia*, Old High German *wāen* (Modern German *wehen*). Kroonen (2013: 576) reconstructs Proto-Germanic **wēan-* and Proto-Indo-European **$h_2$uéh$_1$-e-*.

Within Slavic, apart from Polish *wiać* '(of wind) to blow', the word is also attested in OCS *vějati* '(of wind) to blow', 1sg. *vějǫ*; Russian *véjat'* (*вéять*) 'to winnow, (of wind) to blow', 1sg. *véju*; Ukrainian *víjaty* (*вíяти*); Old Czech *váti* '(of wind) to blow', 1sg. *věju*; *vieti*, 1sg. *věju*; Czech *váti* '(of wind) to blow', 1sg. *věji*; Slovak *viat'* '(of wind) to blow'; Serbo-Croatian *vȉjati* 'to winnow, to fall heavily (of snow)', 1sg. *vȉjēm' vȉjēm'* (based on the Čakavian dialects: Vrgada and Orbanići); Slovene *vẹ́ti* '(of wind) to blow, to winnow', 1sg. *vẹ̑jem*; *vẹ̑jati* 'to winnow, (of wind) to blow', 1sg. *vẹ̑jam*, 1sg. *vẹ̑jem*; Bulgarian *véja* '(of wind) to blow, to blow away, to winnow' – cf. Derksen (2008: 519) and Vasmer (1955: 196). On the basis of these forms, the reconstructed Proto-Slavic etymon is **vějati*.

 ISSN 2453-8035

Outside Slavic, the next branch to look for the cognates is Baltic. Even if there are some doubts as to whether the Balto-Slavic should be understood as a common ancestor (i.e. a common period in the development of Slavic and Baltic languages), of all Indo-European branches, no other branch can be considered more closely related. The evidence of the cognates in the Baltic languages is rarely mentioned, but cf. Smoczyński (2020: 1965, s.v. *vétra*) and Derksen (2015: 499), who distinguish Lithuanian *vė́ti, vė́ja, vė́jo* with two meanings: 'to blow' in Old Lithuanian and 'to winnow' in dialects of Lithuanian. Smoczyński (2020: 1965, s.v. *vétra*) and Derksen (2008: 519, 2015: 499) are unanimous in reconstructing Proto-Indo-European *$*h_2\underset{\smile}{u}eh_1$-*.

The cognates outside Germanic and Balto-Slavic include: Vedic *vā́ti*, Homeric Greek ἄησι [áɛ:si] (from Proto-Indo-European *$*h_2we\acute{h}_1ti$ – cf. Ringe 2006: 191), Avestan (Young) *vāiti* (all of them in the sense of 'blows' 3sg.). Kroonen (2013: 576) also adduces Hittite *$ḫu\underset{\smile}{u}āi$ ~ $ḫu\underset{\smile}{i}anzi$* 'to run, to hurry', for which he reconstructs *$*h_2uh_1$-*ói-ei-*, *$*h_2uh_1$-*énti-*. According to Mann (1984/87: 1506), the late Indo-European ancestor of these words may be reconstructed as *$*\underset{\smile}{u}\bar{e}\underset{\smile}{i}ō$ (*$\underset{\smile}{u}ēmi$*, *$'\underset{\smile}{u}ēmi$*).

2.2 Evidence for the participial formation of *h_2u$\acute{e}h_1$-ent-o-s

In the Germanic languages, the word in question has very similar forms: Gothic *winds*, Old Norse *vindr*, Old English *wind*, Old Frisian *wind*, Old Saxon *wind*, Dutch *wind*, Old High German *wint*, and German *Wind*. Consequently, the Proto-Germanic **winda-* does not seem surprising (cf. Kroonen 2013: 587, who also reconstructs IE *$*h_2u\acute{e}h_1$-ent-o-*), although Orel (2003: 454) deduces **wenđaz* assuming that the change *$*e > *i$* must have occurred later than the reconstructed stage.

Outside Germanic, the cognates can be found in Hittite *$hu\underset{\smile}{u}ant$-* (< *$*h_2uh_1$-ent-*), Tocharian A *want, wänt*, Tocharian B *yente*, Latin *ventus* Old Irish *fet* (cf. Matasović 2009: 423), in some sources spelled as *feth* (e.g., Kroonen 2013: 584), and Welsh *gwynt* 'wind' < **wento-* < *wēnto* < *$*h_2ueh_1$-(e)nt-o-*. According to Kroonen (2013: 587), Vedic *vā́ta-*, and Avestan (Old and Young) *vāta-* 'wind' point to *$*h_2ueh_1$-nt-o-*, whereas

 ISSN 2453-8035

Mann (1984/87: 1531), on the basis of the Indo-Iranian cognates as well as the Greek ones, posits **u̯ētos, ā, is* (*'u̯ētos*) 'wind, air, breeze' as a distinct entry.

De Vaan (2008: 662) reconstructs the following paradigm: nom. sg. **h₂ueh₁-nt-s*, acc. sg. **h₂uh₁-ent-m*, gen. sg. **h₂uh₁-nt-os*, and accounts the development from PIE **h₂uh₁-ent-o-*, which first yielded pre-Italic **u̯ēnto-*, and subsequently Osthoff's shortening would produce **wento-*.

The reconstructions of the Proto-Indo-European form and meaning, available in Pokorny (2002[1959]: 81-84), Mann (1984/87: 1515, 1531), Mallory and Adams (2006: 128-129), Watkins (2011: 98), Kroonen (2013: 587), and Ringe (2006: 77, 149) have the following shapes:

(1)

Pokorny:	IE **au̯(ē)-*, **au̯ē(i)-*, **u̯ē-*, Partiz. **u̯ē-nt-*
Mann:	IE **u̯ĕ̆ntos* (*'u̯ĕ̆ntos*) 'blow, blowing, wind, gust'
Mallory and Adams:	PIE **h₂weh₁-nt-* 'wind'
Watkins:	IE **wē-nt-o-* < **h₂weh₁-* (Germanic **windaz*)
Kroonen:	PIE **h₂uéh₁-ent-o-*
Ringe:	post-PIE **h₂weh₁n̥tós*

Some of the differences are due to the variety of conventions (e.g., **u̯* or **w*), others result from acceptance or rejection of laryngeals. Both approaches can be reconciled assuming there are two stages: the earlier, which takes advantage of the evidence from Hittite: Proto-Indo-European **h₂u̯eh₁-*, and the later, Indo-European **u̯ē-*.

2.3 Evidence for the derivatives containing *h₂u̯eh₁- *and* -tr-

The word is attested in Old Church Slavonic as well as Old Russian *větrъ* (*вѣтръ*), Russian *véter* (*ве́тер*, gen. sg. *ве́тра*), Ukrainian *víter* (*вітер*), Czech *vítr*, Slovak *vietor*, Polish *wiatr*, Upper Sorbian *wětr*, Lower Sorbian *wjetš*, Slovincian[1] *vjãtěr*,

 ISSN 2453-8035

Serbo-Croatian *vjȅtar* (*вjȅмар*) gen. sg. *vjȅtra*, Slovene *vêter*, Bulgarian *vjátăr* (*вя́тър*) (cf. Derksen 2008: 520; Vasmer 1955: 194).

Further evidence supporting the formation with *tr* comes from Baltic: Lithuanian *vė́tra* f. 'storm', (*vė́jas* 'wind'), Latvian *vę̃tra* f. 'storm', and Old Prussian *wetro* f. 'wind' (Mažiulis 1997: 233). These Slavic and Baltic formations containing *tr* have been compared with the Germanic word **weþra-* ~ **wedra-* n. 'weather' (Old Norse *veðr* n., Old English *weder*, Old High German *wetar*), which, for some etymologists, is a cognate (cf. Klein 1966: 1733-1734); for others, a parallel structure – cf. Smoczyński (2020: 1965, s.v. *vétra*). From the perspective of Germanic etymologists, the word for 'weather' can also be compared to the Slavic word for 'good weather', namely Proto-Slavic **vedro* (OCS *vedro*, Russian *vëdro* (obsolete, colloquial, dialectal), Czech *vedro* 'sweltering heat') – cf. Klein (1966: 1733-1734), Derksen (2008: 513), who reconstructs Proto-Indo-European **ued^{h}rom*, Kluge (2011: 985), Orel (2003: 452). Kroonen (2013: 583-584) reconstructs "a mobile neuter in Pre-Gm., viz. **uétr-om*, pl. **uetr-éh$_2$*," which in his opinion implies that "the received etymological link with OCS *vedro* n. 'clear sky' < **uedhro-* cannot be maintained." Likewise, the connection between the Germanic word for 'weather' and the Slavic word for 'wind' is "formally problematic as well, because the underlying form would give PGm. **wēþra-* (laryngeals are not lost before **CR-*)". Instead, the Germanic languages point to **weþra-* ~ **wedra-* n. 'weather' (Old Norse *veðr* n., Faroese *veður* n., Elfdalian *weðer* n., Old English *weder* n. > English *weather*, Old Frisian *weder* n., Old Saxon *wedar* n., Dutch *weer* n., Old High German *wetar* n., German *Wetter* n.). Although Kroonen (2013: 583) specifies the same meaning 'weather' for all these cognates, it is notable that the semantic characterization of Icelandic *veður* in Magnússon (1989: 1112) includes such notions as *illviðri* 'stormy weather' and *stormur* 'storm, strong gale (wind force 9)'.[2] Consequently, it is not only the morphological and phonological similarity, but also their semantic relatedness which raises the question of whether the connection is only coincidental. Mann (1984/87: 1532) also juxtaposes the Balto-Slavic forms with Greek *a-ḗsuros* 'airy, flimsy, agile', and Sanskrit *vātulaḥ*, *vātalaḥ* 'windy, airy'.

 ISSN 2453-8035

On the basis of the evidence provided above, etymological dictionaries offer the following Indo-European reconstructions:

(2)

Pokorny (2002[1959]: 83):	IE *$a\underset{\sim}{u}(\bar{e})$-, *$a\underset{\sim}{u}\bar{e}(i)$-, *$\underset{\sim}{u}\bar{e}$-, under *t*-Weiterbildungen
Boryś (2005: 687):	IE *$\underset{\sim}{u}\bar{e}$-*tro*-
Kroonen (2013: 584):	PIE *ueh_1-*tro*-[3]
Mann (1984/87: 1532):	IE *$\underset{\sim}{u}\bar{e}turos$ ($\underset{\sim}{u}\bar{e}tr$-, *'$\underset{\sim}{u}\bar{e}tur$-*) 'windy, wind'
Smoczyński (2020: 1965, s.v. *vétra*):	PIE *$h_2\underset{\sim}{u}eh_1$-*treh*$_2$- (Proto-Baltic *$\underset{\sim}{u}\bar{e}$-*trā*-)
Derksen (2015: 500):	PIE *h_2ueh_1-*tr*-*o*-

2.4 The methodology

The approach to contrastive analysis which has been adopted in the present paper aims at revealing the common inherited element in modern languages and, subsequently, at explaining the morphological, phonological and semantic changes which lead to the discrepancies between the form and/or meaning of those pairs of cognates under analysis. The notion of a common inherited element refers to a shared, archaic layer in a pair or group of modern languages which contains relics of a common ancestor language, i.e. Proto-Indo-European. Baltic and Slavic languages are attested relatively late – the earliest surviving language is Old Church Slavonic, which was standardized in the 860s by the Byzantine missionaries Saints Cyril and Methodius, who are credited with translating the Bible and other Ancient Greek ecclesiastical texts as part of the Christianization of the Slavs. The oldest extant texts appear over a century later (cf. Lunt 2001: 1-4). It is quite likely that there was another common ancestor language of (Balto-) Slavic and Germanic which was spoken later than Proto-Indo-European, but little is known of this language and, to the best knowledge of the present author, there have been no attempts at reconstructing it.

 ISSN 2453-8035

One of the basic notions referring to a lexical item which occurs in at least two genetically related languages can be shown to have developed from a common ancestor is that of the *cognate*. In other words, the term can also be defined as "one of two or more words or morphemes which are directly descended from a single ancestral form in the single common ancestor of the languages in which the words or morphemes are found, with no borrowing" (cf. Trask 2000: 62). Examples of cognates are Polish *pięść* vs English *fist*, Polish *trzoda* vs English *herd*, Polish *miód* 'honey' vs English *mead*, Polish *wełna* vs English *wool*, etc. For detailed analyses of these cognates, see Rychło (2012; 2013; 2018a).

All these examples can be labelled as exact cognates. Although this term is not found in Trask's *Dictionary of Historical and Comparative Linguistics* (2000), it can be seen as an expected opposite of what Trask defines as *partial cognates*: "Linguistic forms which contain morphological material that is narrowly cognate but at least some of which contain additional material not present in the others" (Trask 2000: 248). By contrast, *exact cognates* can be defined as: Linguistic forms which do not contain additional morphological material which is not cognate. Exact cognates can further be exemplified by the following pairs:

(3)
Polish *gęś* vs English *goose*
Polish *wełna* vs English *wool*
Polish *żywy* vs English *quick*
Polish *broda* vs English *beard*
Polish *gnieść* vs English *knead*
Polish *pełny* vs English *full*
Polish *syn* vs English *son*
Polish *złoto* vs English *gold*

 ISSN 2453-8035

Each of the pairs is descended from the same proto-form in the single ancestor language and does not reveal any traces of later word-formation processes. Some of the exact cognates may exhibit stem-formative adjustments characteristic of the word class, a shift in the stem-class, thematization, etc., but these belong to inflection and not to word-formation.

Partial cognates point to independent word-formation processes that often occurred in later daughter languages, for example:

(4)
Polish *gąska* vs English *gosling*
Polish *wełniany* vs English *woolly*
Polish *żywo* vs English *quickly*
Polish *bezbrody* vs English *beardless*
Polish *ugniatacz* vs English *kneader*
Polish *napełnić* vs English *fill*
Polish *synek* vs English *sonny*
Polish *pozłocić* vs English *gild*

As can be seen, these words with distinct word-formation patterns are not actually inherited, but they were derived in already differentiated languages. They only exhibit cognate roots. Many of them display distinct affixes and reflect independent word-formation processes, which occurred relatively recently. Sometimes one or more languages have lost exact cognate(s) and partial cognates are the only words which survive, for example: Polish *rżysko* 'stubble' preserves the obsolete word *reż* 'rye', which finds cognates in many Slavic and Germanic languages, e.g., Slovak *raž*, Russian *rožь* (*рожь*), English *rye* – cf. Rychło (2018b).

The present paper investigates the pair of cognates: Polish *wiatr* vs English *wind*, which can also be considered partial cognates since they share only the root while their

 ISSN 2453-8035

respective suffixes result from different word-formation processes. The methodology used in this comparative analysis includes the following research stages:

Stage 1 (assessment of the time of attestation) consists in confirming that the candidates for cognates have been attested in the compared languages since the earliest period in the recorded histories of both languages. In the case of the pair: Polish *wiatr* vs English *wind*, there is no doubt about it, but in other cases, there are sometimes pairs of words in compared languages which look alike, because one or both of them were borrowed at some point in history.

Stage 2 (assessment of the scope of attestation) attempts to determine the prehistory of the cognates at issue. Although there is no way of ascertaining the form of words before the time of their earliest attestation, it is possible to reconstruct the prehistoric words with some degree of probability. To this end, it is necessary to compare the corresponding words in the cognate languages starting from the most closely related ones. In the case of P *wiatr* vs E *wind*, in Sections 2.1–2.3, we have seen an extensive scope of attestation in numerous languages from all the subbranches of Slavic and Germanic, including the oldest one (Old Church Slavonic and Gothic, respectively). Based on this comparison, there is little doubt that we can reconstruct PSl. **vętrъ* and PGmc **windaz.*

Stage 3 (the morphological analysis) investigates the structure of each of the cognates at issue. This stage involves the following steps:

A. Determining which morphological material in a pair of words is cognate (shared and inherited).

B. Determining the word-formation processes involved in deriving each of the words under analysis.

C. Revealing the structural meaning of the words in question.

 ISSN 2453-8035

Stage 4 (the phonological analysis) aims at clarifying the phonological differences between the compared words. To this end, an attempt will be made (in Section 4) to find out which sound changes have affected each of the compared words, and when these phonological processes occurred. As an extra procedure, in order to be more convincing, the postulated sound changes should be illustrated with further examples of words (and cognates) which exhibit their effects.

Apart from the four stages described above, the methodology also includes a semantic connection, which can be illustrated with an investigation of the set of cognates containing Gothic *wopjan*, English *weep* and Polish *wabić* (Rychło 2014a, Rychło 2016). This stage need not be developed here, as comparing PSl. **větrъ* and PGmc **windaz* does not present major semantic difficulties.

Although these procedures are designed to disclose shared inherited elements in the compared languages under review, their adoption further benefits the study in a broader context, i.e. apart from explaining the differences in cognates, recognising their evolution and revealing the ancient layer in the languages under comparison. Firstly, an analysis for the differences in cognates sometimes requires postulating new sound changes or refining existing ones. Secondly, the advantage of the new methodology is that it allows for further rigorous investigation in order to compare several etymologies and establish which is better justified. Full details of the analytical methodology are described in Rychło (2019).

3. The morphological analysis

The aim of this section is to explain the morphological structures of Slavic **větrъ* and Germanic **windaz*, which preserve the reflexes of the PIE root **$h_2\underset{\wedge}{u}eh_1$-*. Section 3.1 concentrates on Germanic cognates which reflect the participial formation **$h_2uéh_1$-ent-o-s*. Section 3.2 attempts to disentangle the formation **větrъ*, revealed by the Slavic cognates. In subsections 3.2.1, 3.2.2 and 3.2.3, three possible etymologies are investigated: (1) **větrъ* as an instrument with the suffix **-tro-*, (2) **větrъ* as a nomen

 ISSN 2453-8035

agentis with the suffix *-*ter*-, and (3) **větrъ* as a derivative with the suffix *-*rъ* (PIE *-*ro*-).

3.1 Germanic *windaz

As the etymology of the Germanic **windaz* is more transparent and less controversial than that of the Slavic **větrъ*, the first subsection concentrates on explaining the former. A cursory glance at the main difference between Slavic and Germanic words at issue reveals that the root in the Germanic words is followed by a suffix (possibly suffixes) containing the element *nd*, as opposed to *tr*, (Gothic *winds*, Old Norse *vindr*, Old English *wind*, Old Saxon *wind*, Old High German *wint*). When approaching modern English synchronically, the word *wind* must be considered monomorphemic, as no verb survives which could serve as the derivational base. Yet Old English had such a verb, viz. *wāwan* 'to blow', so diachronically English *wind* is a derivative, i.e. a complex word. The *nd* is reminiscent of German present (active) participles such as:

(5)

*der auf dem Stuhl sitze**nd**e Junge* 'the boy sitting on the chair' (from *sitzen* 'to sit')
*in der komme**nd**en Woche* 'in the coming week' (from *kommen* 'to come').

In Modern German, it seems that the *d* follows the infinitival ending *en*. Yet the comparison with Old English (e.g., *lufi-an* 'to love' vs *lufi-ende* 'loving') shows that the vowel of the participial suffix (*-**e**nde*) was not identical with the vowel of the infinitive (*-**a**n*). Consequently, the statement that *d* follows the infinitival ending *en* can only be seen as a simplified formulation for the synchronic purposes. From a historical perspective, the sounds *nd* belong to one morpheme, as they are descended from PIE *-*nt*- (which alternated between *-*ont*- and *-*n̥t*- – cf. Fulk 2018: 253).

Old English had regular present (or active) participles, which were formed with *-ende* (cognate with Latin *-ent*-). Modern *-ing* results from the confusion of the weakened variant *-inde* with *-inge*. According to the Oxford English dictionary (OED 2009) (s.v.

 ISSN 2453-8035

-ing[2]), "this confusion is especially noticeable in MSS [Manuscripts] written by Anglo-Norman scribes in the 13th c. The final result was the predominance of the form *-inge*, and its general substitution for *-inde* in the 14th c."

There are also many borrowings from Latin (often with a French intermediary) which, etymologically, are present participles, e.g., *absent*, *pregnant*, *present*, *president*, etc. The correspondence of Latin *t* and Germanic *d* (Old English *-ende*) can be explained by Verner's Law, which indicates that either the stress must have followed this consonant, and fell on the ending: **h₂ueh₁-nt-ó-* (in the case of the ancestor of the English *wind*) or, as Kroonen (2013: 587) argues, the participle suffix was in the full grade, and then the stress may have been initial: **h₂uéh₁-ent-o-*.

Apart from the regular present participles in *-ende*, the Germanic ancestor of Old English also had the class of *nd*-stem nouns which comprised substantivized present participles. The examples in Old English include: *hettend* 'enemy', *hælend* 'saviour', *tēond* 'accuser', *āgend* 'owner', *būend* 'inhabitant', *dēmend* 'judge', *wealdend* 'ruler', *wīġend* 'warrior', *frēond* 'friend', and *fēond* 'enemy'. The last two survive in Modern English as *friend*, *fiend*.

Old English grammars do not include *wind* in this class (cf. Campbell 1959: 257, § 632-634, Hogg & Fulk 2011: 62-64). It seems that the main reason for that lies in the fact that *wind* contains *i* as the root vowel, which does not undergo *i*-umlaut. Consequently, the declension of Old English *wind* does not differ from masculine *a*-stem declension. Nevertheless, etymologically, Old English *wind* and its Proto-Germanic ancestor **windaz* can be considered relics of such nominalized petrified present participles, even if it shifted to an *a*-stem declension.

The next question to examine is when the original present participle became fossilized. Don Ringe (2006: 203, 283) mentions **frijōnd-* 'friend' and **fijand-* 'enemy' as examples of participles that have been substantivized in all the daughters. He also states

 ISSN 2453-8035

that it "becomes a matter of speculation whether such a PGmc participle as **frijōnd-* 'loving' was already being used also in its attested derived function as a noun 'friend', and it seems more than a little rash to project back into PGmc the later class of fossilized agent-nouns in *-nd-*" (Ringe 2006: 199). Fulk (2018: 179) refers to this claim as "not impossible, but since Go. *frijōnds* and its Gmc. cognates all have the meaning 'friend' and do not inflect like participles in any Gmc. language, the assumption that PGmc. had *nd*-stem nouns cannot justly be called rash." Similar reasoning can also be applied to the case of PGmc **windaz*: Old English *wind* and its Germanic cognates all have the meaning 'wind' and do not inflect like participles in any Germanic language, these facts support the conclusion that PGmc **windaz* was already a substantivized present participle in Proto-Germanic. The material which is adduced in Section 2.2 permits an even bolder claim: since there are exact cognates in more than two other Indo-European branches outside Germanic (cf. Tocharian A *want*, *wänt*, Tocharian B *yente*, Latin *ventus*, Welsh *gwynt* 'wind', etc.) and they also have the meaning 'wind' and inflect like nouns, we can assume that the nominalization of **h$_2$u̯eh$_1$-(e)nt-o-s* is as early as Proto-Indo-European.

There is one strikingly similar Slavic-Germanic pair, namely Polish *przyjaciel* 'friend' and English *friend* – cf. Rychło (2014b: 206). The relationship between these words resembles the one between Polish *wiatr* and English *wind* at least in two aspects. Firstly, in both Polish-English pairs the common root (but not the suffix) goes back to the shared etymon: **priH-* (Vedic *prīṇā́ti* 'please'; Old High German *frīten* 'to look after', OCS *prijati* 'take care of'), which later served as the derivational base for PSl. **prijatel'ь* 'friend' and, independently, for PGmc **fri(j)ōnd-* 'friend' (cf. Kroonen 2013: 156). Similarly, **h$_2$u̯eh$_1$-* '(of wind) to blow' (Vedic *vā́ti*, Homeric Greek ἄησι [áɛ:si], Young Avestan *vāiti*, Gothic *waian*, Old English *wāwan*, OCS *vějati*) underlies both PSl. **větrъ* and PGmc **windaz*. Secondly, the English words (i.e. *friend* and *wind*) in both pairs represent petrified present active participles, preserving the sounds *nd*, reminiscent of the German participles, while Polish words point to different word-formation processes. In the case of PSl. **prijatel'ь* 'friend', the formation is a *nomen*

 ISSN 2453-8035

agentis derived with the suffix *-*tel'ь* (from *-*tel-jo*-), which in Polish comes down as -*ciel*. The base of this derivation is PSl. **prijati* (OCS *prijati* 'take care of', Polish *(s)przyjać* 'be well disposed towards'). Parallel examples include: PSl. **datel'ь* 'giver, donor' (OCS *datel'ь* 'giver, donor', Russian (dial.) *dátel'* (*дамель*), Czech (rare) *datel*) from PSl. **dati* and PSl. **mьstitel'ь* 'revenger' (OCS *mьstitel'ь* 'revenger', Old Czech *mstitel*, Polish *mściciel*) from PSl. **mьstiti (sę)* – cf. Matasović (2014: 28-30) for further examples and Trubachev (Трубачев 1994: 170) for PSl. **mьstitel'ь*. In the next section, we will attempt to unveil the word-formation processes relevant to understanding the etymology and structure of Proto-Slavic **větrъ* 'wind'.

3.2 Slavic *větrъ

The comparison of the derived noun **větrъ* with the corresponding verb **vějati* (cf. OCS *vějati*, Czech *vát*, Polish *wiać* 'to blow') indicates that the *-*trъ* in **větrъ* might be interpreted as a suffix at first glance. Its most obvious ancestral form can be reconstructed as *-*tro*. As early as in 1889, Brugmann made the following observation:

"*Baltisch-Slavisch. -tro- nur in wenigen und unsicheren Beispielen, wie lit. vė́-tra 'Sturm' aksl. vě-trŭ 'Luft, Wind'. Die Unsicherheit beruht darauf, dass die Möglichkeit jüngeren Übertritts in die o-Decl. oder ā-Decl. nahe liegt, wie solcher bei aksl. bratr-ŭ 'Bruder' sestr-a 'Schwester' unzweifelhaft stattgefunden hat*'." (1889: 115, §62). Eng. "*Balto-Slavic -tro- is found only in a few uncertain examples, as Lith. vė́-tra 'storm' O.C.Sl. vě-trŭ 'air, wind'. The uncertainty is caused by the possibility of a later transference into the o- or ā-declension, which has undoubtedly taken place in O.C.Sl. bratr-ŭ 'brother' sestr-a 'sister'*." (1891: 121, §62).

The problem with this interpretation is that there are very few formations in which it is possible to discern further instances of the putative suffix in Slavic, especially if we want to find the same form of the suffix.

Sławski (2011: 130 [1974–1979, II: 20]) mentions Proto-Slavic **větrъ* under the entry: Suf. *-trъ, -tro, -etrъ*. He describes these formatives as exceptional, making reference to the Proto-Slavic **ętro* 'liver' (Polish *wątroba* 'liver', Vedic *āntrám* 'intestine', Greek ἔντερα n.pl. 'intestines, bowels', Armenian *ənder-k'*, spelled also as *ənter-k'*[4]). The suffix seems to be present also in Russian *нутро* as well as other similar derivatives

 ISSN 2453-8035

like Russian *внутри́* from PSl. **vъn-ǫtrъ* (cf. Polish *wnętrze*, (*we*)*wnątrz* 'inside'), which in turn can be further analysed as deriving from PIE **h₁on-tr-*. This formation can also be found inside the derivative with the suffix *-ba*: **ǫtroba* (OCS *ǫtroba* 'entrails', Russian *utróba* 'womb, (colloquial) belly', Czech *útroba* 'entrails'; Slovak *útroba* 'entrails, womb'; Polish *wątroba* 'entrails', Serbo-Croatian *ùtroba* 'intestines, womb'; Slovene *otróba* 'entrails, womb'). Another example listed by Sławski (2011: 130 [1974–1979, II: 20]) is **pętro* 'floor' (Polish *piętro*, Czech *patro*), which must have been formed in the Proto-Slavic period from the verb **pęti*, **pьnǫ* 'to climb' (Polish *piąć*). The semantic connection is discernible in the derivative *rozpinać* 'to spread, to stretch'. The etymological meaning of *piętro* would then be 'something which is stretched above' (cf. Boryś 2005: 434-435) and *-tr·o* could be a suffix with the neuter nominative singular *·o* (as opposed to the zero ending in the masculine). The Proto-Slavic **esetrъ* 'sturgeon' may serve as another example – cf. Old Russian *jesetrъ*, *osetrъ* (*есетръ*, *осетръ*), Russian *osëtr* (*осётр*), Ukrainian *oseter* (*осетер*), Czech *jeseter*, Slovak *jeseter*, Polish *jesiotr*, Old Polish *jesiotr*, *jasiotr*, Upper Sorbian *jesetr* (arch.), *jasotr* (arch.), Lower Sorbian *jesotr*, Serbo-Croatian *jèsetra* f., Slovene *jesētər*, Bulgarian *esétra* (*есетра*). Its root may be derived from Proto-Indo-European **h₂eḱ-* 'sharp' (The sturgeon has bony plates on the body) – cf. Boryś (2005: 213), though this has been disputed (cf. Derksen 2008: 145-146 with further references). Sławski (2011: 130 [1974–1979, II: 20]) interprets the suffix **-etrъ* in **esetrъ* 'sturgeon' as a variant of the suffix **-erъ*, and likewise, analyses **-trъ*, **-tro* as variants of the suffixes **-rъ*, and **-ro-*.

Let us carry out a more detailed inspection of what might be interpreted as a parallel formation, namely Proto-Slavic **ǫtrъ* (which survives i.a. in Polish *wnętrze* 'interior' and Czech *vnitro* derived from **vъn ǫtrъ* 'inwards', **vъn ǫtri* 'inside'). The Slavic words do not display any vowel between *t* and *r*, which points to an earlier zero-grade. What is significant about this example is that its cognates outside Slavic (cf. Sanskrit *antara-* 'internal', Greek ἔντερα (*éntera*) 'intestines', Latin *inter* 'between', German *unter* 'under') indicate the full grade of the suffix. The oldest languages also exhibit a

 ISSN 2453-8035

following vowel. All this points to the reconstruction: *-*tero*-. Whether dealing with a distinct suffix *-*tero*- (the "contrastive" suffix) or relating it to the suffix in Proto-Slavic **větrъ*, the conjecture which can be drawn on the basis of this example is that the full vowel of the suffix *-*ter*- was perhaps replaced with the zero-grade *-*tr*-, especially if the suffix was followed by the vowel **o*.

Admittedly, while searching for candidates for cognate affixes at the level of Proto-Indo-European, we can find a number of possibilities (which will be discussed in the following sections), but since they are all extremely scantily represented in Slavic, an attempt will be made to argue for a different solution. Let us first review the etymologies which recognize *-tr-* as constituting one suffix.

3.2.1 *větrъ *as an instrument with the suffix* *-tro-

Meillet (1958: 232) provides **větrъ* 'wind' as an example illustrating the suffix *-*tro*-. Although he considers this suffix as a thematized variant of *-*ter*-, Meillet discusses it in a separate section devoted to *nomina instrumenti*. Consequently, one could reconstruct the original, structural meaning of **větrъ* 'wind' as 'the instrument for blowing'. This semantic interpretation does not appear to be convincing. The masculine gender of the Slavic cognates points to a different analysis because the masculine gender is characteristic of agents in contradistinction to the neuter gender, more typical of instruments, e.g., Proto-Slavic **kadidlo* 'incense' (Old Church Slavonic *kadilo* (*кадило*), Russian *kadilo* (*кадило*), Ukrainian *kadylo* (*кадило*), Czech *kadidlo*, Slovak *kadidlo*, Polish *kadzidło*, Serbo-Croatian *kàdilo*, Slovene *kadílọ*). Yet in order to consider possible arguments in favour of the instrumental interpretation, it should be noted that this inconsistency can be explained in terms of a change, which may have occurred in a late common ancestor of Balto-Slavic and Germanic but may also have developed independently. Illič-Svityč (1979: 128) relates this change to a shift in the original accentuation, which has been labelled Illič-Svityč's Law (cf. Collinge 1985: 103-104; Trask 2000: 159), but the very change of the gender was already noticed by Hirt (1893: 348-349), who concluded that unaccented *-om* (the ending of the neuter

 ISSN 2453-8035

nom.sg.) became -ъ. Consequently, many neuter nouns became masculine, the remaining neuter nouns which remained neuter in *-o* are descended from accented *-óm.* (cf. also Derksen 2011; Illič-Svityč 1979: 114-116; Olander 2015: 12-13).

3.2.2 *větrъ *as a nomen agentis with the suffix* *-ter-

The suffix *-*tr*- can be related to the suffix *-*ter*-, which is attested in many ablaut grades: *-*ter*-, *-*tor*-, *-*tēr*-, *-*tōr*- and *-*tr*-. Since apophonic vowel alternations typically involved any of the nuclei *e, o, ē, ō* or zero, *-*tr*- could represent the zero-grade.[5] What supports this connection is also the semantic factor, as *-ter*-, and *-tor*- are often found in *nomina agentis* (e.g., Latin *amātor* 'lover' from *amāre* 'to love'; Latin *dator* 'giver', Greek *δοτήρ, δώτωρ*, Vedic *dā́tar*-), which suggests that, from the semantic point of view, the structural meaning of the Slavic *větrъ* could be 'the blower'. Hirt (2009 [1927]: 206-209) relates these *nomina agentis* to kinship terms, which in turn have been interpreted in a number of ways: among others, they have been compared with the "contrastive" suffix *-*t*(*e*)*r*- (cf. Pinault 2007: 276; de Vaan 2008: 240). Moreover, the masculine gender may suggest that the concept of 'wind' entailed personification. The semantic connection between the non-personified weather phenomenon and the personified agent consists in the association between masculinity (masculine gender) and an active, agentive force. The evidence for personification of wind comes from the Rigveda, in which a number of gods represent natural forces, for example: *Sūrya* 'Sun', *Vāyu* 'Wind' *Parjanya* 'Thunder(storm)', *Uṣas* 'Dawn', and *Dyaus and Pr̥thivī* 'Heaven and Earth', not to mention the ubiquitous *Agni* 'Fire' – cf. Brereton and Jamison (2020: 63), who add that "their names are often identical to the common nouns that express the same natural forces they represent." Further evidence for personification of wind comes from other Indo-European religions and mythologies. As reported by Herodotus, the Persians also worshipped wind (cf. Kowalski 2017: 235).

A weak point of the connection of *-tr*- with *-ter*- is clarification of the apophonic relationship. A possible interpretation may refer to the *r*-stem declension, which

 ISSN 2453-8035

included many kinship terms reconstructed for Proto-Indo-European. In this class, the zero-grade of the suffix appears in some of the oblique cases, e.g., the genitive, the dative and the instrumental (both singular and plural) – cf. Beekes (2011: 190, 194-195). One could assume that Proto-Slavic **větrъ* is a reflex of one of such oblique cases, but there is one more possibility. In order to strengthen the weak link of this explanation, one may also refer to the final *-ъ* of Proto-Slavic (and OCS) *větrъ*. There is also at least one other secure Slavic example of the zero-grade of the suffix *-tr-* in the nominative followed by what must have been a stem formative *-ъ*, namely OCS *bratrъ* (Old Polish *bratr*). The final *-ъ* both in *bratrъ* and in *větrъ* suggests that these original *r*-stem nouns were aligned with the masculine *o*-stems quite early on. The explanation of the zero-grade of the suffix *-tr-* may lie in this realignment, i.e. the transference from the *r*-stems to the *o*-stems and the adjustment of the apophonic grades in the three main word components (root+suffix+ending). It should perhaps be revised at this point that the typical structure of the *r*-stem paradigm exhibited either the full grade of the suffix with a simultaneous zero-grade of the ending, e.g., nom.sg. *-ēr* (length due to Szemerényi's Law), acc.sg. *-er-m*, loc.sg. *-er-i*, or the zero-grade of the suffix with a simultaneous full grade of the ending, e.g., gen.sg. *-r-os*, dat.sg. *-r-ei*, loc.sg. *-er-i* (cf. Beekes 2011: 195, Szemerényi 1996: 171). Consequently, **-tr·o* was much more natural than **-ter·o*.

On the other hand, it should be taken into consideration that kinship terms which exhibit the suffix *-ter* are analysed in a number of ways at the level of Proto-Indo-European. There are at least two interpretations which move the morphological boundary one sound to the left and thus it is possible that the suffix includes the laryngeal, i.e. **-$h_1$ter* – cf. Carruba (1995). There is also another interpretation; namely, that the suffix had the form: **-$h_2$ter* (cf. Blažek 2001; Sihler 1988: 559) – cf. **b^hr$éh_2$ter* 'brother', **d^hugh$_2$tér* 'daughter', **méh$_2$ter* 'mother', **ph$_2$tér-* 'father' and **h_1i̯enh$_2$ter-* 'husband's brother's wife'. The second laryngeal **h_2* regularly caused colouring of the preceding **e*, which resulted in **ā*. This last hypothesis is especially at variance with

 ISSN 2453-8035

the idea that the Slavic *větrъ* was derived with the same suffix as kinship terms, since there is no evidence for h_2 in any cognates of the 'wind' formation.

An argument against the agentive interpretation of the Proto-Slavic **větrъ* is that normally we would expect the Proto-Indo-European agentive **-ter-* to come down as Proto-Slavic **-tel-* – cf. Brugmann (1889: 365, § 122): "Slav *-tel-* entstand durch Dissimilation aus *-ter-*" ("Slav. *-tel-* arose from *-ter-* by dissimilation") – Brugmann (1891: 389, § 122).

For a more up-to-date discussion, see also Pultrová (2007), who reconstructs two ablaut variants of the *nomina agentis* suffix: **-ter-* and **-tor-*. Putrová lists the languages in which the suffix was productive – apart from Latin, Greek, Indo-Iranian languages and Hittite, she says: "in Slavic languages there is to be found the variant *-tel′ъ* (Czech *-tel*)" (ibid., 251).

Before accepting the connection between IE **-ter-* and Slavic **-tel-*, the arguments for and against their cognacy should at least be mentioned. One of them seems to be the inflectional pattern that they exhibit – cf. Vaillant (1974: 315): "Les désinences de flexion athématique invitent à rapprocher le suffixe slave ***-tel-*** du suffixe indo-européen ****-ter-*** de noms d'agents." (The endings of the athematic inflection imply the proximity of the Slavic suffix *-tel-* to the Indo-European suffix **-ter-* for agent nouns.) On the other hand, the variation between *-r-* and *-l-* is not as straightforward as appears prima facie. A possible solution may consist in explaining it in terms of dissimilation, but it is problematic to find a sufficient number of examples in the earliest attested period. This is how the explanation is assessed by Vaillant (ibid., 315):

"*quant à l'idée d'une dissimilation de* ****-ter-*** *en* ***-tel-*** *après un* ***r*** *précédent (Brugmann, Vondrák), elle se heurte au fait que les exemples péniblement cherchés ne sont pas d'époque vieux-slave et sont même à peine attestés en slavon:* ***žrŭteljĭ*** *est rare pour v. sl.* ***žĭrĭčĭ,*** *et* ***oratelji,*** *pour v. sl.* ***ratai,*** *n'est que le russe* ***orátel'***". Eng. As for the idea that ****-ter-*** underwent dissimilation into ***-tel-*** after a

 ISSN 2453-8035

preceding ***r*** (Brugmann, Vondrák), it clashes with the fact that the painfully sought-after examples are not from the Old Slavic period and are even barely attested in Slavic: ***žrŭteljĭ*** is rare for Old Slavic ***žĭrĭčĭ***, and ***orateljĭ***, for Old Slavic ***ratai,*** is only the Russian ***orátel'***".

Furthermore, the case for identifying the Slavic *-*tel*- with IE *-*ter*- would be stronger if the closely related Baltic languages had some cognate suffixes. Such attestation would supply some evidence that at the time of the hypothetical Balto-Slavic community the suffix was productive and that there is a chronological connection between the suffix in the Slavic languages (attested since the late 9th century) and the reconstructed Indo-European *-*ter*- (productive approximately in the fourth millennium BC). The Baltic evidence is, again, non-conclusive. Vaillant (1974: 315) adduces a similar suffix, which he treats as a distinct formative: "Le baltique ignore le suffixe slave, mais il présente un suffixe de nom d'agent en lit. ***-ėlis***, et lette ***-elis***". (Baltic languages do not exhibit the Slavic suffix, but they present a suffix of agent nouns: Lithuanian ***-ėlis*** and Latvian ***-elis***.)

We shall not attempt to assess this possibility further because, even if we assume that the Indo-European agentive *-*ter*- developed into Slavic -*tel*-, it is not beyond bounds of possibility that some remnants of the zero-grade form -*tr*- may have survived. To conclude, although semantically it is conceivable to think of the wind as a 'blower' (i.e. a *nomen agentis*), there are very few parallel formations which exhibit a comparable shape of the suffix in Slavic. Regardless of whether the agentive nominalization is possible, there is not enough evidence to rule out another etymology for the Slavic *větrъ* as will be considered in the next section.

3.2.3 *větrъ *as a derivative with the suffix* *-rъ

Another way of explaining the morphological structure of Proto-Slavic **větrъ* is to assume that the morpheme boundary lies one sound to the right. In comparison to the Indo-Iranian cognates (Sanskrit *vāta*-, Avestan *vāta*- 'wind'), Proto-Slavic **větrъ* could also be analysed as derived with the suffix *-*rъ* (PIE *-*ro*-). In view of the fact that the

 ISSN 2453-8035

root does not have any *-t-* (cf. OCS 1sg. *vějǫ*, Lithuanian 3sg. *véja*, Polish 3sg. *wieje*), the *-t-* would have to be interpreted as a stem formative – cf. Matasović (2014: 103), who says that it "probably derived from a *t*-stem." We shall see that there is some extra evidence in Slavic which supports this new analysis (and has probably never been considered in relation to the etymology of the Slavic **větrъ*).

The new evidence comes from Kajkavian words for 'the place sheltered from wind', which has recently been brought to attention by Boryś (2018). These words include: *zavet* 'the place sheltered from wind' from Kajkavian dialects of Zagorja: *z ˈavet* m. 'the place sheltered from wind' (Crnek 2005: 58), *za:véẹt* 'id.' (Hrg et al. 1996: 121). The word was first attested in the early 18th century as: *za-vet* 'hiding place (receptaculum)' (Vitezović 2009: 1355).

Kajkavian *zavet* also has cognates in other Slavic languages: Slovene (obs. – 18th c.) *zavet* 'the place sheltered from wind', Macedonian *zavet* 'a shelter from the wind', Czech *závět* 'area with no wind, the place sheltered from wind, retreat'. According to Boryś (2018: 12-13), these words are reflexes of the etymon **zavětъ* 'the place sheltered from wind', derived from the preposition **za* 'behind' and the noun **větъ* probably 'wind' from Proto-Slavic **věti*, **vějǫ* 'to blow' (Furlan 2005a: 307; 2005b: 395-396). Boryś (2018: 12-13) also lists numerous dialectal cognates of Kajkavian *zavetje* together with a long list of references (among others Slovene *zavẹ́tje* 'the place sheltered from wind, shelter, protection', Church Slavonic *zavětije* 'locus tectus, tranquillus') and explains them as reflexes of the derivative **zavětьje* with the suffix **-ьje*, typically found in place names **pomorьje* 'coast', **zagorьje* 'place behind a mountain'.

The occurrence of these words not only in South Slavic but also in West Slavic strengthens the evidence for postulating **zavětъ* and **zavětьje* at the time of a common ancestor of the Slavic languages. These forms in turn can be seen as a missing link between the root (found also in verbal forms) and the suffix **-rъ*. As a result, the *t* segment does not have to be interpreted as part of the suffix **-ter-* (**-tr-*). Moreover,

 ISSN 2453-8035

the existence of these forms leads to the conclusion that Proto-Slavic **větrъ* may have been formed with the suffix **-rъ* from a base already containing *t*.

The main function of the suffix **-rъ* (PIE **-ro-*) was to form adjectives. Its vestige in English can be found in the adjective *bitter*, which must be a derivative of the ancestor of the verb *bite*. In Polish (as well as in other Slavic languages), a considerable number of basic adjectives, whose structure is no longer transparent, preserve relics of this suffix: *chory* 'ill', *dobry* 'good', *mądry* 'wise', *modry* 'deep blue', *mokry* 'wet', *stary* 'old', *szary* 'grey', *szczery* 'sincere', etc. Outside Slavic, the suffix can be exemplified by: Vedic *rudhirá-* 'red, bloody', Greek *ἐρυθρός*, Lat. *ruber* 'red', Tocharian B *rätre* 'red' < PIE **$h_1$rud^h-ró-*.

We can assume that such adjectives were sometimes used as nouns, as they can still occur in such use, e.g., *Ten szary jest lepszy od czarnego* 'The grey one is better than the black one'. Some of such uses became lexicalized and survived, while the adjectival ones did not. To support this claim, the examples can be adduced:

(6)

- Proto-Slavic **darъ* 'gift' (OCS *darъ*, Russian *dar*, Polish *dar*, Czech *dar*) contrasted with verbs which do not contain the suffix **-rъ* (PIE **-ro-*): Proto-Slavic **da-ti* 'to give', **da-mь* 1sg. (OCS *dati*, **damь*, Russian *dat'*, *dam*, Polish *dać*, *dam*, Czech *dát*, *dám*);
- Proto-Slavic **mirъ* 'peace' (OCS *mirъ*, Russian *mir*, Polish *mir* obs., Czech *mir*) contrasted with related adjectives which do not contain the suffix **-rъ* (PIE **-ro-*): Proto-Slavic **milъ* 'sweet, dear' (OCS *milъ* 'pitiable', Russian *milyj* 'sweet, dear', Polish *miły* 'dear, nice', Czech *milý* 'sweet, dear').

The examples of masculine nouns with the suffix **-rъ* presented above could serve as further instances parallel to Proto-Slavic **větrъ*. We should also bear in mind that Slavic adjectives and nouns have the same genesis – cf. Townsend and Janda (1996:

 ISSN 2453-8035

177), who explain that "adjectives were nominal, which became abstracted from the nouns with which they were associated, and then assumed syntactic gender." If such nominalization occurred early enough, i.e. before the emergence and development of compound adjectives in Slavic, there was nothing in the adjectives that distinguished them formally from nouns when considered in isolation, without context and meaning – compare Proto-Slavic and OCS *dymъ* 'smoke', *synъ* 'son' with *novъ* 'new', *bosъ* 'barefooted'.

To sum up, although, in general, it is expected of the author to assess various possibilities and decide which one is the most plausible, in the case like this one there are several explanations which are feasible, though not all equally convincing. The least likely seems to be Meillet's conclusion, for semantic reasons: the etymology of the word for 'wind' as 'the instrument for blowing' is not compelling. The hypothesis clarifying the morphological structure of Proto-Slavic **větrъ* as a a substantivized adjective, though not very strong from a semantic perspective, cannot be ruled out. We have also seen extra evidence coming from Kajkavian *zavet* / *zavetje* 'place sheltered from wind' and their related cognates. It seems that an equally attractive interpretation is that 'the wind' developed from a deverbal agentive noun 'the blower' (cf. Latin *amātor* 'lover', *dator* 'giver'), its masculine gender indicating the active, agentive force.

4. The phonological analysis

Bearing in mind that *-tr* in Polish *wiatr* as well as *-nd* in English *wind* result from distinct word-formation processes, we will now attempt to explain the parallel phonological developments which affected the two words. These developments are responsible for the discrepancy between the phonological shape of the Polish-English pair. Even though the spelling of the first two letters is identical, the corresponding sounds are completely different: Polish [vʲatr̥], English [wɪnd].

Starting with the anlaut, the English word exhibits a labio-velar approximant [w], whereas Polish shows the palatalized labio-dental fricative [vʲ]. A difference between

 ISSN 2453-8035

two corresponding sounds in a pair of cognates sometimes results from one language retaining the pronunciation of the common ancestor and the other language presenting an effect of a sound change (or sound changes). Although it happens rarely that a sound has remained intact for several thousand years, it seems that there is a case in point in the anlaut of *wind*. English is here remarkably archaic, preserving the quality of the sonorant since Proto-Indo-European. A comparison of cognates below demonstrates that [w] developed into [v] not only in Slavic, but also in Germanic, e.g., in German. In phonetic terms, the change can be described as spirantization; to be more specific: the voiced labial glide developed into the voiced labiodental fricative.

(7)

a. English *wolf*, German *Wolf*, Polish *wilk*, Russian *volk*, OCS *vlьkъ* (PIE *$\underset{\frown}{u}lk^{w}$-*o*-)
b. English *water*, German *Wasser*, Polish *woda*, Russian *vodá*, OCS *voda* (PIE *$\underset{\frown}{u}$*od-r/n*-)
c. English *widow*, German *Witwe*, Polish *wdowa*, Russian *vdová* (PIE *$h_1\underset{\frown}{u}i$-$d^{h}h_1$-(*e*)$\underset{\frown}{u}$-)
d. English *wool*, German *Wolle*, Polish *wełna*, Russian *vólna*, OCS *vlьna* (PIE *$H\underset{\frown}{u}lh_1$-*néh*$_2$)
e. English *wax*, German *Wachs*, Polish *wosk*, Russian *vosk*, OCS *voskъ* (IE *$\underset{\frown}{u}$*oḱsos* < PIE *$h_2\underset{\frown}{u}$*oĝsos* – cf. Greek ἀέξω 'I multiply, I increase' ← PIE *$h_2\underset{\frown}{u}$*eĝs*-).

Similarly:

f. English *wind*, German *Wind*, Polish *wiatr*, Russian *véter*, OCS *větrъ* (PIE *$h_2\underset{\frown}{u}eh_1$-)

It is interesting to note that modern English is even more archaic in this respect than Latin, which changed [w] to [v] in the first century AD – cf. Miller (2012: 55) as in *ventus* (which underlies borrowings such as *vent*, *ventilate*). By contrast, the oldest loanwords, which date from the time when the ancestors of the English still lived on

 ISSN 2453-8035

the continent, retain the earlier [w], e.g., *wall*, *wine* (Latin *vallus*, *vinum*), as the sound change occurred in Latin, but not in the Germanic dialects ancestral to English.

The change of [w] > [v] in Slavic, illustrated by the cognates in (4), is difficult to date. Although it is taken for granted in most Proto-Slavic reconstructions, the change did not affect the Upper Sorbian language nor the East Ukrainian dialect (cf. Cyran & Nilsson 1998: 89-90) and, until recently, also North Czech dialects mentioned by Stieber (2005 [1979]: 86-87), who concludes that reconstructing Proto-Slavic **v* is unjustified.

[w] > [v] is not the only change which affected the initial consonant in Polish *wiatr*, as it is pronounced with the palatalized labio-dental fricative [vʲ]. Palatalizations are generally caused by the adjacent front vowels. In *wiatr*, however, the second letter actually performs the function of a diacritic marking the palatalized nature of the preceding consonant, and the immediately following vowel does not qualify as palatalizing – the word can be transcribed as [vʲatr̥].

The absence of a palatalizing vowel finds an explanation in another sound change, i.e. the Lechitic sound shift, by which Proto-Slavic **ě* becomes Polish *a* before one of seven unpalatalized obstruents [t, d, s, z, r, n, l]. The last one comes down as Polish [w], spelled as <ł>. Further examples of the words which were affected by the change are listed below. They are contrasted with different forms of these words which exhibit other consonants than the seven mentioned above and, consequently, retain the preceding vowel, almost unchanged: **ě* > Polish <e> [ɛ].

(8)

lato 'summer'	*lecie* 'summer (loc.)'
siadł 'he sat'	*siedzi* 'he sits'
ciasto 'dough'	*cieście* 'dough (loc.)'
gwiazda 'star'	*gwieździe* 'star (loc.)'

 ISSN 2453-8035

piana 'foam'	*pienić* 'to foam'
wiara 'faith, belief'	*wierzyć* 'to believe'
biały 'white'	*bielić* 'to whiten'

So as to find a form (or a derivative) of the word *wiatr* which remained unaffected by the Lechitic sound shift, one can take a closer look at the locative and vocative *wietrze* as well as the adjective *wietrzny* 'windy'. What might seem irregular about these words is the presence of *e* (instead of *a*) before *t*. In the light of the examples above, we would expect *wiatrze* and *wiatrzny*.

We should, of course, bear in mind the following facts: firstly, the presence of the unpalatalized *t* in modern Polish *wietrze* and *wietrzny* does not entail the presence of the unpalatalized *t* at the time of the Lechitic sound shift; secondly, the occurrence of *rz* < r^j, which arose before front vowels, suggests that a front vowel must have followed the consonant cluster *tr* (in the Proto-Slavic ancestor of *wietrz-n-y*, the suffix must have contained the front jer: -*ьn*-). Consequently, a probable explanation of the alternation *wiatr* vs *wietrze*, *wietrzny* is that the Lechitic sound shift did not operate either in *wietrze* or in *wietrzny*, because the front vowel of the case ending and of the -*ьn*- suffix had palatalized the preceding two consonants. Yet the palatalized t^j (or half-palatalized in Rospond's terms – cf. Rospond 1979: 110) failed to develop into *ć* in *wietrze*, and *wietrzny*. In all probability, the reason for this must lie in the cluster. Although such an exception is not indicated in the historical phonology of Polish by Mańczak (1983: 36-37), it seems that the rule describing the regular development of **t*, first into **t^j* as an allophone, and (in the 13th century) into *ć* can be supplemented with the following exception: the second phase (**t^j* > *ć*) occurred unless it was followed by r^j, in which case **t^j* becomes depalatalized, as in *wietrze*, *wietrzny*. It does not suffice to specify that **t* remains unchanged before consonants, since, if it had remained intact, we would expect to find *a* in *wietrze*, and *wietrzny* (the effect of the Lechitic sound shift before *t*). Hence, it must have been palatalized before the Lechitic sound shift, and depalatalized after the Lechitic sound shift.

 ISSN 2453-8035

In order to demonstrate that the vowels of the root (both in PSl. **větrъ* and PGmc **windaz*) are descended from a common origin, at least three other changes should be mentioned. Firstly, Proto-Slavic **ě* regularly developed from long **ē* (cf. Samilov 1964), which, in turn, might result from compensatory lengthening following loss of h_1 in Proto-Indo-European *$*h_2u̯eh_1$-* (for details, see Meier-Brügger 2003: 113 and Ringe 2006: 72). Secondly, the Germanic **i* occasionally goes back to **e*, which can be shown in a number of ways: a) there are more cognates corresponding to English *wind* (e.g., Latin *ventus*), which reveals that a change occurred in Germanic: compare, for example, words for 'five': Greek πέντε and Lithuanian *penkì*, on the one hand, and Old High German *fimf*, *finf*, Old Norse *fimm*, Gothic *fimf*, on the other hand; b) many Germanic strong verbs of class III exhibit *i* in the infinitive (and the present), e.g., *bindan* 'to bind', *drincan* 'to drink', *findan* 'to find', *singan* 'to sing'. The same class III of strong verbs also includes verbs which display *e* in the root, e.g., Old English *delfan* 'to dig, to delve', *helpan* 'to help', *meltan* 'to melt', *sweltan* 'to die'. The comparison of the two subgroups reveals a preliminary generalization that the change of pre-Germanic **e* to Germanic *i* is conditioned by a nasal sound followed by another consonant – the cluster, which is found not only in Old English *bindan*, *drincan*, *findan*, *singan*, but also in Old High German *fimf*, *finf*, Old Norse *fimm*, Gothic *fimf*,[6] and in the word under investigation *wind*. To be more precise about the conditioning environment of the sound change, we should adduce further examples such as PIE **en* 'in' (Greek ἐν, Old Latin *en*) > PGmc **in* (Gothic *in*, Old English *in*) on the one hand, and Old English *stenan* 'sigh, groan' or Old English *cwene* 'woman', (Old Saxon *quena*, Old High German *quena*) on the other, which show that pre-Germanic **e* was raised to Germanic *i* when followed by a nasal in the coda; in other words, before tautosyllabic nasals – cf. Ringe 2006: 149, who discusses the sound change, but does not provide examples like Old English *stenan* and *cwene* in which *n* is in the onset of the second syllable.

 ISSN 2453-8035

Demonstrating the common origin of the root vowels in Polish *wiatr* and English *wind* requires identifying another sound change, as what follows from the discussion above is that the Germanic forms alone point to the short **e*, whereas the Slavic ones continue the long **ē*. This discrepancy can be explained by Osthoff's Law, according to which long vowels underwent shortening before a sonorant followed by another consonant (cf. Collinge 1985: 127-131; Ringe 2006: 75). The reconstructed form which follows from the discussion in the preceding paragraph, i.e. **wenda-*, may therefore have developed from an earlier form **wēnda-*, because [n] is a sonorant, which is followed by another consonant, namely [d]. The explanation presented above seems to be the most probable, but there are also other suggestions, e.g., Ringe (2006: 77) does not exclude "the possibility that loss of the medial laryngeal in such a form as **$h_2weh_1n̥tós$* resulted in a sequence **en* directly, with no lengthening of the vowel".

There is also one change that may be expected to have occurred in a word like English *wind*, but, for some reason, did not occur: the Homorganic Vowel Lengthening (cf. Lass 1992: 71-72; Ritt 1994: 81-93). This change must have affected many similar words which exhibited the short high front vowels before homorganic clusters like [nd], [ld] or [mb], for example: *behind*, *bind*, *blind*, *hound*, *find*, *grind*, *hind*, *mind*, *rind*, *child*, *mild*, *wild*, *climb*. The lengthening was blocked if the clusters were followed by a third consonant, e.g., *hundred*, *children*, *candle*, *gander* (< *gandra*), *timber* (< *timbre*), etc. Needless to add, short vowels remained impervious to the charm of the Great Vowel Shift. Consequently, the expected pronunciation of English *wind* would be [waɪnd], as in the verb *to wind* and, according to the Oxford English dictionary (OED 2009) (s.v. *wind*), "this pronunciation remains dialectally and in ordinary poetical usage. The pronunciation [wɪnd] became current in polite speech during the 18th c.; it has been used occas. by poets, but the paucity of appropriate rhyming words (such as *sinned*, *thinned*, *dinned*) and the 'thinness' of the sound have been against its general use in verse."

 ISSN 2453-8035

It is not easy to find a convincing explanation for the short vowel of [wɪnd]. Minkova and Stockwell (1992: 198) assess the successfulness of the lengthening of [i:] before [nd] at 73%. Apart from *wind* other examples in which the lengthening failed include: *bundle* < *byndele*, *linden*, *tinder*, but these examples differ from *wind* in that they contain a sonorant following the consonant cluster, which may have caused a similar blocking to the one resulting from a homorganic cluster being followed by a third consonant. According to the Oxford English dictionary (OED 2009), "the short vowel of [wɪnd] is presumably due to the influence of the derivatives *windmill*, *windy*, in which [ɪ] is normal." This explanation is not very convincing. Although *windmill* exhibits a consonant cluster consisting of three segments, its influence on the basic word *wind* is doubtful. In a parallel pair, *child* vs *children*, the latter *children*, despite being a much more frequent word, did not have such an influence on *child*. A more likely explanation seems to lie in homonymy avoidance: the pronunciation [waɪnd] started to be associated with the verb *to wind* (from PIE *$\underset{\sim}{\mu}end^{h}$- 'to turn'). Of course, the diphthong results from the Great Vowel Shift, which started in the 15th century, but the vowel must have been lengthened earlier. Since the Homorganic Vowel Lengthening operated in the 9th century (cf. Lass 1992: 71-72), we may expect the vowel to have been a long monophthong for some 600 years between the 9th and the 15th century, but it is also possible that it was never lengthened. There was no ambiguity until the inflection was relatively rich. The time of the Great Vowel Shift coincides with the time when the inflection is considerably reduced, and ambiguity is much greater. Parallel instances in Polish can be furnished by *biada* 'woe' vs *bieda* 'poverty', *na czole* 'on the forehead' vs *na czele* 'at the head/top of sth.'. These examples show that the semantic difference may reinforce the distinction in the phonological shapes. Regularly, we may expect all these words to have undergone the Polish (Lechitic) sound shift. Yet in the words *bieda* and *na czele*, the change did not occur despite the same, favourable phonological environment.

Finally, a word of explanation is in order with regard to the relationship between the vowel in *wind* and that of Old English *wāwan* 'to blow', which, etymologically, also

 ISSN 2453-8035

share the root. For the Proto-Germanic verb, the reconstructed vowel is the long **ē* (cf. Kroonen 2013: 576; Ringe & Taylor 2014: 151). This is what we expect in view of the fact that there was no [nd] cluster, which caused Osthoff's shortening in the ancestor of *wind* (also in Latin *ventus*). This long **ē* regularly developed into **ā* in Proto-North-West Germanic (cf. Lass 1994: 25-26) and, normally, comes down as West Saxon ǣ unless immediately followed by **w* which was in turn not followed by a high front vowel – cf. Ringe and Taylor (2014: 150-151). Further examples include strong verbs of class VII, which had vowel-final roots in Proto-Germanic, e.g., Old English *sāwan* (Modern English *to sow*), cf. Gothic *saian* 'to sow' (like Gothic *waian* 'to blow'). These verbs acquired various hiatus-filling root-final consonants in West Germanic languages. In Old English, the consonant inserted was **w*.

5. Conclusion

PSl. **větrъ* and PGmc **windaz* 'wind' are partial cognates. Yet, although they go back to two different etyma (PIE **h₂u̯eh₁-t-ro-* and **h₂u̯eh₁-nt-o-*), they were derived from the same Indo-European root **u̯ē-* (earlier form: PIE **h₂u̯eh₁-*), which constituted the base of various derivatives. This verbal root without any nominalizing suffix survives, among others, inside modern Polish word *wiać* 'to blow' (*wieje* 'it blows'), whereas English lost the corresponding cognate (Old English had *wāwan* and also modern German retains the verb *wehen* 'to blow'). Consequently, the English *wind* contains a relic of a word which does not survive as an independent word (Old English *wāwan*), and one of the few relics of the present active participle (besides *friend* and *fiend*). All the three words preserve the unaltered Germanic *nd*, which, by Verner's Law, is descended from **-nt-* (cf. Latin *-ent-*, Greek *-ovτ-*, Sanskrit *-ant-*, Slavic **-ǫtj-/-ętj-*, and Polish *-ąc-*).

The *-tr-* in Polish *wiatr* might be interpreted as a suffix, of which further instances might include Proto-Slavic **pętro* 'something which is stretched above' > 'floor' (from **pęti*, **pьnǫ* 'to climb', cf. Polish *rozpinać* 'to spread, to stretch' and *-tr·o*), Proto-Slavic **esetrъ* 'sturgeon' (derived from Proto-Indo-European **h₂eḱ-* 'sharp'). The suffix *-tr-*

 ISSN 2453-8035

can also be related to the suffix *-ter-*, often found in *nomina agentis* (e.g., Latin *dator* 'giver', Greek *δοτήρ*, *δώτωρ*, Vedic *dā́tar-*), which suggests that the structural meaning of the Slavic *větrъ* could be 'the blower', the masculine gender may suggest that the concept of 'wind' entailed personification. Less likely explanations include an interpretation of **větrъ* 'wind' as 'the instrument for blowing', though thematization seems to be more probable. Finally, having examined various arguments, the analysis of the historical structure of Proto-Slavic **větrъ* as **vět-rъ*, i.e. a derivation with the suffix **-ro-* (that became **-rъ*) seems more likely in view of the evidence coming from Kajkavian *zavet* / *zavetje* 'place sheltered from wind'.

The etymology which recognizes the suffix *-ter-* in the etymon of Proto-Slavic **větrъ* requires an explanation of the zero-grade of the suffix *-tr-*, which may lie in a realignment of the original *r*-stem with the masculine *o*-stems, on the one hand (cf. also OCS *bratrъ*, Vedic *bhrā́tar-*, Greek (Attic) φράτηρ 'member of a brotherhood', Latin *frāter*); and on the other hand, it is connected with the typical structure of the *r*-stem paradigm, which exhibited either the full grade of the suffix with a simultaneous zero-grade of the ending or the zero-grade of the suffix with a simultaneous full grade of the ending. Consequently, **-tr·o* was much more natural than **-ter·o*. There was a tendency in Slavic to replace the full vowel of the suffix **-ter-* with the zero-grade **-tr-*, especially if the suffix was followed by the vowel **o* cf. Proto-Slavic **ǫtrъ* as opposed to its cognates outside Slavic (cf. Sanskrit *antara-* 'internal', Greek ἔντερα 'intestines', Latin *inter* 'between', German *unter* 'under'), which indicate the reconstruction: **-tero-*.

In order to see how the Polish-English pair of these partial cognates became differentiated, let us sum up, in the form of a chart, all the sound changes in both lines of development starting with a common ancestor. In addition to the summary of the sound changes discussed in Section 4, Table 1 below includes the sound changes which affected the suffixes and one morphological change.

 ISSN 2453-8035

Table 1. The evolution of English *wind* and Polish *wiatr*

The Germanic line (leading to Modern English)		**The Slavic line (leading to Modern Polish)**	
PIE *$h_2\underset{\smile}{u}eh_1$-nt-o-		**PIE *$h_2\underset{\smile}{u}eh_1$-t-ro-**	
***$\underset{\smile}{u}\bar{e}$-nt-o-**	➢ loss of the initial laryngeal ➢ lengthening of *e by the following *h_1 (*eh_1 > *$\bar{e}$)	***$\underset{\smile}{u}\bar{e}$-t-ru-**	➢ loss of the initial laryngeal ➢ lengthening of *e by the following *h_1 (*eh_1 > *$\bar{e}$) ➢ fusion with *u*-stems
***wenda-**	➢ phonological changes according to Osthoff's Law ➢ phonological changes according to Verner's Law ➢ PIE *o > PGmc *a	***vě-trъ**	➢ *$\bar{e}$ > PSl. *$ě$ ➢ [w] > [v] ➢ rise of jers
***winda-**	➢ raising of PGmc *e before a tautosyllabic nasal	***wietr**	➢ palatalization of [v] (phonologized after the Lechitic sound shift) ➢ loss of jers
***wind**	➢ the Germanic apocope of vowels in absolute finality	***wiatr**	➢ the Lechitic sound shift (PSl. *$ě$ > a)

The analysis conducted in the present paper is meant to illustrate a new approach to contrasting modern languages. The ultimate aim of this approach is to foreground the inherited (archaic) layer in the compared languages and to explain the discrepancy of the cognates. To this end, it is important to distinguish between the native element in contemporary languages and cases of foreign influence. In the context of the words analysed in the current paper, such external influence can be illustrated with words like: *ventil* 'a valve in a wind instrument or a shutter for regulating the airflow in an organ', *ventilate*, *ventilator*, *ventilation*, etc. in English, and similar borrowings in Polish: *wentyl* 'valve', *wentylować* 'to ventilate', *wentylator* 'fan', *wentylacja* 'ventilation', etc. Understanding of the processes summarised in the table above leads to the instant conclusion that even if we arrange them in pairs (e.g., Polish *wentylator* vs English *ventilator*), they cannot be cognates because they belong to the inherited lexicon neither in English nor in Polish. The sound structure of these words reveals traces of their foreign origin. From the English perspective, one such foreign trait is the effect of the change: [w] > [v], which occurred in the history of Latin, but not in the (pre-)history of English. Another foreign trace is the lack of the results of Verner's Law in English (*nt*, instead of the native *nd*), caused by the fact that these words were not

 ISSN 2453-8035

in the language when the change was operative. In Polish, the word *wentyl* 'valve' even sounds foreign: in native Polish words the occurrence of the front vowel [ɛ] after the sound [v] resulted in the sequence [vʲɛ], as in *wieźć* 'to carry, to transport', *wierzyć* 'to believe', or *wieniec* 'wreath'. Comparison and contrast are the keys to raising language awareness but, to be comprehensive, they must involve the diachronic perspective.

Notes

1. Opinions are divided whether Slovincian should be treated as a language or as a dialect: "It has never been argued that Slovincian was anything more than a Cassubian dialect but the Slovicians were distinguished from other Cassubians not only linguistically but also by the fact that they were Lutherans, not Catholics." (Stone 1993: 762). Lorentz (1908-12), on the other hand, believed that Slovincian can be considered a separate language.
2. The English translations of *illviðri* and *stormur* have been taken from Hólmarsson et al. (2009: 197, 433).
3. It is difficult to say why Kroonen does not reconstruct initial h_2 – it looks like a misprint (2013).
4. According to Martirosyan (2009: 280), "Derived from PIE *h_1*enter-*h_2", and it is "related to Russ. *játro* n., pl. *játra* 'entrails, eggs, testicles', *jadró* 'kernel, testicle' from Slav. **jęt/dro*."
5. It is interesting to note that a vowel appears inside the *-tr-* suffix in the diminutive *wiaterek.*
6. The Old English word *fīf* (> *five*) lost the nasal in the Ingvaeonic loss of nasals before voiceless spirants. The long vowel results from compensatory lengthening.

Abbreviations

*… – reconstructed proto-form

<…> – orthographic representation

[…] – phonetic transcription

 ISSN 2453-8035

> – developed into (by a sound change)

< – developed from (by a sound change)

1sg. – first person singular (present tense)

2sg. – second person singular (present tense)

3sg. – third person singular (present tense)

acc. – accusative

dat. – dative

f. – feminine

gen. – genitive

IE – Indo-European

loc. – locative

m. – masculine

n. – neuter

nom. – nominative

OCS – Old Church Slavonic

OED – The Oxford English dictionary

PGmc, PGm. – Proto-Germanic

PIE – Proto-Indo-European

Pre-Gm. – Pre-Germanic

pl. – plural

PSl. – Proto-Slavic

sg. – singular

s.v. – sub verbo, under the lemma

References

Beekes, R.S.P. (2011). *Comparative Indo-European linguistics: An introduction.* 2nd ed. Revised and corrected by de Vaan, M. Amsterdam – Philadelphia: Benjamins.

Blažek, V. (2001). Indo-European kinship terms in *-*ə₂ter*. In *Grammaticus: Studia linguistica Adolfo Erharto quinque et septuagenario oblata*. Brno: Masarykova Univerzita v Brne, p. 24-33.

Boryś, W. (2005). *Słownik etymologiczny języka polskiego.* Kraków: Wydawnictwo Literackie.

Boryś, W. (2018). Ze studiów etymologicznych nad ludowym słownictwem chorwackim. In *Rocznik Slawistyczny*, LXVII, p. 3-23.

Brereton, J.P. & Jamison, S.W. (2020). *The Rigveda: A guide*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Brugmann, K. (1891). *A comparative grammar of the Indo-Germanic languages.* New York: Westermann & Co.

Brugmann, K. (1889). *Grundriss der vergleichenden Grammatik der indogermanischen Sprachen. Vol. 2: Wortbildungslehre (Stammbildungs- und Flexionslehre) Part 1*. Strassburg: Karl J. Trübner. Translated into English as Brugmann, K. (1891).

Campbell, A. (1959). *Old English grammar*. Reprinted in 2003. Oxford: Oxford: Oxford University Press (Clarendon).

Carruba, O. (1995). Die Verwandtschaftsnamen auf *-ter* des Indogermanischen. In *Analecta Indoeuropaea Cracoviensis*. *Vol. 2. Kuryłowicz memorial volume*, part 1, Smoczyński, W. (ed.). Cracow: Universitas, p. 143-158.

Collinge, N.E. (1985). *The laws of Indo-European*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Crnek, V. (2005). *Kaj ne bi pozabili.* Krapina: Društvo za Kajkavsko Kulturno Stvaralaštvo.

Cyran, E. & Nilsson, M. (1998). The Slavic [w > v] shift: A case for phonological strength. In *Structure and interpretation – Studies in phonology.* Cyran, E. (ed.). Lublin: Folium, p. 89-100.

Derksen, R. (2015). *Etymological dictionary of the Baltic inherited lexicon*. Leiden – Boston: Brill.

Derksen, R. (2008). *Etymological dictionary of the Slavic inherited lexicon*. Leiden – Boston: Brill.

Derksen, R. (2011). The fate of the neuter *o*-stems in Balto-Slavic. In *Accent matters. Papers on Balto-Slavic accentology* (Studies in Slavic and general linguistics, 37), Pronk, T. & Derksen, R. (eds.). Amsterdam – New York: Rodopi, p. 59-66.

Fulk, R.D. (2018). *A comparative grammar of the Early Germanic languages.* Amsterdam – Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company.

Furlan, M. (2005a). Vẹ́ti II. In *Etimološki slovar slovenskega jezika*. Vol. 4. Bezlaj, E. (ed.). Ljubljana: Slovenska Akademija Znanosti in Umetnosti, p. 307.

Furlan, M. (2005b). Zavet I. In *Etimološki slovar slovenskega jezika*. Vol. 4. Bezlaj, E. (ed.). Ljubljana: Slovenska Akademija Znanosti in Umetnosti, p. 395-396.

Hirt, H.A. (2009) [1927]. *Indogermanische Grammatik. Vol. 3: Das Nomen*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Hirt, H.A. (1893). Zu den slavischen Auslautgesetzen. In *Indogermanische Forschungen*, 2, p. 337-364.

Hogg, R.M. & Fulk, R.D. (2011). *A grammar of Old English. Vol. 2: Morphology*. Oxford: Wiley-Blackwell.

Hólmarsson, S., Sanders, Ch. & Tucker, J. (2009). *Íslensk-ensk orðabók*. Reykjavík: Forlagið.

Hrg, F., Hranjec, S. & Jembrih, A. (1996). *Ivanečki govor i rječnik* (Ivonjski goavar i riečnik). Ivanec: Narodno Sveučilište "Đuro Arnold".

Illič-Svityč, V.M. (1979). *Nominal accentuation in Baltic and Slavic*. Cambridge – London: The MIT Press.

Klein, E. (1966). *A comprehensive etymological dictionary of the English language. Vol. 2: L–Z.* Amsterdam – London – New York: Elsevier Publishing Company.

Kluge, F. (2011). *Etymologisches Wörterbuch der deutschen Sprache*. 25th ed. Bearbeitet von Elmar Seebold. Berlin – Boston: De Gruyter.

Kowalski, A. (2017). *Kultura indoeuropejska.* Gdańsk: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Gdańskiego.

Kroonen, G. (2013). *Etymological dictionary of Proto-Germanic*. Leiden – Boston: Brill.

Lass, R. (1994). *Old English: A historical linguistic companion*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Lass, R. (1992). Phonology and morphology. In *The Cambridge history of the English language*. *Vol. 2: 1066–1476*. Blake, N. (ed.). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, p. 23-155.

Lorentz, F. (1908-12). *Slovinzisches Wörterbuch.* 2 volumes. St. Petersburg: Imperatorskaja Akademija Nauk.

Lunt, H.G. (2001). *Old Church Slavonic grammar*. (7th rev. ed.). Berlin – New York: Mouton de Gruyter.

Magnússon, Á.B. (1989). *Íslensk orðsifjabók*. Reykjavík: Orðabók Háskólans.

Mallory, J.P. & Adams, D.Q. (2006). *The Oxford introduction to Proto-Indo-European and the Proto-Indo-European world.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Mann, S.E. (1984/87). *An Indo-European comparative dictionary*. Hamburg: Helmut Buske.

Mańczak, W. (1983). *Polska fonetyka i morfologia historyczna.* Warszawa: Państwowe Wydawnictwo Naukowe.

Martirosyan, H.K. (2009). *Etymological dictionary of the Armenian inherited lexicon*. Leiden – Boston: Brill.

Matasović, R. (2009). *Etymological dictionary of Proto-Celtic*. Leiden – Boston: Brill.

Matasović, R. (2014). *Slavic nominal word-formation. Proto-Indo-European origins and historical development*. Heidelberg: Winter.

Mažiulis, V. (1997). *Prūsų kalbos etimologijos žodynas. Vol. 4: R–Z.* Vilnius: Mokslas. Available at: http://www.prusistika.flf.vu.lt/paieska/paieska/

Meier-Brügger, M. (2003). *Indo-European linguistics*. Berlin – New York: Walter de Gruyter.

Meillet, A. (1958). *Wstęp do językoznawstwa indoeuropejskiego.* Warszawa: Państwowe Wydawnictwo Naukowe.

Miller, D.G. (2012). *External influences on English*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Minkova, D. & Stockwell, R. (1992). Homorganic clusters as moraic busters in the history of English: The case of -ld, -nd, -mb. In *History of Englishes: New methods and interpretations in historical linguistics.* Rissanen, M., Ihalainen, O., Nevalainen, T. & Taavitsainen, I. (eds.). Berlin – New York: Mouton de Gruyter.

The Oxford English dictionary. (2009). Oxford: Oxford University Press. CD-ROM (v. 4.0.0.3).

Olander, T. (2015). *Proto-Slavic inflectional morphology: A comparative handbook*. Leiden – Boston: Brill.

Orel, V. (2003). *A handbook of Germanic etymology*. Leiden – Boston: Brill.

Pinault, G. (2007). A star is born: A "new" Proto-Indo-European *-*ter*- suffix. In *Verba docenti: Studies in historical and Indo-European linguistics presented to Jay H. Jasanoff by students, colleagues and friends.* Nussbaum, A.J. (ed.). Ann Arbor – New York: Beech Stave Press, p. 271-279.

Pokorny, J. (2002) [1959]. *Indogermanisches etymologisches Wörterbuch.* Bern – Munich: Francke.

Pultrová, L. (2007). The Latin nomina agentis in *-tor*. In *Listy filologické*, CXXX (3-4), p. 251-264.

Ringe, D. (2006). *From Proto-Indo-European to Proto-Germanic*. (A linguistic history of English, vol. 1). Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Ringe, D. & Taylor, A. (2014). *The development of Old English* (A linguistic history of English, vol. 2). Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Ritt, N. (1994). *Quantity adjustment: Vowel lengthening and shortening in Early Middle English*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Rospond, S. (1979). *Gramatyka historyczna języka polskiego*. Warszawa: Państwowe Wydawnictwo Naukowe.

Rychło, M. (2012). An etymological comparison of English *fist* and Polish *pięść*: How they both descended from the PIE root for 'five'. In *Linguistica silesiana*, 33, p. 19-38.

Rychło, M. (2016). Can weep lure? An analysis of a controversial Slavico-Germanic pair of cognates. In *Beyond philology*, 13, p. 103-124.

Rychło, M. (2019). *Contrasting cognates in modern languages from a diachronic perspective*. Gdańsk: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Gdańskiego.

Rychło, M. (2013). English *herd* and Polish *trzoda*: How the two words developed from one Proto-Indo-European root. In *Acta neophilologica*, XV (1), p. 155-166.

Rychło, M. (2018a). Englisch *mead*, polnisch *miód* und hochdeutsch *Met* aus der historisch-vergleichenden Perspektive. In *Acta Universitatis Lodziensis Folia Germanica*, 14, p. 57-65.

Rychło, M. (2014a). Gothic *wopjan*, Polish *wabić* and English *weep*. In *The Subcarpathian studies in English language, literature and culture.* Vol. 1. Kleparski, G.A., Konieczna, E. & Kopecka, B. (eds.). Rzeszów: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Rzeszowskiego, p. 121-132.

Rychło, M. (2018b). Polish *reż* and English *rye* concealed in Polish *rżysko*: A case study of a pair of cognates and a root archaism. In *Linguistica silesiana*, 39, p. 119-133.

Rychło, M. (2014b). Ślady prawa Grimma w angielszczyźnie w zestawieniu z polskimi wyrazami pokrewnymi: pie.*p > pgerm.*f. In *Język Polski*, 94 (3), p.200-211.

Samilov, M. (1964). *The phoneme* jat' *in Slavic*. The Hague – London – Paris: Mouton & Co.

Sihler, A.L. (1988). Greek reflexes of syllabic laryngeals with a postscript on PIE kinship terms in **-H_2ter*. In *Die Laryngaltheorie und die Rekonstruktion des Indogermanischen Laut- und Formensystems*. Bammesberger, A. (ed.). Heidelberg: Winter, p. 547-561.

Sławski, F. (2011). Słowotwórstwo prasłowiańskie. In *Słowotwórstwo, słownictwo i etymologia słowiańska*. Sławski, F. (ed.). Kraków: Polska Akademia Umiejętności, p. 11-182. Published originally as: Sławski, F. (1974-1979). Zarys słowotwórstwa prasłowiańskiego. In *Słownik prasłowiański.* Sławski, F. (ed.). I: p. 43-141, II: p. 13-60, III: p. 11-19.

Smoczyński, W. (2020). *Słownik etymologiczny języka litewskiego*. 2nd ed. Available at: https://rromanes.org/pub/alii/Smoczy%C5%84ski%20W.%20S%C5%82ownik%20etymologiczny%20j%C4%99zyka%20litewskiego.pdf

Stieber, Z. (2005) [1979]. *Zarys gramatyki porównawczej języków słowiańskich.* Warszawa: Wydawnictwo Naukowe PWN.

Stone, G. (1993). Cassubian. In *The Slavonic languages*. Comrie, B. & Corbett, G.G. (eds.). London – New York: Routledge, p. 759-794.

 ISSN 2453-8035

Szemerényi, O.J.L. (1996). *Introduction to Indo-European linguistics*. Oxford: Clarendon. (Translated from *Einführung in die vergleichende Sprachwissenschaft*, 4th ed., Darmstadt, 1990.)

Townsend, Ch.E. & Janda, L.A. (1996). *Common and comparative Slavic: Phonology and inflection with special attention to Russian, Polish, Czech, Serbo-Croatian, Bulgarian.* Columbus: Slavica Publishers.

Trask, R.L. (2000). *The dictionary of historical and comparative linguistics.* Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.

Trubachev, O.N. (ed.). (1994). *The etymological dictionary of Slavic languages: Proto-Slavic lexical stock.* Vol. 21. Moscow: Nauka. / Trubachev O.N. (red.). *Etimologicheskij slovar' slavyanskikh yazykov: Praslavyanskij leksicheskij fond*. Tom 21. Moskva: Nauka. / Трубачев О.Н. (ред.). *Этимологический словарь славянских языков: Праславянский лексический фонд.* Том 21. Москва: Наука.

de Vaan, M. (2008). *Etymological dictionary of Latin and the other Italic languages*. Leiden – Boston: Brill.

Vaillant, A. (1974). *Grammaire comparée des langues slaves. Vol. IV: Formation des noms.* Paris: Klincksieck.

Vasmer, M.J.F. (1955). *Russisches etymologisches Wörterbuch*. Heidelberg: Carl Winter Universitätsverlag.

Vitezović, R. (2009). *Lexicon latino-illyricum. Vol. 3: Hrvatsko-latinski rječnik.* Prepared by Vajs, N. & Meštrović, Z. Zagreb: ArTresor Naklada – Institut Za Hrvatski Jezik I Jezikoslovlje.

Watkins, C. (2011). *The American heritage dictionary of Indo-European roots.* Boston – New York: Houghton Mifflin Company.

 ISSN 2453-8035

Contact data

	*name:*	**Mikołaj Rychło**
	academic title / rank:	Dr hab. in Linguistics Associate Professor
	department:	English Language and Theoretical Linguistics Division. Institute of English and American Studies. Faculty of Languages
	institution:	University of Gdansk 51, Wita Stwosza St., Gdańsk, 80-308, Poland
	e-mail:	mikolaj.rychlo@ug.edu.pl
	fields of interest:	Etymology, history of English, history of Polish, morphology, diachronic phonology, Proto-Indo-European, historical and comparative linguistics.

Résumé

The paper presents a diachronic analysis of PSl. **větrъ* and PGmc **windaz*. Apart from explaining the etymology, the research seeks to account for the discrepant shapes of these words in Polish and English. The analysis is carried out according to a new approach to contrastive studies developed by the author of the present paper. Taking into account cognates in other languages, an attempt is made to fulfil the following aims. Firstly, the study seeks to uncover the concealed word-formation processes as well as to expose their traces which have survived in modern languages. The original derivation of the ancestor of the English word *wind* is uncontroversial: it is a fossilized present active participle, whose traces can also be found in *friend* and *fiend*. This participle is still productive in German. Polish *wiatr* (and PSl. **větrъ*), however, is more ambiguous. The usual explanation involves the recognition of the suffix **-tro-*, which has been identified with a number of derivational categories, such as *nomina actionis* and *nomina instrumenti*. Several scenarios are considered with a view to supplying some missing links of the previous explanations. Secondly, the paper endeavours to explain the evolution of the common root of Polish *wiatr* and English *wind* by reconstructing its development from Proto-Indo-European. In order to understand both lines of development, the study aims to identify the phonological changes which affected the proto-forms. The conducted analysis has shown that some

 ISSN 2453-8035

of these sound laws should include additional factors, which are offered in Section 4. The phonological changes are illustrated with further examples, and, in the conclusion, they are arranged chronologically.

Key words: etymology, Polish-English cognates, Slavic-Germanic cognates, diachronic word-formation, sound changes, Proto-Indo-European, Proto-Slavic, Proto-Germanic.

Article was received by the editorial board 29.12.2020;
Reviewed 12.02.2021 and 17.02.2021.
Similarity Index 3%