Mikołaj Rychło

Contrasting Cognates in Modern Languages from a Diachronic Perspective

Contrasting Cognates in Modern Languages from a Diachronic Perspective

Mikołaj Rychło

Contrasting Cognates in Modern Languages from a Diachronic Perspective

to Ela

Table of contents

Acknowledgements

Abbreviations

=	the relation of exact cognates (both sensu stricto and sensu lato)
&	one of the compared languages exhibits a derivative whose base occurs in the cognate language
&/	one of the compared languages exhibits a derivative whose base occurs in the cognate language, one of the comparanda displays a foreign trait
^	independent derivatives in both languages with cognate roots
=^	cognates which can simultaneously be considered independent derivatives
//	related by borrowing (direct or indirect, also borrowed independently from a third source)
=/	exact cognates with a foreign trait
>	developed into (by a sound change)
<	developed from (by a sound change)
→ ←	morphological changes or replacements
~	alternating with
+	and later
*…	reconstructed proto-form
<…>	orthographic representation
[…]	phonetic transcription
/…/	phonemic transcription

1sg.	first person singular (present tense, unless otherwise specified)
3pl.	third person plural (present tense, unless otherwise specified)
3sg.	third person singular (present tense, unless otherwise specified)
arch.	archaic
A	accusative
c.	common gender
dial.	dialectal
du.	dual
D	dative
fem., f.	feminine
G	genitive
L	locative
masc., m.	masculine
n.	neuter
N	nominative
obs.	obsolete
pl.	plural
RV	*Rig-Veda*
sg.	singular
s.v.	sub verbo, under the lemma

Language abbreviations

Alb.	Albanian	Cz.	Czech
Arm.	Armenian	Da.	Danish
Att.	Attic	Dor.	Doric
Av.	Avestan	Du.	Dutch
Bulg.	Bulgarian	E	English
CS	Church Slavic	EFri.	East or Saterlandic Frisian
Čak.	Čakavian	Elfd.	Elfdalian, Övdalian

EModE	Early Modern English	OFri.	Old Frisian
Far.	Faroese	OHG	Old High German
G	German	OIr.	Old Irish
Goth.	Gothic	ON	Old Norse
Grk	Greek	OP	Old Polish
Hitt.	Hittite	OPr.	Old Prussian
Ic.	Icelandic	ORu.	Old Russian
Latv.	Latvian	OS	Old Saxon
Lat.	Latin	P	Polish
LG	Low German	PIE	Proto-Indo-European
Lyd.	Lydian	PGmc	Proto-Germanic
Lith.	Lithuanian	PSl.	Proto-Slavic
Luv.	Luvian	Ru.	Russian
MDu.	Middle Dutch	Sc.	Scottish
ME	Middle English	SCr.	Serbo-Croatian
MHG	Middle High German	SerbCS	Serbian Church Slavonic
MLG	Middle Low German	Skt.	Sanskrit
M	Middle	Sln.	Slovene
Mod	Modern	Slk	Slovak
ModE	Modern English	Sw.	Swedish
Nw.	Norwegian	Toch.	Tocharian
O	Old	Umbr.	Umbrian
OAv.	Old Avestan	USrb.	Upper Sorbian
OCS	Old Church Slavonic	WGmc	West Germanic
OCz.	Old Czech	WFri.	West (Lauwers) Frisian
ODu.	Old Dutch	WS	West Saxon
OE	Old English	YAv.	Young Avestan

Part 1

Introduction

Chapter 1
Aims

There are two main aims of this book: firstly, to offer an approach to contrastive analysis of modern languages with a view to revealing the common inherited element and contributing to an understanding of the disparities between the form and meaning exhibited by the cognate material; and secondly, to conduct such analysis on the basis of the collected material in Polish and English. To be more specific, this aim can be further developed into the following objectives:

- to collect Polish-English cognates and to present their Balto-Slavic, Germanic and Indo-European background
- to explain the similarities and differences in each pair of cognates referring to the changes which transformed the common ancestor and to capture the relevant traces of common origin.

It is hoped that the realization of these objectives will help to foreground the common inherited elements in both languages, and also to encourage a view of Polish and English as being genetically related and still carrying traces of Proto-Indo-European origin. The approach which is developed in the present book was preceded by a number of case studies which investigated individual Polish-English cognates (Rychło 2012, 2013, 2016, 2018a), as well as the papers which contrasted more cognates and focused on sound changes (Rychło 2014a, 2014b, 2017a).

Chapter 2
The contribution of the present approach to contrastive linguistics

Contrastive linguistics gives an exhaustive account of differences and similarities between two or more languages under comparison (cf. Fisiak *et al.* 1978: 10, Krzeszowski 1990, Polański 1999: 214). Many works in contrastive linguistics are associated with applied linguistics and focus on specific purposes, such as translating or teaching. The idea of contrastive analysis has often been used with a view to enabling teachers to anticipate areas of learning difficulty on the basis of comparing the learner's language with the target (Strevens 2003: 114). A good illustration of Polish-English contrastive analysis for this purpose is the study by Ewa Willim and Elżbieta Mańczak-Wohlfeld (1997). In general, contrastive linguistics is sometimes associated with practical purposes only, for example Hellinger (1977: 2), who labels the field "anwendungsorientiert." Nevertheless, this does not have to be the case. Fisiak *et al.* (1978: 9) as well as Polański (1999: 214) distinguish two types of contrastive linguistics: theoretical and applied. Gussmann goes even further and considers the association with applied linguistics to be mistaken with reference to the history of contrastive investigations (Gussmann 1978: 148). The theoretical approach to contrastive linguistics used to be associated with generative models, especially in the early years of the journal *Papers and Studies in Contrastive Linguistics*, which eventually changed its name in 1998. Although it no longer has "contrastive linguistics" in its title, many papers still contain contrastive analyses – e.g. volume 47(4), published in December 2011 and entirely devoted to contrastive word formation (guest-edited by Jesús Fernández-Domínguez, Marie-Aude Lefer, and Vincent Renner).

An overview of the field leads to two general conclusions: firstly, contrastive linguistics does not include a diachronic perspective; and secondly, the general aim of contrastive linguistics is to understand the similarities and differences between two modern languages under comparison. The contribution of the present approach to contrastive linguistics can be summarised in the following way.

If the two languages under comparison are genetically related, an important part of the similarities which they display is caused by the fact that they are descended from a common ancestor. Likewise, in many respects, the reasons for the differences lie in the changes that affected these languages over the years. Therefore, the thesis which characterizes the present approach is that a diachronic perspective is a prerequisite for understanding the similarities and differences between the cognate languages; and, consequently, that the study of changes that the contrasting languages have undergone should constitute a crucial part of contrastive linguistics.

One might think that including a diachronic perspective in contrastive linguistics will result in the same discipline as historical and comparative linguistics. Yet this is not the case, because historical and comparative linguistics does not aim at explaining similarities and differences between the modern languages, but instead compares (mainly the oldest attested) languages with a view to reconstructing the common ancestor or the changes which occurred in the languages under comparison.

Needless to say, the aim of understanding similarities and differences between modern Polish and English is more general than the aims of the present book (introduced above). The similarities may result from various factors, such as borrowing, onomatopoeia, independent morphological formations or simply coincidence. Nevertheless, similarity resulting from common ancestry seems to be a very important factor, going beyond practical and utilitarian purposes. It is a question of common roots and heritage, which is often unavailable in other extralinguistic forms. The possibility that the present proposal may have practical aspects cannot be excluded, although they are not the main concern here, i.e. they remain as a potential, which will, it is hoped, be realized in the future.

Chapter 3
The cognates

In the light of the aims introduced above, the basic notion in the current research is that of a *cognate*, which is understood 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" (Trask 2000: 62). This way of conceptualizing cognates excludes numerous pairs such as P *muzyka* // E *music*, P *armia* // E *army*, P *alfabet* // E *alphabet*, P *maszyna* // E *machine*, or P *manuskrypt* // E *manuscript*, P *problem* // E *problem*, because the words did not follow the descending line from Proto-Indo-European, through Proto-Slavic and Proto-Germanic, to Modern Polish and English, but were borrowed relatively late from Latin (and Latin borrowed from Greek) and arrived in modern Polish and English often via other intermediaries, such as German or (Old) French, respectively.

Slavic and Germanic belong to the Indo-European family of languages in the sense that they share a common ancestor. The basic vocabularies of modern Polish and English show numerous traces of common origin, which can be considered the inherited element, as opposed to external (foreign) influence. Rarely are these relics easily discernible for non-specialists, but it is possible to find illustrative examples which bear considerable resemblance even today:

(1)
P *nos* = E *nose*   P *dwa* = E *two*
P *siostra* = E *sister*   P *trzy* = E *three*
P *syn* = E *son*   P *nowy* = E *new*
P *brat* = E *brother*   P *świnia* = E *swine*

P *woda* = E *water*   P *mysz* = E *mouse*
P *strumień* = E *stream*   P *śnieg* = E *snow*
P *wdowa* = E *widow*

Much more often, however, modern cognates are less obvious, as they have been transformed in various aspects. First of all, the orthography, which is often conservative, preserves the connection. When we ignore the spelling, the relatedness of the above cognates is far less straightforward. There is actually not a single sound shared by P *dwa* = E *two*, P *trzy* = E *three*, P *świnia* = E *swine*, P *śnieg* = E *snow*. If we include articulatory details, such as that [n] is alveolar in English, but dental in Polish, there is no sound shared by the pair P *nos* = E *nose*. If we take into account the difference between English [ɒ] and Polish [ɔ], there is no sound shared by the pair P *woda* = E *water*, either. As a result of sound changes, which have been transforming cognates over the years, many Polish-English pairs no longer resemble one another:

(2)
P *trzoda* = E *herd*   P *żarna* = E *quern*
P *osiem* = E *eight*   P *kuć* = E *hew*
P *słoma* = E *haulm*   P *oko* = E *eye*
P *srom* = E *harm*   P *gnieść* = E *knead*
P *pięść* = E *fist*   P *znać* = E *know*
P *złoto* = E *gold*

Yet being familiar with the main sound changes, one can spot the resemblance and it is possible to demonstrate that a given pair of cognates developed from the same common ancestral word.[1] Moreover, when one goes beyond the superficial similarity, and endeavours to reconstruct a common ancestor, one is confronted with numerous problems which undermine what seemed initially to be an evident case, viz. P *nos* = E *nose* (discussed in Chapter 8.4).

---

[1]   Two case studies which investigate two pairs of the cognates mentioned above (i.e. P *pięść* = E *fist* and P *trzoda* = E *herd*) are offered in Rychło (2012) and Rychło (2013).

Apart from sound changes, many cognates have undergone morphological changes. It is sometimes the case that an exact cognate became extinct in one language and the closest cognate is a derivative with a different ablaut grade and/or a suffix that is absent in the other language. Examples are offered below in (3):

(3a)
P *serce* &/ E *heart*
P *słońce* & E *sun*
P *język* & E *tongue*

(3b)
P *jabłko* & E *apple*
P *matka* & E *mother*
P *córka* & E *daughter*

(3c)
P *wiatr* ^ E *wind*
P *przyjaciel* ^ E *friend*
P *rżysko* & E *rye*
P *prosię* & E *farrow*
P *pieszy* & E *foot*
P *dziąsło* & E *tooth*

All these partial cognates contain a common root and at least one word in each pair displays additional morphological material (usually a suffix) which does not find cognate correspondence. In some cases (illustrated in 3a), it is difficult to ascertain what meaning was contributed by the suffix. In other cases (as in 3b), the meaning of the suffix can be established on the basis of older stages of language development coupled with the meaning which persists in other derivatives. The function of *-ka/-ko* and *-yk* in Polish is to derive diminutives, as in *dziur-ka* 'little hole', *jezior-ko* 'little lake' and *noż-yk* 'little knife' – cf. Szymanek (2010: 203–210). Consequently, we may infer that *matka*, *córka* and *jabłko* used to be diminutives as well (cf. Polish *mać*, *córa* and Old Polish *jabło*[2]). Likewise, the word *język* might be interpreted as a historical diminutive were it not for the absence of additional arguments. Although they are not exact cognates, many of the words in (3c) are remarkable, as they disclose concealed word-formation processes and preserve petrified relics of what used to be once productive

---

[2]   The form *jabło* 'apple' is provided by Derksen (2008: 25), but is found neither in *Słownik staropolski* nor in *Słownik polszczyzny XVI wieku*. Yet there is another derivative: *jabłoń* 'apple tree' which appears to confirm the existence of the base *jabło* 'apple'.

affixes, e.g. the *nd* in *wind* and *friend*, which reveal fossilized present participles cognate with productive participles in German (e.g. *fragend* 'asking'), Polish *-ąc* or Latin *-ent/-ant* (which is often found in loanwords, such as *existent*, *present*, *pregnant*). It is also noteworthy that an exact cognate of Polish *przyjaciel* is recorded in Old Saxon *friuthil* 'lover' (cf. Tiefenbach 2010: 108). Another fossil is preserved in *dziąsło* 'gum': the root is the old, Proto-Indo-European word for 'tooth', retained in English, whereas the suffix can be compared with instrumental formatives in *-dło* such as P *mydło* 'soap' and P *kowadło* 'anvil' – cf. Szymanek (2010: 47). The suffix has a synonymous variant *-sło*, as in P *wiosło* 'oar' (from the ancestor of P *wieźć* 'to transport') or P *masło* 'butter' (from the ancestor of P *mazać* 'smear').

The meaning of cognates is often proximate, but may also have undergone various changes. As a result, some cognates exhibit semantic disparities, which can be illustrated with the following examples:

(4)
E *ask* & P *iskać* 'search for lice/fleas'
E *comb* = P *ząb* 'tooth'
E *make* = P *mazać* 'to smear, to doodle'
E *swear* = P *swarzyć* obs. 'quarrel, squabble, gripe'[3]
E *quean* = P *żona* 'wife'
E *quick* = P *żywy* 'alive'
E *red* = P *rudy* 'red-haired, ginger-haired'
E *weep* = P *wabić* 'lure'

Cognates, in general, preserve various traces of common origin, many of which are concealed behind the phonological, morphological and semantic changes which transformed the common ancestor. One of the aims of this book is to show the potential of the offered approach for revealing these oldest native and inherited traces which survive in modern English and Polish. The investigation of many Polish-English cognates for the pur-

---

[3]   Dictionaries of present-day Polish (e.g. Szymczak 1995, Dubisz 2008) do not include the verb *swarzyć*, but there are various derivatives, e.g. *swary* 'strife', *swarliwy* 'quarrelsome'. Doroszewski (1958–1969) includes the reflexive verb *swarzyć się* 'quarrel, squabble' and also *swarzyć* 'gripe', the latter with the label "obs."

pose of the present publication has resulted in capturing various archaic elements which may be identified at several levels.

At the semantic level, the most significant value of revealing the archaic relics lies in accessing elements of the Proto-Indo-European world, e.g. cereals, technical advances (the wheel), wool, vehicles (the cart). The occurrence as well as morphological structure of some words in the common ancestor language can disclose indirectly not only what our ancestors talked about, but also what and how they perceived their realities and what belonged to their world.

At the phonological level, one of the two languages may happen to retain a sound which has remained intact for many centuries or even millennia (for example [w] in English *water*, *widow*, *wolf*, etc. is a remarkable relic), whereas most other Indo-European languages changed the sound, usually to [v], cf. Polish *woda*, *wdowa*, *wilk*. Further examples may be sought not only in German (cf. G *Wasser*, G *Witwe*, G *Wolf*) but also in Latin (cf. Lat. *vīnum*). It is interesting to note that the sound was also pronounced as a semivowel in Latin until the first century AD (cf. Miller 2012: 55). Remarkable traces of this fact are found in early continental loanwords from Latin, which are still pronounced in English with an initial glide, e.g. *wine*, *wall* – cf. Lat. *vīnum*, *vallum* 'palisade' (later reborrowings include *vine*, *vallation* 'rampart').

The relics may also manifest themselves with various degrees of faithfulness to the original stage. By the original stage we assume the language of the common ancestor. If we assume PIE to be the original stage and consider the word for 'tooth': *(*H*)*dont*- (regardless of the apophonic grade) and subsequently compare the English *tooth* with Polish *dziąsło*, we might draw the superficial conclusion that Polish has lost almost all the original features: no original sound is retained, the meaning is no longer 'tooth', there is a different suffix, and ablaut grade. The only certain relic seems to be the root per se, which can undoubtedly be identified with the root of the English *tooth*, and sound changes may be employed to demonstrate this identity.

Yet such a conclusion would be oversimplified because it takes into account only the superficial similarity. On closer inspection, we can point out that Polish retains a few phonological features, such as nasality, which is manifested in the vocalic melody and voicedness of the initial affricate. On the morphological and semantic levels, the structure of *dziąsło* implies that it must have been viewed as an instrument for holding teeth. On

The book presents a convincing attempt at combining the contrastive analysis applied to modern languages with a diachronic approach. The author analyses collected Polish--English cognates, referring to their Proto-Germanic and Proto--Slavic forms, and goes on to explain their relationship at the level of Proto-Indo-European. He researches their similarities and disparities, thoroughly explaining the phonological, morphological and semantic processes that occurred in the histories of the languages under comparison or in their prehistories.

Dr Mikołaj Rychło has elaborated convincing methodological criteria for researching Polish-English cognates, which he skilfully develops, discussing not only the evident and probable cases, but also controversial and difficult ones. The work under review is innovative for methodological reasons and also by virtue of the author's approach to the issue of Polish-English linguistic affinity. I assess the study as being a major scientific contribution to the fields of contrastive and diachronic research.

prof. dr hab. Krzysztof Tomasz Witczak