



**HAL**  
open science

## Is a 'friend an 'enemy'? Between 'proximity' and 'opposition'

Sergueï Sakhno, Nicole Tersis

► **To cite this version:**

Sergueï Sakhno, Nicole Tersis. Is a 'friend an 'enemy'? Between 'proximity' and 'opposition'. M.Vanhove. From Polysemy to Semantic Change, J.Benjamins, pp.317-339, 2008, Studies in Language Companion Series, 10.1075/slcs.106.16sak . halshs-00724577

**HAL Id: halshs-00724577**

**<https://shs.hal.science/halshs-00724577>**

Submitted on 27 Aug 2012

**HAL** is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.

L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.

Cet article a été publié en 2008 dans *From Polysemy to Semantic Change*, M. Vanhove (ed), Amsterdam, John Benjamins, pp. 317-339.

## **Is a ‘friend’ an ‘enemy’ ? Between “proximity” and “opposition”**

Sergueï SAKHNO Université de Paris X, Nicole TERSIS (SeDyL-CNRS)

### **Introduction**

This article is a contribution to a joint project which aims at describing systematically semantic analogies observed crosslinguistically both in synchrony and diachrony, i.e. *isosemies* (semantic relations shared by many languages, cf. Pottier 2001). It focuses on a number of recurring semantic associations for the terms meaning “friend” in different genetic stocks. ‘Friend’ is used here as a generic metalinguistic concept, because it may be difficult to distinguish ‘friend’ from ‘fellow’, ‘comrade’, ‘companion’ and ‘mate’ (Buck 1949: 1343). The notion of ‘friendship’ (Greek *philia*, Latin *amicitia*) in Western philosophical, political and religious traditions partly intersects with that of ‘love’ (Greek *agapê*), and is extremely complex. It has been widely commented since Antiquity (see the excellent overview in Rey 2005: 274-277). The notions of ‘friend’, ‘friendship’, in connection with related words in main European languages, have been thoroughly discussed by A. Wierbicka (1997: chap. 1) from a ethno-sociological and cultural point of view, insisting on the “irreducible” semantic and pragmatic differences between e.g. English *friend* and Russian *drug*. But these questions are beyond our survey in spite of their great interest.

The main question which arises when faced with the crosslinguistic variety in the lexical and semantic fields organized around ‘friend’, as for any other concept, is to decide at which level the associations should be placed in order to use an undisputable methodological approach:

1. The first possible level is that of immediate observable facts, either in synchrony, i.e. polysemy and derivation, or in recent diachrony (rather than remote etymologies), postulating links that seem “natural”. E.g., “Russian *drug* ‘friend’ comes from *drugoj* ‘other’,” in which the semantic link could be glossed as “the ‘other one’ which corresponds to *drug* is the one one should love and respect, i.e. traditionally the closest friend, the most faithful” (cf. Lat. *alter ego* or *alter idem* ‘other oneself’);
2. The second level concerns more theorized “intermediate” semantic relations: the most ancient meaning of the Russian root may not be ‘other’ but rather ‘following’, if one accepts the assumed Indo-European remote etymology (I.-Eu. \**dhroughos* ‘companion’ < \**dh(e)reugh-* ‘to follow; to help; to carry on (a military campaign)’); thus, ‘following’ gave rise to the meanings of ‘other’, or ‘second’, or ‘friend’<sup>1</sup>;
3. The third level is that of very abstract theorized semantic relations: the starting concept could be for instance ‘duality’ and/or ‘complementarity’, which generates ‘other’, ‘second’, ‘friend’, but also ‘opposite’, and ‘deceit, lie’.

Each level shows different granularity of the semantic associations and determines the direction of the semantic connections. Each level has its advantages and drawbacks. Here an attempt is made to overview the semantic data starting mostly from levels 1 or 2 and trying to access to level 3, as reflected in the organization of this paper.

---

<sup>1</sup> However, the semantic chain is not clear. Is it ‘follower, who follows sb’ > ‘companion, friend’ or rather ‘following’ > ‘second’ > ‘other’ > ‘friend’?

The language sample focuses mainly on languages of the Indo-European and Eskimo-Aleut genetic stocks. In addition, data were provided by our colleagues (research group “Typology of semantic associations”, CNRS) for some Afro-Asiatic, Niger-Congo, Nilo-Saharan, Amerindian, and Austronesian languages: Classical Arabic and Beja (Afro-Asiatic, Martine Vanhove), Kasem (Niger-Congo, Emilio Bonvini), Wolof (Niger-Congo, Loïc-Michel Perrin), Gbaya (Niger-Congo, Yves Moñino), Sara-Bongo-Bagirmi (Nilo-Saharan, Pascal Boyeldieu), Nahuatl (Uto-Aztec, Marie-Noëlle Chamoux), Mwotlap, Mota, and Mwesen (Austronesian, Alexandre François). Most of them are synchronic data, but for some of the languages, diachronic evidence could also be used.

The Indo-European data were used within a diachronic perspective, and have been taken from Buck’s dictionary (1949), and Mallory and Adams’s (1997) as well as from the etymological dictionaries mentioned in the bibliography<sup>2</sup>.

For Inuit, as well as for the languages of the Eskimo-Aleut genetic stock (Yupik, and Aleut), the linguistic documents date back to the late 18th century, except for a few vocabulary lists collected in the 16th century by explorers and missionaries. This is the reason why the study of this language group has been led from a synchronic perspective using Inuit documents from Eastern Greenland, and compared with the other Inuit dialects and the Yupik languages drawn from the *Comparative Eskimo Dictionary* (Fortescue et al. 1994). The Eskimo and Inuit proto-forms suggested on the basis of the attested dialectal variants in this dictionary<sup>3</sup> were also investigated.

All these documents show a distinction between several semantic networks which partially overlap, and in which ‘friend’ is linked, in a first approach, to different terms designating the ‘other’ in a dual relation. Our presentation will be threefold according to the semantic associations of ‘friend’ with the following semantic fields: proximity, complementarity, and opposition.

## 1. ‘Friend’ ~ ‘duality’ ~ ‘proximity’

A first type of semantic association associates ‘friend’ with ‘other one’, ‘another’ in a dual relationship which implies proximity or the sharing of relationships. Since the concept of ‘other’ implies ‘the other one, another’, it may be associated with ‘one’, ‘(the first) one’ and/or ‘the same one’, and more precisely with ‘the other one’ as defined in relation to the individual in an exclusive binary relationship (cf. Latin *alter* as opposed to *alius*, Greek *heteros* in contrast with *allos*). The grammaticalization link ONE > OTHER is noted by Heine, Kuteva (2002: 223).

### 1.1. ‘Friend’ ~ ‘other’ ~ ‘one of the two’

This semantic association is attested in synchrony for several language stocks, and the classification below comes under our level 1 of analysis.

- In synchrony, Russian *drug* ‘friend’ seems to establish obvious semantic and formal links with the adjective *drugoj* ‘other’, ‘second’, ‘different’, and ‘the other of two, the other side, opposite (riverbank)’, as well as with the reciprocal marker *drug druga*.

---

<sup>2</sup> Therefore, the references are not systematically cited.

<sup>3</sup> Abbreviations: apart from the usual and easily recognizable abbreviations such as I.-Eu. (Indo-European), we also use the following notations: PE: proto-Eskimo, PI: proto-Inuit, AAY: Alutiiq Alaskan Yupik, CAY: Central Alaskan Yupik, NSY: Naukan Siberian Yupik, CSY: Central Siberian Yupik, SPI: Seward Peninsula Inuit, NAI: North Alaskan Inuit, WCI: Western Canadian Inuit, ECI: Eastern Canadian Inuit, GRI: Greenlandic Inuit, NG: North Greenlandic.

*Drug* ‘friend’ has its own derivative paradigm: *podruga* ‘girl friend’, *družba* ‘friendship’, *družiti* ‘to be friend with sb’, *družeskij* ‘friendly’, *družina* ‘trustis, a prince personal bodyguard’, dialectal *družka* ‘best man (at the wedding)’, *sodružestvo* ‘community’, outdated *sam-drug* ‘both together, together’<sup>4</sup>.

In old Russian, *drugŭ* ‘friend’ was identical to the so-called “short” form (*drugŭ*) of the adjective *drugŭi* / *drugoi* ‘other’ (> modern Russian *drugoj*), showing that *drug* ‘friend’ and *drugoj* ‘other’ are etymologically one and the same word.

The link between *drug* ‘friend’ and *drug druga*<sup>5</sup> ‘each other’ is used in Heine, Kuteva (2002: 91-92) to show the shift COMRADE > RECIPROCAL. But the semantic shift may be more direct between the reciprocal marker and *drugoj* ‘other’ (cf. Fr. *l’un l’autre*, Engl. *each other*), with a semantic shift ‘other’ > ‘marker of the reciprocal’.

- Similar facts can be found in other I.-Eu. languages:  
Breton *keneil* ‘companion’, from *ken-* ‘co-, with’ and *eil* ‘other, second’,  
Old Irish *cēle* ‘friend; other’ which seems to be related to old Welsh *cilydd* ‘friend’ and to Welsh *gilydd* ‘each other (reciprocal)’.
- The data from Austronesian languages show similar heterosemies and semantic links:  
Mota: *tua* ‘fellow, companion, assistant’, may be linked to *tuara* ‘some, someone; the other, another’;  
Mwotlap: *itan* ‘the other of two; one ... the other (in binary structure)’; *tan* ‘and’, is cognate with \**tua-na* ‘accomplice, companion’, cf. *X tan e Y* ‘X and Y = X his accomplice Y’.  
Mota *val* ‘to match, to set one against another; one, one of a pair; in all places, to every one; to stand opposite’; *valu-i* ‘a fellow, match, mate’ (for the enantiosemic link, see below section 3.1).
- As for the Eskimo-Aleut stock, two proto-forms designate the ‘companion’ as clearly referring as the ‘other of a pair’.

a) One of the proto-forms of PE, \**a(C)ippaR*, reconstructed by Fortescue et al. (1994: 9) establishes the semantic value of ‘companion’ as prevailing. The reconstructed meaning may be considered as a sort of “lowest common denominator” (Sweetser 1990: 24) to all the cognate forms.

In Eastern Greenland, *aappaq* means ‘companion, other (of two), second, partner, spouse’, *nutia-ata aappa-a* /spouse-of+their/second-his/ ‘his second wife’.

This term is attested in the Yupik and Inuit domains with very closely related meanings:

- (AAY) *aipaq* ‘companion, spouse, other’
- (NSY) *aypii* ‘(the) second’, *aypaqutaq* ‘companion’.
- (SPI) *aippaq* ‘companion, spouse, other of two’,
- (NAI) *aippaq* ‘mate, other of two, co-wife’,
- (WCI) *aippaq* ‘companion, spouse, other of two’,
- (GRI) *aappaq* ‘companion, spouse, other of two’,

<sup>4</sup> An attempt to synthesize, in a readable format, the synchronic lexical data for this Russian root is made in Sakhno (2005:88-89).

<sup>5</sup> The syntactic structure underlying the marker is not entirely grammaticalized : its second element may be in the accusative (*druga*), and also, depending on the predicate, in the genitive, dative, instrumental or locative, cf. *Oni dumajut drug o druge* (locative) ‘They think about each other’.

(NG) (older) also *aippaq* ‘father of woman’; *aippaxxaq* ‘father of man’; note also *aappar-* ‘get married’ (Fortescue et al., 1994: 9).

b) The second proto-form PE \*alər is reconstructed with the meaning ‘other (of pair)’ by Fortescue et al. (1994: 17), who also reconstruct a proto-cognate form for Yupik, PY *alrapak* with the meaning ‘partner’.

The cognate forms and their derivatives in the Yupik languages refer to the notions of duality and friendship, with a semantic extension towards the concept of ‘placenta’:

(AAY) *aləq* ‘(its) other, companion, placenta’,

(CAY) *alləXpak* ‘placenta’,

(NSY) *alraXpak* ‘placenta’,

(CSY) *aləq* ‘other of pair, companion, afterbirth’, *aalraq* ‘other of cooperating pair of boats, hunting partner, another family in same clan’.

In Inuit, the notion of friendship is not associated to the cognate forms:

(SPI) *arlaaq* ‘placenta, afterbirth’,

(NAI) *alra* (*i*) ‘other one of a pair’, *arlaaq* ‘afterbirth’,

(WCI) *alraq* ‘afterbirth’,

(ECI) *axxaak* ‘placenta’,

(GRI) *arla*(*r*)- ‘one of them’, *arlaaq* ‘afterbirth’, (East Greenland) *artarartit* ‘several’.

## 1.2. ‘Friend’ ~ ‘follow, following’ ~ ‘proximity’

Looking now at etymological data as a starting point, i.e. our level 2, and if the I.-Eu. etymology for \*dthroughos ‘companion’<sup>6</sup>, from \*dh(e)reugh- ‘to help; to follow; to carry on (a military campaign)’ is correct, then it is necessary to study another important link of ‘friend’ with ‘follow’.

‘Follow’ is used here as a kind of “metaterm”, for verbs meaning ‘to follow’ (cf. Engl. *to follow*, French *suivre*) which are often highly polysemous and can be interpreted as ‘to come, to go after sb/smith’; ‘to come close behind, to accompany, to attend sb/smith’; ‘to come, to move with sb/smith, in the same direction with sb’; and sometimes ‘to follow aggressively, to pursue’.

- In Slavic, the root *drug-* ‘other; friend’ studied in the previous paragraph is also polysemous with ‘second’ and ‘following’, e.g. Russian (colloquial) *odin*, *drugoj*, *tretij*... ‘one, second, third...’, *na drugoj den* ‘the following day, the day after’<sup>7</sup>.

---

<sup>6</sup> I.-Eu. \*dthroughos ‘companion’ is allegedly linked to Old Norse *drött* ‘trustis’, *drygja* ‘to carry out’, Gothic *driugan* ‘to help each other on campaign, to do military service’, *ga-drauht* ‘warrior’, Old-High-German *truht* ‘trustis, escort, retinue (of a prince), crowd, multitude, people, army’; Old English *ge-drēag* ‘troop’, *dreogan* ‘lead a (certain) life, to work, to do; to take part in, to perform’, English *to dree* ‘undergo’, *drudge* ‘work hand, beast of burden (fig.)’ and (as a verb) ‘to work hard’, *drudgery* ‘chore, unpleasant task’ (Mallory and Adams 1997: 115-116).

<sup>7</sup> Cf. *Ego ždali v sredu, a on priexal tol’ko na drugoj den* ‘He was expected to come on Wednesday, but he came the following day = the day after (i.e. on Thursday)’. It can be compared to *na vtoroj den* ‘on the second day’ which is more ambiguous and may mean ‘the day after the first day following the day of the expected event’, e.g., referring in the same context to Friday. Russian *vtoroj* (< \*wi-ter-os ‘divided by two’ > ‘separately’, or \*h<sub>1</sub>on-ter-os, cf. Engl. *other*) is the most current term for ‘second’, while *drugoj* means ‘second’ mostly in contexts of “binarity”, so the difference between *drugoj* and *vtoroj* ‘second’ is somewhat similar to the one existing in French between *second* and *deuxième*.

- ‘Other’ is commonly associated to ‘following (in time)’ in other branches of I.Eu., e.g. German *am anderen Tage* ‘the day after = on the other day’ (*ander* ‘second > other’), Albanian (dialectal) *tjatër / tjetër* ‘other’ and ‘following’.
- Russian *vdrug* ‘suddenly’ refers to the immediate succession of two events (the second event being considered to be sudden, unexpected). This word dates back to the Old Russian phrase *vũ drugũ* ‘all of a sudden, all at once’ (< ‘immediately moving on to the next phase, to the next event; both at the same time, all of a sudden’).
- The data in other Slavic languages confirm these semantic relations but also display some specific meanings and word formations. Below is a selective list:

Bulgarian: *drugar* (m) ‘mate, companion, comrade; spouse’, *drugarka* (f) ‘girl friend; spouse’; *drug* ‘other, the other; different; the other of two, the other side, opposite (side of a riverbank)’, *bez drugo* ‘without fail, absolutely’, *drugiden* ‘the day after tomorrow’, (dialectal) *drugošën* ‘old, previously, of the past’<sup>8</sup>, *edin drug* ‘reciprocal marker’= ‘one-other’.

High Sorabic: *druhi* ‘second; other, different’ and ‘next’ (*druhi króć* ‘next time’), *družina* ‘retinue, escort, trustis; species (biological), kind’<sup>9</sup>; *družba* ‘best man (at the wedding)’, *drustwo* ‘cooperative, trade guild’, *druhdy* ‘sometimes, from time to time’<sup>10</sup>.

- Other roots that mean ‘following (in time and space)’ also developed meanings such as ‘companion’ and ‘friend’.

From the assumed I.-Eu. root \*sek<sup>w</sup>- ‘to follow’ one can reconstruct I.-Eu. \*sok<sup>w</sup>-h<sub>2</sub>-oi- ‘follower, companion’ (Mallory and Adams 1997: 115):

Latin *sequi* ‘to follow’ with its derivatives: *secundus* ‘following; other; second’, *secundum* (preposition) ‘right after, following’, *sectator* ‘fellow traveller, accompanying person, supporter, friend’ (cf. *sectator domi* ‘friend of the household’), *secus* ‘differently, in a different way’, *socius* ‘mate, companion, partner, accomplice, parent, brother, ally’;

Among the French words that go back to Latin *sequi* and its family, one finds: *second* (noun, m) ‘friend, companion’, *suivante* (noun, f) ‘handmaiden’, *second* ‘second’, ‘other’; cf. also Middle French (14<sup>th</sup> century) *suiant* (adverbial) ‘at once’.

Cf. also Greek *aósseō* ‘to help’, Sanskrit *sakhā-*, Avestic *haxā-* ‘friend, companion’, Old English *secg* ‘the one who follows, follower’, Old Norse *seggr* ‘follower’.

- Other I.-Eu. terms based on other roots are semantically similar to those derived from \*sek<sup>w</sup>- ‘to follow’, and they can be related to other genetic stock data, for which both synchronic polysemous items or diachronic semantic changes can be taken into account:

Greek *akoloutos* ‘attendant, accompanying person, servant’ (< *a* (copulative) ‘with’ + *keleuthos* ‘path’ < *keleuein* ‘to direct, to push towards’), hence French *acolyte* ‘confederate, associate’;

Latin *comes, -itis* ‘companion’ < *com-ire* ‘to go together’;

Old English *gefēra* ‘fellow traveller’ < *faran* ‘to go’, cf. German *Gefährte* ‘companion’.

<sup>8</sup> Cf. French *autre* ‘other’ and *autrefois* ‘formely, once, in the past’ (< *autre* + *fois*), *l’autre jour* ‘the other day, recently’.

<sup>9</sup> The meaning ‘kind’ comes from ‘different’, cf. French *variété* ‘variety, diversity’ and ‘kind, species’.

<sup>10</sup> As semantic parallel for the latter, cf. Russian *inogda* ‘sometimes’, from *inoj* ‘one; other’ + \**gda* when’.

Classical Arabic: *ṣahḫba* (middle verb) 1. ‘to accompany sb’. 2. ‘to be sb’s companion, friend’. 3. ‘to carry sth., carry sth with o.s.’; *ṣāḫḫb* (active participle) 1. ‘companion, friend’. 2. ‘other, others (with whom one finds himself by accident)’<sup>11</sup>.

In Mwesen (Austronesian), one finds *le tuar to* ‘next year = the other year’, and *tuar* is related to the Mota word *tua* ‘friend, fellow’ (cf. § 1.1).

The PE proto-form \*alər ‘other (of pair)’ studied in section 1.1. (Fortescue et al. 1994: 17), is also relevant here as contextual uses of the cognate forms in Yupik and Inuit can express the notion of following, of proximity. With the addition of a locative affix, the notion of temporal proximity is attested in some dialectal zones of Yupik and Inuit, e.g.:

(CAY) *alXayni* ‘last year’

(GRI) *arlaani* ‘last year’, *arlaayu* ‘next year’ (Fortescue et al., 1994: 17).

• A quite interesting semantic configuration, which involves facts of polysemy and heterosemy, and cumulates some of the different meanings mentioned above, occurs in Kasem (Niger-Congo)<sup>12</sup>. A root conventionally represented as dV- seems to be linked to a whole range of forms referring to notions such as ‘companion, mate’, ‘duality’, ‘association’, ‘follow’, ‘to be together’, ‘at once’, ‘unicity’, etc.:

-dōŋ (sg.) (N.) ‘other, other one, other person; similar, double; of the same age, mate, pal, chum’.

- dā (V.) ‘to follow, go / come in a certain direction, go all over, run through; pass by, go through; to go / come close behind sb, to track, to trail, to tail sb; to conform to sth’.

- di (V.) ‘to pursue, to chase, to run after sb, to track down, to hunt down’.

- didū (N.: according to the nominal class) ‘one, only one, uniqueness, unicity’.

- bidwī (Adv.) ‘once, unique; same, identical; at once, immediately, directly’ .uu

- dā (Adv.) ‘together, one with another, jointly; mutually, reciprocally, reciprocal marker; all together, all at once, without distinction, indiscriminately’.

### 1.3 Etymological discussion

How can the semantic link between ‘friend’ and ‘proximity’ be accounted for, when postulating the intermediary stage ‘duality’? Such a question clearly comes under our level 3 of analysis, which is methodologically the most debatable. However, the above-mentioned typological data from various language stocks may help understanding some difficult cases of Indo-European reconstruction, namely for Latin etymology.

It is known that the etymology of Lat. *amīcus* ‘friend’ is debatable. In archaic Latin, the form was *ameicus*, *amecus* (Ernout, Meillet, 1951: 29). It has been related long ago to *amare* ‘to love’, cf. Greek *philos* ‘dear > friend’ (Ernout, Meillet 1951: 28); *amare*, which has the form of a denominative, is thought to be a popular expressive word, to be related to *amma* ‘mummy’, *amita* ‘aunt on the father’s side’.

But according to other etymologists (Pisani, 1967: 135), this word has to be split up into *am-īcus*, *-īcus* being a suffixal element, and to be related to the prefix-preposition *amb-*, *am-*, *ambi-*, *ambe-*, *an-* ‘on each side of; next to; around’, related to I.-Eu. \*a(m)bhi, \*ambhō ‘on both sides, around’. Indeed there are similar formations in Latin, cf. *ant-īcus* (> *antiquus*) ‘earlier, previous; ancient’, *post-īcus* ‘posterior, rear’.

The same prefix is found in Latin *anculus* ‘servant (male)’, *ancilla* ‘servant (female)’ (Pisani 1967: 143), which recalls of Greek *amphipolos* ‘servant’ and of Gallo-Latin *ambactus* ‘who walks about > servant > vassal, companion’ (a form to which go back Engl.

<sup>11</sup> Among other meanings.

<sup>12</sup> And also some meanings discussed below, see section 2.1.

*ambassador*, Fr. *ambassadeur*, German *Amt* ‘service, administration’ and, more remotely, Russian *jabeda* ‘telltale, informer’). The I.-Eu. prototype is \*ambhi + \*kwel ‘who walks about’. In Breton, one finds *amezeg* ‘neighbour’ < \*ambi + \*nes ‘close to’.

However, Latin *amb-* (*am-*, *ambi*, *ambe-*) ‘around, next to’ is linked to *ambo* (f. *ambae*) ‘both, both of them’. Contrary to its synonym *uterque*, this Latin word implied a spatial and temporal association.

The Latin data can be compared to the following I.-Eu. related forms:

a) Greek *amphō*, Lithuanian *abiem* ‘both’, German *beide* ‘both’, *bei* ‘near, by’ and *um* ‘about’, Engl. *both*, *by*, Russian *oba* ‘both’ (< common Slavic \*ob ‘in close proximity; around’, variants \*obī, \*obi, \*obū, and \*oba ‘both, both together’);

b) Sanskrit *abhi*, Greek *amphi*, Gothic *um-bi* ‘close to, around (< on both sides)’, German *bei* ‘near, by’ and *um* ‘about’.

The Greek phrase *oi amphī tina* ‘those who are close to sb’ = ‘retinue, adepts, companions, followers of sb; warriors, men of sb’ provides an excellent parallel to Latin *am-īcus*.

As for the meaning of ‘proximity’, an I.-Eu. reconstructed word \*h<sub>x</sub>ēpis ‘companion, confederate’ is semantically similar to *am-īcus* (taking into account the remote hypothetical etymology of the latter), if explained as a nominalization of \*h<sub>1</sub>epi ‘upon, near, next to; opposite to’ (cf. Gr. *epi* ‘upon’): cf. Sanskrit *āpi-* ‘ally, friend, acquaintance’, *āpitvam* ‘friendship, confederation’ (Mallory, Adams 1997: 116).

Thus, considering the converging crosslinguistic data mentioned above which show similar types of polysemy and semantic change, Pisani’s etymology concerning Latin seems to be the most convincing one.

#### 1.4 ‘Friend’ ~ ‘sharing’

Considering etymological and synchronic data in both I.-Eu. and Eskimo-Aleut, the ‘companion’ can be considered as the one who shares. This is suggested for instance by a word of a very close lexical field: Fr. *partenaire*, Engl. *partner*, from Ancient French *parçuner* ‘an associate’ (< Lat. *partitio* ‘sharing, division’), Gothic *gadaila* ‘companion’, from *daila* ‘partnership, fellowship’, *dailjan* ‘share’ (cf. Engl. *to deal*).

- One can share food, bread with someone else, hence French *compagnon* ‘companion’, *copain* ‘friend, mate, boyfriend’, *copine* ‘girlfriend’, Engl. *companion*, from Lat. *com-panio* ‘who eats his bread with sb’. Cf. also Greek *syntrophos* ‘one brought up together with’, hence ‘foster-brother’ and ‘companion’, linked to *trephein* ‘to feed’ (+ *syn-* ‘with’), Gothic *gahlaiba* ‘companion’ derived from *hlaifs* ‘bread’, English *mate*, from Middle Low German *mate*, *māt* ‘messmate > companion’, linked to *meat* ‘food > edible flesh’, Welsh *cyfaill* ‘friend’ akin to Old Irish *com-alta* ‘foster-brother’, from *alim* ‘nourish, rear’.

- But one can also share with sb ‘cattle’, ‘livestock’, hence ‘wealth, property’ (the link between the two notions is well known in I.-Eu., cf. Mallory, Adams 1997: 23).

Russian *tovarišč* ‘companion, comrade, mate’ is probably related to *tovar* ‘merchandise’ from Old Russian *tovarŭ* ‘military camp; military train, goods train; property, wealth’, a loan from Turkic languages; cf. Bulgarian *tovar* ‘load, burden’, *tovarač* ‘one who unloads, packer’; Turkic *tovar* / *tavar* ‘property, cattle, merchandise’ (related to Turkish *davar*, Nogai *tuvar*, Bashkir *tawar* ‘merchandise, material’);

English  *fellow*<sup>13</sup> ‘mate, companion; member, associate’ is ‘the one who pools the wealth with sb’, from Old Norse *fēlagi* ‘partner’, hence ‘comrade’ < Old Norse *fēlag* ‘lying (-lag) together of property (fē)’, hence ‘partnership’. Cf. Old Norse *fē* ‘cattle’, hence ‘property,

<sup>13</sup> Not related to *follow*.



money’, Old Engl. *feoh* ‘cattle; property’, Engl. *fee* ‘heritable estate; charge; monetary compensation’;

German *Genosse* ‘companion, comrade, follower, mate’ (< ‘the one who owns the cattle together with sb’), related to German *geniessen* ‘to enjoy (the use of), to make the most of; savour’, *nutzen* ‘to use (wealth, property, etc.)’ and to Old-High-German *nōz* ‘useful property; cattle’, cf. Old Norse *naut* ‘useful property; cattle, oxen’, Engl. *neat* ‘oxen (collectively)’.

- On the other hand, ‘companion’ may also be linked to ‘animal grazing in the same herd, animal which is part of the herd’.

Latin *gregalis* (< *grex* ‘herd’) ‘animal grazing in the same herd; mate’; Lat. *gregarius* ‘(animal) which is part of the herd; who is part of the troops (about soldiers)’ (> Fr. *grégaire*, Engl. *gregarious*, *egregious*, *aggregation*, *congregation*);

Greek *synnomos* ‘animal grazing with another one; mate; spouse’, from *nemô* ‘to share, deal, attribute; graze, graze a herd; enjoy; live in’, cf. *nomê* ‘grazing; sharing’, *nomos* ‘pasture; fact of living in; region’<sup>14</sup>.

- The sharing could refer to different elements of daily life: the activity related to rearing, the working place, lodging.

‘Room-sharing’ explains other words which mean ‘companion, mate’:

Engl. *comrade*, French *camarade* ‘mate’, from Spanish *camarada* ‘chamber-fellowship’, hence ‘chamber fellow’ (< Latin *camera* ‘chamber, room’, Danish *stalbroder* ‘companion’ (< ‘place, stall + brother’), German *Geselle* ‘companion’ (< Old-High-German *gisello* ‘roommate’, related to *Saal* < \*sal- ‘shelter, house, premises’, cf. Russian *selo* ‘village, countryside’). In English, a slurring of *chamber fellow* produces *chum* ‘companion, mate’.

- Similar semantic associations are found in the Inuit data. In western Greenland, there is a very productive affix *-qat(i)* ‘together’ (PI: \*qan (qatə) ‘companion (at doing sth.)’, (Fortescue et al., 1994: 421), which enables, by derivation, the creation of terms that designate a friendship based on a shared action or state:

*atiwa-qat* /go to school-together.sg/ ‘classmate’,  
*suti-qat* /work-together.sg/ ‘colleague’,  
*nutiakkaa-qat* /woman-together.sg/ ‘(girl) friend’,  
*miqsiqti-qat* /child-together-sg/ ‘childhood companion’.

Besides, a specific term, *ikiññut*, designates the ‘childhood friend with whom one has been brought up’, cf. PI: \*əkəññun or \*ikəññun ‘friend (from childhood)’ (Fortescue et al., 1994: 103).

In Yupik, another affix, reconstructed as PY-S \*lyun ‘fellow (one sharing s.th. with one)’ is used with similar shades of meaning and semantic extensions as PI: \*qan (qatə):

(AAY) *lyun* ‘fellow-’  
(CAY) *lyun* ‘one having the same’  
(NSY) *lyute* ‘companion at –ing’  
(CSY) *lyun* ‘one with same’

Moreover, the Yupik Dictionary (Jacobson, 1984) mentions two terms for which ‘friend’ is the one who shares food or the place to sleep:

*naruyaq* ‘very close friend (not a relative)’; cf. *naruyake-* ‘to share food with’ (Jacobson, 1984: 252),

---

<sup>14</sup> Akin to this lexical family, Greek *nemesis* ‘retribution; righteous anger’ (linked to Albanian *nëmë* ‘curse’, Irish *namhaid* ‘enemy’, Buck 1949:1345) is quite interesting because of an enantiosemitic relation which is similar to the data below, section 3.

*teruluk* ‘friend’, cf. *teru* ‘foot of bed or bedding area; bed partner with his body heading in the opposite or the perpendicular direction’ (Jacobson, 1984: 370).

## 2. ‘Friend’ ~ ‘duality’ ~ ‘similarity’ ~ ‘complementarity’

Another productive semantic network connects the terms meaning ‘friend’ with the notions of similarity or of complementarity in the sense of belonging to a whole, be it belonging to a family or to a social group.

### 2.1. ‘Friend’ ~ ‘similar’

Various genetic stocks, but not I.Eu., show a formal and semantic link between ‘friend’ and the notions of identity or of similarity, even of twinship:

- Nahuatl: *-CNE-* ‘friend; brother, sister; compatriot’ = ‘what / the one who is the same, similar’; *-coa-* ‘twin; anything double, duality’. The term was borrowed in Mexican Spanish *cuate* ‘friend, pal’, *cuatismo* ‘friendly contacts (in politics)’.
- Gbaya (Niger-Congo): *dàn* ‘friend’ > *bé-dàn* ‘twin’ (lit. ‘child-friend’).
- In Sara-Bongo-Bargirmi (SBB) languages, a word \**mada* ‘other; similar; fellow, friend, companion’ is reconstructed, and in Yulu the cognate form is polysemous with the reciprocal marker as well: *lot* ‘another, neighbour, mate, companion, colleague, of the same age, partner; each other (reciprocal)’ and ‘opponent’ (for the enantiosemic link, see below, section 3).
- The case of Kasem is more complex, as already mentioned in section 1.2, because the lexical root *dv-* has a whole range of meaning, but what is of interest here is that one of the derived forms also show the association between ‘friend’ and ‘similar’: *dōŋ* (sg.) (N.) ‘other, other one, other person; similar, double; of the same age, mate, pal, chum’.

### 2.2. ‘Friend’ ~ complementarity

The term ‘friend’ seems to be linked to the notion of ‘part of a whole’, thus, ‘complementarity’ in several language stocks.

- In Eastern Greenland *iaqat* ‘friend, companion’ is to be analysed as *ia-qat* / part of sth-together.sg /. The lexical root *ita-* or *ia-* ‘part of a whole, piece’ (PE: \**ila(-)* ‘part’ and ‘to add’, Fortescue et al. 1994: 126) results in derivative series in Yupik and in Inuit. Below are some instances in Eastern Greenland:

<i>ita-</i> ( <i>ia-</i> )	‘part of sth, piece, relative, companion, expression of otherness: one, the other’
<i>ita-a</i>	/part-his/ ‘occupant of the community house where several families lived’
<i>ita-a... ita-a</i>	/part-his/..... /part-his/ ‘one..... the other’
<i>niqu-p ita-a</i>	/meat-of part-his/ ‘piece of meat’
<i>ita-ngiq-puq</i>	//part-remove-ind.3sg// ‘he removes a piece’
<i>itaqutaq</i>	/part.associate.sg/ ‘family member’
<i>ita-qqip-puq</i>	//part-add-ind.3sg// ‘he adds sth., increases, exaggerates’
<i>itaaq-Nutii-waa</i>	//to add-about-ind.3sg.3sg// ‘he makes fun of him’
<i>iaqat</i>	/part of sth-together.sg/ ‘companion, friend’
<i>iaqatii-waa</i>	//part.be together-ind.3sg.3sg// ‘he accompanies him/her’
<i>itaa-wuq</i>	//part-his-ind.3sg// ‘he is a passenger (boat, plane), he is part of sth.’
<i>itaaq-tiq-paa</i>	//to add-factitive-ind.3sg.3sg// ‘he darns, he adds a piece to a garment’

- The Yupik and Inuit languages also attest similar semantic networks:

(AAY) *ila* ‘part (of), relative’, ‘to add’,  
 (CAY) *ila* ‘part (of), relative, associate’, ‘to add’,  
 (NSY) *ila* ‘friend’, ‘to add’,  
 (CSY) *ila* ‘part (of), relative, friend’, ‘to add’.

(SPI) *ila* ‘relative, companion’, ‘to add’,  
 (NAI) *i<sup>y</sup>a* ‘part (of), relative, companion’, ‘to add, get a new participant’,  
 (WCI) *ila (k)* ‘part (of), relative, piece’, *ilaa-* ‘to add’,  
 (ECI) *ila* ‘part (of), relative, piece’, ‘to add piece to garment’,  
 (GRI) *ila* ‘part (of), relative, companion’, ‘to add, increase, exaggerate, get another helping’ (Fortescue et al., 1994: 126).

Two African languages also bear witness of the notion of complementarity associated to ‘friend’:

- Wolof: *xarit b-* ‘friend’ and *xarit w-* ‘detached piece of something’ (from *xar w-* ‘piece; portion’) [b-: classifier of agent nouns / w-: classifier of nouns beginning with /w/].
- In Beja, *raw* means ‘other; companion’ and ‘rests (of food)’, a word probably linked with *araw* ‘friend, companion; honest’.

### 2.3. ‘Friend’ ~ ‘one’s own’ ~ ‘the familiar one’

• If one considers very abstract semantic relations (our level 3), several I.-Eu. facts must be pointed out. Here is one of the best-known: Greek *hetairos* ‘mate, companion’, *hetaira* ‘(girl) friend, mistress, courtesan’ < \*se-t-, from I.-Eu. \*se (but not from \*sew- / \*swe, Chantraine 1968: 380). This I.-Eu. root implied not only ‘the individual’s belonging to a social group’ but also ‘isolation, separation’, cf. Lat. *se* (Acc. and Abl. of *sui*, reflexive pronoun), related to Latin *se(d)-* prefix of ‘separation’; Russian *-sja* postfix of the reflexive and the reciprocal, *po-setit* ‘to visit sth, sb’. A parallel must be drawn between this enantiosemic fact and what will be noted below (section 3) about the relation ‘friend’ ~ ‘opposition’.

• Moreover cognate words deriving from a different, but phonetically closed, I.-Eu. root \*swe- ‘one’s own’ are also related to the ‘one’s own, familiar one’ semantic field:

Greek *hêlix* ‘mate, companion (of the same age)’, probably from \*swe-l-, cf. *hêlikia* ‘youngsters of the same age fit to be warriors’ (Buck 1949: 1346).

Greek *etês / hêtes* ‘companion’; (in the plural:) ‘mates who belong to the same social group; citizen’ (< \*swe-t- < \*swe- ‘his own’, Chantraine 1968: 380)<sup>15</sup>, cf. Russian *svat* ‘relative by marriage’, *svobodnyj* ‘free’ (< ‘belonging to one’s own family’; it indicates the legal position of an individual who is a full-fledged member of the community), Latin *suetus* ‘usual’, but also the ‘stranger considered as a one’s own, as belonging to the community’ as in Lithuanian *svėčias, svečys* ‘guest; (former) stranger’, and Lettish *svešs* ‘guest; stranger’;

Latin *sodalis* ‘friend, mate, fellow traveller, colleague, accomplice’ (< \*swe-dh- ‘to make sth one’s own.’, Ernout, Meillet 1951: 950);

Dialectal Russian *sjabër*, Byelorussian *sjabar* ‘neighbour, relative; companion, friend’ < proto-Slavic \*sembr-, from \*sem-r- ‘family, household, village’ (Vasmer 1987: t.1, 824); cf. Russian *semja* ‘family’, German *Heim* ‘household, house’, Lithuanian *kaimynas* ‘neighbour’, old Icelandic *heimr* ‘house; world’. All these forms are thought to date back to I.-Eu. \*koimos ‘household, village’ < ‘enclosed place where the clan sleeps’, also reconstructed as \*keiw-, \*kiw- ‘household, village as social unit’, probably from \*kei- ‘those that sleep together’ < ‘to lie, to be prostrate’.

<sup>15</sup> No link with *heteros* ‘one of the two; other’ (< \*sm-teros ‘one + differential suffix’, Chantraine 1968: 381), cf. Gothic *sun-dro* ‘aside’, German *sonder* ‘aside’, Lat. *al-ter* ‘one of the two; other’.

The latter I.-Eu. root is linked to I.-Eu. \*keiwos / \*kiwos ‘belonging to the household’, hence ‘friendly, intimate, dear’, cf. Latin *civis* ‘citizen. The particular semantic development that led to the meaning in Latin may be explained by the use of this term as a form of mutual address among members of the same community, e.g. the use of terms meaning ‘comrade, companion’ (Russian *tovarišč*, German *Genosse*, etc.) among citizens of the former Soviet Union and of its East-European satellites such as the former GDR.

- As for Engl. *friend* (< Old Engl. *frēond* ‘friend’), the word goes back to I.-Eu. \*p<sub>ri</sub>h<sub>x</sub>os ‘of one’s own’, hence ‘dear’, ‘love’ and ‘free’, cf. Old English *frēod* ‘love’, *frændi* ‘relative, friend’, *frēogan* / *frīgan* ‘to love’, Engl. *free*, German *Freund* ‘friend’ (cf. Gothic *frijōnd-*, Present Participle of *frijōn* ‘to love’ < I.-Eu. p<sub>ri</sub>h<sub>x</sub>-eh<sub>a</sub>- ‘to love’, a denominative verb), Sanskrit *priyā* ‘spouse’, Russian *prijatel’* ‘friend’. It has been argued that \*p<sub>ri</sub>h<sub>x</sub>os ‘of one’s own’ may be a derivative of \*pēr ‘house’ (attested in Hittite *pēr* ‘house’, thus ‘of one’s household’, although this word may be of non-I.-Eu. origin). As is the case of Latin *liber* ‘free’ and Greek *eleutheros* ‘free’ (< ‘of lawful birth’), it indicates the legal position of an individual who is a full-fledged member of the ethnic community in contrast to outsiders or people subdued into servitude by war (Mallory, Adams 1997: 214, 358).

### 3. ‘Friend’ ~ ‘duality’ ~ ‘opposition’

A third series of semantic associations goes in another direction. It illustrates how, within duality, these associations switch from a relationship of proximity to a more distant, remote, even opposite relationship between the partners of a pair. Enantiosemic facts show that the link ‘duality’ ~ ‘proximity’ in connection with ‘friend’ can be extended to ‘duality’ ~ ‘opposition’ and ‘enemy’.

#### 3.1. ‘Friend’ ~ duality ~ ‘enemy’

- In this connection, it is interesting to remind here the Yulu (SBB) form mentioned in section 2.1, which shows a clear case of synchronic enantiosemy between the notions of ‘friend’ and ‘enemy’ *via* ‘other’:

*lot* ‘another, neighbour, mate, companion, colleague, of the same age, partner; each other (reciprocal)’, and ‘opponent’.

- Eskimo-Aleut also bears witness of this enantiosemy in synchrony, as attested in Yupik in the AAY variety:

(AAY) *iylu* ‘other (of pair), mate, adversary’.

Other dialects of Yupik have favoured one or the other meaning, either in the direction of proximity or of distance:

(CAY) *iylu* ‘other (of pair), enemy, opponent’,

(NSY) *inlu* ‘the other side of’,

(CSY) *iylu* ‘one of a pair, half, partner, spouse’.

In the Inuit dialects, the precise meaning is rather ‘two halves of a couple or of objects which go by pair’ (e.g., toast and coffee). Some varieties have also developed forms with other meanings, all related to proximity, not to distance or opposition:

(SPI) *iylu* ‘other of pair, other side’,

(NAI) *iɣ<sup>l</sup>u* ‘other of two’,

(WCI) *iylu* ‘one of a pair’,

(ECI) *illu* ‘one of a pair’,

(GRI) *illu(k)* ‘one of, other of two, other side, dance partner, end of twisted sinew, slice of bread to eat with tea or coffee’ (Fortescue et al., 1994: 136).

The cognate forms were reconstructed for PE as \*iNlu ‘other (of pair)’, and related to the distal demonstrative root \*iN- ‘away from speaker on level and restricted’ and lu(R) ‘place or thing for performing action’ by Fortescue et al. (1994: 136).

• The Austronesian data is also relevant here, because the synchronic data is related to a proto-form which shows a clear case of enantiosemy between ‘friend’ and ‘enemy’:

Mota *val* ‘to match, to set one against another; one, one of a pair; in all places, to every one; to stand opposite’; *valu-i* ‘a fellow, match, mate’,

Mwotlap *iplu~* ‘friend, mate, companion’, *vel* ‘each’, *vulu* ‘to answer’

are both cognates of proto-Austronesian \*baliw ‘dual division, answer, oppose, opposite part; friend, partner; answer, friend, enemy, repay, revenge, mourn’.

### 3.2. Etymological discussion

The above typological data from three different language stocks add further arguments for the etymology of ‘friend’ in I.-Eu., already discussed in section 1.3.

Although synchronically Greek *amphis* ‘on both sides, around; next to, by; about’ and ‘separately’ has no semantic link with ‘friend’, it is interesting to note the enantiosemy, and its formal relationship with *amphô* ‘both’, *amphi-* ‘on both sides, around; next to’, which are hypothetically linked to Lat. *amīcus* (see above 1.3). It recalls of the enantiosemic relation between *hekastos* ‘each’ and *hekas* ‘far from’ (from the I.-Eu. root \*swe-, see above, section 2.2).

Slavic shows similar facts. In old Russian, the prefix \*ob- (akin to Latin *amb-* which may explain *amīcus* ‘friend’, see above 1.2) accounts for *obščīnikū* ‘co-participant, accomplice, co-leader, companion, friend’<sup>16</sup>, derived from *obščii* / *obščii* (< \*obī-tj- ‘surrounding, all around < located on both sides’) meaning ‘common, conjoined; general; identical’ and, in a seemingly unexplainable manner, ‘foreign, other’. Among derived words of the same family in Russian, one finds *obščij* ‘common, general’, *obščina* ‘old rural community; social or ethnic group’, *obščestvo* ‘society’. As for Polish *obcy*, which dates back to a similar Slavic formation, it means ‘foreign, unknown, strange’.

Thus, ‘friendship’ is linked on one hand to ‘association, proximity, similarity’, as shown in the previous section, and on the other hand to ‘opposition’.

### 3.3 ‘Duality’ ~ ‘opposition’ ~ ‘enemy’

In Eskimo-Aleut, other semantic associations linked to the concept of duality are quite significant for the semantic extensions of the notion of duality, although they are far beyond the strictly defined semantic field of ‘friend’ which was the starting point of our discussion. Such is the case for the PE root: \*aki(-) which is reconstructed by Fortescue et al. (1994: 11) with the meanings of ‘(thing) opposite’, or ‘answer’ (which may have a link with the demonstrative roots \*aγ- ‘away from speaker on level, extended’, and \*akəm- ‘away from speaker on level, obscured’, Fortescue et al., 1994: 11), and which also often means ‘other side (of)’ in many a language. The different cognates of this proto-form show some semantic homogeneity in the sense that they all refer to the notion of duality, of compensation for

---

<sup>16</sup> The word may have been calqued on Greek, because first Old Slavonic texts were mainly translated from Greek, cf. Greek *koinōnos* ‘companion, ally’ < *koinos* ‘common’.

something, but in this case, the ‘other’ is not a peer any more but the ‘opponent’, the ‘enemy’, e.g., in Yupik:

- (AAY) *aki* ‘other side (of)’, ‘to reciprocate, fight back, *aki(q)* coin, money’, *akiqliq* ‘opponent’,
- (CAY) *aki* ‘equivalent, value, price, response’, ‘other side of’, ‘to reciprocate, answer, take revenge’, *aki(q)* ‘coin’,
- (NSY) *aki* ‘value, price, sth. to exchange’, ‘to take revenge, reciprocate, reward’, as positional root ‘other side (of)’,
- (CSY) *aki* ‘equivalent, price, money’ ‘to reciprocate’, as positional root ‘other side (of)’, *akitə-* ‘to answer, take revenge’.

In the Inuit domain one finds:

- (SPI) *ayi* ‘money’, ‘to take revenge’, as positional root ‘across from’,
- (NAI) *aki* ‘cost, price, value’, ‘to respond’, as positional root ‘opposite side (of)’,
- (WCI) *aki* ‘payment, price’, as positional root ‘other side (of)’ *akiraq* ‘adversary’,
- (ECI) *aki* ‘cost, side platform in snow house where lamps are kept’, ‘to answer, revenge oneself’, as positional root ‘other side (of)’, *akiraq* ‘enemy’,
- (GRI) *aki* ‘price, cost, front platform in traditional house’, ‘to answer’, as positional root ‘other side (of)’ (Fortescue et al., 1994: 11).

In Eastern Greenland, the following phrases or derivations are attested:

- aki-* ‘opposite side of sth.’, *aki-a-ni* /other side-his-locative/ ‘on the other side of sth.’
- aki-wuq* //to answer-ind.3sg// ‘he answers’, *akiNaq* /enemy.sg/ ‘opponent, enemy’ = ‘the one who answers’.
- akiq* ‘price, exchange, compensation for sth.’
- akisiq* ‘platform used as a bed located opposite the entrance of a traditional house, bed-head, pillow’.
- akisip-puq* //to be shiny-ind.3sg// ‘it is glittering (reflection of light), it is white’.

- The Eastern Greenland data can be compared to I.-Eu. data displaying similar semantic associations between the semantic domains of opposition, compensation (e.g. price, answer, reflection), and even reflection:

Russian *protiv* ‘against’, *naprotiv* ‘in front of’, etymologically related to Latin *pretium* ‘price’ (> French *prix*)  
 Sanskrit *prati* ‘back, toward’, *prati-vac-* ‘answer’, related to Russian *protiv* ‘against’.  
 Latin *replicare* ‘to reflect (sun rays)’; ‘to reject, to return’; ‘to fold up’, and juridical sense ‘to answer sharply to an objection’ (> French *répliquer*, angl. *reply*).  
 English *answer*, from old-English *andswaru* (*and* ‘against’ + *swaru* ‘to swear, take an oath’).”

- The Austronesian data is helpful to understand the semantic link between almost all the notions discussed above. The diachronic data obviously cumulates the various senses of the different derivative formations attested in the different languages, contrary to the approach of Fortescue et al. for Eskimo-Aleut who favour a common meaning for one proto-form. As a matter of fact, proto-Austronesian \**baliw*, contrary to Eskimo-Aleut and I.Eu., bears also the notion of ‘friendship’ in addition to those of ‘duality’, ‘proximity’, ‘opposition’, ‘compensation’:

\**baliw* ‘dual division, answer, oppose, opposite part; friend, partner; answer, friend, enemy, repay, revenge, mourn’.

### 3.4. Etymological discussion

All the above mentioned data may account for a possible ancient link in Proto-Indo-European between \*dthroughos ‘friend, companion’, and \*dhreugh- / \*dh(e)reugh- ‘deceive; untrue, deceit, lie’, even if the semantic distance may seem too important (Mallory and Adams 1997: 116). The root \*dhreugh- ‘deceive’ can be illustrated by Avestic *družaiti* ‘he lies, deceives’, Sanskrit *druh-* ‘injure, harms, be hostile to’, Old Norse *draugr* ‘ghost, spectre’, Old-High-German *triogan* ‘deceive’, German *(be)trügen* ‘deceive’, Engl. *dream*, German *Traum* ‘dream’.

If admitting an underlying root \*dhreugh- / \*dh(e)reugh- ‘to follow; to help; to carry on (a military campaign)’, three chains of semantic evolutions are possible:

- a) ‘to follow’ > ‘to follow close behind sb, to stick close to sb’ > ‘to be a second member / item in a relationship’ > ‘to be a secondary, an unessential item’ > ‘shadow’, ‘shade’, ‘ghost’<sup>17</sup> > ‘lie, deceit’ and ‘false vision’ > ‘dream’;
- b) ‘to follow’ > ‘mate, partner, companion’ > ‘a second one’ > ‘an opposite one’ > ‘lie, deceit’; etc.
- c) ‘to follow’ > ‘to follow close behind sb, to stick close to sb’ > ‘to be a second member / item in a relationship’ > ‘duality’ > ‘doubt’ > ‘deceit’, etc.

The third shift seems to us the most convincing for cultural and philological reasons. As shown by E. Benveniste, ‘duality’ is linked to such negative meanings as ‘fear’, ‘doubt’, because I.-Eu. \*dwei- ‘two’ explains Greek *deido* (< *de-dwoi-a*, Perfect) ‘I fear’, Latin *dubitare* ‘to doubt’ (> Engl. *doubt*, Fr. *douter* ‘to doubt’ and *redouter* ‘to fear’), German *zweifeln* ‘to doubt’ kindred to *zwei* ‘two’ (Benveniste 1966: 294-295). Other semantic parallels can be added such as Greek *amphibolia* ‘difficult situation; ambiguity, doubt’, with the element *amphi-* ‘on both sides, around; next to, by; about’ (akin to *amphô* ‘both’, seen above), and Engl. *deuce* ‘the 2-pipped side of a die, a cast of 2, a 2-spotted card’, hence ‘bad Luck, the Devil’, from Old French *deus* < Latin *duo* ‘two’ (Partridge 1966: 171)<sup>18</sup>.

## 4. Conclusion

The semantic networks developed around the words meaning ‘friend’, ‘companion’ in a sample of languages (which would need to be enlarged) belonging to various genetic stocks, lead us to two final types of remarks.

First, the data brings to the fore universal semantic associations of ‘friend’ which link the concepts of duality, of complementarity, and of proximity (more or less close).

But these universal associations do not account for all the details of the semantic links, nor for the particular polysemies, heterosemies and semantic changes. It is also necessary to take into account cultural factors of the societies concerned. ‘Duality’ (i.e. the existence of symmetric or opposite pairs) and ‘complementarity’ (i.e. the conception of society as a whole, with different parts added, each of them being linked to the whole) are two concepts particularly active in several societies. The example of the Eskimo domain is particularly relevant in this instance.

The concept of duality seems to have great resonance in Inuit and Yupik where both the nominal and verbal morphology have dual markers in addition to the plural, except in Greenland where the dual is only residual, e.g. in Inuktitut (Eastern Canadian Arctic): *inuk*

---

<sup>17</sup> Cf. as “inversed” semantic parallel in English and French due to metaphorization of ‘shadow’ (*He follows me like a shadow, suivre qqn comme son ombre*): *to shadow smb* ‘to follow smb (as does a detective)’, *shadow* ‘inseparable companion’ (same sense for Fr. *ombre*).

<sup>18</sup> Furthermore, at a more general semiotic level, an excellent literary parallel is provided by the famous Russian writer Fedor Dostoevsky in his novel *Dvojniki* ‘The Double’: the main character, Goliadkin, is followed by an “other himself”, a kind of malefic shadow acting both as a companion and as an opponent, an enemy.

‘human being’, *inuuk* ‘two human beings’, *inuit* ‘human beings’. The dual implies not only a pair but also a mutual relationship, a symmetry and a complementarity as de Reuse’s analysis (2000: 268-282), based on the Siberian Yupik examples, clearly shows: dual is used to mark things that go by pairs (body parts, mittens, boots, twins, couple...), as well as objects with symmetric parts (pants, scissors) or objects that have only one part but which are delimited by parallel lines or which delimit the body with parallel lines (boxes, anorak) and finally an object’s container like a water recipient, or something’s reflection, echo or spiritual entity.

In the Inuit continuum, there also is a very productive affix *-ñiit* (*-Niit*) that means ‘pair, mutual relationship’ and which enables to create associations by only referring to one of the partners of the pair: *nutia-Niit* /spouse-pair+pl/ ‘married couple’, *pani-ñiit* /daughter-pair+pl/ ‘mother and daughter’.

The second remark concerns the fruitful insight that typological studies can bring in order to back up some tricky cases of diachronic reconstructions, or even to consider new semantic networks which were thought before as doubtful. The discussions concerning the etymology of the word meaning ‘friend’ in Latin (section 1.3) and the possible connections of proto-I.Eu roots designating a ‘friend’ and a ‘deceit, lie’ (section 3.4) are significant instances in this respect.

In some cases, the diachronic analysis seems to be favoured by the strong derivative nature of the language which enables to isolate, in many instances, a lexical root with a rather global meaning that is specified by adding different affixes (Mahieu et Tersis 2006). A same stem is used as a common denominator for a whole series of lexical items that refer to various realities. Such is the case of the Inuit language. An important outcome of the strong motivation of the lexicon concerns its evolution: it seems to slow down the semantic shifts insofar as the change of meaning is often accompanied by a formal change. But apart from the derivative series, it is not always easy to determine the direction of the semantic change: should one postulate ‘companion’ > ‘other of a pair’ > ‘spouse’, or rather ‘other of a pair’ > ‘partner’ or rather ‘part of sth.’ > ‘relative’, > ‘companion’?

The table below is a somewhat simplified summary of the semantic parallelisms attested in the language sample surveyed for this study. It gives information on the type of semantic and formal links attested in the data: synchronic polysemy, heterosemy (derivation, composition), historical depth (i.e. diachronic links when available).

The table leaves aside the cases of enantiosemy between ‘friend’ and ‘enemy’, ‘proximity’ and ‘opposition’, but it is important to underline that such an enantiosemic pattern is attested in synchrony in the language sample.

The table does not account either for certain specific semantic extensions towards ‘placenta’, on one hand, and the notion of compensation, on the other hand. The latter gives rise to senses such as ‘price’, ‘reflection’, ‘answer’, which are attested in association with all four notions of ‘friend’, ‘enemy’, ‘proximity’ and ‘opposition’ in part of the Eskimo-Aleut genetic stock and in Austronesian, and only with that of ‘opposition’ in a another part of Eskimo-Aleut and in Indo-European.

It is in this sense, and in this sense only, is a friend an enemy<sup>19</sup>!

---

<sup>19</sup> Apart from some well-known diachronic derivative links. Recall here that the etymology of Engl. *enemy* goes back to Lat. *inimicus*, from \*in-amīcus “un-friend”, which is similar to Russian *nedrug* ‘enemy’, from *ne-drug* “un-friend”.



## References

- Benveniste, E. 1966. Problèmes sémantiques de reconstruction. In Benveniste E., *Problèmes de linguistique générale*. T. 1, Paris: Gallimard, 289-307.
- 1969. *Vocabulaire des institutions indo-européennes*. T. 1, 2. Paris: Minuit.
- Buck, C.D. 1949. *A Dictionary of selected synonyms in the principal Indo-European languages*. Chicago, London: University of Chicago Press.
- Chantraine, P. 1968. *Dictionnaire étymologique de la langue grecque*. T. 1, 2. Paris: Klincksieck.
- Černyx, P. Ja. 1993. *Istoriko-étimologičeskij slovar' sovremennogo russkogo jazyka*. T. 1, 2. Moskva: Russkij Jazyk.
- De Colombel, V. & Tersis, N. (dir.). 2002. *Lexique et motivation. Perspectives ethno-linguistiques*. Paris: Peeters.
- De Reuse, W. 2000. La partie et le tout: Les extensions métonymiques du duel et du pluriel en yupik sibérien central. In Tersis, N. & Therrien, M. (eds), *Les langues eskaléoutes, Sibérie, Alaska, Groenland*, Paris: CNRS Editions, 269-282.
- Ernout, A. & Meillet, A. 1951. *Dictionnaire étymologique de la langue latine*. Paris: Klincksieck.
- Fortescue, M., Jacobson, S. A. & Kaplan, L. 1994. *Comparative Eskimo Dictionary with Aleut Cognates*. Fairbanks: University of Alaska, Alaska Native Language Center Press, Research Papers 9.
- Heine, B. & Kuteva, T. 2002. *World lexicon of grammaticalization*. Cambridge, New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Hénault-Sakhno, Ch. & Sakhno, S. 2001. Typologie des langues et sémantique diachronique: le problème des universaux. *LINX* 45 (Invariants et variables dans les langues. Etudes typologiques): 219-231.
- 2005. Typologie sémantique lexicale: problèmes de systématisation. In G. Lazard & C. Moysse-Faurie (eds), *Linguistique typologique*. Villeneuve d'Ascq: Septentrion, 71-90.
- Jacobson, S. 1984. *Yup'ik Eskimo Dictionary*, Fairbanks: University of Alaska, Alaska Native Language Center Press.
- Lowe, R. 1984. *Siglit Inuvialuit Uqausiita kipuktirutait: Basic Siglit Inuvialuit Eskimo. Dictionary*. Inuvik: Committee for Original Peoples Entitlement, Northwest Territories.
- Mallory, J.P. & Adams, D.Q. (eds.). 1997. *Encyclopaedia of Indo-European culture*. London, Chicago: Fitzroy Dearborn.
- Partridge, E. 1966. *Origins: A short etymological dictionary of modern English*. London: Routledge & Keagan Paul.
- Pisani, V. 1967. *Etimologia: Storia, questioni, metodo*. 2 ed. Brescia: Paideia.
- Pfeifer, W. 1995. *Etymologisches Wörterbuch des Deutschen*, München: Deutscher Taschenbuch.
- Pottier, B. 2001. La typologie et les universaux. *LINX* 45: 19-24.
- Rey, A. (dir.). 1994. *Dictionnaire historique de la langue française*. Paris: Le Robert.
- 2005. *Dictionnaire culturel en langue française*. T. 1-4. Paris: Le Robert, SEJER.
- Riemer, N. 2005. *The Semantics of Polysemy. Reading Meaning in English and Warlpiri*. Berlin, New York: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Robert, S. 1997. Variation des représentations linguistiques: Des unités à l'énoncé. In *Diversité des langues et représentations cognitives*. Paris: Ophrys, 25-39.
- Sakhno S. 2001. *Dictionnaire russe-français d'étymologie comparée: Correspondances lexicales historiques*. Paris: L'Harmattan.
- 2005. *100 racines essentielles du russe: Découvrir les trésors des mots*. Paris: Ellipses.
- Schneider, L. 1970. *Dictionnaire esquimau-français du parler de l'Ungava et contrées limitrophes*. Québec: Presses de l'Université Laval.
- Sweetser, E. 1990. *From etymology to pragmatics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Tersis, N., 2008 *Forme et sens des mots en tunumiisut, lexique inuit du Groenland oriental*. Paris : Peeters.
- Tersis, N. & Therrien, M. (eds). 2000. *Les langues eskaléoutes, Sibérie, Alaska, Groenland*. Paris: CNRS Editions.
- Tersis, N. & Mahieu, M. A. 2006. Sémantique des affixes incorporants en langue inuit (Groenland oriental). *Etudes/Inuit/Studies* 30(1): 157-181.

- Traugott, E.C. & Dasher, R. B. 2001. *Regularity in semantic change*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Trubačev, O. N. (dir.). 1974-2003. *Etimologičeskij slovar' slavjanskix jazykov*. T. 1-30. Moskva: Nauka.
- Vasmer (Fasmer), M. 1986-1987. *Ètimologičeskij slovar' russkogo jazyka* / Translated from German, with addenda by O. Trubačev. 2<sup>d</sup> ed. T. 1-4. Moskva: Progress.
- Wierzbicka, A. 1997. *Understanding cultures through their key words*. New York: Oxford University Press.