Daniel PETIT
Ecole Normale Supérieure, Paris

SUFFIX TRANSFER IN BALTIC

1. Introduction[1]

It is a well-known fact that lexical change may take rather unpredictable ways. Etymologists usually work with two main types of evolutions:

(1) *conservation* of inherited lexemes: without significant changes (e.g. PIE *h_1d-ont-* 'tooth' > Lith. *dantìs* 'tooth') or with significant changes of their form or substance (e.g. PIE *$d^heĝ^hom$-* 'earth', weak stem *$d^hĝ^hm$-* → vṛddhi-derivation *$d^hĝ^hem$-o-* 'earthly' → *$d^hĝ^hem$-ii̯ā* 'the earthly one' > Lith. *žẽmė* 'earth').

(2) *replacement* of inherited items by new ones: through semantic shift (e.g. PIE *$h_1ek̂u̯o$-* 'horse' → Lith. *arklỹs* < 'ploughing horse'), metaphorical creation (e.g. PIE *$ĝ^hes$-r-* 'hand' → Lith. *rankà* < *$u̯ronkā$* 'the gathering one') or borrowing (e.g. PIE *$h_3rēĝ$-* 'king' → Lith. *karãlius* < East Slavic *$korol'$*).

Both types (conservation vs. replacement) are generally seen as mutually exclusive. As a result, the main task of etymological practice is usually to prove that lexemes are inherited or that they have replaced inherited lexemes. However, this alternative is too limited, and probably too strictly dualistic, to provide a suitable explanation for all types of lexical changes that may occur in the life of a language. It is not uncommon that a given lexeme reflects a sort of compromise solution between direct inheritance and complete innovation. A good example of such an intermediary state has been given more than thirty years ago by C. Watkins in a thought-provoking paper on the Greek word ἄλφι, GSg. ἄλφιτος 'barley' (1978, 9–17 [=1994, 593–601]; see also 1995, 156f.). Watkins convincingly shows that ἄλφι is derived from an adjective *ἄλφος 'white', corresponding to Latin *albus* 'white' (< PIE *h_2elb^ho-), but received the suffix *-ιτ- from an older name of 'barley' which

---

disappeared in Greek, but is still preserved in Hittite (Hitt. *šeppit* 'a cereal, wheat'). In this particular case, lexical replacement has taken place (stem *alb^h-* instead of *sep-*), but a part of the lost word (suffix *$-it-$*) was preserved and integrated into the new one, hence *alb^h-it-* 'white barley' > 'barley'. Watkins writes (1995, 156) that 'the epithet *$albho-$* copied the suffix *$-it-$* of the noun it replaced, *$sepit-$*'. Some years ago (2002, 138–150) I proposed a similar explanation for the Old Lithuanian word *krienas* 'bride-price': I tried to explain it as an innovation replacing an older designation *$h_1u̯ed-nom$* 'bride-price' (OCSl. *věno*, Gk. ἔεδνον) the suffix of which was preserved in the new word (*$-nom$* > Lith. *-nas* with regular shift to the masculine gender) with a new stem *$krēi-$* belonging to the PIE root *k^ureih_2-* 'to buy' (OCSl. *kriti*, Gk. πρίαμαι). Recently (2008 [2010]), C. Le Feuvre made a similar proposal for Lith. *saldùs* 'sweet' the suffix of which could have been copied from the older adjective PIE *$su̯eh_2du-$* 'sweet' (OInd. *svādú-*, Gk. ἡδύς), which was lost in Baltic. For such cases, she coins the term 'suffix transfer' (*transfert de suffixe*) and proposes the following definition: *processus par lequel le terme nouveau prend le suffixe du terme qu'il remplace* 'process through which the new term takes over the suffix of the term it replaces' (p. 249). The aim of this paper is to discover other instances of suffix transfer in Baltic and to determine under what conditions it took place.

2. Methodological preliminaries

To begin with, it is necessary to find criteria that might help identify instances of suffix transfer beyond any doubt. If one seeks to reach some degree of probability, one must first look for highly characterized suffixes, in order to avoid improper generalizations based on trivial or productive formations. The fact that, for instance, Lith. *káltas* 'chisel' presents a suffix that looks similar to that of the older word *$dalb-tan$* (preserved in OPr. *dalptan* EV 536, cf. Slav. *$dol(b)to$* > Cz. *dláto*, Pol. *dłuto* 'chisel') is, to my mind, *not* significant, because the suffix *-tas* of tool names is too usual in Lithuanian to exclude a recent creation on the basis of a productive model. The same caveat must apply in the case of Lith. *tešmuõ* 'udder' which presents the same suffix as the older word *$ūd-men-$* (preserved in Sl. *$vymę$*, Russ. вымя, Pol. *wymię*): the morpheme *$-men-$* is simply too trivial to support the claim that we are dealing with suffix transfer. However, even within productive formations, suffix transfer can be reconstructed if the structural relationship between stem and suffix appears to be odd enough for making regular derivation unlikely. Both principles must be used with caution, because suffix transfer

may be hidden behind forms that were integrated into productive models. Moreover, morphological or semantic oddness is far from being the only way to grasp archaic features.

Another principle we have to keep in mind is that suffix transfer is a phenomenon that, to a large extent, belongs to diachronic linguistics: a form *a* is replaced by a form *b* with preservation of the suffix of *a*. But lexical change necessarily implies the coexistence of both forms from a synchronic point of view, since speakers, by nature unaware of the prehistory of their language, cannot replace a given lexeme by another one unless both existed simultaneously and, more crucially, shared at least one common feature at a certain stage, either at a semantic and/or at a syntactic level. In the case of Gk. ἄλφι, for example, lexical replacement was probably made possible by the existence of a phraseological structure [Adjective + Substantive] *h_2elb^hom + *$sepit$ 'white barley' where both stems were associated (see Gk. ἄλφιτα λευκά for a similar association): the adjective replaced the substantive it determined (> *h_2elb^h-*it*-). In the case of OLith. *krienas*, a verbal structure [Verb + Object] *k^ureih_2- + *h_1ued-*nom* 'to pay the bride-price' could have been changed into a construction with etymological figure *k^ureih_2- + *k^ureih_2-*nom* (> *krienas*). The case of Lith. *saldùs* is probably different. One could assume, with C. Le Feuvre, that *$sueh_2du$- was replaced by a synonym based on *sh_2l-, which implies an analogy on a paradigmatic level. If one tries to identify further instances of suffix transfer in Baltic with a high degree of probability, it is necessary to determine on which syntactic, phraseological and/or lexical structure they could have been built. In what follows, I intend to discuss three illustrative instances of suffix transfer in Baltic.

3. Lithuanian *ruduõ*, Latvian *rudens* 'autumn'

The first example I would like to address here is the East Baltic designation for 'autumn' (Lith. *ruduõ*, Latv. *rudens*). There can be no doubt that this word is derived from the adjective represented by Lith. *rùdas* 'brown, red' and refers to the colour of leaves falling during that season. The fact is well known. But the nasal suffix of Lith. *ruduõ*, Latv. *rudens* remains unaccounted for. The only productive nasal suffix in Baltic is *-*mōn*, GSg. *-*měn*-. It is mostly used in deverbative, rarely in denominative formations (e.g. Lith. *augmuõ* 'plant' from *áugti* 'to grow', *veikmuõ* 'function' from *veĩkti* 'to do', and *lygmuõ* 'level' possibly from *lygùs* 'even, flat, equal'). In some derivatives, it could represent an old amphikinetic suffix *-*mōn*, GSg. *-*mn*- (e.g. Lith. *stuomuõ* 'stature, figure', if it reflects, as I assume, the blending of *$steh_2$-

mōn, Gk. στήμων, and **stoh₂-mo-*, Russ. dial. стамой 'constant'). In other forms, it might be traced back to an older hysterokinetic suffix **-mēn*, GSg. **-mn-* (e.g. Lith. *piemuõ*, GSg. *piemeñs* 'sheperd', instead of **piemẽ* < PIE **poh₂i-mēn*, which is still preserved in the Baltic loanword in Finnish *paimen*, cf. Gk. ποιμήν). Finally, some forms could be older neuters in **-mn̥-* (e.g. Lith. *sémenys* 'seed', Plur. tantum, compared with OPruss. *semen*, cf. Lat. *sēmen*, OCSl. *sěmę*).

A bare suffix **-ōn*, GSg. **-ĕn-* is extremely rare. It is found only in three words[2]: Lith. *vanduõ* 'water' (GSg. *vandeñs*), *širšuõ* 'hornet' (GSg. *širšeñs*) and *ruduõ* 'autumn' (GSg. *rudeñs*). The first one is the adaptation of an old heteroclitic **-r/n-* neuter (PIE **u̯od-r̥*, collective **u̯ed-ōr*)[3]. The second one is a derivative based on the PIE designation of the 'head', originally with the same heteroclitic suffix as *vanduõ*: PIE **ĝr̥h₂s-r/n-* (compare Slav. **sьrs-en-* > S.-Cr. *sȑšljen*, OPol. *sierszeń*, and Lat. *crābrō* < **crās-r-ōn-* < PIE **ĝr̥h₂s-r-*). In both instances, integration into the nasal formation in **-ōn*, GSg. **-ĕn-* is secondary. It is unlikely that *ruduõ* is based on such a heteroclitic neuter, since there is no comparative evidence whatsoever for a form ***h₁rudʰ-r/n-* (or the like). Even if the formation of *rùdas* is not entirely clear[4], it is obvious that there is no heteroclitic formation attested within its family. *Ruduõ* is too far removed from *vanduõ* and *širšuõ* to be explained in the same way.

Another striking feature of Lith. *ruduõ* is that it is a deadjectival formation. This is very surprising, since nasal stems are regularly deverbative or denominative in Baltic. The only parallel one could refer to is an abstract **mažuõ* 'smallness, childhood' the existence of which can be inferred from the prepositional phrase Lith. *nuõ mažeñs* 'from childhood' and which seems to be derived from the adjective *mãžas* 'small'. But, even if the derivational pattern of *mãžas* → **mažuõ* is assumed to be right, it rests on too shaky a foundation to provide a basis for the reconstruction of a similar pattern in

---

[2] Skardžius 1943, 295. The reconstruction of a suffix **-ōn*, GSg. **-ĕn-* in deverbative formations such as OLith. *pagéluo* is not immediately comparable, since the suffix is **-ōn-* without vowel change (GSg. *-uonies*, dial. *-uonio*). Even if one argues that they reflect older forms in **-ōn*, GSg. **-ĕn-*, they are quite different from *ruduõ*, since they are mostly deverbative formations.

[3] See my account in Petit 2004, 71–100.

[4] W. Smoczyński (SEJL, 521) convincingly suggests that *rùdas* could represent the dissimilation of a form **rùdras* (< PIE **h₁rudʰ-ro-*, cf. Gk. ἐρυθρός, Lat. *ruber*). For a similar dissimilation see perhaps Lith. *núogas* 'naked' if it goes back to **núog-nas* (with Winter's law < PIE **nogᵘ-no-*, cf. OInd. *nagná-*).

rùdas → *ruduõ*. One could, of course, argue that **mažuõ* and *ruduõ* are not directly based on the adjectives *mãžas* and *rùdas*, but rather on some verbal form, for instance, the stative verbs *mažéti* 'diminish, decrease' and *rudéti* 'become brown'. But there would be no point in proceeding this way, since there is no derivational pattern anyway that could explain the creation of *ruduõ* even from a verbal form.

My assumption is that the nasal formation of Lith. *ruduõ*, Latv. *rudens* is best explained through suffix transfer from the older word for 'autumn', the originally heteroclitic neuter **h₁os-r/n-*. This word is still reflected in OPr. *assanis* (EV 14) and in Slavic **osen-i-* (Russ. осень), **esen-i-* (Pol. *jesień*)[5]. Cognates are also known in other IE languages, e.g. in Goth. *as-ans*, OHG *ar(a)n*, Gk. ὀπώρα 'autumn' (< **ὀπ-ohαρ-α* < prefix **ὀπί* 'around' + **h₁os-r̥-*). The heteroclitic suffix of PIE **h₁os-r/n-* 'autumn' might be connected (or even could have been created by analogy) with that of the inherited word for 'spring' PIE **ṷes-r/n-* (cf. Hom. Gk. ἔαρ, Lat. *ṷēr*, OIcel. *vár*, OInd. *vasantá-* 'spring'). Whereas, in the word for 'spring', heteroclisis is still indirectly reflected through the divergence of Baltic (**ṷes-r-*, hence Lith. *vãsara*, Latv. *vasara* 'summer' with semantic shift, opposed to Lith. *pavãsaris*, Latv. *pavasara* 'spring') and Slavic (**ṷes-n-*, hence OCSl. *vesna*, Russ. весна, Pol. *wiosna*), in the word for 'autumn' the nasal suffix has been generalized in both Baltic and Slavic (**h₁os-n-*, hence OPr. *assanis*, Sl. **os-en-* or **es-en-*). In Slavic, the word became an *i*-stem (**os-en-i-*, **es-en-i-* > Russ. осень, Pol. *jesień*) the feminine gender of which could be due to the analogy of **vesnā* 'spring' or **zimā* 'winter'. The same evolution is observed in the West Baltic cognate (OPr. *assanis*), probably assimilated from an older form **as-en-i-*; its gender is unknown. One can reasonably assume that the older form **as-en-* was inherited in East Baltic as well and that, on the basis of its usual association with the adjective **rudas*, it was secondarily replaced by a new form **rud-en-* with suffix transfer as in Gk. ἄλφι 'barley'. A phraseological structure **rudas* + **asen-* 'the red autumn' gave rise to a new designation **ruden-* in the same way as **h₂elbʰom* + **sepit* 'white barley' created a new substantive **h₂elbʰ-it-* 'barley'. A similar view has already been suggested by V. Mažiulis (PKEŽ 1, 103), who writes about **rud-en-* 'that its formation was perhaps influenced by B.-Sl. **es-en-*'. The conditions under which this influence took place can now be determined in a more precise way.

---

[5] Initial variation of **os-* and **es-* is a common feature of Baltic and Slavic, see A n d e r s e n 1996.

4. Lithuanian *svíestas*, Latvian *sviêsts* 'butter'

The second instance of suffix transfer one could adduce is the East Baltic word for 'butter' (Lith. *svíestas*, Latv. *sviêsts*). The comparison made by V. N. Toporov and O. N. Trubačëv (1962, 231) with the Old Iranian word *xšvid-* 'butter' is probably mistaken, since the Avestan word *xšvid-* is cognate with the Sanskrit root *kṣvid-* (OInd. [lexicographs] *kṣvidyati* 'to become moist', *kṣvedati* 'to hum')[6], which presupposes a prototype **kṣu̯id-*; any comparison with the East Baltic term is therefore impossible. In another way, it is often assumed – and this is obviously a far better analysis – that the East Baltic designation is derived from the verb Lith. *svíesti*, Latv. *sviêst* 'to fling, to throw'. Verbs of 'throwing' are characterized by the existence of two alternative constructions, one construction where the accusative refers to the object that is hit (with the instrumental of the object that is thrown at it) and another construction where it refers to the object that is thrown (with the locative or directive of the object that is hit). Both constructions are attested in the Lithuanian verb *svíesti*, e.g. Lith. *svíesti ką̃ nórs akmenimì* 'to hit somebody with a stone' or *svíesti ãkmenį į̃ ką̃ nórs* 'to throw a stone at somebody' (see the references in LKŽ). In the scholarly literature, this phenomenon is usually described under the name of 'locative alternation'. It plays a crucial role in the syntax of the older stages of Indo-European, as shown by J. Haudry (1977), who speaks of 'model 1' in the case of the instrumental construction (e.g. *svíesti ką̃ nórs akmenimì*) and of 'model 2' in the case of the locative-directive construction (e.g. *svíesti ãkmenį į̃ ką̃ nórs*). If we try to explain Lith. *svíestas*, Latv. *sviêsts* 'butter' as a derivative of the verb Lith. *svíesti*, Latv. *sviêst* 'to fling, to throw', model 1 is to be taken as a point of departure, hence *svíesti* 'to hit' → *svíestas* 'what is hit' with a passive meaning[7]. From a model 2-like construction ('to throw') it would hardly be possible to explain the meaning 'butter'; it is common knowledge that the production of this fatty substance, obtained through churning cream, does not imply at any stage a process of throwing. In Lithuanian, nouns with the suffix *-tas* normally have an instrumental meaning ('a tool used to realize the action expressed by the verb'), e.g. *káltas* 'chisel' (from *kálti* 'to forge'), but a passive meaning is not unusual, e.g. *rãštas* 'writing, something written' (from

---

[6] See Szemerényi 1958; also Flattery, Schwarz 1989, 117.

[7] So W. Smoczyński (SEJL, 620), who reconstructs a primary meaning 'to, co zbito; bita (śmietana)'.

rašýti 'to write'). The problem is that, from a verb 'to hit', a concrete meaning 'butter' can only be explained by assuming a semantic specialization ('to hit' > 'to smear'), hence 'fatty substance that is smeared to produce butter'. This is certainly the right way to proceed. Although the verb *svíesti* does not display in its present use any phraseological association with butter or fatty substances, it may have been used previously in this sense. But it would be better, of course, if we could find a precise contextual scenario to account for this development.

A solution appears if we consider the word for 'butter' in Old Prussian: *anctan* (EV 689, see also *ancte* GrG 61, *aucte* GrA 72, GrF 71). *Anctan* is an old derivative of a root **ang-* 'to oil, smear' which itself disappeared as an independent verbal root in Baltic, but is still reflected in other IE languages (PIE **h₃engᵘ-* 'to oil, smear', cf. OInd. *anákti*, *áñjas-*, Lat. *unguō*). Cognates with the precise meaning 'butter' are also attested (OIr. *imb*, OHG *ancho* < **h₃ŋgᵘ-en-*, **h₃engᵘ-en-*, see also Lat. *unguen*). The suffix of the Old Prussian lexeme *anctan* can be ascribed an instrumental meaning ('fatty substance that is used to smear something'), which is not unusual in Old Prussian; from a semantic point of view, the evolution **ang-* 'to smear' → **ang-tan* 'butter' is paralleled by Slav. **mazati* 'to smear' → **maz-slo* 'butter'. It is difficult to reconstruct the structure of the word **ang-tan* more precisely: the stem **ang-* obviously represents a full grade, which could be either **e* (as in OPr. *meltan* 'flour') or **o* (as in OPr. *dalptan* 'chisel').

My claim is now the following. One may argue that East Baltic once possessed the same word as West Baltic, i.e. **ang-tan*. This word could be used with the verb **svēid-ti-* 'to smear', in an accusative construction of the type **svēid-ti-* + **ang-tan* 'to throw, to put, i.e. to smear butter on something'. In my paper on OLith. *krienas* (2002), I argued that a verbal construction **krī-ti-* + **vēd-nan* 'to pay the bride-price' (verb + object) was changed into an etymological construction **krī-ti* + **krēi-nan* with suffix transfer (hence OLith. *krienas*). A similar explanation could apply for **svēid-ti-* + **ang-tan* 'to throw, to put, i.e. to smear butter on something', changed into **svēid-ti-* + **svēid-tan* with etymological figure and suffix transfer, hence the derivative **svēid-tan*, which at a later stage became masculine, like all previous neuter stems: **svēid-tas* (> Lith. *svíestas*, Latv. *sviêsts*).

5. Latv. *brĩvs* 'free'

A further example of suffix transfer in Baltic could be Latv. *brĩvs* 'free'. This adjective is attested since the beginning of the Latvian written tradi-

tion, e.g. *Briws freÿ* in Fürecker's dictionary (17th century, 45; ed. F e n n e l l 1997, 49), *Brihws frey* in the *Manuale Lettico–Germanicum* (ca. 1690, 67; ed. F e n n e l l 2001, 74). It is usually considered a loanword from Middle Low German *vrī* 'free'; the Estonian adjective *wrī* 'free' would reflect a parallel borrowing from the same source[8]. This view, however, faces a serious difficulty which, to my knowledge, seems to have been overlooked in most of the previous etymological treatments of the Latvian word. The ending *-vs* obviously goes back to a suffix **-vas* which cannot be explained from the Middle Low German source (*vrī* < Germ. **frijaz*). One would expect ***brīs* (from **vrī* + *-s*) or ***brijs* (from **vrī* + *-as*). Karulis (1992 1, 147) notes that the expected form could have left a trace in Old Latvian: *frey / brie* in Mancelis' *Lettus* (1638 1, 64), probably reflecting an adverb **[brī]*, but this variant could well have been secondarily shortened from **brīv*, see the fluctuation *Brih*, *Brihw frey* in the *Manuale Lettico–Germanicum* (ca. 1690, 67; ed. F e n n e l l 2001, 74). Be that as it may, the suffix **-vas* must be old in view of the numerous Old Latvian attestations of the stem *brīv-*, cf. also *brīvība*, *brĩve* 'freedom', the former for example in the *Manuale Lettico–Germanicum* (*Brihwiba freyheit*, ca. 1690, 67; ed. F e n n e l l 2001, 74), the latter for example in Stenders' *Lettisches Lexicon* (1789 1, 29). There is no reason to analyze the labial *-v-* as a glide preventing the hiatus in a sequence **brī + -as*, because this would yield **brijas > *brijs*, cf. Latv. *pamijs* 'abwechselnd geschichteter Flachs' (ME 3, 70) from *pamît* 'abwechseln, ablösen' (ME 3, 72)[9]. Karulis' brief remark that the addition of a Latvian ending caused the insertion of *-v-* (*pievienojot aizgūtajam vārdam galotni, iestarpināts -v-*) is clearly far from satisfactory.

In view of this difficulty, one must reckon with the possibility that the ending *-vs* reflects a characterized suffix **-vas* which was adapted to the German stem *vrī-*. In my opinion, the origin of this suffix could be best explained through the phenomenon of suffix transfer. It is likely that, for the expression of the meaning 'free', Proto-Baltic used an adjective **arvas*. This adjective might have left a trace in a single attestation of Juška's Lithuanian dictionary: *arvesnis čėsas apsidirbus rudeny ulevoti* (1897 1, 109), where the noun phrase *arvesnis čėsas* probably rests on an expression corresponding to Lith. *laĩsvas laĩkas* or *laisvãlaikis* 'free time'. The phrase is reported to belong to the West High Lithuanian dialect of Veliuona. Apart from this late and

---

[8] See ME 1, 336. Note that Livonian has another word: *vabā* 'free'.
[9] S m o c z y ń s k i 2003, 31.

isolated occurrence, which could be due to the influence of substratum (from Prussian or Curonian?)[10], there is no trace of this adjective in East Baltic. In Old Prussian, *arvas 'free' has been replaced in its basic meaning by a new lexeme (OPr. powīrps 'free' III 95₁₈), but it is likely that it still survives with a secondary meaning in the adjective arwis 'true' (III 73₁₅, etc.)[11]. Further cognates include Slavic *orv-ьnъ 'equal, uniform' (> OCSl. ravьnъ 'equal, similar', Russ. ровный, Pol. równy 'flat, smooth, equal') and especially Hittite arau̯a- 'free' (common gender NSg. a-ra-u-u̯a-aš), arau̯aḫḫⁱ- 'to make free, to release' (1Sg. a-ra-u-u̯a-aḫ-ḫi), Lycian arawa- 'freedom'[12]; with Schwebeablaut, one could add the group of OInd. rávas- 'space, freedom', Lat. rūs 'country', etc.[13] The reconstruction of the underlying verbal root is difficult and depends on how one interprets the Anatolian evidence: most scholars would probably agree with a prototype like *h_1or-u̯o-. Fraenkel (LEW 1, 16) compares Lith. dial. *arvas with Lith. ardýti 'to unravel, to unrip' and ìrti 'to disintegrate, fall into pieces', érdvė 'space'. Kloekhorst (2008, 198) tries to compare the Anatolian cognates with OInd. áram 'fittingly', r̥tá- 'truth, order' and Gk. ἀραρίσκω 'to join', but, if the latter forms belong to the PIE root *h_2er- 'to join, to adjust', the absence of initial *ḫ- in Hittite is difficult to account for, unless one accepts Kloekhorst's view that *h_2o- yields a- in Hittite. There is no ground whatsoever for the reconstruction of a PIE root *h_1ar-.

Whatever the precise etymology of *arvas 'free' may be, there are good reasons to assume that it was the usual word for 'free' in Common Baltic. It can reasonably be hypothesized that Latvian inherited *arvas 'free' and later preserved its suffix in combination with the borrowed stem *brī-, hence *brī-vas > Latv. brĩvs. This instance of suffix transfer is instructive and seems to be unique, because it is based on the relationship between an inherited lexeme and a loanword. In another respect as well, it differs from the examples we have seen so far: whereas most instances of suffix transfer reflect a phraseological collocation, i.e. the linear coexistence of two lexemes on the

---

[10] Cf. PKEŽ 1, 461.

[11] From a semantic point of view, one may argue that the basic meaning was 'isolated', hence 'independent' > 'free' (Anatolian, Lithuanian) or 'clear, distinct', hence 'true' (OPrussian); the semantics of the Slavic counterparts ('flat, equal') remains problematic. See also PKEŽ 1, 461. Or could the meaning of OPr. arwis 'true' be due to the model of German freilich 'to tell the truth' / frei 'free'?

[12] Perhaps Goth. arwjo 'in vain'? Cf. Holthausen 1934, 8.

[13] BSW, 14.

syntagmatic level, this example involves two synonyms, thus operating on a paradigmatic level. If one seeks to reconstruct more precisely the evolution that ultimately produced Latv. *brīvs*, one may suppose that there was a stage where both forms were simultaneously in use, perhaps as sociolinguistic vari‑ants (this is very common with loanwords, which only gradually supersede inherited lexemes); one could then explain the diffusion of the suffix *-vas* from *ar-vas* to *brī-vas* as a typical case of 'suffix contamination' between synonyms. By the way, it is striking that Lith. *laīsvas* 'free' displays a nearly identical suffix (*laid-svas*, from *léisti* 'to let, to permit'), but, since it belongs to a somewhat productive formation, there is no compelling reason to assume suffix transfer there.

6. Conclusion

My claim in this paper has been to identify a morphological phenomenon that is often overlooked in studies in word formation. The notion of 'suffix transfer', first elaborated by C. Watkins and afterwards explicitly named by C. Le Feuvre, proves to be an important tool for explaining suffixations that were previously unaccounted for. This is precisely the most important clue that allows for a clear recognition of suffix transfer: suffix transfer might be reconstructed when attention is drawn to unexpected morphological fea‑tures. To be true, this general principle might sound rather abstract. In most cases, one can hesitate as to the extension of the phenomenon. The reason for this probably lies in the fact that suffix transfer is essentially based on phraseological units, while most etymological studies consist in tracing back single words to single prototypes. It belongs to future linguistics to integrate phraseology into diachronic studies to a larger extent than is usually done.

PRIESAGOS PERKĖLIMAS BALTŲ KALBOSE

Santrauka

Straipsnyje aptariami kai kurie priesagos perkėlimo atvejai baltų kalbose. Priesagos perkėlimu vadinamas morfologinis procesas, kurio metu nauja leksema, vykstant leksinei inovacijai, perima pakeičiamo senesnio žodžio priesagą. Taip galima paaiškinti kai ku‑riuos iki šiol nesuprastus sufiksacijos atvejus. Ypač daug dėmesio kreipiama į lie. *ruduõ*, *svíestas* ir la. *brīvs* etimologiją.

ABBREVIATIONS

BSW – Trautmann 1923
EV – *Elbing Vocabulary*
GrA, GrF, GrG – *Simon Grunau's Vocabulary*
LEW – Fraenkel 1962
ME – Mülenbachs, Endzelīns 1923–1932
PKEŽ – Mažiulis 1988–1997
SEJL – Smoczyński 2007

LITERATURE

Andersen, Henning 1996, *Reconstructing Prehistorical Dialects. Initial Vowels in Slavic and Baltic*, Berlin, New York: Mouton, De Gruyter.

Flattery, David S., Martin Schwarz 1989, *Haoma and Harmaline, The Botanical Identity of the Indo-Iranian sacred Hallucinogen 'Soma' and its Legacy in Religion, Language, and Middle Eastern Folklore*, Berkeley, Los Angeles: University of California Publications.

Fennell, Trevor G. 1997, *Fürecker's Dictionary: the First Manuscript*, Rīga: Latvijas Akadēmiskā Bibliotēka.

Fennell, Trevor G. 2001, *Manuale Lettico-Germanicum. The Text of the Original Manuscript*, Rīga: Latvijas Akadēmiskā Bibliotēka.

Fraenkel, Ernst 1962, *Litauisches etymologisches Wörterbuch* 1–2, Heidelberg: Carl Winter Universitätsverlag, Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.

Haudry, Jean 1977, *L'emploi des cas en védique*, Lyon: L'Hermès.

Holthausen, Ferdinand 1934, *Gotisches etymologisches Wörterbuch*, Heidelberg: Winter.

Juška, Antanas 1897–1922, *Litovskij slovar'*, Peterburg.

Karulis, Konstantīns 1992, *Latviešu etimoloģijas vārdnīca*, Rīga: Avots.

Kloekhorst, Alwin 2008, *Etymological Dictionary of the Hittite Inherited Lexicon*, Leiden: Brill.

Le Feuvre, Claire 2008 [2010], Sur la formation de l'adjectif balto-slave *sáldu-* 'doux, sucré' (lit. *saldùs*, v.sl. *sladъkъ*) et du germanique *salt* 'sel', *Historische Sprachforschung* 121, 245–253.

Mancelis, Georgs 1638, *Lettus*, Rīga.

Mažiulis, Vytautas 1988–1997, *Prūsų kalbos etimologijos žodynas*, Vilnius: Mokslas.

Mülenbachs, Kārlis, Jānis Endzelīns 1923–1932, *Latviešu valodas vārdnīca* 1–4, Rīga: Izglītības ministrija (1), Kultūras fonds (2–4).

Petit, Daniel 2002, Lituanien *krienas*: étymologie radicale et histoire des mots, *Historische Sprachforschung* 115, 138–150.

Petit, Daniel 2004, *Apophonie et catégories grammaticales dans les langues baltiques*, Louvain: Peeters.

Skardžius, Pranas 1943, *Lietuvių kalbos žodžių daryba*, Vilnius: Lietuvos mokslų akademija.

Smoczyński, Wojciech 2003, *Hiat laryngalny w językach bałto-słowiańskich*, Kraków: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Jagiellońskiego.

Smoczyński, Wojciech 2007, *Słownik etymologiczny języka litewskiego*, Vilnius: Vilniaus universitetas.

Stenders, Gothards 1789, *Lettisches Lexicon*, Mitau.

Szemerényi, Oswald 1958, Greek γάλα and the Indo-European term for 'milk' with an excursus on Avesta *xsvid-*, *Zeitschrift für vergleichende Sprachforschung* 75, 170–190.

Toporov, Vladimir N., Oleg N. Trubačëv 1962, *Lingvističeskij analiz gidronimov verxnego Podneprov'ja*, Moskva.

Trautmann, Reinhold 1923, *Baltisch-Slavisches Wörterbuch*, Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht.

Watkins, Calvert 1978, Let us now praise famous grains, *Proceedings of the American Philosophical Society* 122, 9–17 [= 1994, 593–601].

Watkins, Calvert 1994, *Selected Writings*, Innsbruck (Innsbrücker Beiträge zur Sprachwissenschaft 80).

Watkins, Calvert 1995, *How to Kill a Dragon. Aspects of Indo-European Poetics*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Daniel PETIT
Ecole Normale Supérieure
Centre d'Etudes anciennes
45, rue d'Ulm
FR-75005 Paris
France
[*daniel.petit@ens.fr*]