

PRODUCTIVE SUFFIX ABLAUT IN BALTIC

1. *ungurỹs* 'eel'

J. Otrębski, *Lingua Posnaniensis* 5, 1955, 26, has correctly observed that *ungurỹs* must have an initial vocalism which shows a quality resulting from assimilation (or „harmony“) to the second syllable. The pre-form would be **angurys*, which is matched by Old Prussian *angur(g)is* (as Fraenkel, *LitEW* 1163, writes it). On the other hand, Finnish *ankerias* seems to attest **angerjas*, while Slavic **agorb* reposes on **angarijas*. Clearly these are all derived from the etymon Lith. *angis*, Latv. *uõdze*, OCS *ažb*, Lat. *anguis*, Gk. ὄφις, and the Old Irish word for 'eel' *esc-ung*.

However, Otrębski's formulation for the development cannot be correct, and Fraenkel does nothing to correct it, while adducing some Latvian place-names of unclarified relationship. Otrębski posits **angarjas* bzw. **angerjas* > **angurys* > *ungurỹs*. He continues: „Die Frage des Verhältnisses der früheren litauischen und preussischen Gestalt **angurjas* zu den in anderen baltischen Sprachen noch auftretenden Gestalten **angarjas* und **angerjas* erfordert eine besondere Behandlung.“ That may be, but Otrębski's chronological series will not lead to a solution.

We cannot simply derive a form with a *u* vocalism from an *a/e* pre-form. Moreover, because Slavic shows **a* in the suffix this does not guarantee an **a* for common Balto-Slavic. However, on grounds of the conservatism of Finnish and because of the maximum variety of vowel quality shown in the one form, **angerjas* can be assumed as valid for an early Baltic shape. But at a very early period there must also have existed **angurjas* in order to explain the Lithuanian and Old Prussian forms. Thus, the only Baltic chronology that will account for Otrębski's facts is **angerjas* ~ **angurjas* (> **angurys*) > *ungurỹs*.

The question now is how **angurjas* arose. Otrębski speculates that the *gu* could be from the original labiovelar, as seen in Lat. *anguilla*. Of course, that cannot be so if we are to conserve any semblance of order in the development of Indo-European sounds. One may consider the possibility that he have here a sequence **g^hu* in the final of the stem, especially in view of the often adduced ἔχιδ¹. This would

¹ But apart from the fact that the interrelation of the etyma *anguis* (ὄφις), ἔχιδ (Skt. *áhi*), and *ežỹs* is unclear, ἔχιδ appears to contain if anything an IE palatal; and that would call for a Baltic reflex *ž* (followed by *v*). For Balto-Slavic questions and literature on this etymon, see for example Sławski, *Słownik etymologiczny języka polskiego* 1. 572–3, s. v. *jeź*.

then call for a treatment parallel to ἐλαχύς, ἐλαφρός, Lat. *leuis*, Skt. *raghú-* etc. But we then have no explanation why the stem of *angis qžb* appears to be truncated in relation to *leñgvas lbgž-kž*. Therefore *angis* Lat. *anguis* Gk. ὄφις must represent **g^{wh}* (and not **g^u*, as Otrębski writes). The *u* of **angurias* must therefore arise in the suffix, and not in the root or stem of the lod simplex.

The simplest solution is to regard *ur* as a normal Schwundstufe, particularly after a velar. Here the original **r* would have syllabified both by Sievers law after the heavy syllable and in position between *g* and yod, if the formation is early enough. The pre-form, then, may be written **ang^w(h)rios*. We may take the Latvian river name *vogre* < **angr-ē* as supporting such a form, but with a revalued syllabification.² On the other hand, the Prussian river name *Angerap* (: *ape*) seems to support **angerias*.

We are therefore led to reconstruct for Proto-Baltic an ablauting formation **angerias* ~ **angurias* < **angerias* ~ *angrias* < **ang^{wh}-(e)rio-*. Lith. *ungurỹs* results, as Otrębski has pointed out, from **angurias*, which is a variant on the Proto-Baltic level.

The Slavic variant **angarias* may easily be an independent formation built on the old ablaut alternation seen in the suffix, much as **kotorž* has been formed alongside Cz. *který* Slk. *koterý* = πότερος (**k^wo-tero-*) : Ukr. *kotrýj* Lith. *katràs* (**k^wo-tro-*)³.

2. *vāsara* 'summer, year'

The following relevant forms are attested: *vāsara*, *vasarà* (Kurschat, Skardžius Daukš akc. 95) Latv. *vasara*; *vasāris*, Žem. *vasēris* adj.; *pavāsaris*, Žem. *pavāseris* 'spring'. Other derivatives need not concern us here. Fraenkel LitEW 1206, referring to Skardžius Arch.Phil. K 7. 41, sees progressive assimilation **pavēseris* > *pavāseris* and „Angleichung des *e* an *a*“ in *vasara*. This account is both ambiguous and insufficiently related to other such vocalic phenomena in Baltic.

Greek ἔγχελυς is called by Frisk (GEW 440) „dunkel“, is said to „recall“ the other names for the eel, and the crossing of the etyma ἔχις and *anguis* is called an old interpretation. A „Pelasgic“ solution would be ad hoc, because of the aspirate. I therefore see no likely solution other than a conflation, especially since that would also explain the absence of the nasal in ὄφις. One might envisage:

<i>*ang^{hw}-is</i>	∕	<i>*e ok^{wh}-is</i>	>	ὄφις
<i>*eǵh-is</i>	>	<i>*ekh-is</i>	>	ἔχις
<i>*ang^{wh}-el-</i>	∕	<i>*enkh-el-</i>	>	ἔγχελυς

² Obviously Latv. *Engure*, with its nasal, cannot be a simple ablauting relation to *ungurỹs*, as Fraenkel states without elaboration.

³ On the Slavic forms of **k^wo-t(e)ro-* see my note, Rocznik slawistyczny, 31, 1970.

We know that we must start from **ues-*. Lat. *uēr* and ON *vár* are not at all clear. Ernout-Meillet treats the putative *uēr* < **uēs-* to **ues-* as pure hypothesis. De Vries 644 is also distrustful of the connexion with **ues-*, while noting the speculation that **uēs-* was reshaped on the model of *iēr* 'year' and considering the Germanic-Italic agreement as significant. But Slavic is perfectly clear: Russ. Ukr. *vesná*, OBulg. *vesna*, SCr. *vèsna*, Slovene *vēsna*, Cz. *vesna*, Pol. *wiosna* all lead to **vesná*. And the Slavic representative paired with Greek $\xi\alpha\rho$ gives us all the information we need: We have two generalizations from the heteroclit **ues-* (> $*\mathcal{F}\varepsilon(h)\alpha\rho$), **uesn-*. Therefore *vāsara* must somehow be derived from **ues-*.

There must have been a plural (or collective) to **ues-* comparable to the inflexion that gave Greek $\ddot{\upsilon}\delta\omega\rho$, etc. I presume this to have been **uesrH_a*. It is difficult to say precisely what such a form would have yielded in Baltic; it might a priori have been either **vesrā* or **vesir*.

In any event we begin to see that there is some evidence that there was a certain productivity in the ablaut of *r*-suffixes in Balto-Slavic. We find beside **k(o)terō* and **k(ot)tro-* also **k(o)torō*; and now beside **anger-ias* also **angr-ias* 'eel'. Now Fraenkel seems to assume that the earlier form for 'summer' in Baltic had a suffix in *-er-* and that the vowel assimilation started in the prefixed form. That is of course possible, but it would seem more natural for the changes to have taken place first in the simplex; and it would be preferable to find a formulation of greatest possible generality for the various instances of vowel adjustment that we find particularly in Baltic. Otrębski has formulated, as we have seen, the vowel assimilation phenomenon for Baltic as applying before suffixes in *r* and *l* particularly in the case of circumflexed (etymologically falling) bases. This would of course suffice to derive *vāsara* from *vāsera*, but unless we take the base in the context of the compound in *pa-* there is no reasonable way of explaining why **ues-* gave *vas-*, particularly since Slavic shows *ves-*.

It therefore seems more in conformity with developments we know to assume that just as **katra-* ~ **katera-* gave also **katara-* so also **ues-* developed **ueser-* and **uesar-* by productive rules of suffix ablaut alternation. Then **vesara* would give *vāsara* by Otrębski's assimilation rule regardless of compounding with *pa-*. On the other hand, Žem. *vasēris* would represent a contamination of older **ueser-* with the widespread *vasar-*.

3. *vākaras* 'evening'

A somewhat similar background would also explain Lith. *vākaras* Latv. *vakars* in relation to Slavic *večerō*. That is, **uekeros* first gave **vekaras* by analogical suffix ablaut, and then **vekaras* became *vākaras* by Otrębski's assimilation. Fraenkel LitEW 1187 actually posits this progression, citing Schmidt, Endzelin, and Skar-

džius, but without giving a motivation or detailed account for what is simply labeled „regressive Assimilation“.

It may, however, be objected that in the pre-form **uekeros* the segment *-er-* was not a true suffix. It is true, as I have argued „Revue des études arméniennes“ n. s. 3, 1966, 13–15, that Armenian *gišer* = Latin *uesper* = Welsh *ucher* = **uekeros* continues an old compound or phrase whose precise IE shape cannot be recovered with the certainty we normally expect, but which may be schematised as **u(e)ik(s) + ksperos*⁴. Thus the element *-er-* was originally a portion of the second element of the compound, and not a simple suffix.

On the other hand, as Goetze originally suggested, the final part of *uesper* seems to be best related to Avestan *xšapar-* and *xšapan- xšafn-*. The stem *xšapar-* is a neuter, but *xšapan-* is neuter only in collocation with *azan-* ‘day’; otherwise *xšapan-* is feminine, as is the simplex *xšap-* and its Vedic cognate *kṣap-* ‘darkness, night’. This leads us to three observations which should be kept strictly separate, even though they are ultimately interrelated.

a.) **ueker-* forms a new Balto-Slavic simplex which has the synchronic configuration of a word with an *r-*suffix. Therefore, it is easy envisage a fresh formation **vėkaras* exactly parallel to **vesara*, etc. This productivity in Baltic is thus synchronically independent of the historical origin of the segment *-er-*.

b.) **uekeros* indeed seems to be a fresh adjectival formation as Fraenkel cites from Nieminen’s argument. On the other hand, this formation seems to be older than just Balto-Slavic; cf. ἔσπερος, ἑσπέρα, etc. Either IE had a derived adjective from the compound **u(e)ik-ksperos*, or an old phrase with a final genitive **uėiks + ksperós* was revalued as an *o-*stem adjectival derivative. Thus there is in this sense an IE pedigree for Slavic *večerǔ* and *vākaras*. There is no need to see some late (and widespread) derivative from a neuter *večer* or **ueker*.

It is also possible that a reflexion of the old phrase with genitive and final accent lives on in *vbčerá*, which Fraenkel remarks matches the Lithuanian allative *vakaróp*.

c.) Quite apart from the new formation whereby the final portion became freshly productive as a Baltic suffix, we recall that the noun in *-ar-* in Avestan was neuter and that the root noun (and some of its derivatives) was feminine. There seems to be a precious relic of this in South Slavic. Although I have just insisted that the formation *večerǔ* must be old, it is noteworthy, as Nieminen has observed, that SCr. *věčě* is neuter. In Vuk’s Srpski Rječnik we find the double entry *věče* neuter and *večêr -ri* feminine; he also gives the phrase *dobâr večê* masculine ‘good eve-

⁴ A vocalism **uiker-* derived from **uik(ksp)er-* would, as I have pointed out, account easily for the variant *vbčerá*, instead of the dubious zero-grade discussed by Fraenkel. In any event, a zero-grade relation in *ũkas* is very doubtful and unclear.

ning'. Thus in *věčē*, and in *jūče* Vuk *juče(r)(a)* 'yesterday', we find an archaic formation mirroring in stem and in gender the Avestan *xšapar-*.

Moreover, *věčer* *věčeri* feminine is not isolated. Fraenkel cites from Nieminen's argument the Slovene phrase „*Bog vam daj dobro večer* 'Gott gebe euch guten Abend', neutral“. But if we consult Pleteršnik's dictionary, s. v., we find in addition to *večēr* masculine (*dober večer*, *sveti večer*, *živi večer*, etc.) another entry *večēr* feminine, attested at least from the 15th century. Here is where the phrase *Bog vam daj dobro večer* is given; clearly a feminine accusative. There is also cited the phrase *kakor daleč je jutro do večeri*. There can be no doubt that we have here a South Slavic feminine. This seems to be a strong candidate for the survival in gender of *xšap-* and *xšapan-* alongside the neuter *xšapar-*. The occurrence as an *i*-stem would be the normal Balto-Slavic resolution of an old consonantstem.

Therefore Slavic gives us besides *večerō* m., a pair of transformed stems *večern-* and *večerō* f. These must go back to **uekeros*, **uekVr-*, and **ueker-* respectively. The neuter could originate in something like **uekur*, oblique **uekr-*, and the oblique forms like those of *mater-* etc. would later have been refashioned to **ueker-*.

Thus we see indirectly in the gender variants in Slavic a basis for ablaut productivity in the suffix in Baltic. On this basis it is not difficult to see how an original **ueker-as* could have formed a fresh ablaut variant **uekar-as*; perhaps the latter was even re-shaped from an extinct neuter **uekur*.

4. *āšarà* 'tear'

It is well known that Lith. *āšara* *ašarà* Latv. *asara* must be related to Skt. *ásru-*, Av. *asru-*, and Toch. A *ākār* pl. *akrūna*. I have tried to explain the absence of **d-* in these forms in the Festschrift for George Lane, p. 153, and I have attempted earlier, PBB (Tübingen) 81, 1960, 263 ff., to give a reasoned account of the forms of the IE etymon underlying these words. We must have **dākru-* ~ *drakur-* from a pre-IE **drakru(-r)*. By a sandhi loss there then developed a dialectal **ākru-*, and this must be the ancestor of the Baltic words. Beyond that, there is no motivation within IE for the development of a vowel between **k > š* and *r*.

A further anomaly, however, is the stem class. In Lithuanian we might easily expect to find the preservation of an old *u*-stem, as with *medus*, OPruss. *meddo*. Thus we might hope to find **aš(t)ru-*. Of course, this could have clashed with *aš(t)rūs*, and in any case the details of development escape us in part at least for the present. But we may hazard a speculation. If the (collective) plural **ašruà* underwent metathesis, a form **ašurà* could have resulted. Then either by the ablaut productivity discussed above for *vāsara* and *vākaras* or by the assimilation for circumflected stems with apparent *r*-suffix specified by Otrębski a form **ašurà* would easily give *ašarà*.

However, to judge by the form *aszeromis* cited from Chylinski by Stang VGBS 33, it may be that **ašurà* was first remodelled to *ašerà* by productive suffix ablaut and later became *ašarà* by Otrębski's assimilation.

5. *vėdaras* 'entrails, sausage'

Beside the above form we find Tverėčius *vėderas*, and Latv. shows both *vėdars* and *vėdęrs*, while OPrussian attests *weders*. One might look for an original *vėdaras*, with *vėderas* produced by assimilation; in fact, Stang VGBS 33 lists this etymon along with *vāsara*, *āšara*, etc. Skardžius has discussed it Arch.Phil. 7. 40ff. But strictly it must be regarded separately for the time being.

Note that we have here not a circumflected base, but an old acuted long. This is, moreover, of unclear exact relation to the zero-grade seen in Skt. *udāra-*, Av. *udara-*; the Hesychius form ὄδερος is of course too problematic to yield any criteria for us. It appears that we have independent thematizations, with zero-grade generalized in Indo-Iranian and Dehnstufe in Baltic. This would point to an old ablauting noun; perhaps a neuter *r*-stem?

In light of this background it seems best to suppose provisionally that *vėdar-* and *vėder-* represent two different suffix ablaut developments from a pre-form whose exact shape we cannot now recover. As pure hypothesis, an *r*-stem from which the thematization would have been derived would have had a nominative **uėdōr* or **uėdir* (< **-r*), an accusative **uėdar-* or *-ir*, a genitive **udr-*, a locative plural **udir-*, and a locative singular **uder-*.

University of Chicago