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A. Sources and bibliography

Baltistica – Baltistica. Vilnius, 1965–.
ESSJ – Этимологический словарь славянских языков. Под ред. О.Н. Трубачева. Москва, 1974–. Вып. 1–.
Kalbotyra – Kalbotyr. Vilnius, 1958–.


LKK – Lietuvių kaišietyros klausimai. Vilnius, 1957–.

LKZ – Lietuvių kalbos žodynas. Vilnius, 1941. T. 1; Kaunas, 1947. T. 2; Vilnius, 1956–. T. 3–.


Toporov PJ – Топоров В.Н. Прусский язык: Словарь. Москва, 1975–.


B. Languages and dialects

Auk. – Lithuanian Aukštaitian
Av. – Avestian
Bal. – Baltic
Blr. – Belorussian
Ch. – Church (language)
Cur. – (Old) Curonian
Dor. – Greek Doric
Germ. – German
Gk. – Greek
Go. – Gothic
Grmc – Germanic
Hit. – Hittite (Nessite)
IE – Indo-European
Ind. – Indic
I-Iran. – Indo-Iranian
Iran. – Iranian
Lat. – Latin
Latv. – Latvian
Lith. – Lithuanian
M – modern
Mid. – middle
NHG – New High German
O – old
OHG – Old High German
OSl – Old Slavic
Pr. – Old Prussian
Rus. – Russian
Sam. – Samogitian
Serb. – Serbian
Serb.-Cr. – Serbian-Croatian
Sl. – Slavic

C. Other abbreviations

abl. – ablative
acc. – accusative
act. – active
adj. – adjective
adess. – adessive
adv. – adverb
all. – allative
aor. – aorist
card. – cardinal (number)
cas.gener. – casus generalis
Cat. – Catechism(s)
cnj. – conjunction
comp. – comparative
conj. – conjunctive
C-stem – consonant stem
dat. – dative
dial. – dialect
dimin. – diminutive
doc. – historical or literary documents
du. – dual
E – Elbing (Vocabulary)
EBaltic – East Baltic
fem. – feminine
frequ. – frequentative
fut. – future
gen. – genetive
gd. – grade
Gr – Grunau (‘s Vocabulary)
id. – indicative
if. – infinitive
imp. – imperative
impf. – imperfect
indecl. – indeclinable
iness. – inessive
inj. – injunctive
instr. – instrumental
intj. – interjection
interrg. – interrogative
iter. – iterative
itr. – intransitive
loc. – locative
masc. – masculine
mod. – mode
neut. – neutral
nom. – nominative
nr. – numeral
num. – number
opt. – optative
ord. – ordinal (number)
part. – partitive
pass. – passive
pc. – participle
perf. – perfect
pers. – personal name
pl. – plural
posit. – positive
poss. – possessive
ppos. – postposition
prf. – prefix
praep. – preposition
ps. – present
pron. – pronoun, or: pronominalized
prtc. – particle
pt. – past
refl. – reflexive
rel. – relative
sg. – singular
sim. – similarly
**Translator’s notes**

One must know how to read and understand examples from Baltic and Slavic languages. The letters ė, š, ž mean ch, sh, zh (French j) correspondingly (Polish cz, sz, ʐ, ć, ść, ż correspondingly mean: ch, sh, zh, palatal c, palatal s, palatal z. Polish rz equals to ʐ). Lithuanian letters a, e, i, u (as well as Polish a, e) are called nasals because they correspond to vowels with the nasal pronunciation as in French. These vowels come from the tautosyllabic units an, en, in, un, still preserved in Prussian in almost all positions, as well as in Lithuanian before the plosive consonants (and other consonants in some dialects). In Latvian these diphthongs first turned into uo, ie, ī, ū, afterwards producing short u, i, ū in the final position.

The nasal pronunciation has been lost in modern Lithuanian (except dialects) and substituted with the long pronunciation ā, ė, ĩ, ū in the literary language.

Dash over a vowel means that this vowel is long. To mark a short vowel the sign ` is used sometimes.

The letter ė means long narrow ē, but the letter y means long ī in modern Lithuanian orthography.

The letter o means diphthong uo in native words in modern Latvian orthography (usually ignored by the linguists who also ignore the sign of length when marking accent, e.g. ė, not ė!).

The linguists use the sign ‘ after the consonant to mark the palatalized (soft) pronunciation of this consonant, cf. t’ < *tj .

The sign “<” means “comes from...”, but the sign “>” means “turns into...”

The sign * means that an item which follows is not attested but is a result of linguistic reconstruction. The sign o means that an item which follows does not exist (is impossible).

For marking sorts of accent see further fn. 2. – L.P.
Preface

The research of Old Prussian\(^1\) faces more problems than the research of cognate Lithuanian and Latvian languages because Old Prussian (= Prussian) has been poorly presented in written documents. “Historical Grammar of Old Prussian” (= HGOP) deals with many debatable problems when synchronical and diachronical aspects of Prussian phonetics (as well as spelling), derivation and especially inflexion are touched upon. This is done basing on 4 volumes of former “Etymological Dictionary of Old Prussian” (Prūsų kalbos etimologijos žodynas. Vilnius 1988–1997 = PEŻ) and on works, referred to in this Dictionary. I do not discuss problems of Prussian syntax which is enough Germanized in attested documents.

\(^1\) Old Prussian is a translation of German Altpreussisch meaning autochthon language of Baltic Prussia (historical West- and East-Prussia) conquered by the Germans in the 13th c. The term Old was incorrect until the emergence of New Prussian (revived modern Prussian) in our days. This term came into being because the Germans comprehended Prussian as an older language of the Duchy of Prussia. Nevertheless the German dialects of West- and New-Prussia were not any Baltic Prussian language but were a local kind of Low German.

The Prussian language really belongs not to the Germanic but to the Baltic group of Indo-European languages and is kinderred to living Lithuanian and Latvian languages. The Baltic group of languages in its turn is closest to the Slavic group of languages (Czech, Serbian, Polish, Russian etc.). The latter, together with the Baltic group, are closest to the Germanic group of Indoeuropean (German, English, Swedish etc.). The Germanic languages are so-called centum-languages (cf. the word Engl. Hundred, Latin Centum), while the Baltic and Slavic languages are satem-languages (cf. Lith. Šimtas ‘hundred’, Polish Sto, Avestian Satam). The Baltic languages in their turn are divided into Western (or Peripheral) Baltic (Prussian, extinct Yatvingian, Old Curonian etc.) and Eastern (or Central) Baltic (Lithuanian, Latvian). The first have retained e.g. an older diphthong ei on the place of the newer ie in the latter. On the other hand, Prussian shares with Latvian the whistling pronunciation of sibilants (s, z) against their hushing pronunciation in Lithuanian (š, ž), all of them coming from “centum” Indoeuropean *k, *g. Prussian is much more archaic than Eastern Baltic, although Lithuanian is much more archaic than Latvian.

Old (!) Prussian, extinct since the beginning of the 18th c., is known in toponyms, lists of personal names and in written monuments: the 802 words Elbing Vocabulary (manuscript of the 13th/14th c.), small Grunau’s Vocabulary (beginning of the 15th c.), fragmental texts, 3 printed Lutheran Catechisms (1545, 1545, 1561 – short prayers and the whole M. Luther’s “Enchiridion”). The last edition of Prussian written documents is PKP by V. Mažiulis (see Bibliography).

The Catechisms reflect several dialects of Samland with the long *ā (as in Latvian) formally corresponding to Common Baltic *ā reconstructed by the linguists. The Elbing Vocabulary with its long *ō (as in Lithuanian) on the place of this *ā reflects some Pomzeanian dialect. – L.P.
1. PHONETICS

Accent and Tones

§ 1. The accent in Prussian (similarly to Lithuanian) was free, and this is apparent in the 3rd Catechism in which the stressed length is marked over vowels in most cases. Cf.: mûti ‘mother’ (**mätë ‘idem’ = Lith. dial. métë ‘idem’), f. antrà ‘the second’ (= Lith. antrà < **antrâ), kaimînan (= Lith. kaimînà), turî (= Lith. turî) ir kt.

§ 2. The same mark is found in spelling diphthongs in many cases in the 3rd Catechism (for the accented diphthongs cf. also § 5):

a) in the circumflex diphthongs (their first component being lengthened), e.g.: ėisi ‘thau goest’ (: Lith. ėi-tî), geide ‘he waits’ (: Lith. geî-dîia, cf. Latv. ģî-dî ‘to wait’, dessînts (: Lith. dešînîtas ‘tenth’, cf. Latv. sîmts ‘hundredth’), mārtin ‘bride’ (: Lith. mařîq, Latv. mārsa ‘brother’s wife’), mērgan ‘girl’ (: Lith. meŗgâ, Latv. mērâga), rānkan ‘hand’ (: Lith. raņka, Latv. rûoku) etc.

b) in the acute diphthongs (their second component being lengthened), e.g.: aînan ‘one’ (< **eînan : Lith. v-ianq, Latv. v-iënu), kaïlins ‘bones’ (: Lith. kâulus, Latv. kaûlus), pogaît ‘to receive’ (: Lith. gâuti, Latv. gût), steîmans ‘to those’ (: Lith. tîems, Latv. tiêm) etc.

2 The terms circumflex, acute vs. grave go back to traditional grammar of the Greek language with its 3 kinds of stress. 2 of them characterize long syllables in which the strength of the stress is unequally distributed during pronouncing the long syllable, whether the monophthong or the diphthong. In Lithuanian grammars and vocabularies these tones are marked with the signs ~ for the circumflex, ~ for the acute on the long syllables and ~ for the dynamic grave stress on the short syllable in accordance with Greek tradition. However Lithuanian accentuation is opposite to Greek, Latvian and Prussian accentuation since Lithuanian acute is a descending (not ascending or expanded!) tone with the weight on the beginning of the syllable, whether the monophthong or the diphthong (for examples cf. Mažiulis further). Literary Latvian possesses 3 tones: the grave sign ~ is used to mark the falling circumflex tone in long syllables, both ~ and ~ mark the acute tone. The sign ~ marks Latvian “broken” acute tone, which came into being due to retraction of stress from an accented ending onto acute stem vowel.

In the Baltic languages the tone may differentiate meaning of similar words sometimes, cf. Lith. rûgsta ‘sours’ vs. rûksta ‘smokes’, Latv. lûoks ‘leek’ vs. luoks ‘bow’, Pr. baîtan = *saîtan ‘sieve’ vs. (larga = *linga)saîtan ‘bond’.

In Western Europe the syllable accent is a feature of Serbian-Chroatin, Skandinavian, some German dialects. – L.P.
For the Prussian accentuation cf. Endzelins SV 19–22 (with bibliography), Stang Vergl. Gr. 143 f., 172 etc. Cf. also Bezzenberger KZ XLIV 315 ff., Girdenis KD I 318 ff.

§ 3. The Prussian syllabic accent, i.e. the circumflex and the acute tone, has been traditionally likened with the Latvian syllabic accent on the basis of these spellings (cf. Endzelins SV 22, Stang Vergl. Gr. 144 etc.). Nevertheless one finds it being more similar to Lithuanian Samogitian, not Latvian syllabic accent (cf. Bezzenberger KZ XLIV 315 ff. and especially Girdenis KD I 320 f.).

§ 4. Similar distribution of both kinds of the tone is not so apparent in the written documents as it is in the 3rd Catechism. In the 1st and in the 2nd Catechism I consider only one instance to be of this kind. i.e. *staey pallapsaey ‘the commandments’ (I 5 = II 5), in which the spelling -aey reflects the stressed circumflex diphthong *-āi of the plural masculine inflection. The letter -e- points out to the lengthening of the first component of the diphthong, cf. the circumflex tone in Lith. nom. pl. (vaik)-aī and PEŽ III 215. I have detected accented circumflex diphthongs, their first component being lengthened, in several instances of spelling in the Elbing Vocabulary, e.g.: *doalgis ‘scythe’ (= Lith. dālgis) = Pr. E) *dōlgis = i.e. *dālgis (the lengthened *ā correlating with the short *ā, cf. §19)3, *moasis ‘bellows’ = (Pr. E) *mōsas < *mōisas = i.e. *māisas (= Lith. māšas), *semo ‘winter’ = (Pr. E) *zēmā < *zēimā (the latter being barytone4 with all probability) = i.e. *zēimā (= Lith. žiemā) etc. Diphthongs of the acute origin are hidden in the Elbing Vocabulary in their turn without any doubt. I do not undertake tracing them today.

§ 5. Note. In case of unstressed circumflex diphthongs, their first component was not lengthened in dialects of the Prussian catechisms, but this cannot be stated for sure for the dialect of the Elbing Vocabulary5. As for unstressed long vowels, all of them were shortened in dialects of the Prussian catechisms, but not in the dialect of the Elbing Vocabulary (cf. also § 11).

3 The signs *a, *ā mark short and long back vowels a, ā of a low timbre correspondingly. – L.P.
4 Greek terms “barytone” vs. “oxytone” mean an accented stem vs. an accented ending. – L.P.
5 For this cf. fn. 13. – L.P.


Vocalism

a) Short vowels

§ 6. The short vowel Pr. *i comes from Balt. *i < IE *i and corresponds to Lith. i and Latv. i, cf.: Pr. is ‘from’ – Lith. iš (dial. iž), Latv. iz; Pr. acc. kittan ‘other’ – Lith. kitq, Latv. cits; Pr. wissa – Lith. visas, Latv. viss etc. There are instances of a syncopated short i in Prussian. e.g.: camstian ‘sheep’ (E) < *kamist’an (PEŽ II 105 ff.), werstian ‘calf’ (E) < *versist’an (PEŽ IV 231)⁶ etc. In written documents short Pr. *i sometimes is rendered with the letter e, e.g.: camenis ‘hearth’ (E) < *kaminas (PEŽ II 103 f.), pekollin ‘hell’ (I) < *pikulin (for the spelling pyculs III reflecting *pik- see PEŽ III 280) etc. This shows an open character of Pr. *i (cf. Girdenis, Mažiulis in: Girdenis KD III 413 ff.). This does not contradict to such sample as meltan (E) ‘meal (fluor)’ (= *miltan), of course. For the phonetic value of the segment -el- cf. PEŽ III 125 f. as well as § 2.

§ 7. It is Baltic *u in which Pr. u, Lith. u and Latv. u originate, cf.: Pr. duckti ‘daughter’ (E) < *duktē (PEŽ I 235) – Lith. duktê; Pr. budē ‘(they) are awake’ (III) – Lith. budēti, būdinti and Latv. budināt ‘to wake’. That the short Pr. u was open in its turn (cf. about the Pr. i above), is witnessed again by the spelling, i.e. by varying o/u (cf. Girdenis KD I. c.), e.g.: Pr. meddo ‘honey’ (E) < *medu (the final inflection *u being unstressed, cf. PEŽ III 118) – Lith. medūs, Latv. medus; Pr. prusnan / prosnan ‘face’ (III) – Lith. prusnâ ‘snout’, Latv. (pl.) prusnas ‘lips, mouth’ (PEŽ III 361); druwē (III) / drowy (II) ‘(I) believe’. One should also pay attention to frequent rendering of ū with the letter o in unaccented inflexional morphemes in the Catechisms: acc. sg. dangon ‘heaven’ (I, III), sounon ‘son’ (III beside sunun I) etc., or if. daton ‘to give’ (III), būton ‘to be’ (III), pūton ‘to drink’ with -on instead of -un too, as well as pc. pt. act. auginnons ‘having grown’ (III) with -ons instead of -uns.

§ 8. Pr. *ē comes from Balt. *e < IE *ē and corresponds to Lith. e

⁶ More precisely: camstian = *kamst’an or (sometimes supposed by Mažiulis earlier) *kamsṭjan < *kamstjan, werstian = *verst’an or werstjan < *versistjan – L.P.
and Latv. e, cf.: Pr. meddo ‘honey’ (E) – Lith. medûs, Latv. medus; Pr. median ‘forest’ = *med’an – Lith. dial. mèdžias ‘idem’, Latv. mežs ‘idem’. Because of the typically Prussian dephonologization of the opposition e : a, the vowel Pr. *ē often turns into ā, e.g.: addle (E) ‘fir’ – Lith. ēglė, Latv. egle; Pr. assaran ‘lake’ = *azaran – Lith. ėžeras, Latv. ezers; Pr. Cat. ast l est ‘is, are’ – Lith. ėsti ‘idem’ etc. Cf. also instances in which the vowel Pr. *ē has turned into a after r and l, e.g. (E): kраklan ‘breast’ < *kreklan (PEŻ II 253 ff.), ladis ‘ice’ < *ledas (PEŻ III 15 ff.)8.  

§ 9. Balt. *a (more precisely Balt. *ɔ --> WBalt. *ɔ, cf. § 19) produced Pr. *a (resp. o), Lith. a, Latv. e, a: golis ‘death’ (E) < *galas (i.e. *golās) ‘idem’ = (III) acc. sg. gallan (PEŻ I 319 ff.); assis ‘axle’ (E) – Lith. aštis, Latv. ass; (III) acc. sg. naktin ‘night’ – Lith. naktis, Latv. naks etc.; cf. the same with an inflectional -a: Pr. (III) adv. ilga ‘long (time)’ (PEŻ II 23), polėnka ‘(he) remains’ (PEŻ III 318) etc. [this -a is often apocopated: (III) empijrint ‘(what has been) gathered’ (PEŻ I 155), isrankit ‘saved’ (cf. PEŻ II 47 s.v. isrankūns) etc., cf. also § 265].

Inflectional Pr. *-*as (singular masculine ending of the nominative case in substantives and adjectives) is usually represented: a) as *-*s in dialects of the Catechisms (e.g. Deiws ‘God’, wijrs ‘man’ etc.), b) as *-*s (e.g. cawx ‘devil’, slayx ‘worm’ etc.) or as *-*s (e.g. Deywis ‘God’, dumis ‘smoke’ etc.) in dialects of the Elbing Vocabulary9.

---

7 Or *median, cf. the previous fttn. – L.P.
8 When speaking about neutralization of phonemes, a position of neutralization should be defined. In Lithuanian dialects this is the initial (weak – not a single contrasting pair exists!) position in which the phonemes /e/ and /a/ may be neutralized (their opposition being absent in the other positions because [e] palatalizes previous consonants and turns into [a] after the palatals). If the variation of the initial e- and a- (ast / est, cf. also the spelling ašt / ašt) in the Catechisms is of the same origin, this points out to a strong palatalization (cf. here § 22 ff.) at least in Samlandian. The variation of spelling post-palatal endings -ian(s) / -ien(s) in all documents shows that Prussian -e was a Lithuanian-like broad open vowel. As for the (E) kraklan, ladis in Pomezanian, this reminds of the depalatalization (velarization) of r and l in East-Lithuanian dialects. In other words: Pomez. *ladis < Balt. *ledas vs. Saml. *l’ads < Balt. *ledas (but Pomez. *[pēda] = pèdel], cf. (E) peadey, § 14) – L.P.
9 The lifted i (as well as any other vowel) marks a reduced sound: dumis = *dûmis. Short final vowels are really reduced to zero in the Catechisms (wijrs as geits < *geitis < *-is), but the long
§ 10. The articulation of Pr. -a moved forward after palatals and j, i.e. was spelled as a and e irrespectively, e.g.: Pr. (E) garian = *gar’an ‘tree’ vs. wargien = *var’an ‘copper’ (the spelling wargien with g shows that the informant perceived *r’ as *rj, cf. PEŻ IV 221 as well as § 24 further), (III) gëide = *gëid’a ‘waits’. At the same time the unstressed Pr. a is spelled as e sometimes, e.g. (III): sedinna ‘states’ (PEŻ IV 34 s.v. sadinna), widewû ‘widow’ (PEŻ IV 234), (E): tresde ‘thrush’ (PEŻ IV 199), wessis ‘sledge’ (PEŻ IV 232).  
b) Long vowels

§ 11. The dialect of the Elbing Vocabulary is more archaic than dialect(s) of the Catechisms in respect to the fate of Baltic long vowels, whether accented or unaccented. The fate of the final lond *-ē in the Prussian word for ‘mother’ is a good example to make this evident. This word is barytone (the ending is unstressed), but the shortening of the final vowel took place in dialects of the Catechisms only, cf. (E) mothe = *mōtē (the ending is long!) vs. (III) mûti (the ending is short!) < *mûtû < *mōtē (for these ü resp. ĭ see further §§ 13, 15).

§ 12. Balt. *ī --> WBalt. *ī produced Pr. (E) *ī, spelled as i, y and ie, e.g.: Pr. (E) giwato ‘life’ (cf. Lith. gyvatà), ylo ‘awl’ (cf. Lith. ĭla, Latv. ĭlens ‘idem’), liede ‘pike’ (cf. Lith. lydīs, Latv. ĭdaka). The same WBalt. *ī is spelled as i, ĭ, ei, ey in the Catechisms. Cf. spelling of the same word

final vowels are reduced to short there (this is obvious from the variations in spelling as in gen. sg. fem. menses II / mensas III < *-āś). Nevertheless this process (known as reduction of the final vowels) is not attested in the Elbing Vocabulary – cf. antis (not ‘ants), wosee. This shows that the inflection nom. sg. masc. -is (with its i reduced) instead of *-as hardly can be explained as a result of purely phonetic shortening (no shortening took place!). Therefore, the inflection nom. sg. masc. -s as well in the dialects of the Catechisms may be older than the reduction of the final vowels there and may have been caused by the same grammatical (not pure phonetic) reasons as in the dialects of the Elbing Vocabulary (cf. here §§ 89, 91–92). – L.P.

10 Spelling a as e reflects the reduction of a in the unstressed position and shows the strength of the dynamic accent in Prussian. Therefore this was namely the strong accent which caused reduction of the final (unstressed) vowels in the dialects of the Catechisms. As for mixing a and e after palatals and j, this reflects the absence of the phonematic opposition between /al/ and /el/ in all positions except initial – cf. fn. 8. – L.P.
‘life’ there: nom. sg. neut. giwan, gen. giwas, acc. gijwan, geiwan, geiwin (geywen) etc. This shows that WBalt. *i developed into (accented) diphthongoid *eî in dialects of the Catechisms (cf. Stang Vergl. Gr. 50). Therefore the dialect E must be regarded to be more archaic in respect to the fate of WBalt. *i than dialect(s) of the Catechisms: no diphthongization of WBalt. *i ever took place in E.


§ 13. Balt. *û produced Pr. *(=)-û-, spelled in E as u, e.g.: dumis ‘smoke’ (cf. Lith. dûmai, Latv. dûmi), suris ‘cheese’ (Lith. sûris). The same *û is reflected in spellings u, ū, ou (au) in the Catechisms. Cf. acc. sg. sunun, soûnan (saiûnan) ‘son’, if. bûton, boûton (baitûn) ‘to be’. The spellings ou, au correspond to (accented) diphthongoid *oû (cf. Stang Vergl. Gr. 50) which (as well as *î, cf. § 12) did not exist in E.

§ 14. Balt. *ê produced Pr. *(=)-ê-, e.g.: semen = *sêmen ‘seed’ (cf. Lith. sëmenys), wetro = *vêtrê ‘wind’ (cf. Lith. vêtra ‘storm’, Latv. vêtra ‘idem’), wosee = *(v)ôzê ‘she-goat’ etc. The same Pr. (E) *ê is reflected in pleynis = *plênîs ‘meninx’ (cf. Lith. plênûs ‘idem’), seyr = *sêr ‘heart’ (cf. Endzelîns SV 26, Stang Vergl. Gr. 46 f.). The spelling -ea- reflects broadened (dial.) Pr. (E) *(=)-ê- (cf. Endzelîns l. c.) in the words (E) geasnis = *gësnîs ‘snipe’ (PEŻ I 332), peadey = *pêÔd’ai ‘socks’ (PEŻ III 240), seabre = *zêbrê ‘vimba’ (PEŻ IV 88 f.).

§ 15. WBalt. *ê turned into Pr. *(=)-î in stems and suffixes in dialects of the Catechisms II, III, e.g. nom. sg. ydi (II) ‘food’ and acc. sg. îdin (III) ‘idem’ (= *îd- < *êd-, cf. Lith. êda ‘eats’, PEŻ II 17), turryetwey (II) ‘to have’ (-ye- meaning *(=)î) and turriîtwey (III) ‘idem’ (= *(=)îîvei < *(=)êîvei, cf. Lith. turêti ‘idem’) etc. Nevertheless there is *(=)-ê- in the Catechism I on the place of *(=)-î in II, III, e.g. (I) acc. sg. eden = *(=)êd- ‘food’ etc. According to Gerullis ON 271, such difference between Catechisms I and II.

11 Cf. ftn. 13. – L.P.
III appeared “because translator of I was not a native Samlandian but was possibly a Natangian”.

As for the final Pr. *-ē, it remained unchanged under the stress in all Catechisms, e.g. *semē (III) ‘earth’, *druwē (III) ‘believes’ = *druwe (I, II, III) ‘idem’ (cf. § 226). However it was shortened when unstressed: *-ē (> *-ī) > *-ī, e.g. *mūti (III) ‘mother’, *drowy (II) ‘believes’12. Besides that, the stressed -ē reflects Pr. (Cat.) *-ēja > *-ēj > *-ē in such instances as *budē (III) ‘is awake’, *milē (III) ‘loves’ etc. (Endzelīns SV 111, Stang Vergl. Gr. 320), see also § 224.

§ 16. Balt. *ā (= *ą, cf. Stang Vergl. Gr. 37, see further) is preserved in the Elbing Vocabulary in spellings o and oa, i.e. *ą = *ā (! cf. § 19), e.g.: mothe = *mōtē ‘mother’, brote = *brōtē ‘brother’, soalis = *zōlis ‘grass’ (PEŻ IV 139). As for the Catechisms, Pr. *ā (= *ą!) turned into *ū there after the labials and gutturals (LG), e.g.: nom. sg. *mūti (III) ‘mother’, acc. sg. *mūtien (II), *muttin (I) ‘idem’ [such *ū never underwent further diphthongization described in § 13 – L.P.]. This Pr. *ā (= *ą!) remained unchanged in all positions except after LG (cf. Būga III 106),

12 druwe (III) cannot have -ē < *-ē because of prae. druwēse, druwēmai, not *-druvēmai-. There is no difference between (III) budē, milē on the one side and (III) druwe (as well as billē, quoitē, stallē § 225). First, the spelling druwe is attested 2x beside drowy 1x in the same II. If the ending -y in the latter was really unstressed, the spelling of the stressed u as o beside the spelling of the unstressed u as u in 2 other instances should seem doubtful. Secondly, in case the verbs druwe, billē, quoitē, stallē are not the same -ē- stem verbs as budē and milē, then their stem vowel ē should have but turned into -i- in plural forms (III) druwe mai, billē mai, quoitē i, quotāmai (probably = *kwāit āmai = *kwāitēmai), stallē mai, stallēti and should have been preserved as ē at least once if this ē were really generalized from the form of the 3rd person (§ 212). Therefore it seems no less credible to see a secondary circumflex diphthong -ēja > *-ēj > *-ēi > -ē in closed syllable in these plural forms. Such diphthong is well preserved in the participle form (III) waitaiantins = *vait‘āintins < *vait‘ājantins. Cf. Palmaitis BGR 223 [cf. ibid. for alternation in allomorph pairs in stems and suffixes āi l ā, ēi l ē (all accented), as well as at the end of words -āi l -ā, -ēi l -ē (accented), -ai l -a, -ei l -e (generalized, unaccented) what can be supported additionally by such hyper-corrections as (III) giwei = *giwē. An oxytone stress in giwei is evident from Latvian correspondence dzīve with a broken acute]. Cf. fn’s 92, 109.

Since there is no apparent reason (except traditional opinions) to make difference between verbs (III) budē, milē and druwe, billē, quoitē, stallē, the spelling drowy (II) can be treated as reflecting a stressed suffix *-/ja, i.e. *druvē = *druvija l *druvēja, cf. pairs Latv. rūsīt l rūsēt, Lith. trūnija l trūnī – L.P.
e.g.: brāti (III) ‘brother’ (cf. above mentioned E brote ‘idem’), sālin III = *zālin ‘grass’ (cf. above mentioned E soalis ‘idem’).13

The spellings kaltzā (III) ‘(it) sounds’, maitā (III) ‘nourishes’ etc. reflect final accented *-ā < *-āj < *-āja (Endzelins SV 113, Stang Vergl. Gr. 360), cf. also § 228.

§ 17. A relic of Balt. *ō (< IE *ō) = Pr. *ū (which was closer than Balt. *ū = *ū) is reflected in the Cathechisms in spellings o and (III) ū, e.g.: perōni (III) ‘community’ (PEŻ III 267), acc. sg. perōniskan (III), perroniscon (I) ‘idem’, tickrōmai (III) ‘right(ful)’ (cf. Stang Vergl. Gr. 48; cf. § 63). This Cat. *ū was accented (!) but its phonetic quality was ca. *ū (narrowed *ū) or even *ū. Being accented, it turned into Pr. Cat. *ū resp. (diphthongoid) *ū after LG, cf. (III) pūton ‘to drink’, poūton ‘idem’, poūt ‘idem’ (PEŻ III 364 f.). Having turned into *ū resp. (diphthongoid) *ū after LG, it coincided with original Pr. (Cat.) *ū / *ū < Balt. *ū, but did not coincide with Pr. (Cat.) *ū which had arisen after LG from Pr. *ū, because the latter never underwent diphthongization (cf. § 16)14.

13 One should pay attention to striking parallelism in spelling “broadened” ea (cf. § 14) = *ē and not-“broadened” e or ee, beside “broadened” (?) o = *ē and not-“broadened” a = *ē in the Elbing Vocabulary: seabre – steeg, peadey – seele, teansis – peempe, and even seamis – semo < *ē-! beside soalis – wosee, moazo – sosto, doalgis – dongo, and even moasis < *ē-! (2x) – grosis. Why were *ē < *ē and *ē < *ē uniformly broadened? What was the reason of broadening *ē- in seamis = *ēmēsis < *ēmēsis and not broadening *ē- in semo < *ēmēs? On the other hand, there is no doubt that the word for ‘winter’ (semo) is oxytone (cf. Lithuanian and Slavic) and that the spelling wosee reflects an oxytone word. As for the “broadened” ea, oa, they are never met in the final position. This resembles narrowing of unaccented uo > o before an accented syllable in North-Panevezys sub-dialects, cf. Lith. dial. podēs < puodēlis on the one hand (Zinkevičius Z., Lietuvių dialektologija, Vilnius 1966, 88), and diphthongization of the lengthened accented a in stems (not in endings!) in Minia Samogitian sub-dialect on the other hand, cf. Lith. dial. vōaži < vāži (ibid. 51 with the reference to Bezzenberger about similar fate of the stressed long ā in Prussian Lithuanian). Therefore I should like to explain (E) ea, oa as under the stress diphthongized ę, *ē. This in its turn allows to define place of the accent in words (E) seabre, peadey, teansis, seamis, soalis, moazo, doalgis, moasis with the stressed stem vs. steeg, seele, peempe, semo, wosee, sosto, dongo, grosis with the stressed ending (cf. Klusis M. Prūsų kalba, I, Vilnius 1989, 22–23). If so, the spelling peempe reflects lengthened first component of the tautosyllabic -em- in unstressed position (the ending *ē being stressed). – L.P.

14 In other words, the fate of new *ū < *ē after LG and of new *ū < *ē after L, G was the same: no subsequent diphthongization took place. – L.P.
§ 18. In several instances Balt. \*ö is reflected in Pr. Cat. ā (not after LG), cf. (III) dät ‘to give’, dätwei ‘idem’ (cf. Lith. düoti, Latv. duöt < Balt. *dö-), dāts (III) ‘given’, dats (I) ‘idem’, daeczt (II) ‘idem’ = dāts. This ā came to being in the following way. The root vowel Balt. \*ö was un-stressed in oxytone forms of this verb [the verb belonged to mobile type of accentuation, of what the “broken” tone in Latvian is the best evidence – L.P.]. As unstressed, this \*ö was broad \*ä and thus coincided with Balt. *ā, i.e. so-called neutralization of *lāl and *lā = *āl took place. Since 2 different root-vowels are not desirable in paradigm of the same word, one of the both had to be generalized onto the whole paradigm. In Prussian this was the unstressed \*ā. Thus Balt. *dö- ‘to give’ turned into WBalt. *dā ‘idem’ > Pr. Cat. (not E!) *dā-. At the same time the accented vowel \*ö was generalized onto the whole paradigm in Eastern Baltic what caused the appearance of Lith. düoti, Latv. duöt (cf. PEŻ I 181 s.v. dät with bibl.); cf. also § 19. It is not easy however to define the phonetic quality of the vowels -o-, resp. -oa- in words (E) podalis, woasis: it might have been Pr. (E) \*ā (< Balt. *-ö-) there, not Pr. (E) \*ö, cf. PEŻ III 302 s.v. podalis, PEŻ IV 259 s.v. woasis. Cf. also § 94 (sīru).

§ 19. Not once has it been said (cf. Bibliography apud Girdenis Baltistica XIII 302 tt., Palmaitis VBR III 15 ff.), that Prussian vocalism, as well as Lithuanian and Latvian vocalism, implies reconstruction of the vowel-quadrangle (not a triangle)\(^{15}\) in Common Baltic:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Short</th>
<th>Long</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>*i</td>
<td>*ī</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*u</td>
<td>*ū</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*e</td>
<td>*ē</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*a ( = *o)</td>
<td>*ā ( = *ā)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^{15}\) Vowels are classified according to place of their articulation: (Balt.) front /el, ėl, ėl, ėl/ vs. back /el, ėl,ūl, ėl/; low /el, ėl/ vs. middle /ūl/ vs. high /ēl, ėl,ūl, ėl/ (correlation in rise of tongue). The sign θ marks absence of a correlate (see table) – L.P.
I consent to the opinion of Girdenis l. c. that the above shown vowels *a (= *æ) and *ā(= *]&) were of low timbre near to the timbre of labialized vowels of the back zone. On the other hand, the sub-system of the long vowels without the foward-zone correlate of *ō could not be stable. For this reason the opposition Balt. */ō:/ */ā(= */]&)/ began to be neutralized as */ā(= */]&)/ in unstressed morphemes (cf. Kazlauskas LKIG 144 f.). In Eastern Baltic such neutralization was impeded by developing a correlate to EBalt. *ō, i.e. by arising EBalt. *ē < *ei. No corresponding correlate arose in Western Baltic (*ei did not turn to *ē there) and this was the reason why WBalt. *ō was more intensively neutralized to *ā (= *Ł) than the EBalt. *ō – cf. § 18.


Consonantism

§ 21. Balt. *j > Pr. *j. The latter is spelled with the letters i and y (1x: yours I) in the initial position, e.g.: iaukint (III) ‘to accustom to’, pl. iūmans (III) ‘to you’ etc. In the middle of the word it is spelled with the letters i, y, g, e.g.: fem. maia (III) ‘my’, nom. crauso (E) ‘blood’, krawia (III) ‘idem’, acc. kraugen (I) ‘idem’ etc. Pr. *j is not marked after the letter i, e.g.: (III) biatwei = *bijtwei ‘to be afraid’, crixtia = *krikstīja ‘I baptize’, (E) kalabian = *kalabijan ‘sword’, clayvio = *klaivijā < *klevijā ‘flank (meat)’ (for this *-ijā cf. PEŻ II 208) etc.

§ 22. The fate of Pr. *j after labials (L) was inconsistent: in some instances Pr. *j was preserved, e.g. E piuclan ‘sickle’, knapios ‘hemp’. However in other instance this Pr. *j disappered, L turning into palatal L’, e.g. (III) etwerpe ‘forgives’ = etwerp’a < *-pjá. The segment -my- in (E) samyen ‘earth’ seems to reflect a palatal *-m’, cf. PEŻ IV 60; cf. also (E) peuse ‘pine-tree’ with its pe- coming from Pr. *p’a- < *pjá- (*pjaušē) with all probability, cf. PEŻ III 227 f.

§ 23. In the same way Pr. *j disappeared after dentals (D) which
became palatalized (D’), spelled as -ti-, -di-, e.g.: median (E) ‘forest’, crixtiānai (III) ‘Christians’ etc. Pr. gēide (III) ‘waits’ ends in -de coming from *-d’a < *dja.

The same is after gutturals, cf. dragios (E) ‘yeast’ with -gi- reflecting Pr. *-g’- (< *-gj-).

§ 24. Pr. *r + *j and *l + *j turned into palatalized Pr. *r’ , *l’. The latter are spelled ri, ry, rg and resp. li, lg, lig, e.g.: (E) garian ‘tree’, karyago ‘military campaign’, *kargis ‘army’ (PEŽ II 119), angurgis ‘eel’ (with -rg- = Pr. *-r’-) etc., kelian ‘lance’ (with -li- = Pr. *-l’-), ansalgis ‘welt’ (with -lg- = Pr. *-l’, cf. PEŽ I 81), saligan ‘green’ (with -lig- = Pr. *-l’, cf. PEŽ IV 43).

§ 25. Pr. *s with subsequent *j turned into *š, or *š’, (spelled sch) before back vowels, e.g.: schuwikis (III) ‘shoemaker’, acc. fem. schan / schian (III) ‘this’ etc.


Letters -ff- in spelling drōffs ‘faith’ render the same spirant Pr. *-v-.

Prothetic Pr. *v- [*u-] is not rare, cf. woasis (E) ‘ash-tree’ (PEŽ IV 259), wosux (E) ‘he-goat’ (PEŽ IV 265 f.), wuschts (I) ‘eighth’ etc.

§ 27. Pr. *s comes either from Balt. *s < IE *s, or (as well as Latv. s) from Baltic *š (> Lith. š) < IE *k.

Pr. *z (as well as Latv. z) comes from Balt. *ž (> Lith. ž) < IE *g.

Pr. *s and *z are spelled with the same letter s in written documents.

For Pr. *s < Balt. *s cf. soūns (III) ‘son’, snaygis (E) ‘snow’ etc.

For Pr. *s < Balt. *š cf. sunis (E) ‘dog’ (cf. Lith. dial. šūnès ‘dog’) etc.

For Pr. *z cf. semo (E) = *zēmĕs ‘winter’ < *zēimă < *đeimā etc.
Pr. *ś has been turned into *š under German influence sometimes, in following compositions:

a) sp – schpartina (III, beside spartint III), schpändimai (III, cf. PEŽ I 122 s.v. auschpändimai);
b) sk – schkellânts (III, beside skellânts III), schkûdan (III, beside skûdan III), schkläits (III, beside sclaits III);
c) sl – schläsitwei (III);
d) rs – kirscha (III, beside kirsa III).

§ 28. For the consonants Pr. k, g, t, d, p, b with easily traced origin, cf. e.g. Endzelîns SV 37–39 (as well as in paragraphs here above).

The fate of the compositions (Balt. >) Pr. *dl, *tl was not uniform. They were preserved in some dialects but they turned into *gl, *kl in some other (sub-)dialects.


For *tl > *kl cf. clokis (E) ‘a bear’ (PEŽ II 20 ff.), piuclan (E) ‘sickle’ < *pjūtlan.

§ 29. Sometimes a varying in spelling voiced and voiceless consonants occurs, i.e.

p instead of b – nom. siraplis (E) ‘silver’ beside acc. sirablan (III) ‘idem’ (PEŽ IV 112 f.),

gn instead of kn – iagno (E) ‘liver’ instead of *iakno ‘idem’, sagnis (E) ‘root’ instead of *saknis ‘idem’, agins (E) ‘eyes’ instead of *akins ‘idem’ (PEŽ I 49), girmis (E) ‘worm’ instead of *kirmis ‘idem’ (PEŽ I 368 f.) etc.

§ 30. Affricate Pr. *-ts of the final position is spelled in different ways:

-tz – ketwirtz II ‘fourth’,
-czt – bylaczt (II) ‘he told’, and even
-tzt – enquoptzt (II).

For this varying in spelling cf. Endzelîns FBR XV 92.
2. ABOUT NOMINAL DERIVATION

Compounds

§ 31. Compounds with (i)a-stem nouns as first components: 

dagagaydis (E) ‘spring wheat’ = *dagagaidîs (PEŻ I 172), cariawoytis (E) ‘military conference’ = *kar’avâitîs (PEŻ II 123 f.), crauyawirps E ‘bleeder’ = *kraujavirp(a)s (PEŻ II 261 f.), laucagerto (E) ‘partridge’ (“field hen”) = *laukagertî (PEŻ III 48), malunakelan (E) ‘mill-wheel’ = *malûnakelan (PEŻ III 107), malunastab[is] (E) ‘millstone’ = *malûnastab(a)s (PEŻ III 107), piwamaltan (E) ‘malt’ = *pîvamaltan (PEŻ III 289), wissaseydis (E) ‘Tuesday’ (“joint session”) = *visasâdis (PEŻ IV 251 f.), acc. grêiwakaulin (III) ‘rib’ = *krêivakaulin (PEŻ I 404 f.) etc.

The connecting vowel *-a- is absent: butsargs (III) ‘house guardian, master’ = *butsarg(a)s (PEŻ I 167), kellaxde (E) ‘pikestaff (stick)’ = *kel’(l)agzdî (PEŻ II 160), kerberze (E) ‘shrubby birch’ = *kerberzî (PEŻ II 161), lattako (E) ‘horseshoe’ = *latakî (PEŻ III 47 f.).

§ 32. Compounds with ā-stem nouns as first components: gertoanax (E) ‘hawk’ = *gertôganaks < *gertôvanag(a)s (PEŻ I 357).

§ 33. Compounds with ĕ-stem nouns as first components: apewitwo (E) ‘osier (willow)’ = *apêvitvî (PEŻ I 87), pelemaygis (E) ‘windhover’ = *pelêmaigîs (PEŻ III 249), pettegislo (E) ‘shoulder artery’ = *petêgîslî (PEŻ III 276 f.).

§ 34. Compounds with i- or u-stem nouns as first components: 
dantimax (E) ‘gums’ = *dantimak(a)s (PEŻ I 179) resp. panustaclan (E) ‘fire-steel (-striker)’ = *panustaklan (PEŻ III 220 f.).

§ 35. A sample of an archaical compound is waispattin (III) ‘mistress’ = *vaispatin (cf. PEŻ IV 214 f.; for -pat- cf. Rosinas Baltistica XXXV 129 ff.).

§ 36. In Prussian dialects there were compounds with a connecting vowel -i- on place of some other older vowel, e.g.: (III) butti taws ‘pater familias, father of the house’ = *buttitâvs beside butta tawas ‘idem’ = *butatâvas (E buttan ‘house’), cf. Lith. šonîkaulis / šonäkaulis (: šonas),

**Reduplicated stems**

Such are the following (usually E) substantives, part of them being onomatopoetic:


§ 39. *dadan* (E) ‘milk’ – together with OInd. *dadhnás ‘curdled milk’, this word is derived from reduplicated IE *dhedhn- ‘milk’ (Pokorny IEW 241 f., PEŽ I 171 f. with bibl.);


§ 42. *penpalo* (E) ‘quail’ seems to have been dissimilated from WBalt. *pelpal5* ‘idem’. The latter, together with Common Sl. *pelpelas* ‘idem’ (> dissim. *perpelas* ‘idem’ > Russ. *nepenel* ‘idem’ etc.), implies reduplicated stem WBalt.-Sl. *pelpel- ‘idem’ (cf. PEŽ III 254 f. with bibl.). Pr. (E) *pepelis* ‘bird’ = *pipelîs* (cf. acc. *pippalins* III ‘birds’, Gr *pipelko* ‘bird’) is an onomatopoeic word of reduplicated stem (cf. PEŽ III 283).

§ 43. *tatarwis* (E) ‘black grouse’ – together with Lith. *tėtervas* ‘idem’, Latv. *teteris* ‘idem’, Russian *menepêe* ‘idem’ etc., comes from Balt.-Sl. *teter(e)va- ‘idem’, i.e. a reduplicated (onomatopetic) stem (cf. Trautmann BSW 320 f., Pokorny IEW 1079);


**Suffix derivation**

Vocal suffixes

§ 46. This old type of various epochs is represented by many derivatives with suffixes -<o>- (< IE *-o-16) and -<a>- (< -<a>-) in written documents of Prussian. Cf. substantives and adjectives:


16 The reader should not understand IE *-o-* etc. as a reconstruction of any real phonetic quality *o* etc. Such symbols are only traditional conventional signs showing phonologic units as members of concrete phonologic oppositions (e.g. */o/ : */a/* in a phonologic system assumed for some stage or dialect of proto-language. A real phonetic quality of IE *-o-* could be *a* if one finds no phonologic opposition */o/ : */a/* in Common Indoeuropean. For the latter possibility cf. Palmaitis BGR 39 with bibl., etc. – L.P.
b) ā-stems (fem.) dongo (E) ‘hoop (arch)’ = *dāŋg̣ (PEŻ I 216 f., cf. also Baltistica XXXIV 96), acc. sg. deinan (Cat.) ‘day’ etc.

§ 47. There are also u-stem derivatives in written documents: apus ‘(water) spring’ (PEŻ I 88 ff.), dangus (E) ‘sky’ (PEŻ I 177 ff.), camus (E) ‘bumble-bee’ = *kamus (PEŻ II 107 ff.), salus (E) ‘brook (rill)’ (PEŻ IV 55 f.) etc.

§ 48. It is not easy to trace derivatives with a suffix -i- in written documents because of the scantiness of the latter as well as because i-stem paradigms have merged with other (especially įa-stem) paradigms in many instances. Although the words geyty[s] (E) ‘bread’, pintys (E) ‘tinder’ are i-stems undoubtedly, they seem to be derivatives with a suffix -ti-, not -i- (cf. PEŻ I 343 f. s.v. geyty[s], PEŻ III 282 f. s.v. pintys), see further. Nevertheless the word pentis (E) ‘heel’ seem to be a derivative with a suffix -i- (cf. PEŻ III 255 f.).

§ 49. įa-stem nouns are well attested: same (E) ‘earth’, semmē (III) ‘idem’ = *semē, berse (E) ‘birch’ = *berzē, kurpe (E) ‘shoe’, kurpi (III) ‘idem’ < *kurpē, teisi (III) ‘honour’ < *teisē, wosee (E) ‘she-goat’ < *(v)ōzē etc. *-i- having vanished before front vowels very early in all Baltic languages, *-ē turned into *-ē, although it was the genetive plural where this *-i- survived for a long time, i.e. Pr. (*-ē + -ōn -->) *-un, cf. Lith. dial. žemju ‘(of) lands’ beside nom. sg. žemē ‘land’ < *žemē.

§ 50. įa-stems are verbal nouns, cf. Pr. (E) boadis ‘prick (stab)’ = *bōdīs (PEŻ I 150), īdis (E) ‘meal (eating)’ < ĕdīs (PEŻ II 17), kirtis (E) ‘blow (stroke)’ = *kirtīs. All of them end in [(Cat.) *-is < ] *-īs < *-(i)jas in the nominative singular.

Suffixes with a consonant -v-

§ 51. Pr. (E) gabawo ‘toad’ = *gabaṿ is a substantivised adj. (fem.) *gabaṿ. Its suffix (fem.) *-avā- points out to a-lā-stem adjective with a suf. *-ava-/*-avā- (PEŻ I 309 ff. and PEŻ I 328 s.v. garrewingi). The latter possibly comes from earlier *-eva-/*-evā-. Adjectives with the a suf. *-ava-/*-avā- (as well as *-eva-/*-evā-) are reflected in adjectives

Besides said adjectives with a suf. *-ava-/avä-, there existed adjectives with a suf. *-îva/-îvä- (extended with other suffixes) in the 3rd Catechism too. Cf. auschaudîw-ings ‘reliable’ (for -î- cf. if. auschau-dîtwei ‘to rely upon’), klausîw-inges ‘listener (confessor)’ (cf. if. klausi-ton ‘to listen’), poseggîw-ingi ‘subordinately’ (cf. if. seggi-t ‘to do’) etc. cf. OSl. aj. ljubivo (if. ljubi-ti); see Endzelîns l.c.17

Suffixes with a consonant -n-

§ 52. Pr. (III) adj. acc. pilnan ‘full’ = *pilna- ‘idem’ < Balt.-Sl. *pîlna- ‘idem’ is an ancient derivative with a suf. *-na- < IE *-no- (Pokorny IEW 800). The same was WBalt. adj. *sasna- ‘grey’ --> subst. Pr. (E) *sasnis ‘hare’ (cf. PEÞ IV 67 f.).

§ 53. Pr. (E) kartano ‘perch (pole)’ = *kartanâ with all probability comes from Pr. *kartenâ ‘idem’. I derive the latter from “a tool for hang-

17 All these samples should not tempt us to see here a stem-ending (*-a |-*-e, *-î-) + the single suffix *-v-. Suffixes adj. *-ava-/avä-, *-eva-/evä- with all probability have been generalized from ancient u-stem nouns in *-au/-eu-, later extended with thematic vowels in Baltic (and in Slavic). Cf. here § 46 and Balt. (Pr.) Deivas < IE *dei-ûo-(s) <= *di-êu-(s) / *di-ûo-(s). As for Pr. suf. *-îva/-îvä- in connection with infinitives in -î-, this seems to be one of later generalizations. For IE pairs *di-êu-(s) / *di-ûo-(s) cf. the name of Zeus: Gk. nom. Zeûç, gen. Διό. For the thematizing of IE athematic stems cf. also athematic Gk. nom. ποûç (= Lat. pēs < *ped-s), gen. ποûç ‘foot’ --> thematic Gk. nom.-acc. neut. πēðov ‘soil (under feet)’ (= Lat. neut. pedum ‘stick’). Here a neuter (as a category) gender (barytone accented) corresponds to “inactive” meaning of one common primary lexeme. Cf. Palmaitis BGR 45 ff. and fn. 38.

NOTE! Thematic are stems which end in a thematic vowel a / e: inflections are added to this vowel or merge with it [cf. Pr. adj. (warg-)a-smu, v. 1 pers. pl. (perweck-)a-mmâ]. Athematic are root stems or suffixal stems to which an inflection is added directly, without a thematic vowel [cf. v. 1 pers. pl. (as-)mâ]. A thematic vowel may be identified only by a linguist. – L.P.
ing” and I consider it to be a derivative with a suffix adj. fem. *-enā from adj. (pc. pt. pass.) Pr. *karta- ‘(what is) hung’ <-- Balt. v. *kar- ‘to hang’ (> Lith. kārti etc.). Cf. more detailed in PEŽ II 131–134. Pr. (E) gle[f]uptene ‘mouldboard’ = *gl’aubtenē or *gl’aubtinē arose in the same way (PEŽ II 275 f.).

For Pr. suf. *-ēnā cf. krixtieno (E) ‘earth-swallow’ = *krikstinē (PEŽ II 275 f.).

54. Adjectives with a suf. *-en- (: *-an-) produced: glosano ‘slow-worm’ (PEŽ I 383 f.), pelanno ‘hearth’ (PEŽ III 247) and pelanne ‘ashes’, warene ‘copper cauldron’ (PEŽ IV 220), wissene ‘ledum (palustre)’ (PEŽ IV 255).

55. Pr. suf. *-men- was used to derive consonant-stem nouns, e.g.: Pr. (E) semeno ‘plover (Brachvogel)’ = *sēmenō < adj. (fem.) *sēmenā <-- subst. *sēmen- ‘sowing, seed’ (PEŽ IV 96 f.), schumeno ‘wax-end’ = *šūmenō (PEŽ IV 87 f.), plasmeno ‘resting basis of the foot’s sole’ = *plasmenō (PEŽ III 290), sealtmeno ‘oriole’ (PEŽ IV 89 f.), (Cat.) kērmens ‘body’ (PEŽ II 168 ff.) 18.

56. Pr suf. -in- was used to derive adjectives and substantivized adjectives, e.g.: awins (E) ‘ram’ < *avinas ‘idem’ (PEŽ I 127), adj. acc. sg. deininan (III) ‘daily’ (PEŽ I 190), adj. acc. sg. lank[i]nan ‘festive’ (PEŽ III 37), acc. sg. mîlinan (III) ‘blot’ (PEŽ III 140), aulinis (E) ‘(boot’s) leg’ (PEŽ I 118), drawine (E) ‘hollow-tub’ (PEŽ I 223 f.), plauxdine (E)

18 As seen, these nouns were derived from verbs (the root Balt.(-Sl.) *sjū- > WBalt., EBalt. Latv. *šū- ‘to sew’, cf. Pr. (E) schumeno), as well as from adjectives (Balt. dial. *plesa-, cf. Pr. (E) plasmeno – PEŽ l.c.), or substantivized adjectives (Balt. *želtan, cf. Pr. (E) sealtmeno – PEŽ l.c.). This derivation was no younger than Common (or at least West) Baltic epoch, therefore could not be productive in historical Prussian. – L.P.

19 Suf. *-in-, *-ēn- meant origin or belonging to a group (sort), and were used to derive nouns and adjectives from nouns. They were productive in Prussian, cf. Pr. fem. *deinā (cf. acc. sg. deinan III) ‘day’ --> deininan (III) ‘daily’, *kaims (cf. caymis E) ‘village’ --> acc. sg. kaiminān (III) ‘neighbour’. This root (similarly to Lith. kaimas ‘village’, kiēmas ‘farm, yard’, Latv. ciems ‘idem’) represents a “centum” exception of satemization in a “satem” language – cf. its regular “satem” counterpart Pr. seimēs III, Lith. šeimā, Latv. saime, ORus. съёмъ. For regular correspondences in “centum” languages cf. Go. haims ‘village’, Gk. καίμενω ‘idem’. Lith. kaimas is considered to be
‘feather-bed’ (PEŻ III 292), sompisinis (E) ‘bread of coarse-ground flour’ (PEŻ IV 140) etc.

There are also derivatives with a suffix *-ǐn in Prussian, e.g.: adj. alḵins (III) ‘hungry’ (PEŻ I 66), subst. acc. sg. kaimīnan (III) ‘neighbour’ (PEŻ II 75 f.), subst. seimīns (III) ‘family’ (PEŻ IV 93).

§ 57. Pr. suf. -ain- and -ein- were used to derive adjectives and substantivized adjectives, e.g.: deynayno (E) ‘morning star’ = *deinainī < adj. (fem.) *deinainā ‘daily’ (PEŻ I 188), g[el]taynan (E galatynan) adv. ‘yellow’ = *geltainan (PEŻ I 344 f.), s[j]weynis (E seweynis) ‘piggery’ = *suvein- (PEŻ IV 103 f., cf. Ambrazas DDR II 57), adv. angstainai (III) ‘early’ and angstaina ‘idem’ (PEŻ I 78 f.).


a borrowing from Prussian because of irregular correspondence of tone in Pr. kāima(luke) ‘visits’ (= Pr. caymis E = acute *kaim(a)s, not circumflex ‘coymis! – see § 4 and fn. 2) vs. Lith. acute kāimas ‘village’ (not circumflex as in kiēmas = Latv. ciems, i.e. not *kaīmas!). As for the said “centum” exception in general, it may have been not an exception but a result of borrowing from Germanic (cf. Gothic above) into Baltic.


30 Such words as Pr. waldûns (III) show that suf. *-ūn was still productive in Prussian, in spite of earlier derivatives of Common Baltic past, as e.g. Pr. percunis (E) – cf. Lith. perkūnas, Latv. dial. pērkūns, or Pr. alkunis (E) – cf. Lith. alkāné, Latv. ėlkuonis – L.P.
§ 59. Suf. *-ôn was used to form consonant-stem nomina agentis. This may be traced in Pr. (III) *perönì ‘community’ < Pr. *perônë, the latter having been derived from a deverbal consonant-stem substantive *perôn ‘pressing smth. together by means of whipping’, which had been derived in its turn from Balt. v. *per- ‘to whip’ with Balt. suf. *-ôn (for another explanation cf. PEŽ III 267 f. and § 60).

Yet it is not clear, whether suf. *-ôn can be traced in Pr. ackons (E) ‘awn’ (PEŽ I 64 f.), ansonis (E) ‘oak-tree’ (PEŽ I 82 ff.).

§ 60. Suf. *-ân is traced in Pr. (E) medione ‘hunt(ing)’ = *med’õnè (PEŽ III 122)\(^{21}\).

§ 61. Suf. *-snà and b) *-senà /-senis (for -is cf. Endzelîns SV 47) are widely represented in the Catechisms. They derive verbal substantives from infinitive stems, e.g.: a) aumûsnan ‘washing off’, biâsnan ‘fearing’, acc. etskïsnan ‘resurrection’, nom. etwerpnsà ‘forgiveness’, gîrsnàn ‘praising’, rickaûsnan ‘governing’, segisna ‘doing’, etc.; b) nom. atskisenna ‘resurrection’, acc. etwerpssennian ‘forgiveness’, -gîmsennien ‘birth’, crixissennien ‘baptizing’. For origin of the suf. *-snà and *-senà /-senis (as well as for Pr. E *lauk-snà ‘star’) cf. PEŽ I 151–153 (s.v. bousennis) and PEŽ III 53 (s.v. lauxnos)\(^{22}\).

---

\(^{21}\) There is a “suf. -jân” in the author’s original text of HGOP, p. 28. But cf. PEŽ III 122: “Pr. *med’õnè < *medjânè is derived from Pr. v. *medjâ-(tvei) ‘to hunt in a forest (E median)’ with a suf. *-ð(à)në”. Since -ja is a stem ending in the word median < *medjan, one could see lengthening in verbal stems like *medjâ-(tvei) – cf. also a precise parallel Lith. dial. medžiônë ‘hunting’ < v. medžioti < *medjâti. In this case suffixes *-ânë in Pr. mediane, Lith. medžiônë, abejônë, svajônë etc. in palatal stems, Lith. raudônë, vakarônë etc. in hard stems, are complex. They were derived with lengthening of a stem vowel in verbs (infinitives) *-(ð)i > *-(ð)å + suf. *-në. Cf. § 52 f. and Skardžius ŽD, p. 272, 276. – L.P.

\(^{22}\) J. Endzelîns l.c. considers suf. *-senis < *-senîs to be an innovation in accordance with such verbal substantives as Pr. ja-stem kîrtis, ìdis.

V. Mažiulis derives suffixes Pr. -sena, Lith. -sena, Latv. -šana from Balt. adj. masc., neut. *-sjena (> *-sena) /*-sjana, but fem. *-sjenà (> -senà) /*-sjanà. He considers segment *-sj- to be of a modal meaning near to Baltic “proto-future”, but he identifies segments *-ena, *-ana with corresponding Baltic suffixes *-ena, *-ana. As for Pr. suf. -snà, V. Mažiulis derives it from a
Suffixes with a consonant -m-

§ 62. There is a group of numerals with a suf. *-ma- in Prussian: sepmas I ‘seventh’ (PEŻ IV 102), acc. asman III ‘eighth’ (PEŻ I 103), pirmas I ‘first’ (PEŻ III 284).

It seems to have been the analogy of *pirmas ‘first’, after which Pr. adjective *pansdauma- ‘last’ (pansdaumannien III, cf. Endzelins SV 47, PEŻ III 219 with bibl.) was formed.

There are also adjectives with a suff. *-im- in Prussian: *auktima- ‘high (prominent)’ (cf. PEŻ I 114 ff. s.v. auctimmienn), *deznima- ‘frequent’ (cf. PEŻ II 290 f. s.v. kudesnammi), *iligima- ‘long’ (PEŻ II 294 s.v. kuilgimai).

In adj. *auktuma- ‘tall’ a suffix *-um- may be traced (cf. PEŻ I 116 s.v. Auctume).

§ 63. Pr. suf. (a-lā-stem) adj. *-ōma- (cf. nom. pl. tickrômai ‘rightful’, -tickrôms ‘righteous’) may be reconstructed as a composition of (consonant-stem nominative) *-ōn- + *-ma-, cf. Lith. *maž(o)n + *-ma- > adj. *mažuoma- --> subst. mažûom-enë ‘minority; pauperdom’ (for another view cf. Skardþius ŽD 237, Ambrazas DDR II 60 with bibl.).

Suffixes with a consonant -l-

§ 64. Pr. suf. *-el/-al- is well attested in (E), cf. areli[s] ‘eagle’ = *arelîs (PEŻ I 90). It is diminutive in patowelis ‘stepfather’ = *patôwelîs (PEŻ III 234), podalis ‘(worthless) pot’ < *pôdalîs (PEŻ III 302).

Pr. suf. *-il- is represented in (E): sirsilis ‘hornet’ = *sirsîlis (PEŻ IV 116 f.), wobilis ‘clover’ = *(v)ôbilis (PEŻ IV 259).

§ 65. With Pr. suf. *-ail- resp. *-eil- are derived (E): scritayle ‘rim’ = *skritailë (PEŻ IV 124 f.), [c]rupeyle ‘frog’ = *krupeilë (PEŻ II 287 f.).

much more archaic (IE) epoch and divides it into modal IE *-s- and IE suf. adj. *-no-, which (i.e. Balt. *-na-) may be traced either in Balt. suf. *-ena, *-ana. For all this cf. PEŻ I 153. Nevertheless the difference between *-senä and *-snä may have originated in binomial relation between barytone and oxytone forms in Western Baltic (not in Prussian itself!). – L.P.
With Pr. suf. *-ôl- and *-âl- are derived gramboale (E) ‘beetle’ < *grambölê (PEŻ I 395), peisâlei (III) ‘letter, scripture’ (PEŻ III 242 f.)\(^{23}\).

Pr. suf. *-ul- is represented in wadule ‘shaft of a wooden plough’ = *vadulê (PEŻ IV 212), weydulis ‘(eye’s) pupil’ = *veidulês (PEŻ IV 228).

Pr. suf. *-sl- is represented in (E): kersle ‘double-edged axe’ = *kerslê (PEŻ II 176 f.), stroyles ‘flounders (fishes)’ (PEŻ IV 161 f.).

\(\S\) 66. Pr. suf. *-tl- resp. (*-tl- >) *-kl- is represented in nouns (adjectives and substantives): adj. acc. dîrstlan (III) ‘firm’ (PEŻ I 207 f.), subst. *zentla- ‘sign’ [: ebsentliuns ‘(one who has) marked’] (PEŻ I 245), abstocle (E) ‘lid (of a pot)’ = *abstõklê (PEŻ I 47), auclo (E) ‘(horse) halter’ = *auklõ (PEŻ I 113), gurcle (E) ‘throat’ = *gurklê (PEŻ I 425 f.), piuclan (E) ‘sickle’ = *pjûklan (PEŻ III 288), riclis (E) ‘loft’ = *rîklîs (PEŻ IV 27), spertlan (E) ‘ball of the toe’ = *spertlan (PEŻ IV 145), stacle (E) ‘support (abutment)’ = *staklê (PEŻ IV 149), -tinklo ‘net’ = *tinklõ (PEŻ IV 68 f. s.v. sasintinklo)\(^{24}\).

Suffixes with a consonant -k-

\(\S\) 67. Suf. *-ika-\(^{25}\) had several functions in Prussian. First, it was used to derive agent nouns, cf. (masc.): mynix (E) ‘tanner’ = *mînik is (= Lith. mynîkas ‘idem’, PEŻ III 141), genix (E) ‘woodpecker’ = *genik’s (PEŻ I 350 f.), schuwikis (E) ‘shoemaker’ = *šuvik’s (cf. Lith. siuvîkas ‘tailor’, PEŻ IV 88), *vidik(a)s ‘witness = seeing’ (PEŻ IV 235 s.v. widekausnan), (fem.) grandico (E) ‘plank (board)’ = *grandikõ (PEŻ I 396 ff.)\(^{26}\).

---

\(^{23}\) Pr. peisâlei is a “hyper-correction” of *peisâli due to generalizing of the unaccented counterpart of alternation -êi / -e (accented) vs. -êi / -e (unaccented) – cf. ftn. 12.

Pr. *-älê is a complex suffix: *peisâli < *peisâlê and similar words come from adjectives, derived from infinitives with a long vocal suffix + *-la with subsequent inflectional derivation (PEŻ III 243). Such words mean a result of the verbal action (e.g. *peisäwei ‘to write’). – L.P.

\(^{24}\) All these nouns have been derived from infinitive stems (PEŻ l.c., cf. modern Lith. rašy-klê derived from if. rašy-ti). Substantives with this suffix usually meaning “a tool”, the suffix should have been productive in Prussian. – L.P.

\(^{25}\) *-ika- means a thematic (a-stem) form of *-ik-. For the term thematic cf. ftn. 17. – L.P.

\(^{26}\) This suffix was used to derive agent nouns from infinitive stems and was productive in Prussian. – L.P.
Secondly, it had a primary diminutive meaning with which have been derived: *gunsix (E) ‘swelling (bump)’ (PEŻ I 422 f.), *instixs (E) ‘thumb’ = *instik’s (PEŻ II 29 f.), *kuliks (E) ‘(small) pouch’ = *kulik’s (PEŻ II 299 ff.).

Thirdly, it could mark male animals in respect to basic feminine appellative, cf. *lonix (E) ‘bull’ = *länik’s (derived from a polonism fem. *länī ‘doe’, cf. PEŻ III 79 f.).

Finally, with this suffix were derived substantives from adjectives, cf. acc. pl. *swintickens (III) ‘saints’ = *svintikans (from adj. *svinta- ‘holy’, cf. PEŻ IV 177), *prēisiks (III) ‘enemy’ = *prēisk’s (PEŻ III 351 f.).

It was Pr. suf. *-ık (>*-ik in an unstressed position) with which diminutive forms of substantives were derived in dialects of the Catechism, cf.: acc. *gannikan (III) ‘woman’ (PEŻ I 323), *malnijkix (III) ‘child’ = *malnîkik(a)s (PEŻ III 106), acc. wijnikan (III) ‘man’ = *vīrikan (PEŻ IV 246), acc. grîmikan (III) ‘song’ (PEŻ I 410), acc. madlikan (III) ‘prayer’ (PEŻ III 94), *stûndiks (III) = *stûndik(a)s ‘while (moment)’ (PEŻ IV 163).

§ 68. There are also diminutive forms with a suf. -uk- in Prussian: *gaylux (E) ‘ermine’ = *gailuk’s (PEŻ I 315 f.), *wosux (E) ‘he-goat’ = *(v)özuk’s (PEŻ IV 265 f.), *mosuco (E) ‘weasel’ = *mazuk’s (PEŻ III 152).

§ 69. It was Pr. suf. *-inîk- / *-enîk- (= Lith. dial. -inyk-, cf. Ambrazas DDR II 120 ff.) with which substantives meaning “possessor of a feature” were derived:

a) from other substantives, cf.: dat. pl. *auschtenikenikamans (III) ‘debtors’ = *aušutenikenikamans (PEŻ I 121), *balkniniks (E) ‘saddle-maker’ = *balkninik’s (PEŻ I 131), dat. pl. -algenikamans (III) ‘(day -)labourers’ = *algenikamans (PEŻ I 188 s.v. deināalgenikamans), *grikenix (III) ‘sinner’ < *grikenik(a)s (PEŻ I 409), *laukiniks (E) ‘landowner’ = *laukinik’s (PEŻ II 48), *medenix (E) ‘woodman’ = *medenĩk(a)s (PEŻ III 118 f. s.v. medenixtaurwis), *pogalbenix (III) ‘helper’ = *pagalbenik(a)s (PEŻ III 305), *stubenikis (E with -o- instead of -e-) ‘barber-surgeon’ = *stubenik’s;
b) from adjectives, cf. maldenikis (E) = *maldenîk's (PEŻ III 106 f.);

c) from verbs, cf.: scalenix (E) ‘hound’ = *skalenîks (PEŻ IV 118), crixtnix (III) ‘baptizer’ = *krikst(i)nik(a)s (PEŻ II 279 f.), acc. retenîkan (III) ‘Saviour’ = *retenikan (PEŻ IV 20 f.), nom. pl. masc. -wêldnikai ‘(co-)heirs’ < *-vêldnîkai (PEŻ IV 99 f. s.v. sendraugiwêldnikai), acc. schlûsnikan (III) ‘servant’ < nom. sg. *šlûz(i)nik(a)s (PEŻ IV 86), dat. sg. klausîweniki ‘confessor’ < nom. sg. *klausîvenîk(a)s with a complex suffix *-îvenîk- [<*-îva- (cf. § 51) + *-enîk-] from if. klausî- ‘to hear’ (PEŻ II 213 f.).

§ 70. Pr. suf. *-isk- was used to derive adjectives:


§ 71. Adjectives with a suffix fem. -iskâ- undergoing substantivization (cf. Lith. jaun-iškë ‘youth’, see Ambrazas DDR II 47), many ā-stem adjective abstracts with this suffix came into being, cf.: acc. ginniskan ‘friendship’ (PEŻ I 336), labbisku28 (III) ‘kindness’ (PEŻ III 10

---

27 Pr. kêrmeniskai is a “hyper-correction” of *kêrmeniska due to generalizing of the unaccented counterpart of alternation -âi/â (accented) vs. -ai/a (unaccented) – cf. ftm’s 12, 23. – L.P.
28 nom. sg. fem. (unaccented) -isku < *-iskû < *-iskâ after a guttural k, cf. §§ 16, 17, 5 – L.P.

Suffixes with a consonant -g-

§ 72. Pr. suf.*-agā is represented in (E) karyago ‘military campaign’ = *kar’agā (PEŻ II 121 f.), witwago ‘water-hen’ = *vitvagā (PEŻ IV 256), but Pr. suf. *-igā is represented in (E) wedigo ‘adze’ (PEŻ IV 228).

§ 73. Pr. suf. *-īng- (for its circumflex cf. van Wijk KZ LII 151 f., Endzelīns SV 51) occurs in many adjectives derived with it from:

a) substantives, cf.: nigīdings (III) ‘shameless’ (cf. Lith. gēdingas ‘shameful’, PEŻ III 188), (ni)quātings (not-)wishful’ = *-kwātings (PEŻ III 189), ragingis (E) ‘deer’ < *ragīngas ‘idem’ (< ‘horned’, PEŻ IV 7);


c) verbs, cf.: aulāikings (III) ‘restrained’ (PEŻ I 116), pomettīwingi (III) ‘subordinately’ with a complex suffix *-īving- (cf. above and PEŻ IV 322), etc.

Suffixes with a consonant -t-

§ 74. Pr. suf. *ta (< IE *-to) resp. *-tā is represented in ordinal numerals (cf. kettwirts ‘fourth’), in passive past participles (cf. § 264) and in nouns, e.g.: anctan ‘butter’ (PEŻ I 80), *aukta- ‘high’ (PEŻ I 113 s.v. auctairikijskan), meltan (E) ‘meal (flour)’ = *mīltan (PEŻ III 125 f.), sosto (E) ‘bench’ = *sōstō (PEŻ IV 140), etc.

§ 75. There are also a number of substantives in *-tā, some of which possibly coming from *-et-, cf.: giwato (E) ‘life’ = *gīvatō (= Lith. gyvata ‘idem’, PEŻ I 376), bruneto (E) ‘hazel-hen’ = *brūnētō (PEŻ I
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159), melato (E) ‘(black) woodpecker’ = *melatō (PEŽ III 112 f.), kamato (E) ‘dill (Fenchel)’ = *kamatō (PEŽ II 100 ff.)

§ 76. 3 (E) substantives with Pr. suf. *-ait/-eit- seem to have a collective meaning (Ambrazas DDR II 59) and, therefore, are not diminutives: crichaytos ‘bitter plums’ = *krîkaitōs (PEŽ II 272 f.), sliwaytos ‘plums’ = *slîvaitōs (PEŽ IV 131), wisnaytos (E) ‘cherries’ = *vîsnaitōs (PEŽ IV 255).

§ 77. Pr. suf. *-utis */-utīs seem to have expressed a concrete, not a diminutive (Ambrazas DDR II 103) meaning, what may be seen in the following 2 (E) substantives derived with this suffix: locutis ‘bream’ = *lukutīs < *‘light-coloured fish’ (PEŽ III 78 f.), cf. Lith. lauk-ūtis ‘horse with a white spot on the forehead’ (Skardžius ŽD 363); nagutis ‘fingernail’ = *nagutis (: OSl. nogītb ‘idem’), cf. Lith. krauj-ūtis ‘milfoil’ (Skardžius l.c.).

§ 78. Pr. suf. *-āt- occurs in nouns: deiwuts (Cat.) ‘blissful’ < *deiwātas ‘devout’ (= Lith. dievotās, PEŽ I 193), nagotis (E) ‘(iron) cauldron with legs’ = *nagōtis (PEŽ III 168), sarote (E) ‘carp’ = *zarūtē <-- adj. *zārūta- ‘(marked with) sparkling’ (PEŽ IV 64 f.).

§ 79. Pr. suf. *-ent- is represented in consonant-stem Pr. (III) smunents ‘man’ = *zmūnents < *zmānent- ‘idem’.

§ 80. Pr. suf. *-ti- was used to derive names of tools from verbs: granstis (E) ‘borer (drill)’ = *granstis = *granztis (PEŽ I 398 ff.), lanctis (E) ‘oven prongs’ = *lanktis (PEŽ III 38), pagaptis (E) ‘grab, tool’ = *pagaptis = *pagabtis (PEŽ III 207).

§ 81. Similar was Pr. suf. *-sti /*-s)ti, e.g.: trumpstis (E with t- = č-) ‘poker (rake)’ = *krumpstis (name of a tool! – PEŽ IV 201), saxtis (E) ‘bark, rind’ = *sakstis (PEŽ IV 42), grea[n]ste (E) ‘twig tie (rope)’ = *grēnstē = *grēnztē (PEŽ I 404), sarxtes (E) ‘scabbard’ = *sarkstēs = *sargstēs (PEŽ IV 64), etc.

Pr. subst. gen. sg. etnīstis (III), if an i-stem (Endzelīns SV 53, PEŽ I 298), has a suf. *-sti-. However considered to be an ē-stem, it should have a suf. *-stē-, cf. Endzelīns l. c., PEŽ, l. c.
§ 81. Pr. suf. *-ūst- is found in adj. *kailūsta- ‘sound (healthy)’ (-\rightarrow acc. kailūstiskūn\textsuperscript{29} III ‘health’), cf. PEŽ II 73 f.

§ 82. Pr. suf. *-ist- was used to derived diminutives (of the neuter gender): eristian (E) ‘lamb’ = *(j)ẽrist’an (= ėrisčias ‘idem’ PEŽ I 284),  
gertistian (E) ‘chicken’ = *gertist’an (PEŽ I 356), *woʃsístian (E) ‘goatling’  
= *(v)įzist’an (PEŽ IV 262), *wersistian (wersitian E) ‘calf’ = *versist’an  
(PEŽ IV 231), *parsistian (prastian E) ‘pig’ = *parsist’an (PEŽ III 334 f.); cf. also Endzelîns SV 53.

With Pr. suf. *-ist- an abstract name cristionisto (E) ‘Christianity’ =  
*krist’ōnīstō was derived (PEŽ II 280 f.).

§ 83. Pr. suf. *-t(u)v- [= *-t(u)y] was used to derive names of tools  
or means to do smth.: coestue (E) ‘brush’ = *kōst(u)vē < *kāist(u)vē (PEŽ II 237),  
nurtue (E) ‘shirt’ = *nurt(u)vē (PEŽ III 203), romestue (E) ‘wide-  
bladed axe’ = *ramest(u)vē < *remest(u)vē (PEŽ IV 31 f.), preartue (E)  
‘plough-knife’ = *prei(j)art(u)vē (PEŽ III 346), neut. schutuan (E) ‘twisted  
yarn’ = *šūt(u)vvan (PEŽ IV 88); pl. tantum artwes (E) ‘cruise’ = *art(u)vēs  
< *ert(u)vēs ‘sculling (as means of a cruise)’ (PEŽ I 93 f.).

§ 84. With Pr. suf. *-t`ja-, *-ţja-, *-ija- (i.e. masc. *-t`jas, *-ţjas,  
*-ijas, *-ijas) agent nouns were derived, cf. Pr. (E) artoys ‘ploughman’ = *artōj’s  
(PEŽ I 93), gewineis ‘(unskilled) worker’ < *gevinēj’s (PEŽ I 360), medies  
‘hunter’ = *medīs < *medijas ‘idem’ (PEŽ III 120 f.) – see Skardžius ŽD  
80, 83 f., 86 f., Urbutis ŽDT 256, Ambrazas DDR I 116, II 134.

§ 85. Pr. suf. *-uţē seems to have been used to derive diminutives,  
cf. Pr. (E) geguse ‘cuckoo’ = *geguzē < Balt. *geguţē ‘idem’. The same  
may be seen in Pr. (Gr) spelling merguss ‘maid’ = *merguţē ‘idem’ –  
see Endzelîns SV 54, PEŽ III 134 with bibl., Ambrazas DDR II 98.

\textsuperscript{29} With the ending -\textit{un} in accordance with nom. *kailūstiskū < *kailūstiskā, cf. previous ftn. – L.P.
3. DECLINATION OF SUBSTANTIVES

Common notes

§ 86. The following grammatical categories of nouns (substantives, adjectives and numerals) are attested in written documents: a) 3 genders (masculine, feminine, neuter), b) 2 numbers (singular and plural), c) 4 cases (nominative, genitive, dative, accusative). All this will be discussed in following paragraphs.

It is not easy to reconstruct declension (as well as inflection in general) in scarce and poor old written documents. For the beginning let us observe variation (intermingling) of declensional types in the Cathecisms.

§ 87. Although Pr. wijrs (III) ‘man’ is an a-stem substantive (cf. acc. sg. wijran, acc. pl. wîrans etc.), its i-stem forms occur occasionally, cf. (III) acc. sg. wijrin, acc. pl. (sallubai)wîrins, dat. pl. wijrimans. And vice versa: an innovative a-stem form acc. sg. geitan ‘bread’ of the i-stem substantive nom. sg. geits (< *geitis, cf. *126) occurs too, cf. PEŽ I 343. I think that it was due to formal phonetic coincidence of the a- and i-stem inflections -s\(^30\) in the main = direct case [nom. sg. (wijr)-s = (geit)-s], that translators of the catechisms (and not the spoken Prussian language itself) produced such innovative variants, as e.g. (Cat.) acc. sg. wijrin, geitan respectively. In the same way an innovative a-stem acc. sg. qu`itan arose beside i-stem nom. sg qu`its ‘will’ (with its -s < *-is, cf. PEŽ II 324 and § 126)\(^31\). Similarly, translators of the catechisms produced innovative a-

---

\(^{30}\) This -s being of different origin there, i.e. < *-as and *-is respectively. – L.P.

\(^{31}\) Pr. acc. sg. wijrin (with -i- instead of -a-) is the single occurrence among 5 instances of this form in the Catechisms, while geitan (with -a- instead of -i-) is the single occurrence among 10 (!) instances of this form in the Carechisms. This possibly points to a printer’s mistake. On the other hand, acc. sg. qu‘itan (instead of qu‘ititn) is one occurrence among 3 instances of this form in the Catechisms what makes its parallel use more plausible. This was probably a reason why V. Mažiulis conjectured the a-stem variant (qu‘itan) to be a fact of the living Samlandian speech (not a translator’s mistake!) in PEŽ II 324 (cf. also a-stem Emeiñings labs qu‘its III 51\(^{20}\)). Otherwise why does V. Mažiulis still keep speaking about innovations and not about mistakes even here in HGOP? What “innovation” can produce a foreigner except a mistake? – L.P.
stem acc. sg. soūnan ‘son’ beside older u-stem acc. sg. sunun ‘idem’ because of the nom. sg. (soūn)-s (an u-stem form in Pr. Cat. -s < Pr. *-us, cf. § 134) = (deiw)-s (an a-stem form)\(^{32}\).

§ 88. In the same way were produced innovative a-stem forms of a numeral Pr. (Cat.) card. acc. sg. *-an (desimton III 27, ‘ten’ used as a nominative), acc. pl. *-ans (dessimtons III 67\(_{3}\)). These forms originate in i-stem nr. (subst.) nom. sg. *desimts ‘(a) ten’ (Pr. Cat. *-is > *-s) under the influence of a-stem Pr. Cat. ord. nom. sg. *desimts (< *desimtas) ‘tenth’.

Finally, Pr. (III) card. acc. pl. tūsimtons ‘thousands’ = *tūsimtans should be treated as an innovative a-stem instead of original i-stem, Pr. (Cat.) nom. *tūsimts ‘thousand’ < *tūsimtis (cf. Lith. tūkstantis ‘idem’). Cf. also § 156.

\(a\)-stems

§ 89. Nom. sg. masc. Balt. *-as (< IE *-os) produced an inflection Pr. *-as, which turned either into Pr. (E) -s, e.g.: awins ‘ram’, slayx ‘worm’ etc., or (most frequently) into *-i’s (< *-as), e.g.: Deywis ‘God’,

\(^{32}\)This short survey does not embrace all instances when acc. sg. -in occurs instead of a-stem -an in the Catechisms. The i-stem declensional model hardly could influence even foreign translators to substitute with it much more frequent a-stem forms. One should take into consideration more frequent ja-stem forms (strongly mixed with i-stem forms) as well as a doubtful difference between ja-, i- and e-stem accusatives [uniformly spelled as -ian(s) l -ien(s) l -in(s)] in the Catechisms. A hard-stem accusative (-an, -un) was opposed to a palatal-stem accusative in which older inflections were neutralized and became allomorphs in Samlandian dialects of the Catechisms (cf. ftn. 54). Since a resonant *l seems to have been palatal in these dialects [cf. an a-stem nom. pl. masc. kaulei (III) = *kaul’ai < Pr. *kaulai, and ftn’s 48 and 8], such instances as a-stem acc. pl. kaulins (III) should have arisen as a regular result of the said neutralization – cf. Palmaitis BGR 77 and Borussica: 3. Über die Herkunft der Form kaulins in der prußischen Katechismensprache / Baltistica XXVI (1) 20–22. – L.P.
dumis = *dūm’s ‘smoke’, caymis = *kaim’s ‘village’, etc.

In the Catechisms an ending -s is usual, e.g.: Deiws (III) ‘God’, tāws (III) ‘father’, wijrs (III) ‘man’ etc. Three times an ending -as occurs: Deiwas (III 99, 14), tawas (III 47, 10).33

Note: An inflection nom. -as in lāiskas (III) ‘book’ is an ā-stem feminine plural, not (as usually considered) an a-stem masculine singular, cf. PEŽ III 28.

§ 90. Nom.-acc. sg. neut. Balt. *-an (cf. PEŽ III 50 f. s.v. salta) --> Pr. *-an, well preserved in dialects of (E): assaran = *azaran ‘lake’, buttan ‘house (home)’, dalptan ‘chisel’ (cf. Ch.Sl.Rus. dlato ‘idem’), creslan ‘arm-chair’ (cf. OSl. krēslo ‘idem’), lunkan ‘bast’ (cf. OSl. lyko), etc.


§ 91. Gen. sg. (masc., neut.) *-as is attested in all Catechisms, e.g. (III): Deiws ‘God’, buttas ‘house (home)’, gīwas ‘life’, grīkas ‘sin’, etc. The origin of this form was searched for in Pr. ā-stem gen. sg. (fem.) *-ās (Leskien Deklin. 31, Berneker PS 186). According to a more popular hypothesis, (Deiwi)-as goes back to WBalt. *-as(j)a (van Wijk Ap. St. 77, Trautmann AS 216, Endzelins SV 58, Stang Vergl. Gr. 181, Kazlauskas LKIG 173 f., Gamkrelidze–Ivanov I 387 f.).

I think that a-stem Pr. gen. sg. masc.-neut. -as points to IE *-ōs

33 Cf. also adj. nom. sg. masc. -skas (isarwiskas III, etc.), not shortened due to difficulty in pronouncing complex *-skɔ, or ord. pirmas (I, Gr) ‘first’, not shortened because of the complex *-rmɔ. All this points to considerably late differentiation of nom. -as and gen. -as in Prussian, i.e. to a “pre-accusative” syntactical structure of Common Prussian (Palmaitis BGR 115). For the purpose of shortening Pr. nom. *-as > -s cf. also fn. 47.

34 Thematization (sic! BS 247) of IE consonant-stem (“athematic”!) *-es /*-os (with the same usual vowel-gradation *e /*o, as in gen. sg. masc. Pr. -as = Grmc *-es) was first explained in Palmaitis BGR 40/41, 78 f., and even 19 years earlier in Палмаитис М.Л. Индоевропейская апопония и развитие деклинационных моделей в диахронно-типологическом аспекте / Издательство Тбилисского университета, 1979. All these ideas were highly appreciated by A. Desnitskaya who wrote: “Author heaps up hypotheses into a complex construction which, upon his mind, is able to solve all problems of Indoeuropean linguistics”
which produced WBalt. *-as (BS 88–99) as well as, possibly, EBalt. *-as (for the latter cf. Palmaitis Baltistica XIII 337). Cf. also further.

§ 92. Rosinas BĪM 83 f. (cf. also Girdenis, Rosinas GL 17, No 1, p. 3) proposed a new and interesting hypothesis: an original unaccented a-stem Pr. gen. sg. *-a [= Lith. (vilk)-o etc.] turned into Pr. *-ā.

§ 92. Rosinas BĪM 83 f. (cf. also Girdenis, Rosinas GL 17, No 1, p. 3) proposed a new and interesting hypothesis: an original unaccented a-stem Pr. gen. sg. *-a [= Lith. (vilk)-o etc.] turned into Pr. *-ā. Translators of the Catechisms replaced it with (Cat.) -as under the influence of German morph gen. sg. -(e)s; this was the source of 50 times used gen. sg Deiwas “God” = Germ. Gottes ‘idem’.

However why just an opposite thing was not possible: it was Germ. morph gen. sg. -(e)s which helped original a-stem gen. sg. -as to survive? A. Rosinas’ (and A. Girdenis’) hypothesis does not take into consideration that Pr. gen. sg. -as is attested not only in the Catechisms, cf. silkasdrūb’ (E 484, see PEŻ IV 108, and especially Pakalniškienė Vbk III 39 f.), top. Wilkaskaymen (1419, probably in Notangia) having gen. sg. masc. Wilkas- ‘wolf’ (Gerullis ON 201, 243, PEŻ IV 138 s.v. wilkis). There is also no need to explain the first stem Butta in compounds (III) Butta Tawas ‘father of the house’ and Butta Rikians ‘house owners’ as a genitive form in -a < *-ā = Lith. (but)-o (Rosinas l. c., cf. Endzelīns FBR XI 190): in spite of separate spelling, this stem is compounded with following stems (e.g. Tawas, Rikians) with the help of usual connecting vowel -a- (cf. also § 37 and PEŻ I 168 s.v. butta tawas). Either is it not but risky to appeal to a form pēnega in Bazel Prussian Distich (BPD) in this connection because of the strong morphologic intricacy of BPD. Therefore, I am still inclined to treat Pr. gen. sg. -as not as an innovation (as Rosinas l. c. does), but as an archaism coming from Balt. (dial.) *-as (BS 88 f., 95 ff., Palmaitis BGR 78 ff., idem Baltistica XVI 22 f., cf. e.g. Stang Vergl. Gr. l.c., Gamkrelidze–Ivanov l. c.), cf. also § 160. It seems to have been an ā-stem Cat. gen. sg. -ās (< Balt. *-ā) beside acc. sg. -ān (< Balt. *-ān) that contributed to the presence of an unreduced a-stem gen. sg. -ās

---

(a “black” review from Leningrad to Moscow “VAK” of 1979). For the terms cf. fn. 17. – L.P.

35 Thus V. Mažiulis has showed that A. Rosinas’ hypothesis was neither new (it was stated with the help of A. Girdenis in GL 1977), nor interesting, i.e. neither the same translators (“editorial board”) for all 3 Catechisms ever existed, nor this hypothesis was worth mentioning at all since it demonstrated ignorance of primitive prussologic facts (silkasdrūb’, Wilkaskaymen etc.). – L.P.
V. Mažiulis

(not -s as in nom. sg. masc.) beside acc. sg. -ān (“casus generalis”).


§ 94. Dat. sg. masc., neut. ends in -u which is attested in following instances: a) (III) grīku ‘sin’, malnīku ‘child’, walndiku ‘ruler’, piru ‘community’, sīru ‘heart’ and b) in the pronoun (and adjective) morph -mu (III, II), e.g. stesmu ‘that’, kasmu ‘whom’, etc. (cf. also § 163). The final -u in piru may have arisen under the influence of steismu (piru) ‘to that (community)’ III 9715, i.e. due to attraction in Abel Will’s speech (for my earlier a bit other explanation cf. PEŽ III 284). It was a similar attraction, by which such instances as sīru (stūrnawingisku prei sīru III 11519) arose. The final -u (I, II), at least the pronominal [(stesm)u] one, may be derived from Balt. *-ō (not *-ōi as conjectured traditionally, cf. Endzelīns SV 58, 59, Stang Vergl. Gr. 240), see BS 106–127. It seems, however, that the final -u in stesmu ‘that’ comes from Pr. *-ū (= *-ā) < unstressed Balt. *-ō (cf. § 19, § 163)

§ 95. Adv. (III) bītai ‘in the evening’ points to a-stem loc. sg. Balt.

36 V. Mažiulis speaks about a-stem dat. sg. masc., neut. -u < *-ā, which cannot be -u < *-ū < *-ō after a labial or a guttural consonant (cf. § 17), cf. sīru, piru with their -u after -r. In this instance *-a < *-ā = *-ū < generalized *-ū < unstressed *-ō (cf. § 19) should be expected according to the theory of V. Mažiulis. Allusions to “attraction” cannot help already because in case of attraction at least one “unattracted” instance with -a should be expected, e.g. when the word sīru does not follow the word stūrnawingisku (III 11519) immediately, i.e. *sīra = a-stem v. 1 pers. sg. ps. as crixtia III 129 < *-a < *-ā = *-ū < unstressed *-ō (BS 22). Therefore, the single way is to accept the first version of V. Mažiulis’ theory, according to which oxytone nouns had a stressed Balt. dat. sg. masc. *-ō = *-ō > -ū, i.e. dat. Pr. *sērū > (Cat.) sīru (BS, ibid.) = stu (ilgimi) (cf. § 163). Thus the theory of V. Mažiulis should be supplemented with a description of differences in the fate of Prussian stressed *-ō in the middle (> Cat. *-ō-, cf. perōni III) and in the final (> Cat. *-u, cf. sīru III) positions. – L.P.

37 BS 127 ff., on the contrary, states that paradigmatic locative forms come from unparadigmatic adverbial forms. Here and further V. Mažiulis negates his earlier views on the archaic character of Prussian 4-cases declension, and declines his own theory of the origin of Baltic and IE declension (BS) in favour of Rosinas l. c. Nevertheless, even the latter admits that “the locative, genitive, dative and instrumental, as “secondary cases”, shaped in late Indoeuropean, possibly
*-ai/*-ei, in which Pr. adv. *-ei (qu-ei ‘where’) originates in its turn, cf. Lith. -iē (nam-iē, or-iē), cf. BS 127 ff., Rosinas Baltistica XXXIV 179.

An opinion that the inflection -ai in the first part of the compound sallubai busennis (III) is locative (Endzelīns SV 58 f.), seems to be doubtful (cf. PEŻ IV 51 f. s.v. sallubai).

§ 96. Nom. pl. masc. Balt. *-ai > Pr. *-ai, cf.: wijrai (III) ‘men’, tawai (III, voc. pl.) ‘fathers’, grīkai (III) ‘sins’. The same Pr. -ai is reflected in pallapsaey (II 5, I 5) ‘commandments’ with an accented final circumflex *-āi rendered as -āey (i.e. reflecting a lengthened first component of the diphthong, cf. PEŻ III 215, as well as § 4). For the a-stem (i.e. ale-stem) inflection Balt. (pron. adj.) *-ei cf. BS 170 ff., as well as § 164.

§ 97. Nom.(-acc.) pl. neut. inflection is usually seen (due to OSl. nom.-acc. pl. neut. vrat-a < IE *-ā) in Pr. (E) warto ‘door’ (e.g. Endzelīns SV 59, Stang Vergl. Gr. 301) with Pr. (E) -ā = *-ā. Nevertheless it is not easy to say whether there still existed an a-stem neutral plural form of nominative-accusative in the time of (E) in Prussian, or it had already turned into a collective noun, i.e. into an ā-stem feminine singular form, cf. PEŻ IV 226 f. The same should be said about Pr. (E) slayo ‘sledge’, cf. PEŻ IV 126 f. (s.v. slayan) and bibliography. In spite
of attempts to regard Pr. *malnijkiku* (III 47.13., 113.14–15) to be an a-stem neutral plural form (Trautmann AS 218, Endzelîns l. c., cf. Stang op. cit. 184), this seems to be a mistake with -u instead of nom. pl. masc. -ai (cf. PKP II 128, PEŽ III 106).39

§ 98. **Gen. pl. (masc.)** An allomorphism -an / -un is apparent in this case, cf.: *grîkan* (7x III), *grijkan* (4x III), *griquan* (2x III), *grecon* (1x I) ‘sins’, substantivized adj. *swintan* (III), *swyntan* (II) ‘saints’, but (pron.) *nusan* (I) and *nusun* (III), *noïson* (III) ‘our’, *ioïsan* (III) and *ioûson* (III) ‘your’, *stêisan* (III) and *stêison* (III) ‘these’, etc. Pronouns in -an may have a possessive meaning (Endzelîns SV 89).

A segment spelled (subst., pron.) -on reflects Pr. -un (cf. also top. *Tlokunpelk* ‘Bears’ Marsh’, PEŽ II 220) coming from Balt. *-*ôn > Lith. (vilk)-û etc. This is a common opinion. Nevertheless there is no common opinion for -an (e.g. Berneker PS 159, Trautmann AS 220, Endzelîns SV 59, Stang Vergl. Gr. 184, Schmalstieg OP 36), cf. §§ 99, 165.

§ 99. Upon my mind, there existed an accented allomorph gen. pl. *-*ôn and an unaccented allomorph gen. pl. *-*ân in Baltic. The latter turned later into Balt. (*-*ôn =) *-*ân due to neutralization of the opposition Balt. *ô : *â (cf. §§ 18, 19). In course of the shortening of the tautosyllabic diphthongs, these allomorphs Balt. gen. pl. *-*ôn /*-*ân turned into *-*ûn / *-*ân. Further the accented allomorph *-*ûn was generalized in all positions, including unaccented, in EBaltic dialects, while it was the accented allomorph *-*ân which was generalized in WBaltic dialects. Cf. what has been said above about the origin of vocalism in Pr. v. dât ‘to give’ (§ 18), as well as § 98.

---

39 The same mistake in the same word (3x only!) on 2 different places of the same text is possible but nevertheless doubtful. I propose to explain nom. pl. *malnijkiku* instead of *malnijkikai*, as well as adv. *sîrisku* (1x III) ‘heartily’ instead of *sîriskai*, as a usual manifestation of the allomorphism of alternating pairs Pr. (Cat.) âi / i (accented), ai / a (generalized, unaccented), cf. fn’s 12, 23, 27. Such pairs as *malnijkiku* / *malnijkikai*, *sîrisku* / *sîriskai*, or nom. sg. fem. *deiwûtisku* / *deiwûtiskai* (cf. further fn. 43) show that this allomorphism arose before the epoch of transition *-ô > i after the labials and gutturals. – L.P.
Pr. (Cat.) gen. pl. *-an was supported by its phonetic coincidence with Pr. (Cat.) acc. sg. *-an, both forming so-called “general case” [casus generalis (acc. sg. = gen. pl.)]. It was the latter a-stem pattern, according to which an innovative i-stem gen. pl. (Cat.) *-in (cf. nidruwîngin III 121) came into being.


I should like to reconstruct Balt. acc. pl. masc. *-ôns which, in course of development, manifested in 2 allomorphs (cf. §§ 18, 19):

1) as an accented Balt. *-ôns > EBalt. *-ôs40 > Lith.-Latv. -ús (cf. Endzelîns l. c., Stang l. c., Kazlauskas l.c.), and

2) as an unaccented Balt. *-âns > WBalt. *-âns > Pr. -ans (cf. Stang l. c.). This WBalt. *-âns coincided with WBalt. acc. pl. fem. *-âns41 which had replaced an older WBalt. *-âs < Balt. *-âs (Lith.-Latv. -as), cf. BS 185 ff., 311 f.

§ 101. Rosinas BİM 82 ff. (with bibliograhy) has formulated a hypothesis that Pr. acc. pl. masc. -ans goes back to Balt. *-ôs which, when unstressed, turned into WBalt. *-âs, but the latter, due to “secondary nasalization”, turned into Pr. *-âs, spelled as -ans in the Catechisms.

---

40 V. Maþiulis explains East-Baltic denasalization in *-ôns due to mostly redundant character of its -n- in plural in the opposition acc. sg. *-an : acc. pl. *-ôns, cf. BS 188. For an alternative view that Eastern Baltic never possessed acc. pl. *-ôns but developed its acc. pl. *-ôs independently, cf. Palmaitis BGR 100 f. – L.P.

41 The assumption of this secondary acc. pl. fem. *-âns in Western Baltic had to explain the survival (due to systemic reasons) of acc. pl. masc. *-âns in spite of its redundant -n- (BS ibid.). For an alternative view of -n- formally transferred into Prussian masculine and feminine plural in accordance with the pattern *-an in singular, cf. Palmaitis ibid. – L.P.
§ 102. This “nasalization” hypothesis does not convince already because not a single alternative spelling Pr. acc. pl. masc. o-\textit{as} (not -\textit{ans}) is attested. As for the reasonng, it is not sufficient in its turn, e.g.:

a) the main (first) argument of gen. sg. \textit{sounons} (1x!) as if ending in *\textit{-q}s (with a nasal *\textit{-q}-, Rosinas BİM 82 ff.) is not correct because the spelling \textit{(soun)-ons} (II 11_{14-15}) is nothing but a mistake instead of \textit{(soun)-os} [= (sun)-\textit{os} (I 11_{13}) = Pr. (Cat.) gen. sg. *\textit{-u}s, cf. more in § 135;

b) the 2nd hapax, referred to by Rosinas (BİM), is dat. sg. \textit{schisman} (1x III) ‘this’ in which the segment -\textit{an} is not any nasal *\textit{-q}, but a mistake by Abel Will who added an -\textit{n} to this word due to attraction to other words in -\textit{n} in sentence III 125_{4-5};

c) the 3rd hapax \textit{gubas} (1x III) does not show the same “nasal” *\textit{-q}, as supposed in part. \textit{gûbans} (III), but is another A. Will’s mistake instead of \textit{gûbans} (Endzelîns SV 181, PEŽ I 419);

d) similarly, one cannot assume the same “nasal” *\textit{-i} in (III) \textit{kîrk} and \textit{kîrk} because \textit{kîrk} (III 109_{10}) is a mistake instead of gen. sg. \textit{kîrk}is (cf. PEŽ II 193);

e) -\textit{a} in the 4th hapax \textit{winna} (III) is is not any “nasal” *\textit{-q}: probably it is an occasional mistake either instead of *\textit{-\text{a}} = *\textit{-an} (Endzelîns FBR XV 102), or as a result of dissimilation instead of *\textit{-an}.

Thus I cannot find any evidence of nasal *\textit{q}, *\textit{e}, *\textit{i} etc. in the Catechisms. Therefore I cannot consent to Rosinas (BİM) that a nasal *\textit{q} might be reconstructed in Pr. acc. pl. -\textit{ans}, or (cf. § 103 further) in the morphs dat. pl. -\textit{mans} and -\textit{mas}.

§ 103. \textbf{Dat. pl.} -\textit{mans} characterizes the entire system of Prussian declension in the Catechisms (cf. \textit{waikammans} ‘servants’ etc.). Beside this, an allomorph -\textit{mas} occurs among personal pronouns there, cf. 2 pers. pl. \textit{ioumas} beside \textit{ioûmans}, 1 pers. pl. \textit{noumans} etc. The origin of the allomorphs -\textit{mans} and -\textit{mas} is regarded to be unclear, cf. Trautmann AS 220, Endzelîns SV 59 f., Stang Vergl. Gr. 185 f., Schmalstieg OP 36, Kazlauskas Baltistica IV 180 ff.
I should like to derive the morph Pr. -mans = Pr. -māns from WBalt. *-māns, and I regard the latter to be an unaccented variant of accented Balt. *-mōns < (accented / unaccented) Balt. *-mōns. It was its unaccented variant *-māns (> Pr. -mans) which was generalized in West-Baltic dialects, however in East-Baltic dialects the accented variant was generalized, i.e. *-mōns > EBalt. *-mōs > Lith. -mus (= Latv. *-mus) – cf. what has been said about the origin of acc. pl. masc. Lith.-Latv. -us and Pr. -ans (§ 100).

Similarly, it was a dual inflection (accented / unaccented) Balt. dat. *-mō which manifested in 2 variants as (an accented) Balt. *-mā and as (an unaccented) Balt. *-mā > Pr. -mā in its turn. The dual number vanishing in some later epoch, this Pr. -mā was pluralized according to the pattern dat. pl. *-māns, i.e it was supplemented with final -s as mark of the plural. In this way dat. pl. Pr. (III) -mas (in pronouns only!) came into being beside older -mans (I, II, III).

This is the explanation (cf. also Mažiulis Baltistica II 43–52, BS 209 ff., Palmaitis Baltistica XII 161) to which Rosinas BĀM 45 consented in principle. Nevertheless it is difficult to believe his reconstruction Balt. dat. pl. *-mōs, not *-mōns. Cf. also § 166.

§ 104. Nom. sg. (fem.) The single spelling of this inflection in (E) is -o (cf. galwo ‘head’, gerto ‘hen’, mergo ‘maiden’). It reflects Pr. (E) *-ā = (conventionally) *-ā < Pr. *-ā (= *-ā), which turned into Pr. (Cat.) -ū (cf. mergu III, widdewū III ‘widow’) after the labials and gutturals, but

42 It was the quality Pr. *ā which enabled its transition into *ū after the labials and gutturals (*ā could not turn into *ū directly). This is confirmed by data of first German record of Samlandian toponyms in which o (= *ā) is attested on place of Cat. ā just as in (E), cf. top. Byoten and biätwei (III), Būga III 106. Beside the transition *ā > ū (after L, G), a transition *ē > ī is attested in (II, III). First records of Samlandian toponyms come from the 13th c., but many were recorded later, cf. Krome 1463, Gerullis ON 73, or Sapoten 1402/ Seppothenn 1494, ibid. 151. This means that *ā still had not turned into ā in 1463 (82 years before I, II), but in 1494 (51 years before I, II) even had not turned into ū after p. A question arises whether in course of 51 years *ā had time to turn into ū after L, G, but afterwards (*ā) had time to turn into ā in other positions? In 1545 (II) *ē had already turned into ī, but this means that the transition of *ā into ā “downwards from above” had to run almost simultaneously to an opposite transition *ē > ī “upwards from below”! Since therefore the transition *ā > ā in one of the mostly archaic Baltic languages (which are very
it turned into Pr. (Cat.) -ā (cf. spigsnā III ‘widow’) in other positions (not after the labials and gutturals)\textsuperscript{42}.

Pr. (Cat.) -ū (< *-ū), -ā, if unstressed, were shortened as -u, -a.

Pr. (E, Cat.) *-ā (= *-ē) < Balt. *-ā (= *-ā) (IE < *-ā), as well as Lith. (rank)-ā = Latv. (rūok)-a.

There are a number of instances when -ai occurs instead of -a in (III), e.g.: mensai ‘meat’ (beside mensā ‘idem’, cf. E menso ‘idem’), deiwutiskai ‘salvation’ (beside deiwūtisku ‘idem’), crixtisnaia ‘baptism’ (beside crixtisna ‘idem’) etc. This -ai possibly comes from adj. / pron. -ai (cf. Trautmann AS 223, Endzelīns SV 62)\textsuperscript{43}.

§ 105. Note. A conjecture (Endzelīns SV 62, Karaliūnas LKK XLIV 100) that the final -a in rapa (1x E2) can reflect a “non-labialized” inflection Pr. nom. sg. fem. -a because of -a in (Gr) merga (: E mergo) hardly can be grounded (cf. also Karaliūnas l. c.) because: 1) E rapa is a hapax legomenon morphologically as well as lexically; 2) all nominative singular feminine forms are spelled only with a “labialized” Pr. (E) *-ā = *-ē in the Elbing Vocabulary; 3) in Grunau’s Vocabulary the morphology of Prussian words is rendered much worse as in the Elbing Vocabulary, not to mention that 4) E is ca. 200 years older than Gr.

§ 106. Gen. sg. (fem.) ends in Pr. (Cat.) -as: ālgas III (: Lith. algōs) ‘salary’, galwas III (: Lith. galvōs) ‘head’, gennas III ‘woman, wife’, menses conservative, cf. the same dialects ourdays and in the 16th c. in Lithuania) appears to be doubtful chronologically as well as phonologically, I proposed to treat the language of Catechisms with their ā on place of Pr. *-ā as Sudovian or as a mixed Sudovian slang, i.e. as a language of Sudovians who had been settled in “Sudovian Nook” by the Germans at the end of the 13th c. For this cf. VBK III 15–19 (the same in Polish: Komunikaty Mazursko-Warmińskie, 2000 3(229) 501–507). Cf. also Grammatical Incompatibility of 2 Main Prussian “Dialects” as Implication of Different Phonological Systems / www.eidem.lt/dialangn.htm (2002–2004). – L.P.

\textsuperscript{43}These instances hardly can be separated from such “hyper-correction” as giwēi = *giwē in the same dialect (with no trace of any adj. / pron. -ai) and are typical samples of alternations in stems and suffixes Pr. (Cat.) āi l ā, ēi l ē (all accented), as well as at the end of words -āi l -ā, -ēi l -ē (accented), -ai l -a, -ei l -e (generalized, unaccented). For the origin of this allomorhism cf. ftî. 12. Cf. also ftî's 23, 27, 39, 89, 92.

For a more risky (“new and interesting”) my earlier explanation of (mens)-ai l (mens)-o as allomorphs of collectivity meaning cf. Palmaitis BGR 98. – L.P.
II ‘meat, body’, etc. This (Cat.) inflection was unaccented, and therefore shortened as -as, because the transition *-₅ > *-ᵣ after L, G did not occur, cf. älgas III (not ᶠₐₐ₃s) or a reduced ending in menses II (beside mensas III) – Endzelîns SV 62, Stang Vergl. Gr. 197, 293.


§ 108. Acc. sg. (fem.) Pr. -an = *-ān < Balt. *-ān: deinān ‘day’, rankān ‘hand’, aumūsan ‘washing (off)’.

Such forms as mergwan ‘maiden’ (I, II) have -wan instead of -an (cf. mergan III), cf. Endzelîns SV 63, PEŻ III 133 (s.v. mergo); otherwise Stang Vergl. Gr. 39. Similarly, (III) krixtiāniskun ‘Christianity’ (beside christiāniskan) etc. have -un instead of -an; cf. Trautmann AS 226, Endzelîns SV 63 with bibl., PEŻ II 275 s.v. crīxtiāniskun45.

§ 109. Nom. pl. (fem.) Pr. (E) *-ās (= *-₅s) < Balt. *-ās [> Lith. (žmón)-os (unaccented!)]: lauxnos ‘stars’, wayos ‘meadows’, etc.

Forms (stai) gennai (III) ‘women, wives’, preibillîsnai (III) ‘promises’ are innovations in accordance with the a-stem pattern nom. pl. (masc.) -ai, cf. Trautmann AS 228, Endzelîns SV 6346.

§ 110. Gen. pl. ends in *-un as in a-stems (cf. § 98): menschon (1x I 1910) = *menson = *mensun ‘bodies’.

44 Why not! Cf. ft.n’s 39, 43. – L.P.
45 Forms acc. sg. fem. mergwan, crīxtiāniskun point to nom. sg. fem. mergu, *crīxtiānisku with their -u < *-ᵣ < *ā after L, G, plg. gallī (III) < *galvā < *galvā ‘head’ beside galvo (E). Since tautosyllabic diphthongs had been shortened already in common Baltic, the inflection acc. sg. fem. -an was short and could not turn into -un phonetically. Forms acc. sg. fem. -un, -wan arose analogically in accordance with nom. sg. fem. -u, but the form in -wan additionally underwent a contamination with a usual acc. sg. (fem.) -an: -un + -an = -wan. – L.P.
46 A mistake (not an innovation) is credible, especially in preibillîsnai. Neverthess for the plausibility of stai gennai as a collective form (cf. Greek nom. pl. fem.!?) see ft.n. 43 and Palmaitis M.L. Borussica: I. Stai Gennai – ein Nomen Collectivum? / Baltistica XXV (2) 126 f. – L.P.
§ 111. **Dat.pl.** is formed with the morph -mans (cf. § 103): (III) 
gennāmans ‘wives’, mergiōmans ‘maidens’, widdewūmans ‘widdows’.

§ 112. **Acc. pl.** ends in -ans on place of earlier -as (cf. adv. 
perpettas III 35, PEŻ III 268 f.) < Pr. *-ās (> Lith.-Latv. -as): 
deinās ‘days’, gennās ‘wives’, rānkās ‘hands’, billijsnās ‘sayings’, etc., cf. BS 
311 f., Rosinas BIM 46 and Endzelīns LVG 419, SV 64, Berneker 
PS 195, Kazlauskas LKIG 186.

§ 113. The evolution of these paradigms in Prussian (as well as in 
Lithuanian and Latvian) underwent multiple reciprocal contamination as 
well as a strong influence of the i-stem paradigm (cf. Endzelīns SV 60 
ff., Stang Vergl. Gr. 191 f., 194 f.), see further.

**Nom.-acc. sg. neut.** ends in (ia-stem) *-’an in (E): median 
‘forest’ (= *med’an), eristian ‘lamb’ (= *iērist’an, PEŻ I 284), wargien 
‘copper’ (= *var’an, PEŻ IV 221), etc.

**Nom. sg. masc.** occurs with following inflections in (E): a) an 
iija-stem *-īs, cf. rikis ‘lord’ (= *rikīs), and b) (i)ja-stem *-īs, cf. [c]uylis 
‘boar’ (= *kuilīs), kadegis ‘juniper’ (= *kadegīs), angurgis ‘eel’ (= *angurīs, 
PEŻ I 79), etc. In the Catechisms the ija-stem inflection *-īs was short-
ened into *-ēs, if the stress had been retracted from it to the stem: bousennis 
(III) ‘position (situation)’ (= *būsenis with the 1st syllable stressed, cf. 
speaking -ou!), nosēlis (III) ‘spirit’ (= *nōsēlis with the main stress on 
the 1st syllable and the secondary occasional stress on the 2nd syllable, cf.

---

47 One should reconstruct: Baltic ija-stem nom. sg. (masc.) *(dag)-ijs-s ‘thistle’ (borrowed into Estonian takijas!), ija-stem – *(svet)-ja-s ‘alien’, i-stem – *(vag)-i-s ‘thief’ (cf. Kazlauskas LKIG 178 ff.). Nom. sg. masc. a-stem *-as should have lost its accent in oxytone nouns (OInd. 
virā-, but Pr. Cat. wijrs) when IE fientive (“active”) case *-as differentiated (Palmaitis BGR 
47, 78–83) into gen. *-as and nom. *-as (for syntactical differentiation in Anatolian cf. Иванов 
Вяч. Вс. Общендевеscapeская, праславянская и анатолийская языковые 
системы / Москва: Наука 1965, p. 54). Then the stress in oxytone *-ija-s was retracted 
from *a to previous *i. This led to a syncopation *-ija-s > *-ij-s > *-īs (cf. Lith. dagūs ‘thistle’, 
Pr. rikīs ‘lond’). Since as a result the morphological contrast between nom. *-īs and acc. *-ijan 
became unclear, the latter form was replaced with acc. *-in > *-in which coincided with the i-
PEŻ III 198). The ija-stem inflection *-īs was not shortened if the word was oxytone and the stress was not retracted: rikīs ‘Lord’ (= *rikīs < *rikīs with the stressed ending, cf. PEŻ IV 24 ff.)

§ 114. Acc. sg. inflections are:

an ija-stem -ijan – cf. (III) rickijan ‘Lord’ (for variation in spelling cf. PEŻ IV 25 f.),

a ā-l ija-stem *- ’an – cf. tawischan, tawischen (III) ‘neighbour’ with -schas < *-s’an, noseilien (III) ‘spirit’, etc., cf. Endzelins SV 61, Stng Vergl. Gr. 194, and

an innovative i-stem *-in – cf. noseilin ‘spirit’, etc., see § 129.

§ 115. Gen. sg. inflections are:

an ija-stem -ijas – cf. (III) rickijas ‘Lord’,

a ā-l ija-stem *-’as – cf. tawischas (III) ‘neighbour’ with -schas < *-s’as, and

an ā-l ija-stem *-īs – cf. (III) nosēilis ‘spirit’, powaisennis ‘conscience’; this is an innovation which came into being under the influence of acc. sg. -in (§ 114) according to i-stem pattern Pr. (Cat.) gen. sg. -īs (which is an innovation in its turn); cf. § 127 and Trautmann AS 235 f., Endzelins l. c., Stng Vergl. Gr. 195.

§ 116. Nom. pl. masc. is attested with an inflection -ijai in the ija-stem subst. rikijai ‘lords’. As for (III) nom. pl. nasc. kaulei ‘bones’,

stem accusative (Kazlauskas, ibid.). According to this pattern, first baryton masculine ija-stems, then – all masculine ā-stems replaced their nominative with *-īs (ja-stem neut. nom.-acc. *-jan survived in Prussian, cf. median, but nom. *-jas occasionally survived in EBaltic, cf.: Lith. svečias ‘guest’, Latv. svešs ‘alien’). Formally Pr. ija-stem rikīs (III) is an a-paradigm noun with stem-ending -j and a contracted nom. rikīs = rikij-s (gen. rikij-as, dat. *rikij-u, acc. rikij-an). – L.P.

48 A trend of generalizing acc. -in in all palatal stems. Cf. fn’s 49, 54. – L.P.

49 Further in § 117 acc. pl. (III) kaulins is omitted. It is not enough clear why in the latter instance the final -lins is a translator’s mistake in accordance with a (rare!) i-stem pattern (§ 117 and § 87 referred), but in the former instance the final (kaul)ei is a result of reduction in an unstressed position (§ 116). Cf. even the 3rd explanation for the SAME -lin(s) in grēiwakulín III in § 117 (stem-ending of the 2nd component of a compound does not change usually: crauyawirps E, butsargs III, etc.). As it was assumed in 1989 (cf. Klusis M. Prūsų kalba I, p. 69), l in Samlandian may be treated as palatal due to the influence of German, i.e. just as l was (and still is among Klaipėdiškiai) in Lithuanian dialects of Lithuania Minor. Cf. fn’s 32 and 8, 48, 54. – L.P.
this is not an ija-stem form (thus: Trautmann AS 238, Endzelîns l.c.), but an a-stem form *kaulai, which was barytone (cf. Lith. kâulai, Latv. kaâls). As a barytone form, it ended in unstressed *-ai, spelled as -ei (PEŻ II 143, Schmalstiege OP 45)49.

§ 117. Acc. pl. masc. is attested with following inflections:

-ijans in the ija-stem word rikijans (III) ‘lords’,

*-’ans in the (i)ja-stem word bousenniens ‘positions’ with -niens = *

*-n’ans,

*-îns in (III) bîskopins ‘bishops’, predickerins ‘church rectors’, etc., which is borrowed from i-stems to replace former acc. pl. masc. *-ans (Trautmann AS 239, Endzelîns l.c.), cf. (III) acc. sg. wijrin ‘man’ instead of wiran, cf. § 8750.

Pr. (III 10113–14) grêiwakaûlin ‘rib’ ending in -in may be a genitive plural (= accusative singular!), i.e. an innovative i-stem “general case” (casus generalis) form, cf. Endzelîns l.c.51

î / iâ-stems

§ 118. This type of declension of feminine substantives is very archaic, cf. e.g. Lith. nom. martû ‘bride’ < *-î / gen. marčiûs < *-iâs etc. beside OInd. nom. devî ‘goddess’ / gen. devyîs etc. The Prussian language not only preserved this type better than Lithuanian, but even made this type productive. There are 30 such substantives – usually nominatives in *-î – in the Elbing Vocabulary: asy ‘boundary’ = *azî (< *ezî ‘idem’) crausy ‘pear-tree’ = *krausî (nom. pl. E krausios ‘pears’ < *-iâs), mary ‘sea’ = *marî, nozy ‘nose’ = *nûsî, pelky ‘marsh’ = *pelkî, sansî ‘goose’ etc.; cf. PEŻ II 184 f. (s.v. kextî and bibliography), Kaukienë LKK XXXVI 87 ff. (and bibliography). These (E) words are of different age and origin (cf. Kaukienë l.c.), there are even borrowings among them, e.g. dusi (E) ‘soul’ = *dûsî, a slavism.

50 predickerins is a German word ending in -er. Its r after a front e may be perceived as palatal – cf. fn’s 48, 49. Similar rendering of unstressed German or English -er is a norm in Lithuanian, cf. Hitleris, Himleris, makleris, etc. As for bîskopins, it was a foreign word too. – L.P.
51 Cf. fn. 49. – L.P.
§ 119. **Nom. sg. (fem.)** Balt. *-ē* produced in Prussian Cat-echisms 1) accented *-ē* (e.g. *semme* III ‘earth’), 2) and unaccented (*-ē > *-ī*) *-ī* (e.g. *kurpi* III ‘shoe’, cf. Lith. *kürpė*).

Rare forms (only in III) are *giwei* ‘life’ (cf. Latv. *dzīve* ‘idem’) and *peisālei* ‘letter, scripture’ with nom. sg. *-ei* in accordance with *ā*-stem nom. sg. *-ai* beside nom. sg. *-a*, cf. § 104 and Endzelīns SV 64.

In the Elbing Vocabulary both accented (e.g. *wosee* ‘goat’) and unaccented (likely *kurpe* ‘shoe’) variants of *ē*-stem nominative singular inflection *-ē* (cf. Endzelīns l. c.) come from Balt. *-ē*. The latter originates in *-iē* (> Lith. *-ē*, Latv. *-e*) which still seems to be of unclear provenance (one of more or less interesting hypotheses belongs to Stang Vergl. Gr. 201 ff.)

§ 120. **Gen. sg.** III *-īs* comes from unaccented (and therefore shortened) *-īs* (cf. III *ā*-stem gen. sg. *ālgas* with *-as < *-ās* due to retraction of stress onto the 1st syllable, § 106) < *-ēs < Balt. *-ēs* (> Lith. *-ēs*, Latv. *-es*): *gijwis* ‘life’, *teisis* ‘honour’, etc.

In the first parts of compounds top. (doc.) Sawliskresil ‘Sun’s Chair’ (1423, Varmia), Wosispile ‘Goat’s Castle’ (1331, Samland) gen. sg. fem. *-is* may be *-īs* (< *-īs*) or *-īs* from *-ēs* (PEŻ IV s.v. Sawliskresil), cf. Endzelīns SV 64.

§ 121. **Dat. sg.** *-ei* (semme* I, semmey II ‘earth’) reflects Pr. (Cat.) *-ēi* < Balt. *-ēi* (Lith. > -eį).

52 For an alternative view cf. fn’s 12, 23, 27 etc. – L.P.


54 Cat. acc. sg. *-in* is a usual *ē*-stem ending (ca. 70x vs. ca. 20x *-ien*). Because of the neutralization of *al : el*, and since not a single spelling *-ian* (all being *-ien*) is found for the *ā*-stem accusative singular, any spelling *-ien* cannot be regarded reflecting *ē*-stem Pr. acc. sg. *-en*. In the Cat-echisms both *ā*- and *ē*-stems’ accusatives have the same soft ending, contaminated with *i*-stem acc. *-in*, which tends to be generalized in all palatal stems. Spellings acc. *-ien, -ian, -in* correspond to 2 allomorphs of the soft ending: acc. *-’an* and *-’in*. Cf. fn’s 32, 48, 49. – L.P.
§ 122. **Acc. sg.** -ien (geywien II ‘life’, perônien III ‘community’ with -i- marking palatalization of w) = Pr. *-en < Balt. *-ēn (Lith. > -e). An innovative (thus also Endzelëns SV 64 f.) ending is -in (perônin III ‘community’).

§ 123. **Nom. pl.** (E) -es reflects Pr. *-ēś (e.g. raples ‘tongs’, cf. Lith. rëplës). This form is not attested in the dialect of the Catechisms, in which it should have been *-ēś < (unaccented) *-ēs (cf. Lith. nom. pl. žēmës ‘lands’, kâtës ‘cats’, etc.; Endzelëns SV 65 with bibl.).

§ 124. **Gen. pl.** not attested. **Dat. pl.** not attested, however it can be easily reconstructed for dialects of the Catechisms of the 16th c., e.g. *kurpimans ‘shoes’ (a barytone form – cf. Lith. kûrpëms – with *-i- < *-ē- < *-ē-), and *zemêmans ‘lands’ (an oxytone form – cf. nom. sg. semmë III – with preserved *-ē-). For dat. pl. -mans cf. § 103.

§ 125. **Acc. pl.** has -ins on place of older *-ens < Balt. *-ēns, cf. PEŽ II 311 f. and Endzelëns SV 65. It seems doubtful whether the spelling kîrkis III 131 ‘church’ reflects accusative plural (thus Bezzenberger KZ XLI 81, Toporov PJ V 13), cf. PEŽ II 193 with bibl., Endzelëns l. c.

\[ i\text{-stems} \]

§ 126. **Nom. sg. (masc., fem.)** Balt. *-is > Pr. *-is is preserved as -is (antis ‘duck’, assis ‘axle’, etc.) in the Elbing Vocabulary. With the same (E) nom. sg. -is Balt. *-iâs > Pr. (E) *-îs is spelled there (kadagus ‘juniper’ etc.). The latter belongs to iâ-stems (cf. Lith. kadugûs ‘idem’ and § 113).

In dialects of the Catechisms i-stem Pr. nom. sg. *-is (being unaccented) turned into -s (cf. § 87), but iâ-stem Pr. nom. sg. *-îs turned into (unaccented) *-îs (cf. § 113). Both transitions took place simultaneously, both nominative forms being finally opposed to the same accusative form i-stem -in = (i)â-stem -in <-( replaced) *-ân (§ 114), cf. Lith. i-stem acc. (ãv)-î ‘sheep’ = iâ-stem acc. (dag)-î ‘thistle’.

As for (Cat.) adj. nom. sg. masc. arwis ‘true’ and adv. (nom.-acc. neut.) arwi ‘true’, these forms possibly reflect an old i-stem [if not an
(i)ja-stem?] paradigm.

§ 127. **Gen. sg.** is not attested in (E) and is not clearly presented in (Cat.). I assume that in the Prussian Catechisms an innovative (i)ja-stem gen. sg. *-is was produced (probably by Abel Will) beside nom. sg. *-is (< *-is, cf. § 113) according to equation

\[
\begin{align*}
a\text{-stem nom. sg. } & \text {-s} : \text {acc. sg. } -\text{an} : \text {gen. sg. } -\text{as} = \\
i\text{-stem nom. sg. } & \text {-s} : \text {acc. sg. } -\text{in} : \text {gen. sg. } X = \\
(i)ja\text{-stem nom. sg. } & \text {-is} : \text {acc. sg. } -\text{in} : \text {gen. sg. } Y,
\end{align*}
\]

i.e. \(X = Y = *-is\).

With this innovative \(Y = \text{Pr. (Cat.) gen. sg. } *-	ext{is} \) (probably attested in wyssenmukis ‘almighty’ II, cf. also § 148 further) an old i-stem Pr. gen. sg. *-eis (cf. BS 263 ff.) was replaced\(^\text{55}\). Cf. Stang Vergl. Gr. 207.

§ 128. **Dat. sg.** -ei (Pr. Cat. nautei ‘trouble’) < Balt. *-ei.

Similarly to processes described in § 127, an innovative dat. sg. *-i could be produced (with all probability by same Abel Will too) beside innovative Pr. (Cat.) (i)ja-stem gen. sg. *-is, cf. (i)ja- or a-stem dat. sg. klausıweniki (III) ‘confessor’ (Endzelēns SV 65). Such (innovative) Pr. (III) dat. sg. *-i, gen. sg. *-is cannot be purely inherited Baltic i-stem forms because otherwise their short vowels should have disappeared in dialects of the Catechisms\(^\text{55}\).

Nevertheless that (innovative) Pr. (III) dat. sg. -i seems to indirectly imply old Pr. dat. sg. *-i < Balt. *-i beside dat. sg. -ei < Balt *-ei (Pr. Cat. naut-ei) etc.). For i-stem dat. sg. *-eil/*-i \(^\text{55}\), cf. BS 288 f., Rosinas Baltistica XXXIV 179, Stang l. c.

§ 129. **Acc. sg.** ends in Pr. (Cat.) -in (nautin ‘trouble’) < Balt. *-

\(^{55}\) BS 271 explains distribution of i₁, u₁-stems (originally “active”, i.e. fientive) and i₂, u₂-stems (originally “inactive”) in later EBalt. gen. sg. *-eis, *-aus, but WBalt. gen. sg. *-is, *-us. Cf. also BS 288 f., Palaitis BGR 89. Survival of unstressed Pr. (Cat.) gen. sg. *-is was possible due to morphological reasons (“Systemzwang”), what is obvious especially in the dative: pure-stem dat. ‘naut should have contradicted to a-, a-, e-stem datives as well as to all other cases with vocal inflections. – L.P.

\(^{56}\) These variants seem to have been allomorphs of the same soft ending, cf. ftn. 54. – L.P.
in (> Lith. -i) beside Pr. (Cat.) *-en (nautien etc.), which was an innovation borrowed either from the ė-stem, or from the ūjā-stem (if not even ja-stem) paradigm into the i-stem paradigm \(^{56}\). Cf. Endzelīns SV 66 and bibl.

\section*{§ 130. Nom. pl.} ends in -is (ackis III) reflecting Pr. (Cat.) *-iš < (unaccented) Pr. *-iš < Balt. *-iš, cf. Lith. (āk)-ys ‘eyes’ and Latv. (ac)-is ‘idem’ < Balt. *-iš (for this inflection cf. BS 297 ff.).

This Pr. (Cat.) nom. pl. *-iš differentiated sufficiently well from nom. sg. Pr. (Cat.) *-s (cf. §§ 87, 126). Both (i-stem nom. sg. *-s < *-iš and nom. pl. *-iš < *-iš) seem to have arisen simultaneously, therefore one should not identify Pr. nom. pl. ackis (III) with Lith. nom. pl. ākys.

\section*{§ 131. Gen. pl.} is attested only in innovative forms, old forms are not represented (Endzelīns SV 66, Stang Vergl. Gr. 212). For innovative forms in the Catechisms cf. § 99. For an original form cf. BS 299 ff.

\section*{§ 132. Acc. pl.} ends in Pr. (Cat.) -ins (ackins ‘eyes’, āusins ‘ears’ nautins ‘troubles’, etc.) = *-iņš < WBalt. *-iņš < Balt. *-iņš (> *-iš > Lith. -iš); cf. more exhaustively BS 189, 300 ff., Endzelīns BVSF 133. It was under the influence of very productive a-stem acc. pl. WBalt. *-ans (§ 100) that WBalt. acc. pl. *-iņš did not undergo denasalization.

\section*{§ 133. Dat. pl.} has a morph -mans (cf. § 103) attached to the stem ending in crixtiānimans (III). Cf. OLith. krikščionimus.

\subsection*{u-stems}


\textbf{Nom. sg. masc.} ends in -us (E apus ‘(water) spring’, dangus ‘heaven’, camus ‘bumble-bee’) = Pr. (E) *-ūs (cf. Kaukienė PK 54 ff.). In dialects of the Catechisms this inflection turned into *-s (III soūns ‘son’) < (unaccented) *-ūs, cf. i-stem nom. sg. *-iš (= E geytys) > (Cat.)

\[^57\] Cf. an alternative reconstruction WBalt. gen. sg. *-us in BS 271; cf. ftn. 55. – L.P.
§ 135. **Gen. sg.** -us is attested in the Catechisms where it is innovative. This inflection arose in the same way as an innovative i-stem (Cat.) gen. sg. -is (§ 120, cf. Endzelīns SV 66 with bibl.)

This (innovative) Pr. (Cat.) *-ūs replaced original Pr. *-aus < Balt. *-aus (> Lith. -aus, cf. BS 263 ff.). The innovative form is evident in spelling Pr. (I 11\textsubscript{13}) sunos ‘son’ = *-us. Therefore, a segment -ongs (cf. a separate opinion of Rosinas BĪM 82) in spelling (II 11\textsubscript{14-15}) soumons should not be corrected into *-ous (thus e.g. Trautmann AS 433). It was an occasional influence of the segment -ohns in German (II 10\textsubscript{13}) sohns ‘son’ on original -os (= sunos I 11\textsubscript{13}) = Pr. (Cat.) *-ūs, under which the spelling soumons appeared; similarly also van Wijk Apr. St. 74, 76, cf. Endzelīns l. c. and BS 269 ff.

A spelling soūnas (5x III) reflects gen. sg. -as and belongs to a-stems, not to u-stems.

§ 136. **Dat. sg.** ends in -u in the Catechisms (III pecku ‘cattle’), cf. III PEŽ 245 (s.v. pecku). The same occurs in the a-stem singular dative too (for its origin cf. § 94). For ancient forms of Baltic u-stem singular dative cf. BS 272 ff. with bibl.

§ 137. **Loc. (iness.) pl.** is attested in a fragment of prayer of the beginning of the 15th c., i.e. andangonsvn ‘in heaven’, which was translated from Latin pl. in coelis (Mikalauskaitė APh VII ,102 ff.). This Prussian form seems to have arisen as a contamination of Pr. iness. pl. *dangusu ‘idem’ and a prepositional construction ill. *en *danguns ‘to heaven’, used also in sense of the inessive ‘in heaven’.

**Acc. pl.** -uns is evident just in this *danguns (spelled -dangons-*) showing the existence of u-stem Pr. acc. pl. *-ūns < Balt. *-ūns in the 15th c. For this inflection cf. Endzelīns SV 136 f., Stang Vergl. Gr. 218, BS 223 ff., 301 f.

Consonantal (= C)-stems
These forms are rare, most frequent being nominative and accusative in singular.

§ 138. **Nom. sg. neut.** is of the bare stem: (E) *semen* ‘seed’ (PEŽ IV 95 f.), *seyr* ‘heart’ = *sēr* (PEŽ IV 95 f.).

**Nom. sg. masc., fem.**: (E) *brote* ‘brother’ = *brōtē, mothe* ‘mother’ = *mōtē* and (III) *mūti* ‘idem’ (with -ū- < *-ū- = Balt. *-ā- and with *-ī < *-ī < *-ē*). In the Catechisms is attested a corresponding innovative **acc. sg.** -in: *mūtin* (III, spelled 1x *muttin* in I) ‘mother’ < *i*-stem *-īn*, beside ē-stem acc. sg. *-en: mūtien* (III, *mutien* I) ‘idem’ = *mūten*.

These forms of the accusative point to the absence of original *r*-stem paradigm in dialects of the Catechisms in the 16th c. (cf. Lith. dial. nom. sg. môtë, acc. sg. môtēri vs. Latv. nom. sg. mātē, gen. sg. mātes).

Pr. (E) *smoy* ‘man’ = *zmôj* (: Lith. dial. *žmuōj* ‘idem’ < *žmuō* ‘idem’) imply Baltic *n*-stem nom. sg. *žmō* ‘idem’ < *žmôn ‘idem’; cf. Endzelîns SV 67, PEŽ IV 132 ff. with bibl. As for Pr. (E) *irmo* ‘arm’, it is difficult to define whether this word was an *n*-stem, cf. Endzelîns 1. c., PEŽ II 36 ff. with bibl.

§ 139. In the Catechisms one finds instances of former consonantal-stem nouns with **nom. sg.** -s (which comes from the *i*-stem inflection *-is* with all probability, cf. further): *dessimpts* (II, *dessempts* I) ‘ten’ = Pr. (Cat.) *desimts* < Pr. *desimtis* (cf. Lith. *dešimtis*), skellânts ‘owing (indebted)’ < Pr. *skelântis* [cf. Lith. *(bêga)-ntis*]; *(emprijki)sins* ‘being (in front), *(praesens* ‘ < *sens* ‘being’ (PEŽ I 257, as in Lat. *ab-sens* ‘not-being, absent’) < (Cat.) *sents* < Pr. *sentis* ‘idem’ (cf. Lith. *ēsantis* ‘idem’),

---

58 A direct interpretation of acc. sg. (III *mūt*-ien as -en < *-en* is questionable in so far all kinds of the soft accusative (spelled -ian, -ien, -in) may be treated as allomorphs of one innovative soft ending (the same concerns acc. pl. -ians, -iens, -ins) in dialects of the Catechisms. Cf. ftn. 54. – L.P.

59 Therefore, the reader should not perceive (Cat.) *mūti* as a sample of consonantal stems: this word belonged to the ē-stem paradigm in the Catechisms. The single attested relic of the *r*-stem is a word (III 89) *bratrikai* ‘brothers’ (nom. pl. masc.) with the a-stem suf. dimin. -îk(a)-. – L.P.

60 V. Mažiulis reconstructs an ā-stem *irmē, cf. l. c. – L.P.
smunents ‘man’ (= *zmûnents < Pr. *zmônentis, PEŻ IV 135), (emm)ens ‘name’ = (kêrm)ens ‘body’.

I consider Pr. (Cat.) nom. sg. -s in all these instances to be an innovation, produced according to pattern of i-stem Pr. *-is (Endzelîns SV 67, 126; cf. also Stang Vergl. Gr. 219 for an another opinion. Up to now it has not been taken into consideration that Pr. (Cat.) nom. sg. geits ‘bread’ (as well as E geýty[s] = *geitis ‘idem’) and nom. sg. quäits ‘will’ are i-stem forms having their Pr. (Cat.) nom. sg. -s from i-stem Pr. nom. sg. *iis, cf. PEŻ I 343 (s.v. *geytys) and PEŻ II 324 (s.v. quäits) respectively; cf. also §§ 87, 126.

§ 140. Acc. sg. has a consonantal-stem = i-stem inflection Pr. *-in < Balt. *-in (> Lith. -i); (III) smunentin ‘man’, -gimmusin ‘born’ (PEŻ I 52 s.v. ainangimmusin), cf. Lith. acc. sg. (móter)-į = (ãk)-į.

Cf. also (C-stem = i-stem) acc. pl. Pr. (Cat.) *-ins (= III smunent-ins ‘people’ etc., cf. Endzelîns SV 67) < Balt. *-îns (§ 132) 61.

Acc. sg. (III) kermenėn ‘body’, emnen ‘name’ end in -en = unaccented (!) *-in. The ending *-in seems to have been reshaped as -en by Abel Will in accordance with synharmonic vocalism in stems kermen-, em[n]- (for another opinion cf. Endzelîns l.c.). As for innovations acc. sg. (III) kërmenan, emnan, their -an arose in a similar way as in acc. sg. (geit)-an (III) beside original (geit)-in (§ 87).

§ 141. Gen. sg. ends in -es (III 5x kermenės ‘body’), which is usually considered to be an archaic (n-stem) inflection Balt. *-es [> Lith. (akmen)-ës], cf. van Wijk Apr. St. 75, Endzelîns l.c., idem BVSF 140, Stang Vergl. Gr. 220, Kazlauskas LKIG 253, BS 246, Zinkevičius LKIG 243, Rosinas BİM 83. However there is no ground to assume that (III -es) was accented (Stang Vergl. Gr. 297). The genitive singular of

61 V. Maþiulis considers C-stem Balt. acc. pl. *-îns to have been lengthened according to pattern of i- (BS 259) and other stems by analogy with morphologic (not phonetic) lengthening in IE o-(= Balt. a-) stems (BS 200 f.). – L.P.

62 The same may be said about a-stem gen. sg. -as too. Systemic (not phonetic) reasons (“Systemzwang”) prevented appearance of “nominative” -s in the genitive. Cf. ftn. 55, 63. – L.P.
any declension was unaccented in the Catechisms, cf. even 1) ā-stem āl̄gas III ‘salary’ with unaccented -ās < original accented Pr. *-ās (= Lith. algōs), or 2) ĕ-stem teis̆is III ‘honour’ with unaccented -īs < original accented Pr. *-īs < *-ēs (under the stress the final *-ēs should not have turned into *-īs > III -īs at all). On the other hand, (kermen)-es could not come from unstressed *-ēs since then the latter should have been reduced into *-s.62.

I think that kermen̆es ‘body’ has an innovative (i-stem) gen. sg. -es = Pr. (III) *-īs [= (niaubillint)-is (III) ‘not speaking’], which appeared here in the same way as -en = Pr. (III) *-īn in acc. sg. kermen̆en (III, see above).


§ 143. Acc. pl. masc., fem. has -ins (smūnentins III ‘people’ etc.) < C-stem = i-stem Pr. -ins, for which see § 132.
4. DECLINATION OF ADJECTIVES

a / ā-stems

§ 144. Nom. sg.:

a) masc. ends in (III) -s, (E) -is < *-as (plg. E Deywis ‘God’ etc., § 89), cf. labs III ‘good’, swints (III) ‘holy’, gaylis (E ‘white’);

b) neut., adv. (neut.) ends in -an, cf. E adv. kirsnan ‘(in) black’ (PE Ż II 198), sywan ‘(in) grey’ (PE Ż IV 117) etc. For neut. III (pron.) wissan ‘all’ and (pron.) wissa63 ‘idem’ (cf. Lith. visa), as well as Gr salta ‘cold’ (cf. Lith. šáltá Paulauskienë LKM 211 ff.) see PE Ż IV 50 f.

c) fem. ends in (E) -o = *-ō (= *-ā), (III) -a < *-ā and (after labials and gutturals) -u < *-ū < *-ā, cf. pausto E ‘wild’ (PE Ż III 238 f. s.v. paustocatto), tickra III ‘right’ (PE Ż IV 192), (pron.) wissa ‘all’, peronisku ‘common’, swintai ‘holy’ (cf. III mensai ‘meat’ beside mensā ‘idem’)64 etc.

§ 145. Nom. pl.:

a) masc. ends in -ai: maldai III ‘young’ (cf. nom. pl. subst. wijrai III); an ending -ei (wertei III ‘worthy’) is of pronominal origin = Lith. -i < -ie < *-ei (Endzelîns SV 69);

b) fem. ends in -as: mijlas III ‘lovely’ (cf. nom. pl. subst. lauxnos E = *-ōs < Balt *-ās).

§ 146. Dat.:

a) sg. masc. ends in -asmu: wargasmu III ‘evil’ (cf. § 163);

b) sg. fem. ends in -ai: III prabutskai ‘eternal’, pron. wissai ‘all’;

c) pl. ends in -amans: wissamans III ‘all’ with a nominal inflection, a pronominal inflection being -eimans: wisseimans ‘idem’ (§ 164).

63 Cf. ft. 62. – L.P.

64 Pr. kai stāi Swintai bousei bhe niebvinūtėi III 10313–14 is translated from das sie Heilig sey und vnstreiflich III 10211–12 either in adverbial meaning “sacredly and inaccusably”, cf. PKP 20098, or with pronominalized forms (cf. further § 152) in accordance with previous pronominalized form pron. stai < *stājī, cf further § 158. For mensai / mensā cf. ft. 43. – L.P.
§ 147. Other a / ā-stem adjective (and substantive) inflections are:

**gen. sg. masc., fem.** -as: swyntas II ‘holy’;

**acc. sg. masc., fem.** -an: labban III ‘good’;

**acc. pl.** -ans: III maldans ‘young’, (fem.) swintans ‘holy’;

**gen. pl.** -an: swintan III ‘holy’ (cf. subst. grīkan ‘sins’, § 98).

It was the coincidence of such forms (especially in the accusative in singular and in plural) due to which an innovation

**nom. pl. fem.** dûrai III ‘timorous’ with an ending -ai came into being (apparently produced by Abel Will himself), cf. § 109.

(i)ща-stems

§ 148. **Nom. sg. masc.** ends in Pr. (Cat.) -is < *-īs (cf. § 113): mukinewis III ‘teaching (teacher)’;

**Gen. sg.** ends in innovative Pr. (Cat.) -is (§ 127): wyssenmukis II ‘almighty’ (PEŻ IV 254).

Other forms also show influence of the i-stem paradigm over the (i)ща-stem paradigm, e.g.:

**acc. sg. (masc.)** druwingin III ‘believer’,

**acc. pl. (masc.)** druwingins III ‘believers’,

**dat. pl. (masc.)** druwingimans III ‘believers’.

These forms imply nom. sg. masc. -ingis with an (i)ща-stem *-is < *-īs [similarly to Lith. (a-stem -ingas -->) įa-stem -ingis, cf. Skardžius ŽD 121], not an i-stem *-is (thus Kaukienè LKK XXXVI 95). A conjecture of Kaukienè l. c. that the ending -is even in E gaylis might belong to the i-stem *-is, is not grounded (cf. PEŻ I 312 ff.).

u- and C-stems

§ 149. An u-stem **nom. sg. neut. = adv.** polīgu ‘similarly’ is a bare stem, dat, sg. masc. being (em)polījgu III, cf. Endzelīns Sv 71, PEŻ III 316.
§ 150. For C-stem adjectives (participles), which belonged to the (i)ja-stem in the Catechisms. cf. § 139.

Pronominalized adjectives

§ 151. Pronominalized adjectives are not attested in the Elbing Vocabulary. In the Catechisms they are few, often used in a basic (not pronominalized) sense.

§ 152. Nom. sg. fem. pirmoj (III) ‘the first’ = Pr. (Cat.) *pirmūi < *pirmūi < Pr. *pirmājī ‘idem’.

According to this pattern, an innovation nom. sg. masc. *pirmūis = pirmois (II, III) ‘the first’ was produced. A pron. adj. pirmonnis ‘the first’ comes from Pr. (Cat.) *pirmūnis (with -ū- on place of an older -a- under the influence of *pirmūis) < *pirmanis (cf. acc. sg. pirmanien ‘the first’ III), which is a combination of acc. sg. *pirman + pron. nom. sg. *-jīs ‘that, he’.

All this elucidates also (III) acc. sg. pansdaumannien (1x spelled pansdaumonnien) ‘the last’, walnennien ‘better’ (with -ne- on place of original -na-), cf. PEŻ III 219 (s.v. pansdaumannien), PEŻ IV 218 (s.v. walnennien)65.

Degrees of comparison

§ 153. A word muīsieson III 69 ‘größern’ with all probability means Pr. acc. sg. ‘bigger’ with -on = *-an (for muis- cf. PEŻ III 154 f. with

---

65 V. Mažiulis reconstructs pronominalized acc. sg. *panzdauman’an, *walnan’an (l. c.), i.e. historical combinations of acc. *panzdauman + acc. *jan, acc. *walnan + acc. *jan. Corresponding nominatives should have been Pr. (Cat.) *panzdaumanis, *walnanis similarly to *pirmanis (§ 152). However such combinations (accusative form as a stem + nominative inflection) could not be original. Their authenticity rests upon 2 instances of the word pirmonnis (III). Original combinations could be only nominative + nominative, i.e. Pr. *panzdaumasīs [*panzdauma(ja)s + *jis] ‘last-that = the last’, *walnasīs [*waln(a)s + *jis] ‘better-that = that better’. Unfortunately, V. Mažiulis omitted the single possible sample of this kind in (III): dengnennisīs ‘celestial’ (cf. PEŻ I 196) = possibly Pr. (Cat.) *dengininisīs < Pr. *dengininīsīs = (i)ja-stem *dengininīs + *jis.

For pronominalized adjectives cf. Lith. (non-pron.) nom. gēras, gen. gēro, dat. gerām, acc. gēra, etc. vs. (pron.) nom. gerāsīs, gen. gērojo, dat. gerājam, acc. gēraji (cf. Lith. jīs, jō, jām, jīf), or Rus. (already in basic sense only) хороши-и, хороши-его, хороши-ему, etc. – L.P.
This word (a hapax legomenon) represents a comparative degree with a segment -sies-, which possibly implies Pr. *s'es- < *sjes- <-- Balt. *-jes- > Lith. -es- (ger-ès-nis); cf. Endzelīns SV 72, PEŽ III l. c.

This time I propose a new hypothesis: *muisieson may be corrected into *muisiesnon (with an occasional or dissimilative loss of *-n-) < Pr. (dial.) acc. sg. *mūisģesnan, cf. Lith. gerès-nis.

§ 154. An apophonic alternant Pr. *-is- of a comparative grade Pr. *-jes- < Balt. *-jes- seems to be present in words gen. sg. tawischas ‘nearer’, adv. toûls ‘more’ (< *tûlis) etc. (Stang Vergl. Gr. 268, PEŽ IV 203 s.v. tūlan), maldaisin ‘younger’ etc. Cf. also Endzelīns l. c., Stang l. c. PEŽ III 101 ff. (s.v. maldaisin). For another opinion concerning the segment -ai- in maldaisin cf. Schmalstieg OP 101–102.

§ 155. The superlative degree is expressed by a combination of the word ucka + a positive or a comparative degree of corresponding adjective. The superlative may be also expressed by the comparative degree directly; cf. Endzelīns SV 73, Stang Vergl. Gr. 269 f.
5. NUMERALS

They are few and occur in the Catechisms only.

§ 156. Only 4 cardinal numerals are attested: ains ‘one’ (see § 186), dwai ‘two’ (cf. PEŻ I 243), dessimpts II and dessempts I ‘ten’ = Pr. (Cat.) *desimts < Pr. *desimtis (cf. § 88) < Balt. *desimtis (> Lith. dešimtis) an tūsimtons III ‘thousands’.

Baltic numeral ‘ten’ was an i-stem, but its declension had alternating C-stem forms too (cf. C-, i.e. t-stem Lith. gen. pl. dešimtû beside i-stem dešimčiû), cf. Stang Vergl. Gr. 280. As for ‘thousand’, the word tūsimtons III implies Pr. (Cat.) i-stem nom. sg. *tūsimts < Pr. *tūsimtis (cf. Lith. tûkstantis); cf. PEŻ IV 206 and § 88.

§ 157. More attested are the ordinals. They are declined as (masculine or feminine) adjectives. These are ten ordinals:

pirmas ‘first’ (= Lith. pîrmas), pron. masc. pîrmois, fem. pîrmoi ‘that first’, cf. PEŻ III 284 f.;

antars ‘second’ = *ant(a)ras, fem. antrâ < Balt. *antaras ‘idem’ (> Lith. dial. aûntaras > aûntras ‘idem’), *antarâ respectively, cf. PEŻ I 84;

tirts / tîrts, fem. tîrta ‘third’ maybe coming from Balt. *trîtîas ‘idem’ --> EBalt. *trêtîas ‘idem’ (> Lith. trēčias ‘idem’), cf. PEŻ IV 194 f.;

kettwirts, fem. kettwirta ‘fourth’ < Balt. *kettvîras ‘idem’ (> Lith. ketvîrâs ‘idem’, etc.), derived with suf. *-ta- from the stem of cardinal ‘four’, cf. PEŻ II 177 f.;

penckts, fem. pienckta (with i marking palatalized p) ‘fifth’ < Balt. *penkîtas ‘idem’ (> Lith. peûkîtas ‘idem’, etc.), derived with suf. *-ta- from the stem of card. ‘five’, cf. PEŻ III 254;

---


67 Segment -ar- in Pr. (Cat.) nom. sg. antars can be directly compared with *-ar- in the reconstruction Balt. *antaras only because of dat. antersmu III = *āntarsmu. Otherwise one could explain nom. sg. antars as having arisen in the same way as nom. sg. tickars III ‘right’ instead of *tikrs (to avoid difficulty in pronouncing *krs), cf. III acc. āntrant = tickran, see fn. 33. However dat. antersmu III in its turn might have been occasionally fitted to nom. antars, i.e. a form dat. *antrasmu could also exist. – L.P.

septmas (I), septmas (II, III) ‘seventh’ < Balt. *septmas ‘idem’, derived with suf. *-ma- from Balt. card. *sept- ‘seven’; since root consonant *-t- tended to be lost in earlier epochs (cf. Pr. septmas and Lith. sekmas < *sepmas), one may regard -t- in Pr. septmas (II, III) to have been introduced anew according to card. *sept- ‘seven’. Cf. PEŽ IV 102 with bibl.;


noveints ‘ninth’ < Balt. *nevintsas ‘idem’ (with a circumflex *-in-), derived with suf. *-ta- from Balt. card. *nevin ‘nine’ < IE *neuŋ ‘idem’; original initial *n- has been replaced with *d- in Eastern Baltic and Slavic (cf. Latv. deviņ ‘idem’), cf. PEŽ III 181;


---

68 Pr. asmus = *asm's with an auxiliary labialized (after m) vowel to enable pronouncing complex *sms, cf. ftn's 67, 33. – L.P.
6. PRONOUNS

Gender pronouns

stas ‘that’

§ 158. Gender pronouns are found only in the Catechisms. Were at least few of them attested in the Elbing Vocabulary, then the history of gender pronouns should have been more clear.

A neutral deixis stas (used also as a definite article\(^6\)) is one of the most problematic pronouns in Prussian.

**Nom. sg. masc.** stas ‘that; this’;

**Nom.(-acc.) sg. neut.** sta (1x stae II) and (more frequently) stan;

**Fem.** sta (1x stä III) beside stai, which is easy to derive from a pronominalized Pr. *štaijî* (thus also Rosinas BĪM 86; otherwise Endzelins SV 75, Stang Vergl. Gr. 244); see further.

§ 159. The origin of initial st- in stas is obscure. According to a known hypothesis (van Wijk Apr. St. 111, Endzelins l.c.), this st- comes from a suppletion of stems *sa/-təa-*. However it is not easy to consent to this opinion: Pr. stas with all probability comes from Pr. *šitas* (Lith. šitas) < Pr. *ši-‘this’ (see further) + Pr. *təs* < Balt. *təs*, cf. Stang Vergl. Gr. 232, Kuzavinis Kalbotyra VII 217 f., Mažiulis Baltistica XXVI 27, and especially Rosinas BĪ 208 with bibl. Balt. (masc.) *təs* (fem. *tä, neut. *tä) was common to all Balts (Lith. *tas, Latv. *tas) having developed from IE suppletive pron. *so/-tə-*.\(^6\)

---

\(^6\) A controversial concerning Prussian article is very old. Most of researchers are inclined to negate article in Prussian. They try to explain a corresponding usage of stas as a literal translation from German. Insufficient morphosyntactic oppositions of case inflections (so called “general case”, § 99) in substantives and adjectives beside full distinction of all cases in the pronouns (cf. absence of the “general case”: gen. sg. stesse vs. gen. pl. stesōn) reveal a syntactic function of artroid stas in differentiating cases, what is a feature of analytism in Samlandian of the Catechisms, cf. Palmaïtis M.L. *Rekreation als Überprüfung der Rekonstruktion/ Baltistica XXXIII (1) 43–46, as well as Grammatical Incompatibility of 2 Main Prussian “Dialects” as Implication of Different Phonological Systems / www.eidem.lt/dialangn.htm (2002-2004). – L.P.

§ 161. Gen. sg. masc., neut. stesse (etc.) is obscure in its turn. It may be derived from WBalt. *tēsja (*tēsje), i.e. from a / e-stem *tēs, extended with a formant *-ja (*-je), cf. Endzelins SV 75 f. with bibl., idem BVSF 167, Stang Vergl. Gr. 240, cf. also Schmalstieg OP 124, BS 93 ff., Gamkrelidze–Ivanov 378 f. After this WBalt. *tēsja (*tēsje) had been associated with a / e-stems adjectives and pronouns, it could produce Pr. gen. masc. *tēsja- and gen. fem. *tēsjā-.

§ 162. Quite new and worthy of attention hypothesis belongs to Albertas Rosinas (and Aleksas Girdenis): Pr. (Cat.) nom. masc. stesse (etc.), fem. stessies (etc.) come from pronominalized forms of this pronoun, i.e. masc. *štās-jā, fem. štās-jā respectively (Rosinas BİM 86, Girdenis, Rosinas GL 17, No 1, l). True this hypothesis does not seem to be reliable. Beside sigmatic pronominal forms of this pronoun, there is also a sigmatic nominal a-stem gen. sg. form in -as, which evidently comes from Balt. (dial.) *-as (§ 92) and is not any “morphological borrowing” (sic Rosinas BİM 84). A plenty of forms with stem-vowel -e-, stesse, stessie, etc., as well as dat. stesmu, stessie, etc. (except stasma 2x I, for which Endzelins SV 77) point to WBalt. a / e-stem pron. *tēs- (→ *tēs-, cf. Stang Vergl. Gr. 240, BS 93 ff., Baltistica XVI 23), not to Pr.

---

70 The reader should understand as if gen. sg. stessias III 125 (1x) is spoken about. The latter is feminine (So wöllet mir an oder jrer seiner stat : ... adder en stessias stessei deicktan ‘... or on her / his place’. If feminine, this (stessi)-as seems to have come from Balt. *-ās (cf. a bit intricate speculations of Endzelins l. c.), although such conjecture for 1 occurrence is not necessary. As said, the opposition /a/ : /e/ was neutralized in all positions except initial, therefore spellings stessias and stesses, stessies meant just the same [(cf. also variations -ian(s) / -ien(s))]. – L.P.

71 J. Endzelins explains a as a broad e. However not only was /el/ broad, but its opposition against /al/ was neutralized, cf. stasma on the same place in (I). For stasma I = *st’asm̩a [(with not fully finished */s/ > */u/ after L, G in (I)] cf. Comments (No 88) in the Reconstruction by M. Klosse in: CATECHISMUS IN PREUßNISCHER SPRACH, UND DAGEGEN DAS DEUDSCHER. First published: 1545. 6th reprint: Vilnius 1995. Introduction, text, philological comments, reconstruction. / In: Bibliotheca Baltica. Vilnius: Pradai 1995, p. 107. – L.P.
In addition, when inquiring into the origin of Pr. -es- (stesse etc.), one should not ignore the segment -es- in OSlav. gen. česo ‘what’

Note: forms sg. steises, steismu, etc. got their -ei- from the genitive plural (cf. Endzelîns l. c.). With all probability this -ei- indirectly confirms oldness of Pr. -es- (stesse etc.).

§ 163. Dat. sg. masc. stesmu ends in -u < (oxytone-stems) accented dat. sg. *-ô < Balt. *-ô (Rosinas B|M 85). Pr. (Cat.) stesmu (stesma) < WBalt. *tesmô -- Balt. *tamô (cf. BS 163 ff.). See also § 94.

For dat. sg. fem. (stessei etc.) cf. Endzelîns SV 77.

A relic of instr. sg. is adv. stu ‘so’ < Pr. (accented) *stô < Balt. *tô (> Lith. tuô) in expression stu ilgimi ‘so long as’. In another expression, ste mijls ‘the more willingly’, the word ste = Pr. *stê shows that there existed an alternant instr. sg. *tê beside *tô in Baltic.

---

72 Some comparative-historical ruse is necessary to ground the reconstruction stesse < *tesja (*tesje), e.g. either *tesja > *tešja > *teše --> *tese (similarly Endzelîns l. c.), or *tesja > *tesje > *tese. In any case the transition *sja > *sje (usually speaking – Baltic-Slavic *Tjâ > *Tîē, cf. ftm. 53) is hardly imaginable on Prussian level: Pr. gen. sg. masc. subst. *-as and pron. *-es- are of the same IE origin with apophonic Balt. *a */e (IE *a */e), e.g. Pr. (deiw)-as = Hit. (esih)-aš = Go. (wulf)-is < *-es- = Pr. (st)-ess-e = OSl. (č)-es-α; 2) difference in final vowel between Pr. (stess)-e and OSl. (čes)-o is also apophonic. Palmaitis BGR 47–54, 82 explains this final vowel as relic of Proto-IE vocalisation of the inflection -s < deictic *-sole, cf. IE pronoun OInd. nom. sá, Gk. ὁ, Go. sa. – L.P.

73 This contradicts to Mažiulis BS, which is a theory of Baltic (and Indoeuropean) declension. Contrarily to tradition, BS shows that Indoeuropean “secondary cases”, especially locative and instrumental, were formed in different IE dialects by different paradigmatising of often the same adverbial stems (not the adverbs might be relics of “Common-IE” cases which as if differently vanished in various groups due to “syncretism”). Thus Greek appears to have had 4-cases paradigms from the very beginning. Of course, Prussian instrumental may be discussed in frames of BS. However dative, instrumental and locative alternants (the same form often appearing in different cases) even in Lithuanian dialects make their paradigmatic (not adverbial) provenance impossible. BS does not allow to reconstruct 6-cases paradigms neither in Common Indoeuropean (7-cases), nor in Common Baltic. To speak about “Baltic instrumental”, whether in 2 forms, means to assume paradigmatic instrumental, locative, etc. in Baltic. Cf. also ftm. 37. – L.P.
§ 164. **Nom. pl. masc.** stai (III), staey (I, II with -aey = circumflex -äi, § 96) ‘those; these’ = Pr. (Cat.) *stäi ends in -ai which is a nominal (subst.) inflection. This inflection replaced original pron. *-ei (cf. e.g. gen. pl. stëison with this archaic *-ei, Endzelîns l. c.). These Pr. (Cat.) stai, stei come from Pr. *tai, *tei respectively, both originating in Balt. pron. *tei (cf. also § 96). For more exhaustive explanation cf. BS 170 ff.

Note: An opinion, as if nom. pl. fem. stai (3x) is not a mistake (Endzelîns SV 79), is incorrect (cf. also Rosinas BİM 88).  

§ 165. **Gen. pl. masc., neut.** stëison (4x), steison (8x), stëisan (1x) reflect allomorph alternants Pr. (Cat.) *stëisun // *stëisan (with a circumflex *-ëi-) < Pr. *tëisun // *tëisan. These form were also feminine (Endzelîns SV 79).

It seems that the morphs Pr. (Cat.) gen. pl. *-ën and *-än imply an accented Balt. *-ön and inaccented Balt. (*-ön >) *-än (> Pr. *-än) respectively: cf. origin of nominal Pr. gen. pl. *-ën // *-än, § 98.

§ 166. **Dat. pl.** (attested for all genders): stëimans (11x), steimans (18x), steîmans (2x probably a mistake instead of stëimans or steimans, cf. Endzelîns l. c.).

Pr. stëimans (with a circumflex *-ëi-) comes from Pr. *tëimâns < Balt. *tëimôns (for *-môns see § 103). The circumflex *-ëi- was replaced with an acute one when Balt. *-ëi- turned into *-ê [cf. Lith. tiëmus, Latv. tiëm(s)].

It seems that the segment *têî- in Balt. *tëimôns is of the same origin as Balt. nom. pl. masc. *têî ‘those, these’ with a circumflex *-êî. The latter was replaced with an acute *-ê (*têî > *tê, cf. Latv. tiê, although Lith. tiê⁷⁵) at the same time as *têî- > *tê- in *tëimôns.

§ 167. **Acc. pl. (masc.)** is stans. Two allomorphs may be distinguished in this form theoretically: 1) an unaccented Balt. *tâns (< *tôns) and 2) an accented Balt. *tôns. The 1st was generalized in WBaltic

---

⁷⁴ For a form of collectivity in -ai cf. ftm. 46. Typologically cf. Polish “forma mianownika rzeczowa” (this does not imply a similar paradigmatic form in Prussian). – L.P.
(> Pr. stans) but the second was generalized in EBaltic (> Latv. tuõs, although Lith. tuõš). Cf. also § 100 f. For the origin of the segment -ans in Pr. acc. pl. fem. stans from Balt. *-ás see § 112.

schis ‘this’

§ 168. Pr. (Cat.) nom. sg. masc. schis = *šis begins with š- (on place of original *sis). This š- was generalized from case forms beginning with *šjā- (as in Latv. šis ‘this’ too). However it is not clear whether Pr. sis (1x II) ‘this’ reflects original initial Balt. *š- in Pr. *sis < Balt. nom. sg. masc. *šis [neut. *ši, fem. *šî (> Lith. ši)], or it is misspelled instead of *schis with initial š- reflecting a non-nominative stem Balt. *šjā- (cf. Lith. šiòš).

Declensional forms of Pr. *sis are discussed in PEZh IV 79 ff. Its gen. sg. was Pr. (Cat.) *sis- = *schisse > schisse-s, which arose similarly to Pr. gen. sg. *tes-/*tas- (§ 161) : nom. sg. masc. *tas = gen. sg. X : nom. sg. masc. *sis with X = *sis- (cf. Rosinas BIM 87 f.). This explains an appearance of dat. sg. (masc.) Pr. *sis-mō > schismu in its turn (for dat. sg. schisman cf. § 102 b).

§ 169. Acc. sg. (masc.) schian implies Pr. (Cat.) *s’an on place of original Pr. *sin < Balt. *šin (> Lith. šį).

Acc. sg. fem. Pr. (Cat.) *schian etc. < Pr. acc. sg. fem. *s’an < Balt. *šjān (> Lith. šiā).

§ 170. Nom. pl. masc. schai ‘these’ <-- Pr. *sei (for this *-ei cf. Pr. nom. pl. masc. *stai with -ai on place of original *-ei, cf. § 164) < Balt. *šei > Lith. šieč.

§ 171. Gen. pl. schiēison (1x III 11114 used as genitive singular!) = Pr. (Cat.) *šēisun < Pr. *sēisun, which arose according to pattern *tēisun (*tēisan) ‘those’, cf. § 165.

§ 172. Acc. pl. masc. schans < Pr. *s’ans < Balt. *šjôns (> Latv. šuõs, Lith. šiuõs) with *-ôns (§ 100 f.). As for acc. pl. masc. schins (III),

73 This circumflex in Lithuanian one-syllable words is a result of later metatony. – L.P.
this is an innovation in accordance with acc. sg. masc. *sin, and not an old form (thus PEŻ IV 81).

\[ \text{tāns} \text{ ‘he’} \]

§ 173. **Nom. sg. masc.** is tāns (III, very frequent) \( \text{‘he’} = \text{tāns} < \ast \text{tanās} \) (with a short accented \( \ast \text{ā} \) in the 1st syllable\(^{76}\)).

**Nom. sg. fem.** is tānnā, tennā (III) ‘she’. Root vowel e (not a) is more frequent in other cases, plg. Pr. (Cat.):

**gen. sg. masc.** tenessei (beside tanassen), **dat. sg. masc.** tennesmu, **acc. sg.** tennan, tennen, **nom. pl. masc.** tennei, **dat. pl. masc.** tennēimans, **acc. pl.** tennans (beside tannans), etc.

For the derivation of this forms (their ten- coming from tan-, cf. Endzelīns SV 81, Stang Vergl. Gr. 253 f.) see what has been said about pron. stas correspondingly.

§ 174. Pr. masc. *tanās, fem. *tanā come from the composition of stems Pr. *\( \text{ta} \)- ‘that’ (§ 158) + *\( \text{ana} \)- ‘that there’ (= Lith. anūs), cf. van Wijk Apr. St. 115 ff., Endzelīns l. c., Stang Vergl. Gr. l. c.

Note: relics of archaic Pr. pron. *\( \text{jīs} \) ‘he, that’ < Balt. *\( \text{is} \) (> Lith. įis) are represented in pronominalized forms of adjectives and pronouns, cf. § 152, as well as Endzelīns SV 71, Rosinas BĮ 166.

\[ \text{-dīn} \text{ ‘him, her’} \]

§ 175. This is an anaphoric enclitic, attested in following forms (Cat.): **acc. sg. masc.**, **fem.** -dīn, **acc. sg. fem.** dien, **acc. pl. masc.** -dīns, **-diens.** There is also -dīl-dei, a translation of Germ. man, cf. PEŻ I 202 f.

§ 176. Pr. -dīn etc. < Balt. (dial.) *-dīn ‘him, her’ is related to Av. dim ‘idem’ < Iran. *dim ‘idem’, cf. Toporov PJ I 342 ff. with bibl. This enclitic should not be regarded an innovation (as Rosinas BĮ 167 f. do

\(^{76}\) This *ā underwent circumflex lengthening (cf. § 4) in a tautosyllabic diphthong an (> ān) which arose due to a syllable closed with the formant -s < *-as. – L.P.
An enclitic IE *-*di should have existed which was morphologically neutral. It became morphologized in some Indoeuropean dialects independently, i.e. its turned into:

- a) Balt. (dialect) acc.-nom. sg. *-*di, acc. sg. *-*din etc.;
- b) Iran. acc.-nom. sg. *-*di, acc. sg. *-*dim etc.

§ 177. Pr. nom. sg. masc., fem. kas, nom.-acc. neut. ka is:

- a) pron. interrg. ‘who? what?’, e.g.: Kas pogaunai [...] wertīwings? “Who gets [...] worthy?” (III 779–10), Ka ast sta billîton? “What is that (what is) said?” (III 278);
- b) pron. relat. ‘who, what’, e.g.: T̡awa Noûson kas tu essei Endargon “Our Father who art in Heaven” (III 476), Wissan ka prei kermenes “All what [belongs] to body” (III 531).

§ 178. It is an undoubtful archaism that Pr. pron. interrg., relat. kas / ka earlier had no plural form and two genders (masculine-feminine and neutral), Rosinas BĮ 191 ff., PEŻ II 136–138). This means that pron. relat. fem. quai, nom. pl. masc. quai, acc. pl. masc. kans were innovations.

§ 179. Gen. (sg.) is not attested. It is not difficult to show that Abel Will should have pronounced this form as *kasse, cf. gen. sg. stesse.

For the origin of dat. kasmu (III) (with -ū < *-*ū < *-ō) cf. stesmu (§ 163).

Pr. acc. masc.-fem. *kan (cf. Lith. kā) is reflected in cnj. kan (III 105z) ‘while, as’. The latter meaning developed under the influence of innovative pron. relat. neut. *kan, which occasionally replaced original ka, cf. PEŻ II 110 s.v. kan). This facilitates understanding the origin of innovative pron. relat. acc. pl. kans (1x III 6518: stans kans).

Pr. adv. ku (III) ‘as, how’ (PEŻ II s.v. kudesnammi, kuilgimai) is a relic of Pr. instr. sg. *kū < *kū < Balt. *kō (Lith. kuō), cf. stu (§ 163).

77 Cf. ftn. 73. – L. P.
§ 180. I regard Pr. adv. *quei (III) ‘where’ = *kvei to be Pr. *ku extended with a formant loc. *-ei [e.g. cf. Lith. adv. (nam)-iē ‘at home’]. Pr. *ku, in its turn, is a root pron. *k- ‘who, what’ extended with a formant loc. *-u (cf. Endzelīns SV 93, Stang Vergl. Gr. 243); cf. adv. Lith. kuř < *k-+*u-+*-r. See also PEŽ II 41, 327, Mažiulis Baltistica XXVII 94.


kawīds ‘which’, stawīds ‘such’

§ 182. Pr. (III) pron. interrg./relat. nom.sg. masc. kawīds (PEŽ II 146 ff.) comes from pron. *ka (see kas) ‘what’ + suffixoid *vīda- < subst. *vīda- ‘appearance, looks’, i.e. “(that) what is of this shape”. Pr. subst. *vīda- is related with Latv. veīds ‘shape’, Lith. vēdas ‘face, appearance’. Cf. Endzelīns SV 84 f., Stang Vergl. Gr. 238, Rosinas BI 204. Just the same is Pr. stawīds ‘such’, i.e. *sta (see stas) + *vīda-, cf. also adv. ainawīdai (III) ‘in the same way’ (PEŽ I 54) etc.

§ 183. For Pr. (Cat.) gen. sg. masc. kawijdsa (III) cf. Endzelīns SV 85. For Pr. (Cat.) dat. sg. masc., neut. kawīdsmu, stawīdsmu (III), with their -smu = (ste)-smu, as well as for other attested forms, cf. Endzelīns l. c.

wissa ‘all’

§ 184. Of all declensional forms of Pr. (Cat.) pron. wissa- ‘all’ (PEŽ IV 248 f.), I would specially mention here dat. sg. (masc.) wismu (III 85), not 83 as l. c.). The latter has the same segment -smu as in kawīdsmu, cf. Endzelīns SV 85 with bibl.

§ 185. Pr. wissa- implies Baltic collective pron. *visa- ‘all’ (> Lith. visas, Latv. viss), which, as well as OSl. viss ‘all, whole’, comes from Baltic-Slavic adjective *‘increasing’ etc. The latter was an inflectional derivative from Balt.-Sl. *vīs-/*veis- ‘to increase’ (PEŽ IV 228 f. s.v. wēisin); for all this cf. Rosinas Baltistica XX 52, idem Bļ 196, PEŽ IV 249.
ains ‘(some)one’

§ 186. For declensional forms of Prussian pronoun, article\(^78\) and cardinal number (Cat.) *aina- ‘one’* cf. PEŻ I 56 f. It comes from Pr. pron., num. card. *aina- ‘one’* < Pr. *eina- ‘idem’* < Balt.-Sl. *eina- ‘idem’* (cf. Rosinas B[1 197]). From the latter also comes EBalt. *v-eina- ‘idem’* (Lith. > *vienas* = Latv. *viēns*) with a prothetic *v-* of unclear origin (Stang Vergl. Gr. 276). This *v-* originates in some particle, i.e. *ve* (Fraenkel 1239), or probably Balt. *vi* (Endzelīns l. c., idem BVSF 155) = Balt. adv. *vi-* ‘separately, particularly, namely’ < IE *yī- ‘idem’* (cf. Pokorny IEW 1175 f. s.v. *yī*). In this case EBalt. pron., num. card. *eina-* > EBalt. num. card. *vi-eina- ‘exactly one’* > *veina- ‘one’. The latter, after having ousted an older EBalt. pron., num. card. *eina-,* turned into EBalt. pron., num. card. *veina- ‘one’.*

subs ‘(one)self’

§ 187. **Nom. sg. (masc.)** subs, sups, **gen. sg.** supsei, **dat. sg.** subbsmu, **acc. sg.** subban, **acc. pl.** subbons imply Pr. **pron. nom. sg. masc.** *suba-, fem. subā-;* cf. Endzelīns SV 85 f.

§ 188. Pr. *suba- ‘(one)self’* comes from WBalt. *sv(e)ba- ‘one’s own’,* which was derived from pron. *s(e)v(e)- ‘one’s own’* (related with Pr. swais ‘one’s own’) with suf. *-ba-* (< IE *-bho-,* cf. BS 213 ff.). Cf. PEŻ IV 166 (with bibl.), Rosinas Baltistica XXXV 131 (with bibl.).

Note: as Rosinas Op. cit., 123–139 has shown, pron. Lith., Latv. *pats ‘(one)self’* comes from Balt. subst. *pat(is)*, i.e. it is not of pronominal origin.

**Non-gender (personal) pronouns**

Singular


\(^78\) Pr. *ains* was used beside *stas* (under German influence) similarly to *stas* (ftn. 69). – L.P.
Nom. 2 pers. toû (III), tou (10x II), thou (10x I), tu (III) ‘thou’ reflects Pr. *tû and *tû (the latter coming from *tû in enclisis) which originate in Balt. accented *tû / unaccented *tû [> Lith. tu (Sam. tô), Latv. tu] < IE *tu /*tû > OSl. ty, Gk. (Dor.) τû, Lat. tû kt.

§ 190. Gen. 1 pers. maisei ‘my’, 2. twaise ‘thy’, refl. swaise, swaisei ‘his, her, their, one’s’ are genitive singular forms of possessive pronouns (§ 200), cf. Endzelîns SV 87, Rosinas BĮ 47 f. In spoken Prussian had to exist non-possessive genitives 1 pers. *mene, 2. *teve, refl. *seve (Rosinas BĮM 35) < Balt. *mene, *teve, *seve which was later used for the accusative too. In this way arose Lith. (dial.) acc. manè, tavè, savè still used as genitives in some dialects 79.

Dat. 1 pers. mennei ‘to me’, 2. tebbei, tebbe ‘to thee’, refl. sebbei ‘to oneself’ come from Balt. 1 pers. *menei / *meni, 2. *tebei / *tebi, refl. *sebei / *sebi. The latter produced Lith. mãnë / mânë as well as tãvie / tãvi, sãvie / sãvi with v which had replaced original *b in them.

§ 191. There were also enclitic (atonic) personal pronouns in Prussian (WBaltic) 1. pers. sg. dat.-acc. *mei / *mi, 2. *tei / *ti, refl. *seï / *si, inherited from Common Baltic 80.

§ 192. Acc. 1 pers. mien, 2. tien, tin (1x), refl. sien, as well as a reflexive particle sin, si are attested. An opinion, as if spellings mien, tien, tin, sien should be read as *mîn, *tîn, *sîn (Endzelîns SV 87 f. with bibl., idem BVSF 162), is not plausible, because tautosyllabic *î should have been shortened in such an instance. Even less plausible is an opinion, as if these spellings should be read as *mën, *tiën, *siën (Stang Vergl. Gr. 248): *î before *-en should have had disappeared in much earlier epoch.

79 A “Slavic” (not “Lithuanian”!) character of Prussian non-gender pronominal system (cf. correspondences of Pr. singular dat. mennei, tebbei, sebbei to Slavic msnë, tebë, sebë, plural 1 pers. nom. Pr. mes – Sl. my, Pr. 1 pers. dat. noûmans – Sl. name, 2 pers. acc. Pr. wans – Sl. vaso) forces to assume Pr. sg. gen. 1 pers. *mene, 2. *tebe, refl. *sebe = Sl. mene, tebe, sebe, not any Lithuanized *teve, *seve in spite of Av. mana, tava, etc. Finally, whether and when any boundary between Baltic and Slavic dialects of Baltic-Slavic “language” could exist, is a question. Seeing isomorph features in Prussian and in Slavic, how can we reconstruct “Baltic” without these features? Cf. Palmaitis BGR 118, 132. – L.P.

80 Since enclitics dat. *mei, *tei, *seï are reflected in Sl. mî, ti, si, they should be reconstructed on Baltic-Slavic level in their turn. – L.P.
As a matter of fact, -i- is a mark of palatalization in these spellings 81, which reflect Pr. *mēn, *tēn, *sēn. The latter come from Balt. acc. *mē, *tē, *sē (cf. Rosinas BIM 36) extended with a formant acc. -n. The reason of this extension was that the segment *ē in *mē, *tē, *sē was identical to the same segment *ē in orthotonic gen.-acc. *menē, *tevē, *sevē.

As for Pr. (Cat.) tin, sin, they come from pronominal enclitics Pr. (Cat.) *ti, *si (§ 191), extended with an accusative formant -n.


§ 194. A relic of the instrumental case may be seen in 1 pers. sg. (used as dative) māim (III 107) ‘to me’ and (used as instrumental) sen māim (III 79), sen maim (III 81) ‘with me’82. Many assumptions and

81 Such marking of palatals points to Polish influence, cf. Polish spellings mię, cię, się. – L.P.

82 Here (see the end of § 194) a paradigmatic instrumental case is reconstructed not only for Baltic, but even for Baltic-Slavic (in this case such contradictions should be explained as e.g. between thematic forms Balt. instr. pl. *-ais and Sl. loc. pl. *-ēxē < *-ois-u; cf. also V. Toporov’s term “casus indefinitus”, Топоров В.Н. Локатив в славянских языках. Москва 1961, p. 349). Cf. earlier ftnt. 73. For the term thematic cf. ftnt. 17.

To show that dat. māim is instr. manim (an opinion of Endzelîns) in phrase As N. imma tin N. māim prei ainan Saluin (III 107) “I N. take thee N. to me for a spouse”, one must first explain a corresponding reading. The latter may be justified only in case if a dash over ā in māim marks omission of following n. This is impossible since: 1) shortening by omitting vowels was usual in manuscripts to save place and paper; it occurred in any position, not in some specific words (such might be only sacred taboo or frequent and well-known shortenings, not an informative pronoun); 2) in print, as e.g. in the 3rd Catechism, such shortening could occur only occasionally, once or twice in different words, or when it was necessary to find room for a sentence on one line; 3) there was enough place for n on line III 81, not to say that there were entirely no reason to evade moving a word to next lines (20) on pages III 79 and 81 (cf. teikūsnā = teikūsanan III 39 due to centering lines!); 4) one can hardly imagine shortening by omitting a letter (so rare in print) 3 times in the same word, which does not occur without shortening at all (as if a sacred taboo); 5) on page III 81 there is no dash-marking of as if omitted n in māim at all; 6) a dative form may express instrumental in many languages, however it seems incredible that an instrumental form could express dative at the desire of A. Rosinas. As for Latv. manim, formally instrumental, it is really used to express dative in Latvian. This was a reason for J. Endzelîns to look for an analogy in Prussian. However Latv. manim ends in -m, what is a generalized inflection of dative masculine even in a-stem substantives in Latvian. In Lithuanian dialects 1 pers. sg. dat. mani is wide-spread. With no doubt such form in Latvian dialects could be extended with Latv. dat. -m, thus coinciding with older instr. manim. For pr. māim cf. Palmaitis BGR 111–112. – L.P.
hypotheses concern the origin of this māim (see bibl. in Endzelīns SV 88 f., Rosinas BJM 35 f.). An opinion of Endzelīns (FBR XI 83) is especially worthy: Pr. māim (III) should be read manim and connected with the instrumental case Lith. manim(i) = Latv. manim (see also Rosinas l. c.). Then a question arises, “how an instrumental form with the stem man- could coexist beside a dative form with the stem men- in Prussian?” (Endzelīns SV 89, as well as Palmaitis Baltistica XII 160). However it seems that the form instr. *manim, when no more paradigmatic (in dialect of III) and having an unstressed -a- with all probability, had just arisen from Pr. *menim < *menimi; cf. Lith. (with an unstressed -a-) manimi > manīm, tavim > taviū, savimi > saviū and Latv. manim (on place of older *men-), tevim, sevim

Note: a formant Pr. instr. sg. *-m comes from Balt.(-Sl.) *mī, not from Balt.(-Sl.) *mî; cf. BS 210 f.

Plural


§ 196. Other plural (and dual) cases of these Balt. *mes, *jūs had suppletive stems Balt. *nō- ‘us’ and *vō ‘you’ respectively. These forms produced Balt. *nū- and *jū- respectively (Mažiulis Donum Balt. 334–339); see further.

83 This explanation still is not enough convincible, especially when as if a new and no more paradigmatic Pr. māim is compared with paradigmatic Latv. manim, tevīm, sevīm again (in Latvian all non-nominative cases of 1 pers. sg. have the stem man-). More perspective would be a direct comparison of Pr. māim with really existing instr. mainim (Lazūnai), tajiūm, sajiūm (Zietela) in Lithuanian dialects od Belorussia (Zinkevičius Z. Lietuvių dialektologija. Vilnius: Mintis 1966, p. 125, 301). Of course, this can lose neither the problem of the dative use of instrumental, nor 6-cases paradigms in Baltic and Indo-European (+ the 7th ablative!), cf. previous ftnt. – L.P.

84 Lith. mēs has a short e, which underwent circumflex lengthening (together with a short a) in almost all stressed positions. In literary Latvian mēs ē is long in accordance with jūs. According to Endzelīns l. c., initial m- replaced original *v- (cf. Germanic or Aryan) due to 1 pers. pl. verbal inflections with initial -m-. However the replacement of *v- in pronouns was Baltic-Slavic, not Baltic (cf. Sl. my). The same m- is also represented in Armenian mekh ‘we’. – L.P.
§ 197. **Gen. 1 pers.** Pr. noûson / noûsan, **2. iouson / ioûsan** (with the inflection *-un/*-an < *-ôn in both instances, cf. § 98) imply WBalt. *nûsôn, *jûsôn respectively (cf. Endzelîns BVSF 163, Stang Vergl. Gr. 255); see Maþiulis l. c. 

§ 198. **Dat. 1 pers.** Pr. noûmans etc., **2. ioûmans** etc. imply Baltic *nómôns, *vômôns respectively. 

There are also forms with a morph -*mas* (19x) beside forms with a morph -*mans* (22x) in Prussian (Cat.). According to traditional view, the origin of these morphs is obscure, cf. Endzelîns SV §§ 111, 191, Stang Vergl Gr. 185, 255. The newest hypothesis (Rosinas BÁM 82), as if both -*mans* and -*mas* reflect *-*mâs with a nasal vowel *-*q-, is not plausible. I consider:

a) Pr. -*mans* to have originated in *-*mâns < *-*mâns < Balt. *-*móns; 

b) Pr. -*mas* to have originated in *-*mâs < *-*mâs = dual. *-*mâ (< Balt. *-*mô) + pl. *-*s; see § 103 with bibl.


The fate of these Balt.(-Sl.) *nôns / *vôns, (for their inflection *ôns cf. § 103) in Eastern Baltic is analysed by Maþiulis l. c.\(^5\)

---

\(^5\) V. Maþiulis l. c. reveals the history of the distribution of plural stems and their vocalism Balt.-Sl. 1 pers. *nô, 2 pers. *û<*ù, *ùô in Western and Eastern Baltic, as well as in Slavic. For the study of Prussian it is necessary to mention that all these changes took place due to the weaknes of Balt. *y* before *ô* (as well as Sl. *j* before *i < *y*). The presence of Pr. *y*- in the accusative *wans* and its presence in all forms of the 2nd person pl. in Slavic allow to reconstruct Pr. *y*- also in the genitive and dative. There was initial Pr. (Balt.) *j* in the nominative. This suppletion allowed Pr. *y* to vanish before *ô* in the genitive (*yôsôn) and dative (*yômôns): the *ô* was accented there. In the atonic (one-syllable) accusative there had been *a* on place of *ô* already (*yâns), therefore *y* did not vanish in the accusative. *y* having vanished in the genitive and in dative, these forms had to appear without root. Therefore the root *jù* was borrowed from the nominative: nom. *jûs, gen. *jûsôn, dat. *jûmôns, acc. *yâns. Further, the 1 pers. gen., dat. *nô* was accomodated to the vocalism in the paradigm of the 2 pers. gen., dat. *jû- : *nû, but 1 pers. acc. *nâns > *mâns (with its *m*- from the nominative *mes) remained parallel to 2 pers. *yâns. – L.P.
Possessive pronouns


§ 200. **Gen. sg.** are Pr. (Cat.) *maisei*, *twaisei*, *swaisei* < Pr. *majasei*, *tvajasei*, *svajasei*, see Endzelīns l. c.

§ 201. **Dat. sg.** *twaismu* (1x III), *swaismu* (3x III) are rare. More frequent are (for all genders, III): *mai`smu* (2x), *twai`smu* (3x), *swai`smu* (10x) with the long -*ā-* of unclear origin (Endzelīns l. c. with bibl., Stang Vergl. Gr. 240 f., Schmalstieg OP 127). I am inclined to explain this long -*ā-* (on place of short -*a-* ) as accented and influenced by ā-stem feminine forms of this possessive pronoun.

§ 202. **Acc. sg.** (for all genders) are *maian*, *twaiian*, *swaiian* etc. with -*an* (< Balt. masc. *-*an) = -*an* (< Balt. fem. *-*ān).

In plural only dative and accusative forms are attested.

§ 203. **Dat. pl.** is *swaimans*, *swāimans* (with a circumflex *-*āi-, cf. stēimans, § 166) < *swaiamans* (with a morph -*mans* < Balt. *-*móns, § 103).

**Acc. pl.** is (masc., fem.) *maians*, *twaians*, *swaians* with masc. -*ans* (< Balt. *-*āns, § 167) = fem. -*ans* (< Balt. *-*ās, § 165).

The relic of **instr. sg.**86 may be *swaiéis* (corrected by Endzelīns SV 91 into acc. pl. *swaiiens*) in a phrase *sen wissan swaiéis* (III 11915–16). Here -*eis* = Balt. *-*ais, see BS 234 ff.); cf. also Trautmann AS 272, Stang Vergl. Gr. 178, Schmalstieg OP 131.

§ 204. **Gen. pl.** *noûson*, *ioûson* were used to produce declinable forms nom. sg. masc. *ioûs* (< *jūsas*), fem. *nousā*, *iousa*, dat. sg. *noûsesmu*, *noûsmu*, *ioûsmu*, acc. pl. *noûsons*, *ioûsons*. Cf. also Endzelīns SV 91.

86 Cf. fn's 73, 81. – L.P.
7. CONJUGATION

Verbum finitum

§ 205. **Ps. 1 pers. sg.** is attested in athematic verb of the root *es-* ‘to be’: asmai (10x), asmu (2x), asmau (1x) ‘am’. Only the first of these forms is really athematic. The last, asmau, occurs only once and therefore is not reliable: its segment -au may be a mistake instead of -u (cf. Trautmann AS 273, Endzelins SV 104). As for asmu (2x), it apparently has a mixed ending, Pr. *-ū (< *-ū < *-ū) having been transferred from the thematic paradigm and having replaced original final vowel of the athematic inflection. Cf. Lith. esmù ‘idem’ beside original athematic esmî (as well as fully thematized literary esû), Latv. esmu ‘idem’.

§ 206. However the origin of asmai (10x) is problematic too. According to a traditional hypothesis, asmai (< *esmai) replaced original athematic *esmi im accordance with *vaid(m)ai ‘I know”. The latter came into being as a result of contamination of “perf.” *vaidai ‘I know’ (= OSl. vēdē ‘idem’) and ps. *vai(d)mi ‘idem’ (= OSl. vēms ‘idem’). See Endzelîns SV 103, cf. Stang Vergl. Gr. 314, 406 f., Schmid IF LXXIII 355 ff., Schmalstieg Balt. Verb. 36.

This hypothesis is not plausible since it does not take into consideration that there is also 1 pers. pl. asmai “we are’ beside 1 pers. sg. asmai ‘I am’. 1 pers. pl. -mai should be explained in its turn.

According to Kazlauskas LKIG 295, there was 1 pers. pl. *-mā beside 2 pers. pl. *-tē originally. According to pattern 1 pers. sg. *-mi, the inflection *-mā was reshaped into *-mai and then ousted both older inflections, i.e. *-mi and *-mā. I have slightly reinterpreted this contamination in Baltistica I Priedas, 97.

§ 207. I propose another solution: under the influence of 2 pers. sg. *(es)-sei ‘thou art’ (a very old form, cf. Mažiulis l. c.) there appeared Balt. (dial.) 1 pers. sg. *(es)-mei ‘I am’ beside older *(es)-mi ‘ibid’. The

---

87 For the terms thematic, athematic cf. ftn. 17. – L.P.
88 In this article V. Mažiulis assumes a development in direction singular --> plural. – L.P.
new form 1 pers. sg. *(es)-mei underwent contamination with athematic and thematic 1 pers. pl. *-mē/*-mā (<*-mē/*-mā) and turned into Balt. (dial.) athematic and thematic 1 pers. pl. *-mei/*-mai. The latter produced athematic and thematic Pr. 1 pers. pl., sg. -mai, as well as Lith.-Latv. (dial.) 1 asm. pl. *-mei > *-mie (for the latter cf. Endzelīņš SV 105, Zinkevičius LKIG II 81 f.)

§ 208. **2 pers. sg.** is spelled with the endings -sei, -se, -si: assei (4x), essei (1x), assai (7x), asse (2x), aesse (1x) ‘art’, dāse (1x) ‘givest’, ēisei (1x) ‘goest’, waisei (1x), waisse (1x) ‘knowst’, gīwassi (1x), giwassi (2x if not reflexive) ‘livest’, druweše (2x) ‘beliest’, seggēsei (1x) ‘doest’, etskīsai (1x) ‘standst up’, postāsei (2x) ‘wilt become’, quoitīlaisi (5x) ‘wouldst’. Spellings -sei, -se, -si reflect Pr. *(es)-sei (see over), however -sai = *-sai is an innovation in accordance with 1 pers. sg. -mai.

§ 209. **3 pers.** did not differentiate number similarly to other

---

89 As Mažiulis l. c. emphasizes, the coincidence Pr. 1 sg. = 1 pl. -mai was a recent innovation. The origin of pl. -mai seems to be connected with Lith. dial. 1 pl. (neša)-mies, 2 pl. (neša)-ties (Zinkevičius l. c.) <*-mei, *-tei. First, the presence of a diphthong is important, not relations to singular (and even not the quality -ai or *-ei) because, similarly to Lithuanian, a diphthong is attested in Pr. 2 pl. -tei too (see § 211). Therefore, seconly, inflections 1, 2 pers. pl. with a diphthong may be treated as a Common Baltic (“dialectal”) feature. Not trying to explain the origin of Pr. 1 pl. -mai, 2 pl. -tei [l -te in accordance with usual alternation Pr. (Cat.) -ei / -e, see further], I only should present a simple explanation of Pr. (Cat.) 1 sg. asmai. The latter is nothing else but a well-known Baltic “thematized” form *asma = Pr. (Cat.) asmu < *asmū (= oxytone asmau III 3712 (?) < *asmā = Lith. dial. esmu = Latv. esmu (see § 205).

Pr. 1 sg. *asma had *-a instead of *-u in accordance with all thematic inflections 1 sg. -a due to systemic morphological reasons (“Systemzwang”). However it (in its manifestation asmai, see further) was not rare (in comparison with a “normal” asmu) because of the influence of 1 pl. -asmai, of course. As for the difference between 1 sg. asmai and *asma, there was no difference at all, because both variants were allomorph due to usual alternation Pr. (Cat.) -ai / -a, -ei / -e etc. (cf. fn’s 12, 27, 39, 43). As said, the variant asma was not attested because the existence of 1 pl. asmai (which in its turn was equal to *asma) factually neutralized morphological difference of number in the 1st person. The diphtong form (which in plural was equal to *asma, but was supported by diphthongs 2 pl. -tai, -tei) appeared to be “stronger”, therefore the variant asma (although existing) was rare and accidentally was not used by translators.

This explanation is correct on synchronic level of the language of the Catechisms. As such it cannot fully deny a possibility of some archaic “medial” -mai (cf. Gk. -ματι <*-mi + medial-perf. *-ai, which could exist independently. For this cf. OLith. 1 sg. refl. (duo)-mies beside 1 pl. (nēša)-mies, if all these instances, including Latvian, are not a result of generalizing vocalism of 2 sg. -ie- before refl. -s(i). – L.P.
Baltic languages (Lithuanian, Latvian). Athematic verbs ended in Pr. -t (< *-ti): ast ‘is’ (= Lith. ėsti), ėt ‘goes’ (= Lith. dial. ešt, Latv. iēt\(^{90}\)), dāst ‘gives’ (= OLith. duosti).

Forms of the 3rd person are extended with the formant -ts sometimes: astits ‘is es’, pt. billāts ‘spoke’ etc. This -ts seems to have come from WBalt. pron. *tas, used anaphorically. See Stang Vergl. Gr. 410, cf. Endzelīns SV 105\(^{91}\).

§ 210. 1 pers. pl. is attested with the morph -mai (see §§ 206, 207) in all types of stems. e.g.: asmai ‘we are’ perēmai ‘we come’, giwammai ‘we live’, läikumai ‘we keep’, turrmaī ‘we have’.

§ 211. 2 pers. pl. possesses morphs -ti (ca. 80x; spelled also -ty), -tei (9x), -tai (8x), -tei (4x), -ta (1x), e.g. asti, estei, astei ‘ye are’, seiti ‘be!’, laikutai ‘ye keep’ (in imperative sense), turrīti ‘have!’, immaiti ‘take!’, edeitte ‘eat!’, nidrausieiti ‘do not forbid!’, rikauite ‘dominate!’, seggīta ‘do!’ The morph -te seems to have appeared on place of -tei\(^{92}\). The latter has its -tei in accordance with pattern 2 sg -sei, while -ai in -tai came from 1 pl. -mai; the spelling -ta (1x) seems to be a mistake. For all this cf. Endzelīns SV 105 f. with bibl. The most frequent (ca. 80x) -ti is authentic < Pr. *-tē (Endzelīns l. c.) < Balt. *-tē (> Lith.-Latv. *-tē > -te)\(^{93}\).

---

\(^{90}\) Here Latvian acute differs from Lithuanian and Prussian circumflex. \(–\) L.P.

\(^{91}\) If (asti)-ts = (ist) es, why (imma)-ts = (nahm) er? What anaphora can be seen in nostan kai tans sparts asits prei paskulīton (III 87\(_{v}\)) = auff das er mechtig sey zu ermanen? Why is anaphoric *tas used in the nominative when corresponds to a direct object: limatz bha daits I 136 – nom. ‘he’ or acc. ‘it (= es)’? (Cf. : “took bread and blessed it, and brake it, and gave it” Math 26 : 26). In all instances -ts occurs only when something is narrated. For Pr. (Cat.) -ts as a mark of narration (relative mood), as well as for an alternative view of its origin, cf. Borussica 2 in Baltistica XXV (2) 128–132. \(–\) L.P.

\(^{92}\) Here V. Mažiulis de facto recognizes alternation Pr. (Cat.) -ei / -e (cf. ftm’s 12, 23, 27, 39, 43, 89, 109). \(–\) L.P.

\(^{93}\) V. Mažiulis’ samples show 2 pl. -ti being typical for the imperative mood. Balt. 2 pl. *-tē was possibly ousted from the indicative by innovative *-tei. If the latter had been really accomodated to 2 sg. Balt. *-ei, not necessarily to athem. *-sei, its diphthong could occasionally provoke diphthongization of 1 pl. too (for *-tei cf. EBaltic facts, ftm. 89). As for spellings -tai, -ta, they may reflect Pr. (Cat.) *-tai / *-a (= *-tei / *-te) without the letter i as usual mark of palatalization (*-tai, *-tia). \(–\) L.P.
Note. 1 pers. pl. giwammando, lāikumai, turrimai etc., 2 pers. pl. turriti etc., beside 3 pers. giwa, lāiku etc., could be comprehended as if derived from the 3rd person. Due to this reason such innovations could arise as 1 pers. pl. wîrstmai ‘we become’ (: 3 pers. wîrst), dînkaumai ‘we thank’, massimai ‘we can’ (: 3 pers. massi), grîkimai ‘we sin’ (: 3 pers. grîki-si), schlûsimai ‘we serve’, waitāmai ‘we speak’ (: 3 pers. en-waitia), druwêmai ‘we believe’ (: 3 pers. druwe), seggêmai ‘we do’ (: 3 pers. seggê), etwêrpimai ‘we forgive’ (: 1 pers. = 3 pers. etwerpe), girrimai ‘we praise’ etc.; cf. Endzelîns SV 106.

Tense and mood

In the language of the Catechisms present, past and future tenses are attested, as well as 2 numbers: singular and plural. The form of the 3rd person is often used in the meaning of the 1st and the 2nd person in singular, e.g.: as drowe (I), es drowy (II), as druwe (III) ‘I believe’, thou tur (I), tou tur (II) ‘thou shalt’. This seems to be a fault of translators (Endzelîns SV 102 f.), but possibly not only theirs (cf. Mažiulis Baltistica I Priedas, 95–100). An authentic form of the 1st person is that of the verb ‘to be’ (see § 205 ff.); for 2 sg. -si, -sei, -sai see § 208.

94 Having in mind Prussian and Slavic isomorphism (cf. ftn. 79), one really could expect an inflection 2 sg. *-sei, ‘borrowed’ from the athematic paradigm, as this possibly took place in Slavic (*-sei, not the “primary” *-si!). However forms without this -sei (cf. giwu III 85, beside gîwasi III 95) are also attested. What “translators” could then make such terrible mistakes? Who can believe that priest Abel Will did not know how to say corresponding verbs in the 2nd person or even in the 1st person singular? The formulas of Matrimony As imma ti[en] III 107, ‘I take thee’, and of Baptism As Crixtia tien III 129, ‘I baptize thee’, were used by priests throughout all Prusa (Baltic Prussia), first translated by native-speaking “tolkers”. Such “tolker” was also Paul Megott, helper of A. Will (P. Megott could not made primitive mistakes but A. Will was a translator, not “translators”). No doubt, 1st sg. (as if the 3rd person) imma, crixtia are authentic forms. In referred article (Baltistica I Priedas 101) V. Mažiulis says: “when in occasional instances an athematic -s(e)i was added, arose Pr. 2 sg. -a + s(e)i > -a-s(e)i, cf. Pr. giw-a-ssi”. An explanation of Pr. 1 sg. (as if the 3rd person) -a is given by V. Mažiulis in BS 22: this was regular ending of barytone verbs, in which Balt. 1 sg. *-ō > Pr. *-ō > Pr. (Cat.) > -a. As in other instances, barytone, not oxytone, allomorphs were generalized in Prussian. Thus the a-stem form of the 1st person in singular was identical with that of the 3rd person in the ā-stem present and in the ā-stem preterite. This supported the a-stem 3 pers. pr. *-ā after the shortening of the final vowels and prevented the latter from disappearing. As a result, wide processes of neutralization and decline of inflectional oppositions between persons and tenses took place in the said dialects. A need of analytism appeared (cf. www.eidem.lt/dialangn.htm). Cf. also ftn. 114. – L.P.
Present stems

a) athematic stems

§ 214. For 1 pers. sg. asmai, asmu ‘am’ cf. § 205; for 2 pers. sg. assei, essei, assai, esse, aesse, esse ‘art’ cf. § 208; for 3 pers. ast, astits (I, III), aest, est ‘is’ cf. § 209; for 1 pers. pl. asmai ‘we are’ cf. § 210; for 2 pers. pl. astai, estei ‘ye are’ cf. § 211;

2 pers. sg. ėisei ‘goest’; 3 pers. ėit ‘goes’, 1 pers. pl. perēimai ‘go’;
2 pers. sg. dāse ‘givest’; 3 pers. dāst ‘gives’;
2 pers. sg. waisei, waisse ‘knowst’; 1 pers. pl. waidimai ‘know’; 2 pers. pl. waiditi ‘know’ – these forms underwent the influence of i-stems, see Endzelīns SV 107, Stang Vergl. Gr. 420;

3 pers. quoi ‘wants’ is used also in the meaning of the 1st and the 2nd person in singular, see Endzelīns l. c., cf. PEŻ II 329 f. with bibl.

b) ā-stems

§ 215. Prussian ā-stem presence corresponds to ā-stem infinitive in case of the ā-stem correspondence in Eastern Baltic, e.g. beside ps. läiku ‘keeps’ (< *-ā, see further), there is an if. laikūt ‘to keep’ (with -kū < *-kā) vs. Lith. laikyti = Latv. laicīt; see Endzelīns l. c. with bibl., Kaukienē LVI I 190. A word maisotan E 466 ‘gemengt’ < ‘mixed’ implies Pr. if. maisāt ‘to mix’ beside ps. *maisā ‘mixes’ (PEŻ III 99), cf. Lith. maišyti (= Latv. maisīt), ps. maišo95;

perbānda ‘tempts’ (= Lith. pērlando, if. pērbandyti, cf. PEŻ III 258) beside if. *perbandat ‘to tempt’ (implied by verbal noun perbandāsnan ‘temptation’);

läiku ‘keeps’ (= Lith. laiko, Latv. làika), 1 pers. pl. läikumai (: Lith. laikome = Latv. làikām), 2 pers. pl. läikutei, if. laikūt (see over);

bia ‘is afraid’ = *bijūj, if. biātwei (= Lith. bijōti, Latv. bijāt).

---

95 But cf. if. giwīt < *giivītvei (?) beside ps. (2 sg. = 3 pers.) giwu (< *giwū < *giwā), 3 pers. giwa (with -a generalized due to “Systemzwang”?), 1 pl. giwammai (with a generalized -a?). – L.P.
c) *i*-stems

§ 216. There are *e*-stem infinitives beside *i*-stem present forms, e.g. if. *turētwei* (III), *turryetwey* (II) ‘tu have’ < Pr. *turētvei* (= Lith. *turē-ti*, Latv. *turē-t*) and ps. *tur* (20x I, II) ‘has’ < *turi* (with *-ī*) = turri 96 (28x III), 1 pers. pl. *turrimai* (III), 2 pers. pl. *turriti* (III). A form ps. *turei* (10x III) ‘has’ is an *ēja*-stem innovation with *-ei* < *-ēja* (see § 226); cf. Endzelēns SV 108 with bibl.

It seems that 1 pers. pl. *kîrdimai* ‘we hear’ (beside if. *kirdît* ‘to hear’) with -ī < *-ē-) implies an *i*-stem present form too, see Endzelēns l. c. differently from PEŽ II 191 f. (I doubt the latter today).

d) *a*-stems

§ 217. a) pure *a*-stem present forms are: *imma* ‘takes’ (in the meaning of the 1st person in singular), 2 pers. pl. *immati* (= Lith. *ìmate*), 1 pers. pl. *immimai* [with -i-(mai) under the influence of *i*-stems]; *ebimmai* ‘we embrace’ (possibly an optative form); see Endzelēns SV 114 with bibl., cf. Stang Vergl. Gr. 361 with bibl.

Note: for the fate of Balt. *a*-stem 1 pers. sg. *-ō* in Prussian see Mažiulis Baltistica I Priedas 95 ff.97;

3 pers. (pl.) *ertreppa* (1x) ‘overstep’ beside if. *trapt* (1x) ‘to step’ < *trept* with all probability;


---

96 Pr. (III) 3 pers. *turri* cannot come directly from *turi* because of the non-reduced final -i. Differently from -a in crïxtia (see ftn. 97), there was no ground for -i to survive in *turri*. This form can be either a result of generalizing of the *īja*-stem ending -i < *-i*j = *-i* < *-į*jā, which “restored” original *-i*, or it was directly a parallel *īja*-stem (cf. Lith. *trûni* / *tronija*), or a *ja*-stem (cf. Lith. *kôri* / *kôria*) form, cf. Palmaitis BGR 212, as well as further § 221 about Pr. (Cat.) *giri* < *girja*. – L.P.

97 There, and much more clear – in BS 22 (cf. ftn. 94), V. Mažiulis shows that Pr. (Cat.) *imma* (with its -ā < *-ā* < *-ō*) was a regular 1 pers. sg. form, not any form “in the meaning of the 1st person”. Even more, it is not on the contrary obvious, how *imma* could be a 3rd person form with its short unstressed -ā not reduced to zero at the end of the word (cf. 3 pers. *wîrst* < *vîrsta*) – cf. 3 pers. (III) *senvînka, ertreppa, kniëipe, gêide* etc.! It was namely -a of the 1st person in singular, which maintained preservation of the latter when coincided with the 3rd pers. -a (see www.eidem.lt/dialangn.htm). – L.P.
I do not consider Pr. *enterpo to be a 3rd person form (thus Trautmann AS 329, Endzelīns FBR X 37, idem SV 109) – see PEŻ I 227 s.v. *enterpen.


d) a form with an affix -n- is attested in 3 pers. *polînka ‘remains’ = Pr. *pa- + *lînka = Lith. dial. liñka (if. *lîkti) ‘idem’ (PEŻ III 318), see also

\(^{98}\) It seems to be hardly credible that verbs of different stems were used for the SAME meaning ‘to live’ in such a considerably small document as the 3rd Catechism, cf.:
1) 2 sg. = 3 pers. *gîwu (III) (which is regarded to be an aja-stem by Endzelīns SV 178, but now is written off as a mistake by Mažiulis § 228 contrarily to PEŻ I 377),
2) 3 pers. *giwa (as if corresponding to an unattested if. *gîtwei = OSl. *žīti, PEŻ I 375, = Lat. vîvere, Endzelīns J. Latviešu valodas gramatika. Rīga 1951, § 610) and
3) if. *givūt < as if *gīvēuui, PEŻ I 376 with the 3rd pers. *giwe (< *givēja, see § 224)!

Since *givūt is the single infinitive form attested for the verb ‘to live’ in Catechisms, a comparison with EBalt. if. Lith. (dar)-yūt, Latv. (dar)-iūt, ps. Lith. (dār)-o, Latv. (dar)-a < Balt. *-ā becomes justified. This allows to unite all 3 instances (giwe being a misspelling of giwa) in one verb. A spelling -e- in giwemmai instead of -a- shows that this syllable was unstressed, i.e. the syllable *gi- was stressed. For -a- instead of expected -u- (-ū-), and more, cf. fn. 95. – L.P.

\(^{99}\) Not an absence of -a in the 3rd person but its presence needs explanations (cf. fn. 97).

On the other hand, if this verb was used as an auxiliary one, this does not mean as if the 1st pers. sg. -a was not necessary. Therefore, in spite of reliable East-Baltic parallels, one might assume an athematic (not a sta-stem!) verb of a kind 1 pers. sg. *vîrsmē < -vîr-t-mi, 2 pers. sg. *vîrse < *vîr-t-sei, 3 pers. *vîrsti < *vîr-t-ti > Pr. (Cat.) wîrst (= as-t) with a regular generalization of the latter on all persons in singular [cf. *as-t turri; (tû) turri; (tâns) turri, see fn. 94] and later ousted of original 1 pl. *vîrsmai by an innovative wîrstmai due to the 2 pl. *vîrstei and all other persons wîrst. Thus Pr. (Cat.) wîrst (similarly to waîst ‘to know’?) appears to be a “semi-athematic” verb. – L.P.

§ 220. e) *na-stem forms are: opt. 3 pers. pogâuiai (= *pogâunai) in the indicative meaning ‘gets’ (cf. Lith. gûuna) – for this form, as well as for 1 pers. pl. pogaunimai, cf. Endzelëns l. c., Stang Vergl. Gr. 352; for opt. 3 pers. postânaí ‘becomes’ and 1 pers. pl. postânimai see Endzelëns SV 110, Stang Vergl. Gr. 352 f., PEŻ III 331100.

§ 221. f) *ja-stem forms are: 3 pers. gêide (gêîdi) ‘awaits’ < Pr. *gêî'â < Pr. *gêîðja ‘idem’ = Lith. geîðžia ‘thirsts for’ (see PEŻ I 338 ff.), cf. also Lith. (ja-stem) ps. lâteka : if. lâteki : Pr. ps. *geîðja : if. *geistveî;

1 pers. pl. girrimai ‘we praise’ (if. girtwei, cf. Lith. gîria-me) is an innovation according to 3 pers. *gîri < *gîrîa ‘praises’ (Endzelëns l. c.);

3 pers. knîëipe ‘scoops’ < probably *kneîpja ‘idem’ (Endzelëns l. c., Stang Vergl. Gr. 453, PEŻ II 232 f.), cf. also Lith. (ja-stem) sêmîa ‘idem’;

3 pers. etwêrpe ‘looses (forgives)’ (1 pers. pl. etwêrpîmai) < *-verpja, cf. Lith. dial. 3 pers. verpja ‘spins’, cf. PEŻ I 307 f. (see also Endzelëns l. c., Stang l. c.).

3 pers. kûntî ‘protects’ < *kuntja (Endzelëns l. c., Stang l. c., PEŻ II 302).

§ 222. e) *auja-stem forms are: 3 pers. (in the meaning of the 1 pers. sg.101) dînkama, dînkîama (III) = *dînkauia ‘thanks’; 1 pers. pl. dînkauimai, dînkauimai are innovations according to 3 pers. *dînkau(i) (< *-auja) (§ 212); cf. Endzelëns l. c., PEŻ I 204;

100 Great prussologists could not resist the temptation to compare Pr. III (postânaí)-ai with Gk. opt. (πατισθανεῖ) -ai as well as Pr. III poklaúsimanas (1x!) with Gk. part. pt. pass. (πατισθενονος) (thus already Brugmann KGr. 316; first denied by Mažiulis PKP II 297165). Unfortunately, Prussian “optative” forms in -ai are used in an indicative meaning (such optative meaning as postânaí ‘werde’ III 485 corresponds to cases when indicative is used for optative). Thus they appear to be the same forms in -a (in the na-stems, postânaí, as well as in the other, ina-stems: ebsignai / ebsigna, mukina, wartîna, swîntina), i.e. they occurred due to alternation -ai / -a: (ni)swîntinai III 5115 = swîntina III 4517, cf. Palmaitis BGR 224, as well as fn’s 12, 27, 39, 43, 89. – L.P.

101 Cf. fn’s 97, 99.
3 pers. *pogerdawie ‘narrates’ (= *-auja) and *pogerdawi ‘promises’ (PEŻ III 306 and 349 respectively);


The same is to be said about 3 pers. *wêraui ‘lasts’, *wûkawi ‘calls’. Unattested forms of this kind are implied by if. *grîkaut ‘to confess sins’, *neikaut ‘to walk’, *kariaut (restored from the verbal noun kariausnan) ‘to make war’ etc.

Taking into account Lithuanian forms of the type *juokáu-ja / *juokúo-ja, Endzelîns SV 111 wonders at the absence of the stem-ending Pr. *-ô- beside Pr. -au-. I think that the Prussians had only -au-, cf. BS 446 etc.¹⁰²

§ 223. f) ūia-stem forms are: 3 pers. (in the meaning of the 1 pers. sg.) *crixtia ‘baptizes’¹⁰¹ (for -a cf. Mažiulis Baltistica I Priedas 97)¹⁰¹ = *krixtîja (cf. Lith. krikšťja, krikštyja ‘idem’, Latv. krikstîju ‘idem’) beside if. *crixtitw(e)i; 3 pers. refl. *grîki(-si) ‘sins’ having -i < *-ĩja; 1 pers. pl. *grîkimai (with stem vocalism accomodated to 3 pers. grîki-; § 212); in a similar way arose 3 pers. madli, schlûsi as well as 1 pers. pl. madlimai, -schlûsimai respectively. Cf. also Endzelîns l. c.

§ 224. g) ėja-stem forms are:

3 pers. *budê ‘is awake’, cf. Lith. dial. budêja (on place of original i-stem bûdi ‘idem’) beside if. *budêti : OSl. bûdëti ‘idem’ etc.;


3 pers. druwe ‘believes’ (in the sense of the 1st and the 2nd persons

¹⁰² On the basis of Jerzy Kuryłowicz’s conclusion about “mythologic” character of reconstructing Indoeuropean alternation ou : õu, as a source of Lith. au : uo, V. Mažiulis has shown that uo (< *ô) automatically appeared as a member of apophonic alternation u : au after its counterpart ie (< *ei) had been included into the alternation i : ai : ei. However the Prussians had never had a diphthong ie. Cf. BS 49. – L.P.

¹⁰³ Cf. ftn. 97.
in singular\textsuperscript{103}); forms 6 pers. sg. \textit{druwēse}, 2 pers. pl. \textit{druwētei} are innovations according to pattern 3 pers. \textit{druwē} (§ 212); (II) \textit{drowy} (2x) (with -y = *-ɨ- < *-ɨ) beside (I) \textit{drowe} (2x) (with -e = *-ē) came into being due to accomodation to inf. \textit{druwīt} with ɨ- < *-ē\textsuperscript{104}, see PEŻ I 234, cf. Endzelīns SV 108, 111. Prussian verb ‘to believe’ was derived from a substantive ‘faith’ (PEŻ l. c. with bibl.).

3 pers. \textit{giwe} ‘lives’ (if. \textit{giwīt} having -ɨ- < *-ē-), if not a mistake instead of \textit{giwa} (Stang Vergl. Gr. 452), < *gīvēja ‘idem’ (Endzelīns SV 111, Stang l. c., PEŻ I 376 with bibl.); cf. Lith. gývēja ‘comes to live’ as well as (for the meaning) Lith. gýti ‘to live’ and gýti ‘to convalesce’ (for these words see Skardžius ŽD 458 f.)\textsuperscript{105};

3 pers. \textit{pallapse} ‘desires’ = *palapsē ending in *-ē < *-ēja, beside if. \textit{pallaipsītwei}, were derived from subst. *\textit{palaipsa-} (\textit{pallaips} III) ‘desire’; cf. Lith. subst. bādas ‘hunger’ --> v. bādēti ‘to starve’ (for the latter see Skardžius ŽD 521). Cf. also PEŻ III 215 f. (s.v. \textit{pallapsītwei}) with bibl.;

3 pers. \textit{milē} ‘loves’ (if. \textit{milijt} < *mīlē-) < *mīlēja ‘idem’ (cf. Latv. mīlē ‘idem’) on place of original *mīli ‘idem’ (: Lith. mīli ‘idem’); cf. Stang Vergl. Gr. 320, PEŻ III 138 f. (with bibl.);

3 pers. \textit{segge} ‘does’ (: if. \textit{seggīt}), with its -e = *-ē < *-ēja, was a basic form for innovations 2 pers. sg. \textit{seggēse}, 1 pers. pl. \textit{seggēmai}, 2 pers. pl. \textit{seggēti} (§ 212), cf. PEŻ 91 f. with bibl.);

3 pers. (also in the meaning of 1 pers. sg.) \textit{paskulē} ‘incites’ (: if. \textit{paskulīton}) ends in -ē < *-ēja (Endzelīns SV 112). Pr. inf. (pa)skulī- < Pr. (III) *skūlī- < Pr. skūlē- ‘to demand a debt back’ -- subst. Pr. *skūlē ‘debt’ PEŻ III 329 f.;

3 pers. \textit{auschaudē} ‘trusts’ (if. \textit{auschaudītwei} ‘to trust’) ends in -ē < *-ēja (Endzelīns l. c., PEŻ I 120 f. with bibl.);

1 pers. pl. \textit{waidleimai} ‘we conjure’ is an innovation accomodated to 3 pers. *\textit{waidlei} (§ 212) with -ei < *-ēja (Endzelīns l. c., PEŻ IV 212 f.);

\textsuperscript{104} Cf. ftn. 12. – \textit{L.P}.

\textsuperscript{105} Cf. ftn. 98. – \textit{L.P}.
3 pers. *enwackē* (with -ē < *-ēi < *-ēja), *enwackēi* (*-ēi < *-ēja) ‘calls’ were basic forms for innovations 1 pers. pl. *enwackēmai* and *enwackēimai* respectively (§ 212)\(^{106}\), cf. PEŻ I 278 f. with bibl.

3 pers. *wargē* ‘arouses pain’ (if. *wargitwei* < *-ētwei*) ends in -ē < *-ēja*, cf. Endzelīns l.c., PEŻ IV 221.

§ 225. 3 verbs possess two parallel present forms each, i.e. in -ē and in -ā:

3 pers. *billē* ‘speaks’ (ending in -ē < *-ēja*) has a parallel form *billā* ‘idem’ (ending in -ā < *-āja*). According to 3 pers. *billē*, an innovation 1 pers. pl. *billēmai* was produced (§ 212); if . *billū* with -ī- < *-ē-. There is also a parallel present form in -i: 3 pers. *billi* (cf. 3 pers. *drowy*, § 224);

3 pers. *quoitē* and *quoitā* ‘wishes’ in their turn became basic forms for innovations 2 pers. pl. *quoitēti* and 1 pers. pl. *quoitāmai* respectively (§ 212). The existence of inf. *quoitūt* (with -ī- < *-ē-* is implied in part. pt. pass. nom.-acc. neut. sg. *paquoititōn* ‘(what was) wanted’.

3 pers. *stallē* and *stallā* ‘stands’ were basic for innovations 1 pers. pl. *stallēmai* and 2 pers. pl. *stallēti* respectively (§ 212); if . *stallū* with -ī- < *-ē-. There is also a parallel present form in -i: 3 pers. *stalli* (cf. above 3 pers. *billi*).

§ 226. Discussed present forms in -ē (< *-ēja*) and in -ā (< *-āja*) correlate in the same way as Latv. *guodēju* and *guodāju*, cf. Endzelīns l. c., van Wijk Apr. St. 21 f., otherwise Berneker PS 214 f.\(^{107}\)

---

\(^{106}\) Here one sees origin of the alternation (-ēi l / -ē) [generalized (-ēi l / -ē)] etc. cf. fn. 12 etc. However in such cases as 1 pers. pl. *enwackēmai* or pc. ps. act. acc. pl. *waataintins* a syncopation may be assumed too, e.g. *-ējamai > -ēmai, -ējant- > -ēant-. – L.P.

\(^{107}\) Cf. also Lith. *štiautėja* / *štiautoja*. Such correlates occur in different dialects. Even if A. Will was accustomed to *kvaitīt*, but P. Megott used *kvaıtār*, this cannot explain variability in such frequent and needful verb as ‘to speak’. One should pay attention that both ‘to speak’ and ‘to stand’ have a resonant l before stem ending, but this resonant with all probability was palatal (*kaulei, kaulins*, cf. fn. 32). This means that spellings *billē* and *bilā* reflect the same ps. (= pt. *billai* III) *bil’āi / *bil’ā*, what means *bilēj < ps. *būlēja* (pt. *būlējā*) because of the if. *billū*, not *billāt*! If one could spell *kaulei* and *kaulai* (cf. spellings of illiterate Lithuanians *akei* = *akiai*, *žvakiai* = *žvakei*), what was the same, then the same were spellings *bille(i)* and *billai* too. The same is true for *stallē, stallā = *stal’ā < *stalēja*, cf. Palmaitis BGR 222 f. – L.P.
§ 227. One can assume together with Endzelîns SV 102, 112 f. that there were also such parallel forms, as *-inêja (cf. Lith. frequ. kand-inêja ‘frequent bites’) and *-inâja in Prussian:

3 pers. enlaipinne ‘desires, orders’, ta[u]kinne ‘promises’ possibly have -inne < *-inei < *-inêja;

3 pers. (in the meaning of the 2 pers. sg.) sâtuinei ‘satiates’ possibly has -inei < *-inêja (Endzelîns SV 112 differently from PEŽ IV 69 (what I do not believe any more);

3 pers. powaidinnei, powaidinne ‘shows’ possibly has -innei, -inne < *-inêja

§ 228. h) āja-stem forms are:

3 pers. kelsâi / kaltzâ ‘sounds’ = *kalsâi / kalsâ (PEŢ II 99 s.v. kaltzâ) with -âi / -â < *-âja (PEŢ l. c. with bibl.)109;

3 pers. maitâ ‘nourish’ [maitâtunsin ‘to feed (upon)’] with -â < *-âja, cf. Endzelîns SV 113, PEŢ III 99 f. ;

3 pers. peisâi ‘writes’ [: part. pt. pass. peisâton ‘(what is) written’] with -â < *-âja, cf. PEŢ III 243 f. with bibl., Kaukienë LVI I 204);

3 pers. enwaitia ‘accosts’ (in an optative meaning, PEŢ 278) with -â = -â < *-âja, cf. OSl. vêštajo ‘I speak’; 1 pers. pl. waitiâmai is an innovation accomodated to 3 pers. enwaitia (§ 212);

Then such verbs should have corresponding 1) infinitives in *-inêt < *-inêt. However only usual if. -int is testified: powaidint ‘to show’, not ‘powaidinnit. Similar are other forms, i.e. 2) of the verbal noun: potaukinsnas, not ‘potaikinnisnas, 3) of the past paticiple passive: potaukinton, not ‘potaukinnit; enlaipints, not ‘enlaipinnits, 4) of the past paticiple active: (po)taukinnwuns, not *(po)taukinnwuns. With all probability spellings -inne(i) instead of -inna(i) appeared due to insufficiently clearly heard unstressed -na(-) in the final position. Besides that, one sees the same variation in the na-stems too: “opt.” engaunai = engaunei (pogauni 1x is probably a misspelling instead of pogaunai; otherwise the stem should be *-nâja, not *-na).

As for Endzelin’s assumption of the existence of Latvian-like verbs with a suffix *-inâja in Prussian, it also fails without finding other necessary forms, derived from such a stem, i.e. corresponding infinite (infinitive, verbal noun, participles) forms. Cf. ftn. 112. – L.P.

109 Here V. Mažiulis de facto recognizes alternation Pr. (Cat.) -âi / -â (cf. ftn’s 12, 23, 27, 39, 43, 89, 92). – L.P.
3 pers. *dwigubbū* ‘doubts’ (in the meaning of the 2nd person in singular\(^{110}\)) with -\(û\) < \(*-\ddot{u}\) (after a labial consonant) < \(*-\ddot{a}\) < \(*-\ddot{a}ja\);

3 pers. *gīwu* ‘lives’ (in the meaning of the 2nd person in singular\(^{110}\)) is a hapax legomenon (PEŻ I 377) and may be a misspelling instead gīwa ‘idem’ (cf. Stang Vergl. Gr. 452), not any \(āja\)-stem\(^{111}\).

§ 229. 3 pers. *swintinai / swintina* ‘sanctifies’ (cf. if. *swintint* ‘to sanctify’) and similar instances with a suffix spelled -\(inai / -ina\) may originate in suffix \(*-\ddot{iāja}\) (cf. Latv. -\(ina\) < \(*-\ddot{iā}\)\), but 3 pers. *mukinna* (cf. if. *mukint* ‘to teach’) and similar instances with a suffix spelled -\(inna\) may originate in suffix \(*-\ddot{ina}\) (cf. Lith. *mokīna*), see Stang Vergl. Gr. 370 f., for *mukinna* cf. Endzelīns SV 114\(^{112}\).

For Prussian (Cat.) stems and forms of the present tense cf. Kaukienė PK 87 ff.

### The future tense


In all other instances a periphrastic future is used which may have arisen due to German and Polish influence\(^{113}\): *wīrst* ‘becomes, become’ + part. pt. act., e.g.: *wīrst boūuns* ‘becomes been = will be’, *pergubuns wīrst* ‘being come becomes = will come’ etc.

\(^{110}\) Any inflection, which may show person, has been lost here due to shortening \(*-\ddot{a}ja > -\ddot{a}j\), therefore such forms are not more the 3rd, than the 2nd or the 1st person in singular. – L.P.

\(^{111}\) See fin. 98. – L.P.

\(^{112}\) Why then the infinitive is not ‘swintināt’ (cf. Latv. *svečināt*), but *swintint*? Why its past participle is not ‘swintināwuns’ (cf. Latv. *svečinājīs*), but *swintinons*? Cf. fin’s 100, 108. – L.P.

\(^{113}\) In spite of precise semantic and etymologic correspondence between Germ. *wird* and Pr. *wīrst*, periphrastic future is not any calque, because the second part of the construction is “Polish”, not “German” (active participle, not the infinitive!). – L.P.
The past tense

Similarly to Lithuanian and Latvian, 2 verbal stems were used in forms of the past tense in Prussian, i.e. an ā-stem and an ē-stem:


§ 232. b) ē-stem forms are: weddē(din) ‘took (her)’, ismigē ‘fell asleep’, pertraûki (with -i < *-ē unstressed) ‘pulled on’, jmmitz, ymmits (I, with -i < *-ē unstressed), ymmeits, ymmeyts (II, with -ei- possibly on place of *-i- < *-ē-) ‘took’, cf. Endzelûns SV 118.

§ 233. From Pr. pt. *-ājâ (: Lith. -ôjo, if. -ôtû) come 3 pers. pt. -āi, -ā, -û, see Stang Vergl. Gr. 375, e.g.:

dai, daits ‘gave’ imply Pr. *dâjâ ‘idem’, coming from *dô of the aorist origin + -jâ (cf. also Stang Vergl. Gr. 391; for Pr. ā < *ô see § 18);
signai, ebs[ï]gnâ ‘blessed (“marked”, “crossed”)’ (: if. signât, cf. Lith. if. žegnoti, ps. žegnôjo);
postâi ‘began, started’ (: if. postât, cf. Lith. if. stôti, pt. stôjo);
billai, billa, billâts ‘spoke’ (: ps. billâ<115, cf. Lith. if. bylôti, pt. bylôjo);
widdai ‘saw’ (PEŽ IV 234);
teikû (< *-ă) ‘made’ (: if. teickut ‘to make’);

114 Since preterite stem ending was shortened at the end of the word *-î(ij)â > -(ij)â, such forms (if the root vocalism or stem suffix did not change) coincided in the past and in the present tense. Present-like endings -i < *-ija and -i < *-î < *-ē appeared additionally to -a in the 3rd person. [As a result, new patterns were formed having the same endings in the past and in the present. Tense marking became neutralized in most instances (a conclusion formerly taught by V. Mažiulis) in dialects of the Catechisms, and a need of analytic participle constructions appeared.]

Consequently, an ending -a of the 3rd and singular persons was frequent and morphologically strong. Therefore it could occur instead of phonetically regular -u (after labials and gutturals) due to “Systemzwang”. Cf. ftn. 94 and www.eidem.lt/dialangn.htm. – L.P.

§ 234. Pr. (III) pt. 3 pers. bêi (also spelled beî and bhe) ‘was’ is particularly archaic. It implies Pr. *bê-jä ‘idem’ (Stang Vergl. Gr. 460) which, together with OSl. aor. bê ‘was’, OLith. opt. 2 pers. sg. -bei, comes from Balt.-Sl. *bê- ‘was’ with its allomorph Balt.-Sl. *bî- ‘idem’ > OLith. athematic biti ‘was’ with the root -i- < *-î-, Latv. bij-a ‘idem’ (with -ij- < *-î-) etc., see Stang Vergl. Gr. 429, Kazlauskas LKIG 293 ff.

Balt.-Sl. *bê-/*bî- was derived from IE v. *bhû- ‘to be’ (Lith. bûti, etc.) with apophonic correlating suffixes *-î-/*-ê-, i.e.:

a) IE *bhû- + *-ê- > *bh(u)ê- > Balt.-Sl. *bê- (with *-ê- having regularly disappeared before *-ê-) and

b) IE *bhû- + *-î- > *bh(u)i- > Balt.-Sl. *bî-.

For Prussian (Cat.) stems and forms of the past tense cf. Kaukienë PK 90 ff.

**Optative forms**

a) imperative

§ 235. Imperative forms of athematic verbs end in 2 pers. sg. -eis, 2 pers. pl. -eiti in the Catechisms:

sg. ieis, pl. ieiti ‘go!’, ideiti ‘eat!’, sëiti ‘be!’, cf. Stang Vergl. Gr. 437, 439, Endzelîns SV 120 with bibl.

Imperative (optative) forms of this kind were supported by ja-stem imperatives with [*-ja-] -ei- (see further).

§ 236. Imperative forms of thematic verbs end in 2 pers. sg. -ais, 2 pers. pl. -aiti in the Catechisms:

sg. gerbais, pl. gerbaiti ‘speak!’ (: if. gërbt ‘to speak’, sg. immais, pl. immaiti ‘take!’ (: if. îmt ‘to take’), sg. wedais ‘lead!’ (: if. westwei ‘to lead, bring’; for the form weddeis ‘idem’ see further).

Formant -ai- comes from Balt. opt. *-ai-/*-ei- in these forms, cf. OSl. 2 pers. pl. nesête (with -ê- < *-oi- = Balt. *-ai-) beside 2 pers. sg. nesi (with -i < *-ei-, not *-oi-, cf. BS 172) ‘carry!’, cf. Endzelîns l. c. – cf. Lithuanian ja- and i-stem imp. refl. 2 pers. sg. -ies < *-ei- (sukiës, Bariës, etc.), Kazlauskas LKIG 378 f. Pr. 2 pers. sg. weddeis (III) ‘lead!’ (beside
I wedais ‘idem’) may have acquired its -ei- from ja-stem imperatives with -ei- (see further).\footnote{More likely (than 2 different suffixes for the same form) is that -ai-, -ey-, -ei- are allographs of *-ai-, i.e. both wedais (1x I) and wedeys (1x II), weddeis (1x III) reflect an a-stem form *vedais. Cf. spellings key (I) vs. kay (I), mukinaita (I) vs. mukinai (II) and many similar variations so much expectable in an unstressed position (the formant of imperative was unstressed, when not an a-stem like signa/sf, cf. kirdeitei, tûlnainaiti). V. Mažiulis warns in § 57: “The Germans (resp. Germanized Prussians) could confuse spellings -ain- and -ein- in Prussian texts (especially in Catechisms)”. This concerns not only -ain-, -ein-. Cf. also § 237. – L.P.}

§ 237. Pr. inä-stem imperative forms are attested sufficiently: kackinna ‘let have!’ (cf. kackint, PEŻ II 83 ff.), smuninai ‘honour!’ (cf. if. smûnint), klumstinta ‘knock!’, mukina ‘teach!’ (cf. 3 pers. ps. mukina), erpilninaita ‘fill!’, tickinaita ‘do!’ (cf. tickint), tûlninaita ‘multiply!’; spellings with -ei- may be errors instead of -ai- (Stang Vergl. Gr. 439): mukineyti ‘teach!’; poauginneiti ‘bring up!’, powaidinneiti ‘show!’.

§ 238. Pr. ja-stem imperative forms have -ei- < *-iai-: draudieiti ‘forbid!’ (cf. Lith. 3 pers. ps. draûdžia), poieiti ‘drink!’, etwerreis ‘open!’ (cf. Lith. vêria), etwerpeis ‘forgive!’ (cf. Lith. veîpia, PEŻ I 307 f.), pokunteis ‘protect!’ (for this verb see PEŻ II 302 s.v. kûnti), tensieiti ‘drag!’ (cf. Lith. 3 pers. ps. têsia, PEŻ IV 192 s.v. tûnstwe).

§ 239. Imperative forms of Pr. ä-stems were derived from corresponding infinitive stems: 2 pers. sg. daits, 2 pers. pl. däiti ‘give!’ (cf. if. dâtwel ‘to give’), frequent 2 pers. sg. ettrais, 2 pers. pl. atträiti ‘answer!’; cf. Stang Vergl. Gr. 437, Endzelîns l. c.

§ 240. Imperative correspondences of the ë-stem infinitives (the same whether this -ë- < *-ë-, or < *-ë- end in sg. -ës, pl. -ë(e)i: crixtei [with -(ë)(ë)- < *-ë-], crixteiti (with -ei- < *-ë-) ‘baptize!’; madliti ‘pray!’ (cf. madlit ‘to entreat’ with -i- < *-ë-), engraudës ‘have mercy!’ (possibly with -ë- < *-ë-, not *-ë-, endirës ‘discern!’ (possibly with -ë- < *-ë-, cf. PEŻ I 264), 2 sg. mijlis, 2 pl. milijti ‘love!’ [with -i(s)-, -ij- < *-ë- with all probability, cf. PEŻ III 138 f.], etc.

§ 241. Imperative forms of Pr. au-stems were derived from corre-
sponding infinitive stems: 


b) permissive

§ 242. Prussian permissive possesses only one inflection -sei (14x) of the 3rd person, spelled -se (9x), -sai (3x), -si (2x), e.g.: seisei, boîse ‘let ... be!’; audasei ‘let (it) happen!’, dase ‘let (him) give!’, galbse ‘let (him) help!’, pareysey ‘let ... come!’ tussîse ‘let (her) be silent!’, wirse ‘let become!’, pokûnsi ‘let (him) protect!’ It seems that the origin of Prussian permissive 3 pers. -sei is connected with an optative -s- form of the future tense, cf. Stang Vergl. Gr. 442 f., Endzelîns SV 122 f. with bibl.

§ 243. Above discussed permissive forms in -sei are used mostly in main clauses. As for subordinate clauses, one finds there more often forms in -lai in the 3rd Catechism. Their meaning is close to subjunctive mood, e.g.: kaden ... (ni) boûlai III 113-23-27 ‘when ... would (not) be’, ickai ainonts ... turîlai III 99 ...11 ‘if anybody ... had’, quai niturrîlai III 103-12 ‘which should not have’, madlîmai ... kai stas ... perêilai III 49-18 ‘we pray ... that it ... come’, Tou quoitîlaisi III 79-14-15 ‘Thou wouldst wish’, enkasmu mes ... turrîlîmai boûl III 113-21-23 (with -limai < *-laimai) ‘in what we ... should be’, quoitîlaiti III 67-14-15 ‘ye would wish’, etc.

§ 244. An attempt to derive Prussian formant -lai, together with Lith. prtc. lâã, Latv. prtc. laî, from v. *laid-/-leid- ‘to let’ (e.g. Fraenkel 329 with bibl., cf. Endzelîns SV 124 with bibl.) was strictly criticized by Bûga I 452 ff. He showed on rich Baltic material that all these formants come from particle *l- extended with various vocal and diphthong elements (cf. Endzelîns l. c., Stang Vergl. Gr. 443). This opinion of K. Bûga has been supported and proved by Toporov PJ IV 418–436 (with bibl.).

---

Infinite verbs

Infinitive

§ 245. Infinitive forms with the ending -t (e.g. boūt ‘to be’, dāt ‘to give’, etc.) are used in the 3rd Catechism only. This -t is usually derived from *-ti (cf. Lith. -ti), although original *-tū is no less plausible (cf. further).

§ 246. In all Catechisms infinitive forms with endings -twel (−twey) and -twi (2x III) are usual, e.g. dātwei ‘to give’, girtwei ‘to praise’, westwei ‘to lead’, biātwei ‘to be afraid’, etc. They come from WBaltic tu-stem dat. (sg.) *-t(ve)i [< *-tu + *-(ei)] which was an allomorph of WBalt. *-tū (> Pr. III -t, see above). Cf. more thoroughly BS 272–296.

§ 247. Sometimes if. -tun (-ton) occurs (e.g. issprestun ‘to understand’ etc.) which originates in Baltic supine without any doubt (cf. Lith. eĩ-tu < *-tun).

Participles

Active present

§ 248. This participle is derived with suf. -nt-: skellànts ‘owing’, gerund giwantei ‘while living’, dîlants ‘working’ (PEŻ I 200), nidruwîntin gen. sg. ‘not believing’, niaubillînts ‘not speaking, mute’, acc. sg. rîpintin ‘following’, (emprijkki)-sins ‘(against)-being’ (possibly with -in- on place of -en-) < (Cat.) *sents ‘being’ < *sentis ‘idem’ (PEŻ I 257).

§ 249. Nom. sg. masc. Ending -nts in forms skellànts (of an a-stem verb) and dîlants (of an ā-stem verb) comes from *-ntis (cf. attributive and enough old Lith. sùkantis ‘spinning’) with an i-stem inflection nom. sg. *-is > Pr. (Cat.!) -s (see § 139 and PEŻ I 343 f. s.v. *geytys). The ending -ens in Pr. (II) syndens ‘sitting’ reflects *-ans < *-ants, but the ending -ats in Pr. (I) sindats ‘idem’ should be corrected into *-āts = *-ants < *-antis (for all this cf. PEŻ IV 109 f. with bibl.). Both instances represent a form of a n-infixed a-stem verb with above discussed final segment Pr. (Cat.) *-ants < *-antis. The latter possibly implies Pr. *-antis (: Lith.
vérd-antis = Latv. dial. veīd-uots), see § 139, cf. Endzelâns SV 126. It
seems that an older inflection of this participle was (?) Balt.-Sl. *-ön (e.g.
*vedōn ‘leading’, not Balt. *-ant(i)s; cf. BS 242–246.

§ 250. **Nom. sg. neut.** (participle) form cannot be seen in Pr.
(III) enterpo (corrected into *enterpon) and enterpen (Endzelâns SV 127),
cf. PEŽ I 227 f. (woth bibl.).

§ 251. **Gen. sg.** niaubillânt’s ‘not speaking, mute’ ends in Pr. -is <
innovative i-stem Pr. (Cat.) gen. sg. *-is, cf. § 141, Endzelâns l. c.

§ 252. **Dat. sg.** (emprïki)sentismû ‘to (against) being = positioned’
ends in pronominal -smu and has an i-stem ending -i before -smu, cf.
Endzelâns l. c.

§ 253. Gerunds giwântei ‘while living’, stâîntie and stâînti ‘by
standing’ reflect archaic C-stem dative inflection *-ei /*-i, cf. BS 248 ff.

§ 254. **Acc. sg.** nidruwîntin ‘not believing’ and rîpintin ‘following’
have an i-/C-stem inflection -in, cf. van Wijk Apr. St. 36, Endzelâns
l. c. (cf. Lith. tîl-intî).

§ 255. **Nom. pl. masc.** skellântei and skellântai ‘owing’ are
innovations ending in a pronominal -ei and nominal -ai respectively (cf. §
‘women’] vanished in Prussian as well as in all Baltic dialects.

§ 256. **Acc. pl. masc.** forms (wargu)seggîentins III 93−1/2 ‘(malici-
ously) doing’ < *segējântins and (emprijki) waitiâiântins III 87−12 ‘speak-
ing (against)’ (with waitiâiântins to be corrected into *waitiâiântins,
Endzelâns l. c.) end in i-(C-)stem inflection Pr. acc. pl. masc.-fem. -ins <
Balt. masc. *-îns, fem. *-îs, cf. § 132 (with bibl.)¹¹⁸.

¹¹⁸ Endzelâns l. c. points to A. Bezzenberger who was the first to correct waitiâiântins into
*waitiâiantins. As for J. Endzelâns himself, he on the contrary, points to no less possible compre-
hension of this form as of an âja-stem = OSl. vēščajo, which in its full shape could be Pr.
*waitiâiantins. Why should Bezzenberger’s correction be accepted? Not because of finite plural
forms in which as if the 3rd person is generalized (druvâ-mai, waitiâ-mai): it is namely 3 pers.
enwackîmai which points to a possible syncope, similar to waitiâiântins, cf. ft. 106. – L.P.
Passive present

§ 257. Nom. pl. fem. Pr. (1x III) poklausīmanas (< *-ās) ‘listenable’, because of its segment -manas, is traditionally compared with formant Gk. pc. ps. pass. -μενο- / -μενη- etc. and, therefore, derived from WBalt. *-mana-/*-manā-, cf. bibl. apud PEŽ III 310 f. Nevertheless such a reconstruction cannot be supported by internal data of Baltic and Slavic languages (Ambrazas DIS 50 f.). I think that Pr. poklausīmanas is not any present participle. It is an adjective *paklausīmen`s (its *-e- was spelled as -a- in III), derived with a suf. *-enā- (cf. also enimumne, PEŽ I 267) from Pr. pc. ps. pass. *(pa)klausīma-/*-(pa)klausīmā- ‘(now being) listened’. The latter was derived from infinitive stem Pr. *klausī- ‘to listen’ with Pr. suf. *-ma-/*-mā- (< Balt.-Sl. *-ma-/*-mā-). For details cf. PEŽ III 310 f., Ambrazas l. c.\(^{119}\)

Active past

§ 258. Nom. sg. masc. ends in -uns (e.g.: ēduns ‘having eaten’, pergubuns ‘having come’, dāuns ‘having given’, etc.), which is also spelled as -ons (e.g.: pergūbons ‘having come’, sīdons ‘having sat down’, etc.) and even as -ans (e.g. pergūbans, sīdans, etc.). The latter appeared on place of -uns possibly under the influence of pc. ps. act. -ans (< -ants), cf. Endzelins SV 128, PKP II 252 f.). For the origin of Pr. pc. ps. pass. -uns see further.

§ 259. Acc. sg. masc. (ainan)gimmusin ‘(single)born’ possesses a C-stem inflection -in and a stem suffix -us- (cf. Lith. gimusį, OSl. nesęšę ‘having carried’) < Balt.-Sl. *-us- (see further).

§ 260. Nom. pl. masc. [immusis ‘having taken’, aupallusis ‘having found’, refl. embaddusisi ‘having stuck themselves’ (PEŽ I 249)] ends in -usis < *-*sīs (cf. Lith. dial. sūkusys ‘having spun’), what is an i-stem innovation on place of original C-stem form (see further).

\(^{119}\) A brilliant career of Prussian poklausīmanas > ποχλαυσίμενος from hapax legomenon to Brugmann’s Bible of comparativists (cf. Kurze Vergleichende, § 387, 3) reveals accuracy with which classical truths of Indoeuropean linguistics were grounded. One should not forget that these are, among others, a seven-case declension, or Common-IE paradigmatic aorist, which just represent these truths. – L.P.
§ 261. **Acc. pl. masc.** ends in -\textit{usins} (*aulāuusins ‘dead, having died’), spelled \textit{aulauūsins} 1x, as well as \textit{aulausins} 1x, \textit{aulaunsis} 1x II) and in -\textit{usens} < -\textit{usins} (\textit{aulauuussens} 1x I), i.e. has a suf. -\textit{us-} and (C- >) i-stem inflection -\textit{ins} (§ 143).

§ 262. Prussian and Baltic active past participle possessed a \textit{C}-stem (an athematic) paradigm. Its reconstruction has not been enough clear up to now (Endzelīns BVSF 225 ff., Stang Vergl. Gr. 265 ff., Zinkevičius LKIG II 249 f.). It seems that WBalt. nom. sg. *-\textit{uns} and EBalt. nom. sg. *-\textit{ens} (= *-ē\textit{ns}, not *-ē\textit{ns}, because of the circumflex, not acute, tone in Lith. -ė\textit{s}) come from Balt. *-\textit{vens} with -\textit{n-} borrowed from the paradigm of corresponding present participle. Balt. *-\textit{vens} comes from apophonic Balt. *-\textit{ves} (: *-\textit{us-}), cf. Endzelīns l. c., Stang l. c. A dilemmic assumption of Stang l. c. that Pr. -\textit{uns} (: -\textit{us-}) could come from IE *-\textit{yōs} (: *-\textit{us-}) cannot be proved on the material of Baltic and Slavic languages. The latter shows the existence of Balt. *-\textit{ves} (: *-\textit{us-}) < IE *-\textit{yes} (: *-\textit{us-}) parallel to IE *-\textit{yōs} (: *-\textit{us-}) in other dialects (for the latter see Szemerényi Einf. 294).

§ 263. On some stage Balt. *-\textit{ves} (: *-\textit{us-}) --> *-\textit{vens} (: *-\textit{us-}) lost its -\textit{v-} (Endzelīns l. c., Stang l. c.) and was reshaped into WBalt. *-\textit{uns} (: *-\textit{us-}) for understandable reasons. However it survived in EBalt. [*-\textit{vens} (: *-\textit{us-}) -->] *-\textit{ens} > Lith. -ė\textit{s} (Latv. -\textit{is}), e.g. būv-ė\textit{s}, nēš-ė\textit{s}.

Balt. (e.g. \textit{a-stem}) pc. ps. act. *-\textit{ans} (\textit{> Lith. -qs}) : *-\textit{an} (\textit{> Lith. -q}), was a pattern to form an asigmatic pc. pt. act. nom.-acc. sg. neut. *-\textit{ven} (beside *-\textit{vens}) in some dialects. This *-\textit{ven}, used also for nom.-acc. pl. neut., turned into *-\textit{en} (\textit{> Lith. -ę, e.g. nēşę etc.}), cf. Stang Vergl. Gr. 267\textsuperscript{120}.

\textsuperscript{120} Does this mean an existence of unattested nom.-acc. neut. *\textit{dāwusī} (§ 126) > Pr. (Cat.) *\textit{dāwus} (not any *\textit{dāwun}) in Prussian (in Catechisms a masculine form is used)? It is hardly correct to speak about nominative or accusative cases in Common Baltic because its structure was not “accusative”. V. Mažiulis uses terms “ergative” in BS and (corrected) “active” in PEŻ, what means that Balt. *-\textit{ans}, *-\textit{vens} were “active” (\textit{> masculine-feminine}), but *-\textit{an}, *-\textit{us} were “inactive” forms (nominative and accusative cases did not exist at all). Absence of neuter plural in Prussian and absence of paradigmatic neuter gender in EBaltic beside the use of singular “neut.” -ę for the plural points to not developed neuter in Baltic. This was connected with number-indifferent 3rd “person” in verb. See Palmaitis BGR 234–237 and ftn. 38. – L.P.
Passive present

These participles are derived from infinitive stems with suf. -ta/-tä- in Prussian, as well as in Lithuanian and Latvian.

§ 264. **Nom. sg. masc.:** crixtits ‘baptized’ (: Lith. krìkštytas, Latv. krikstīts), laikūts ‘kept’ (with -ū- < -ā-; if. laikūt ‘to keep’), mukints ‘taught’ (with -ū- < -ā-; if. mukint ‘to teach’), enimts ‘taken’ (: if. ėmt ‘to take’), dāts (III), daetcz (II) = *dāts (§ 18) ‘given’ (: if. dātwei / dāt ‘to give’) etc.

**Nom. sg. fem.:** ėmtā (III) ‘taken’ (: if. ėmt ‘to take’).

§ 265. **Nom. sg. neut.** ends in -an and in *-ā (§ 144):

* maysotan (E) = *maišōtan ‘motley (= mixed)’ (: if. *maišātwei ‘to mix’, PEŽ III 99), dāton ‘given’ (: if. dātwei / dāt ‘to give’), pralieiton (with -on instead of -an) ‘shed (poured out)’ etc.;

* isrankīt III 113, ‘rescued’ (< *izrankīt-a, § 9) in a predicative function, etc. (cf. Endzelīns SV 130 with bibl.).

§ 267. **Acc. sg.:** pertrinctan ‘stun (stubborn)’ (: if. *pertrinktvei ‘to stun), pogauton (with -on instead of -an) ‘received’ (: if. pogaūt ‘to receive, start’), etc.

§ 268. **Nom. pl. masc.:** entensītei ‘drawn into’, pogautei ‘conceived’ (with a pronominal -ei¹²¹) and (with a substantive -ai) absignātai ‘blessed’ [: if. signāt ‘to bless (to “mark” by crossing’)], enkaitītai ‘instigated’ (: if. *enkaitītvei ‘to instigate’), milijtai ‘(be)loved’ (: if. milijt ‘to love’). For the inflections -ei and -ai see § 145.

§ 269. **Acc. pl. fem.:** senditans (< *sendētans) ‘folded (put together)’. For -ans cf. §§ 112, 147.

¹²¹ Cf. ftn. 116. – L.P.
8. INVARIABLE PARTS OF SPEECH

Adverbs

§ 270. a) Adverbs derived from adjectives with an inflection -ai are very frequent, e.g.: labbai ‘well’ (<-- adj. labs ‘good’) = Lith. labaï (Latv. labi), skîstai ‘purely’ (<-- adj. skîsta- ‘pure’), kânxtai ‘decently’ (<-- adj. kanxta- ‘decent’), têmprai ‘dearly’ (<-- adj. têmpra- ‘dear’), etc.

Many of them have suf. -iska, e.g. prûsiskai ‘in Prussian’ (<-- adj. prûsiska- ‘Prussian’), deiwûtiskai, deiwûtiskai ‘blissfully’ (<-- adj. deiwûtiska- ‘blissful’), arwiskai ‘truly’ (<-- adj. arwiska- ‘true’), etc.

As for adv. deinenisku (beside deineniskai) ‘daily’, laimisku (beside laimiskai) ‘richly’, etnîwingisku (beside etnîwingiskai) ‘graciously’, etc. with final -u of an unclear origin (cf. Endzelîns SV 92, Stang Vergl. Gr. 276, BS 170), these are not any old forms of adverbs but innovations of translator (instead of -ai) with all probability, see PKK II 167, PEŽ I 55 s.v. ainawidiskan122.


For ainawijdei / ainaweidi (beside ainawîdai, ainawydan) ‘in the same way’, garrewingi ‘hot(ly)’, etc. cf. PEŽ I 54 f. s.v. ainawîdai, ainawijdi and PEŽ I 328 s.v. garrewingi).

122 Cf. ftn. 44. – L.P.
123 This form cannot be directly derived from Pr. *(ilg)-a = Lith. (gê)r-a, because an unstressed final vowel could not be preserved in dialects of the Catechisms (except paradigmatic instances of the “Systemzwang”). Pr. (Cat.) ilga is an allomorph of *ilgai due to alternation -a/-ai, cf. ftn’s 12, 23, 27, 39, 43, 89, 109. – L.P.
124 These pairs are not fully synonymous at least on diachronic level: adverbs derived from neutral forms originate in nominal predicates of the neutral meaning. Cf. Lith. man gêra ‘I feel myself well’ = ‘it is good for me’, i.e. the subject is defined, vs. jis dirba geraî ‘he works well’, i.e. a verbal predicate is defined. Cf. also Polish bardzo dobre! ‘very well!’ vs. wiem to dobrze ‘I know this well’, although today one says mnie jest dobrze = Lith. man geraî instead of man gêra. – L.P.
Adv. *etkûmps ‘again’ seems to be of the adjective origin too (cf. PEŻ I 296).

Finally adverbial forms of the comparative grade, derived from adjectives, should be mentioned, i.e.: *mîjs ‘more kindly’, tâls, tâls ‘further’ and *toûls ‘more’ (cf. PEŻ IV 181 f. s.v. *tâls).

§ 271. Particularly old are adverbs of the pronominal origin: *kadan ‘when’ as well as its unattested counterpart *tadan ‘then’ (see PEŻ II 63 ff. s.v. kadan). Of the pronominal origin are also adv. *tei- (i.e. teinu) ‘now’, cf. PEŻ IV 189, *tit ‘so’ (PEŻ IV 195), quei ‘where’ (§ 180).

Adv. *schai ‘here’ was derived from Pr. *si- ‘this’ (§ 166) + *-ai or *-ei (PEŻ IV 78 f.), schan ‘here’ (PEŻ IV 79 s.v. schan). For stwi ‘here’ cf. PEŻ IV 164 f., for *ten- (i.e. tenti) ‘now’ cf. PEŻ IV 191.

Adv. stwen ‘there’ (PEŻ IV 164) has borrowed its -w- from *kven ‘where’ (see Endzelîns SV 93), cf. also stwendau ‘from there’ (PEŻ II 51 s.v. isstwendau). For the latter cf. pansdau ‘then’, pirsdau ‘before’, sirsdau ‘amid’ (PEŻ s.v.v.).

There are more other adverbs in Prussian, e.g. *ainat ‘constantly, always’ (PEŻ I 52 f.), dabber ‘yet’ = *dabar (= Lith. dâbar ‘idem’, PEŻ I 169 f.), zuit ‘enough’ (PEŻ IV 273).

**Prepositions and prefixes**

§ 272. Pr. ab-/eb-/ep- ‘over’ (PEŻ I 37 f.), at-/et- (orients a situation herein, PEŻ I 106 f.), au- (orients a situation hereof, PEŻ I 110) are attested as prefixes only.

Pr. *assa / esse ‘from, about’ (PEŻ I 289–294), bhe ‘without’ (PEŻ I 139 s.v. II bhe), pagâr ‘beside’ (PEŻ III 206 f.), schlâit / sclait ‘without, except’ (also used as a conjunction, PEŻ IV 123 s.v. sclait), kirschâ ‘above, on’ (PEŻ II 196 ff.) are attested as prepositions only, but paggan ‘because of’ is used as a postposition (PEŻ III 205 f.).

§ 273. Both prepositions and prefixes are: *en / an ‘in’ (PEŻ I 257–263), er ‘till, up to’ (PEŻ I 282 f.), is ‘from’ (PEŻ III 39), na / no ‘on’ (PEŻ III 162, 191 ff.), pa / po ‘under, after, according to’ (PEŻ III 297 f.), per /
par ‘for’ (PEŻ III 256 ff.), pra / pro ‘through’ (PEŻ III 338 f.), prei ‘at, by’ (PEŻ III 347 ff.), sen / san ‘with’ (PEŻ IV 98 f.), sur(gi) ‘around’ (PEŻ IV 169).

§ 274. All prepositions govern the accusative case, sometimes – the dative case. Ppos. paggan governs the genitive. For Prussian prepositions and prefixes cf. also Kaukienė PK 102 ff.

**Particles and conjunctions**

§ 275. Prtc. ni / ny ‘no, not’ is used as a prefix too (PEŻ III 181).

Other particles are: iau ‘already’ (PEŻ II 12), anga ‘whether’ (PEŻ II 77), ter ‘only’ (PEŻ IV 191).

Conjunctions are: bhe ‘and’ (PEŻ I 138 f. s.v. I bhe), adder ‘or’ (PEŻ I 48), neggi ‘neither, nor’ (PEŻ III 173), kai ‘that’ (very frequent, PEŻ II 68 f. s.v. kai II), beggi ‘because, since (because)’ (PEŻ I 137), ikai ‘although, even if, if’ (PEŻ II 19).
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