

**Vytautas Mažiulis**

**HISTORICAL GRAMMAR  
OF OLD PRUSSIAN**

*Translation from Lithuanian and comments by Dr. Letas Palmaitis*



## *Table of Contents*

Abbreviations / 6
Sources and bibliography / 6
Languages and dialects / 8
Other abbreviations / 9
Preface / 12

---

### **1. Phonetics / 13**

Accent and tones / 13
Vocalism / 15
Short vowels / 15
Long vowels / 17
Consonantism / 22

---

### **2. About nominal derivation / 25**

Compounds / 25
Reduplicated stems / 26
Suffix derivation / 27
Vocal Suffixes / 27
Suffixes with a consonant <i>-v-</i> / 28
Suffixes with a consonant <i>-n-</i> / 29
Suffixes with a consonant <i>-m-</i> / 32
Suffixes with a consonant <i>-l-</i> / 33
Suffixes with a consonant <i>-k-</i> / 34
Suffixes with a consonant <i>-g-</i> / 37
Suffixes with a consonant <i>-t-</i> / 37

---

### **3. Declination of substantives / 40**

Common notes / 40
<i>a</i> -stems / 41
<i>ā</i> -stems / 49
<i>īa</i> and <i>īā</i> -stems / 52
<i>ī</i> / <i>īā</i> -stems / 54
<i>ē</i> -stems / 54
<i>i</i> -stems / 56
<i>u</i> -stems / 58
Consonantal (= C) stems / 59

#### 4. Declination of adjectives / 63

- a* / *ā*-stems / 63
- (*i*)*ī**a*-stems / 64
- u*- and *C*-stems / 64
- Pronominalized adjectives / 65
- Degrees of comparison / 65

#### 5. Numerals / 67

#### 6. Pronouns / 69

- Gender pronouns / 69
- stas* 'that' / 69
- schis* 'this' / 73
- tāns* 'he' / 74
- din* 'him, her' / 74
- kas* 'who' / 75
- kawīds* 'what (kind)', *stawīds* 'such' / 76
- wissa-* 'all' / 76
- ains* '(some)one' / 77
- subs* 'self' / 77
- Non-gender (personal) pronouns / 77
  - Singular / 77
  - Plural / 80
- Possessive pronouns / 82

#### 7. Conjugation / 83

- Finite verbs / 83
- Tense and mood / 86
- Present stems / 87
  - a) athematic stems / 87
  - b) *ā*-stems / 87
  - c) *i*-stems / 88
  - d) *a*-stems / 88
- The future tense / 95
- The past tense / 96
- Optative forms / 97
  - a) imperative / 97
  - b) permissive / 99

Infinite verbs / 100
Infinitive / 100
Participles / 100
Active present / 100
Passive present / 102
Active past / 102
Passive past / 104

**8. Invariable parts of speech / 105**

Adverbs / 105
Prepositions and prefixes / 106
Particles and conjunctions / 107

## Abbreviations

### A. Sources and bibliography

- Ambrasas DDR – Ambrasas S. Daiktavardžių darybos raida. Lietuvių kalbos veiksmažodiniai vediniai. Vilnius, 1993.
- Ambrasas DIS – Ambrasas V. Lietuvių kalbos dalyvių istorinė sintaksė. Vilnius, 1979.
- Aph – Archivum Philologicum. Kaunas, 1930–1939. Kn. 1–8.
- AsIph – Archiv für slavische Philologie. Berlin, 1876–1929. Bd. 1–42.
- Baltistica – Baltistica. Vilnius, 1965–.
- BB – Beiträge zur Kunde der indogermanischen Sprachen. Hrsg. von A. Bezzenger. Göttingen, 1877–1906. Bd. 1–30.
- Berneker BS – Berneker E. Die preußische Sprache. Straßburg, 1896.
- BS – Mažiulis V. Baltų ir kitų ide. kalbų santykiai. Vilnius, 1970.
- Būga I, 11, 111 (Būga RR) – Būga K. Rinktiniai raštai. Sudarė Z. Zinkevičius. Vilnius, 1958–1961. T. 1–3.
- Burrow SL – Burrow T. The Sanskrit Language. London, 1973.
- EH – Endzelīns J. un Hauzenberga E. Papildinājumi un labojumi K. Mülenbacha latviešu valodas vārdnīcai. Rīgā, 1934–1946. Sēj. 1–2.
- Endzelīns BVSF – Endzelīns J. Baltu valodu skaņas un formas. Rīgā, 1948.
- Endzelīns SV – Endzelīns J. Senprūšu valoda. Rīgā, 1943.
- ESSJ – Этимологический словарь славянских языков. Под ред. О.Н. Трубачева. Москва, 1974–. Вып. 1–.
- Fraenkel – Fraenkel E. Litauisches etymologisches Wörterbuch. Heidelberg, 1962–1965. Bd. 1–2.
- Gamkrelidze – Ivanov – Гамкrelидзе Т.В., Иванов Вяч. Вс. Индоевропейский язык и индоевропейцы. Тбилиси, 1984. Т. 1<sup>2</sup>.
- Gerullis ON – Gerullis G. Die altpreußischen Ortsnamen. Berlin und Leipzig, 1922.
- Girdenis KD – Girdenis A. Kalbotyros darbai. Vilnius, 2000–2001. T. 1–3.
- GL – General Linguistics. The Pennsylvania State University Press, 1961–.
- IF – Indogermanische Forschungen. Strassburg, 1892–1916. Bd. 1–37; Berlin, 1917–.
- Kalbotyra – Kalbotyra. Vilnius, 1958–.
- Karaliūnas BKS (ir BKB) – Karaliūnas S. Baltų kalbų struktūrų bendrybės ir jų kilmė. Vilnius, 1987.
- Kaukienė LVI 1 – Kaukienė A. Lietuvių kalbos veiksmažodžio istorija. 1. Klaipėda, 1994.
- Kaukienė PK – Kaukienė A. Prūsų kalba. Klaipėda, 2002.
- Kazlauskas LKIG – Kazlauskas J. Lietuvių kalbos istorinė gramatika. Vilnius, 1968.

KZ – Zeitschrift für vergleichende Sprachforschung auf dem Gebiete der indogermanischen Sprachen, begr. von A. Kuhn. Berlin, 1852–1885. Bd. 1–27; Gütersloh, 1887–1907. Bd. 28–40; Göttingen, 1907–.

Levin SE – Levin J. F. *The Slavic Element in the Old Prussian Elbing Vocabulary*. Berkeley-Los Angeles-London, 1974.

LKK – Lietuvių kaibotyros klausimai. Vilnius, 1957–.

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

Mayrhofer – Mayrhofer M. *Kurzgefaßtes etymologisches Wörterbuch des Altindischen*. Heidelberg, 1956–1980. Bd. 1–4.

ME – Mülenbachs K. *Latviešu valodas vārdnīca. Redīgējis, papildinājis, turpinājis J. Endzelīns*. Rīgā, 1923–1932. Sēj. 1–4.

PKP – Mažiulis V. *Prūsų kalbos paminklai*. Vilnius, 1966–1981. T. 1–2.

Palmaitis BGR – Palmaitis L. *Baltų kalbų gramatinės sistemos raida*. Kaunas, 1998.

Paulauskienė LKM – Paulauskienė A. *Lietuvių kalbos morfologija*. Vilnius, 1994.

Pokorny – Pokorny J. *Indogermanisches etymologisches Wörterbuch*. Bern und München, 1959–1969. Bd. 1–2.

Rosinas BĮ – Rosinas A. *Baltų kalbų įvardžiai*. Vilnius, 1988.

Rosinas BĮM – Rosinas A. *Baltų kalbų įvardžiai: morfologijos raida*. Vilnius, 1995.

Sabaliauskas LKL – Sabaliauskas A. *Lietuvių kalbos leksika*. Vilnius, 1990.

Schmalstieg Balt. Verb. – Schmalstieg W. R. *The Historical Morphology of the Baltic Verb*. Washington, 2002.

Schmalstieg OP – Schmalstieg W. R. *An Old Prussian Grammar*. University Park and London, 1974.

Schmalstieg SP – Schmalstieg W. R. *Studies in Old Prussian*. University Park and London, 1976.

Skardžius ŽD – Skardžius Pr. *Lietuvių kalbos žodžių daryba*. Vilnius, 1943.

Stang Vergl. Gr. – Stang Chr. S. *Vergleichende Grammatik der Baltischen Sprachen*. Oslo, 1966.

Stundžia B. in: *Colloquium Pruthenicum primum*. Warszawa, 1992, p. 151 ff.

Szemerényi Einf. – Szemerényi O. *Einführung in die vergleichende Sprachwissenschaft*. Darmstadt, 1980.

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

Trautmann AS – Trautmann R. *Die altpreussischen Sprachdenkmäler*. Göttingen, 1910.

Trautmann BSW – Trautmann R. *Baltisch-Slawisches Wörterbuch*. Göttingen, 1923.

Trautmann PN – Trautmann R. *Die altpreußischen Personennamen*. Göttingen, 1925.

Urbutis ŽDT – Urbutis V. *Žodžių darybos teorija*. Vilnius, 1978.

Vasmer – Фасмер М. *Этимологический словарь русского языка*. Москва, 1964–1973. Т. 1–4.

VBK – Vakarų baltų kalbos ir kultūros reliktai. Klaipėda, 2000.

Wijk Apr. St. (and AS) – Wijk N. van. Altpreußische Studien. Haag, 1918.

Zinkevičius LKIG – Zinkevičius Z. Lietuvių kalbos istorinė gramatika. Vilnius, 1980–1981. T. 1–2.

ZsIph – Zeitschrift für slavische Philologie. Leipzig. 1924–1950. Bd. 1–20; Heidelberg, 1951–.

## B. *Languages and dialects*

Auk.	– Lithuanian Aukshtaitian
Av.	– Avestian
Balt.	– 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
OSI	– 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.	– genitive
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, <i>or</i> : pronominalized
prtc.	– particle
pt.	– past
refl.	– reflexive
rel.	– relative
sg.	– singular
sim.	– similarly

subst.	– substantive
subst.m.	– mobile substantive
suf.	– suffix
sup.	– supine
superl.	– superlative
top.	– toponym
tr.	– transitive
us.	– usually
v.	– verb
voc.	– vocative
WBaltic	– West Baltic
I	– the 1st Prussian Catechism
II	– the 2nd Prussian Catechism
III	– the 3rd Prussian Catechism

---

### *Translator's notes*

One must know how to read and understand examples from Baltic and Slavic languages.

The letters *č, š, ž* mean *ch, sh, zh* (French *j*) correspondingly (Polish *cz, sz, ź, ć, ś, ż* correspondingly mean: *ch, sh, zh, palatal c, palatal s, palatal z*. Polish *rz* equals to *ź*).

Lithuanian letters *q, e, ĭ, ų* (as well as Polish *q, 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, u* in the final position.

The nasal pronunciation has been lost in modern Lithuanian (except dialects) and substituted with the long pronunciation *ā, ē, ī, 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 *é* 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. *ē*, not *ē̄*!).

The linguists use the sign *˙* after the consonant to mark the palatalized (soft) pronunciation of this consonant, cf. *l' < \*lj*.

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 ° 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<sup>1</sup> 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 = PEŽ) and on works, referred to in this Dictionary. I do not discuss problems of Prussian syntax which is enough Germanized in attested documents.

---

<sup>1</sup> *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 kindred 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 Indo-European (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 *Satəm*). 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” Indo-European \**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 Pomezianian 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.: *mūti* ‘mother’ (< \**mātē* ‘idem’ = Lith. dial. *mótē* ‘idem’), f. *antrā* ‘the second’ (= Lith. *antrà* < \**antrá*), *kaimīnan* (= Lith. *kaimýna*), *turīt* (= Lith. *turēti*) 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<sup>2</sup> diphthongs (their first component being lengthened), e.g.: *ēisei* ‘thou goest’ (: Lith. *eĩ-ti*), *gēide* ‘he waits’ (: Lith. *geĩ-džia*, cf. Latv. *gāi-dīt* ‘to wait’, *dessĩmts* (: Lith. *dešiĩmtas* ‘tenth’, cf. Latv. *sĩmts* ‘hundredth’), *mārtin* ‘bride’ (: Lith. *maĩrčia*, Latv. *māŗša* ‘brother’s wife’), *mērgan* ‘girl’ (: Lith. *meĩrga*, Latv. *mēŗga*), *rānkan* ‘hand’ (: Lith. *raĩnka*, Latv. *rūoku*) etc.

b) in the acute diphthongs (their second component being lengthened), e.g.: *aīnan* ‘one’ (< \**eīnan* : Lith. *v-ieną*, Latv. *v-iēnu*), *kaūlins* ‘bones’ (: Lith. *kāulus*, Latv. *kaiļus*), *pogaūt* ‘to receive’ (: Lith. *gāuti*, Latv. *gūt*), *steīmans* ‘to those’ (: Lith. *tiems*, Latv. *tiēm*) etc.

---

<sup>2</sup> 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. *rūgsta* ‘sours’ vs. *rūksta* ‘smokes’, Latv. *lūoks* ‘leek’ vs. *luōks* ‘bow’, Pr. *baytan* = \**saītan* ‘sieve’ vs. (*larga* = \**linga*)*saītan* ‘bond’.

In Western Europe the syllable accent is a feature of Serbian-Chroatian, Skandinavian, some German dialects. – L.P.

For the Prussian accentuation cf. Endzelīns SV 19–22 (with bibliography), Stang Vergl. Gr. 143 f., 172 etc. Cf. also Bezenberger 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. Endzelīns SV 22, Stang Vergl. Gr. 144 etc.). Nevertheless one finds it being more similar to Lithuanian Samogithian, not Latvian syllabic accent (cf. Bezenberger 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 other 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<sub>1</sub> = II 5<sub>1</sub>), 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*)-*aĩ* 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. *daĩgis*) = Pr. E) *\*dōlgis* = i.e. *\*dālgis* (the lengthened *\*ō* correlating with the short *\*ā*, cf. §19)<sup>3</sup>, *moasis* ‘bellows’ = (Pr. E) *\*mōsas* < *\*mōsas* = i.e. *\*māsas* (= Lith. *maĩsas*), *semo* ‘winter’ = (Pr. E) *\*zēmō* < *\*zēmō* (the latter being barytone<sup>4</sup> with all probability) = i.e. *\*zēmā* (= Lith. *ziemà*) 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 Vocabulary<sup>5</sup>. 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).

<sup>3</sup> The signs *\*o*, *\*ō* mark short and long back vowels *a*, *ā* of a low timbre correspondingly. – L.P.

<sup>4</sup> Greek terms “barytone” vs. “oxytone” mean an accented stem vs. an accented ending. – L.P.

<sup>5</sup> For this cf. fn. 13. – L.P.

## Vocalism

### a) Short vowels

§ 6. The short vowel Pr. *\*i* comes from Balt. *\*i* < IE *\*ī* and corresponds to Lith. *i* and Latv. *i*, cf.: Pr. *is* ‘from’ – Lith. *ìš* (dial. *iž*), Latv. *iz*; Pr. acc. *kittan* ‘other’ – Lith. *kìtq*, Latv. *cits*; Pr. *wissa* – Lith. *vìsas*, 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)<sup>6</sup> 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 (flour)’ (= *\*miltan*), of course. For the phonetic value of the segment *-el-* cf. PEŽ III 125 f. as well as § 2.

§ 7. It is Baltic *\*ū* in which Pr. *u*, Lith. *u* and Latv. *u* originate, cf.: Pr. *duckti* ‘daughter’ (E) < *\*duktē* (PEŽ I 235) – Lith. *duktē*; Pr. *budē* ‘(they) are awake’ (III) – Lith. *budėti*, *bùdinti* 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 *\*ū* being unstressed, cf. PEŽ III 118) – Lith. *medùs*, Latv. *medus*; Pr. *prusnan* / *prosnan* ‘face’ (III) – Lith. *prusnà* ‘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. *\*ě* comes from Balt. *\*ě* < IE *\*ē* and corresponds to Lith. *e*

---

<sup>6</sup> More precisely: *camstian* = *\*kamst’an* or (sometimes supposed by Mažiulis earlier) *\*kamstjan* < *\*kamistjan*, *werstian* = *\*verst’an* or *werstjan* < *\*verstjan* – L.P.

and Latv. *e*, cf.: Pr. *meddo* ‘honey’ (E) – Lith. *medūs*, Latv. *medus*; Pr. *median* ‘forest’ = *\*med’an*<sup>7</sup> – Lith. dial. *mėdžias* ‘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. *ėglė*, Latv. *egle*; Pr. *assaran* ‘lake’ = *\*azaran* – Lith. *ėžeras*, Latv. *ezers*; Pr. *Cat. ast / 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): *kraclan* ‘breast’ < *\*kreklan* (PEŽ II 253 ff.), *ladis* ‘ice’ < *\*ledas* (PEŽ III 15 ff.)<sup>8</sup>.

§ 9. Balt. *\*a* (more precisely Balt. *\*ɔ* --> WBalt. *\*ɔ*, cf. § 19) produced Pr. *\*a* (resp. *ɔ*), Lith. *a*, Latv. *a*, e.g.: *golis* ‘death’ (E) < *\*galas* (i.e. *\*gɔlɔs*) ‘idem’ = (III) acc. sg. *gallan* (PEŽ I 319 ff.); *assis* ‘axle’ (E) – Lith. *ašis*, Latv. *ass*; (III) acc. sg. *naktin* ‘night’ – Lith. *naktis*, Latv. *nakts* etc.; cf. the same with an inflectional *-a*: Pr. (III) adv. *ilga* ‘long (time)’ (PEŽ II 23), *polinka* ‘(he) remains’ (PEŽ III 318) etc. [this *-a* is often apocopated: (III) *empijrint* ‘(what has been) gathered’ (PEŽ I 155), *isrankīt* ‘saved’ (cf. PEŽ 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 *\*-i*s (e.g. *Deywis* ‘God’, *dumis* ‘smoke’ etc.) in dialects of the Elbing Vocabulary<sup>9</sup>.

<sup>7</sup> Or *\*medjan*, cf. the previous fn. – *L.P.*

<sup>8</sup> 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 *le/* and *la/* 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 *aest* II 7<sub>13</sub>) 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) *kraclan*, *ladis* in *Pomezanian*, this reminds of the depalatalization (velarization) of *r* and *l* in East-Lithuanian dialects. In other words: Pomez. *\*lad’s* < Balt. *\*ledas* vs. Saml. *\*l’ads* < Balt. *\*ledas* (but Pomez. *\*[pēd’ai = pēdeī]*, cf. (E) *peadey*, § 14) – *L.P.*

<sup>9</sup> The lifted *i* (as well as any other vowel) marks a reduced sound: *dumis* = *\*dūm’s*. 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. PEŽ IV 221 as well as § 24 further), (III) *gēide* = \**gēid'a* 'waits'. At the same time the unstressed Pr. *a* is spelled as *e* sometimes, e.g. (III): *sedinna* 'states' (PEŽ IV 34 s.v. *sadinna*), *widdewū* 'widow' (PEŽ IV 234), (E): *tresde* 'thrush' (PEŽ IV 199), *wessis* 'sledge' (PEŽ IV 232)<sup>10</sup>.

#### 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 long \**-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) *mūti* (the ending is short!) < \**mūti* < \**mōtē* (for these *ū* resp. *ī* 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. *ýla*, Latv. *īlens* 'idem'), *liede* 'pike' (cf. Lith. *lydỹs*, Latv. *lidaka*). The same WBalt. \**ī* is spelled as *i*, *ī*, *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 < \**-ās*). 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.*

<sup>10</sup> 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 /*a*/ and /*e*/ in all positions except initial – cf. fn. 8. – *L.P.*

‘life’ there: nom. sg. neut. *giwan*, gen. *gīwas*, acc. *gijwan*, *geīwan*, *geiwin* (*geywiēn*) etc. This shows that WBalt. \*ī developed into (accented) diphthongoid \*eī 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. \*ī than dialect(s) of the Catechisms: no diphthongization of WBalt. \*ī ever took place in E.

Note. The letter -e- in Pr. (I) acc. sg. masc. *rekian* ‘Lord’, (II) nom. sg. masc. *skresizt* ‘crucified’ reflects a shortened vowel (I unaccented, II unaccented < accented) \*-ī- < long vowel \*-ī-, cf. PEŽ IV 25 f. (s.v. *rikis*) resp. PEŽ IV 124 (s.v. *scrīsits*).

§ 13. Balt. \*ū produced Pr. \*-ū-, spelled in E as *u*, e.g.: *dumis* ‘smoke’ (cf. Lith. *dūmai*, Latv. *dūmi*), *suris* ‘cheese’ (Lith. *sūris*). The same \*ū is reflected in spellings *u*, *ū*, *ou* (*au*) in the Catechisms. Cf. acc. sg. *sunun*, *soūnan* (*saūnan*) ‘son’, if. *būton*, *boūton* (*baūton*) ‘to be’. The spellings *ou*, *au* correspond to (accented) diphthongoid \*<sup>o</sup>ū (cf. Stang Vergl. Gr. 50) which (as well as \*eī, cf. § 12) did not exist in E.

§ 14. Balt. \*ē produced Pr. (E) \*ē, e.g.: *semen* = \**sēmen* ‘seed’ (cf. Lith. *sėmenys*), *wetro* = \**vētrō* ‘wind’ (cf. Lith. *vėtra* ‘storm’, Latv. *vētra* ‘idem’), *wosee* = \*(*ν*)*ōzē* ‘she-goat’ etc. The same Pr. (E) \*ē is reflected in *pleynis* = \**plēnis* ‘meninx’ (cf. Lith. *plėnis* ‘idem’), *seyr* = \**sēr* ‘heart’ (cf. Endzelīns SV 26, Stang Vergl. Gr. 46 f.). The spelling -ea- reflects broadened (dial.) Pr. (E) \*-ē- (cf. Endzelīns l. c.) in the words (E) *geasnis* = \**gēsniš* ‘snipe’ (PEŽ I 332), *peadey* = \**pēd’ai* ‘socks’ (PEŽ III 240), *seabre* = \**zēbrē* ‘vimba’ (PEŽ IV 88 f.)<sup>11</sup>.

§ 15. WBalt. \*ē turned into Pr. \*ī in stems and suffixes in dialects of the Catechisms II, III, e.g. nom. sg. *ydi* (II) ‘food’ and acc. sg. *īdin* (III) ‘idem’ (= \**īd-* < \**ēd-*, cf. Lith. *ėda* ‘eats’, PEŽ II 17), *turrytwey* (II) ‘to have’ (-*ye-* meaning \*ī) and *turrītwei* (III) ‘idem’ (= \**ītvei* < \**ētvei*, cf. Lith. *turėti* ‘idem’) etc. Nevertheless there is \*-ē- in the Catechism I on the place of \*-ī- in II, III, e.g. (I) acc. sg. *eden* = \**ēd-* ‘food’ etc. According to Gerullis ON 271, such difference between Catechisms I and II,

<sup>11</sup> 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.  $*-\bar{e}$ , 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:  $*-\bar{e}$  ( $> *-\bar{i}$ )  $> *-\bar{i}$ , e.g. *mūti* (III) ‘mother’, *drowy* (II) ‘believes’<sup>12</sup>. Besides that, the stressed  $-\bar{e}$  reflects Pr. (Cat.)  $*-\bar{e}ja > *-\bar{e}j > *-\bar{e}$  in such instances as *budē* (III) ‘is awake’, *milē* (III) ‘loves’ etc. (Endzelīns SV 111, Stang Vergl. Gr. 320), see also § 224.

§ 16. Balt.  $*\bar{a}$  (=  $*\bar{\sigma}$ , cf. Stang Vergl. Gr. 37, see further) is preserved in the Elbing Vocabulary in spellings *o* and *oa*, i.e.  $*\bar{\sigma} = *\bar{a}$  (! cf. § 19), e.g.: *mothe* =  $*m\bar{\sigma}t\bar{e}$  ‘mother’, *brote* =  $*br\bar{\sigma}t\bar{e}$  ‘brother’, *soalis* =  $*z\bar{\sigma}l\bar{i}s$  ‘grass’ (PEŽ IV 139). As for the Catechisms, Pr.  $*\bar{a}$  (=  $*\bar{\sigma}$ !) turned into  $*\bar{u}$  there after the labials and gutturals (LG), e.g.: nom. sg. *mūti* (III) ‘mother’, acc. sg. *mūtien* (II), *muttin* (I) ‘idem’ [such  $*\bar{u}$  never underwent further diphthongization described in § 13 – *L.P.*]. This Pr.  $*\bar{a}$  (=  $*\bar{\sigma}$ !) remained unchanged in all positions except after LG (cf. Būga III 106),

<sup>12</sup> *druwe* (III) cannot have  $-\bar{e} < *-\bar{e}$  because of praes. *druwēse*, *druwēmai*, not  $^u$ -*druwīmai*! There is no difference between (III) *budē*, *milē* on the one side and (III) *druwē* (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 *druwē*, *billē*, *quoitē*, *stallē* are not the same *ēja*-stem verbs as *budē* and *milē*, then their stem vowel  $\bar{e}$  should have but turned into  $\bar{i}$  in plural forms (III) *druwēmai*, *billēmai*, *quoitēti*, *quotāmai* (probably =  $*kwait\bar{a}mai = *kwait\bar{e}mai$ ), *stallēmai*, *stallēti* and should have been preserved as  $\bar{i}$  at least once if this  $\bar{e}$  were really generalized from the form of the 3rd person (§ 212). Therefore it seems no less credible to see a secondary circumflex diphthong  $-\bar{e}ja- > -\bar{e}j- = -\bar{e}i- > -\bar{e}-$  in closed syllable in these plural forms. Such diphthong is well preserved in the participle form (III) *waitaintins* =  $*wait\bar{a}intins < *wait\bar{a}jantins$ . Cf. Palmaitis BGR 223 [cf. *ibid.* for alternation in allomorph pairs in stems and suffixes  $\bar{a}i / \bar{a}$ ,  $\bar{e}i / \bar{e}$  (all accented), as well as at the end of words  $-\bar{a}i / -\bar{a}$ ,  $-\bar{e}i / -\bar{e}$  (accented),  $-ai / -a$ ,  $-ei / -e$  (generalized, unaccented) what can be supported additionally by such hyper-corrections as (III) *giwei* =  $*giw\bar{e}$ . 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 *druwē*, *billē*, *quoitē*, *stallē*, the spelling *drowy* (II) can be treated as reflecting a stressed suffix  $*-ija$ , i.e.  $*druv\bar{i} = *druvij < *druviija / *druvēja$ , cf. pairs Latv. *rūsīt / rūsēt*, Lith. *trūnija / trūni* – *L.P.*

e.g.: *brāti* (III) ‘brother’ (cf. above mentioned E *brote* ‘idem’), *sālin* III = *\*zālin* ‘grass’ (cf. above mentioned E *soalis* ‘idem’)<sup>13</sup>.

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

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

<sup>13</sup> One should pay attention to striking parallelism in spelling “broadened” *ea* (cf. § 14) = *\*ē* and not-“broadened” *e* or *ee*, beside “broadened” (?) *oa* = *\*ō̄* and not-“broadened” *o* = *\*ō̄* in the Elbing Vocabulary: *seabre* – *steegē*, *peadey* – *seese*, *teansis* – *peempe*, and even *seamis* – *semo* < *\*-ēi*! beside *soalis* – *wosee*, *moazo* – *sosto*, *doalgis* – *dongo*, and even *moasis* < *\*-āi*! (2x) – *grosis*. Why were *\*-ē-* < *\*ē* and *\*-ē-* < *\*ēi* uniformly broadened? What was the reason of broadening *\*-ē-* in *seamis* = *\*zēmīs* < *\*zēmīs* and not broadening *\*-ē-* in *semo* < *\*zēmīs*? 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. *podēl’s* < *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* < *vāžī* (ibid. 51 with the reference to Bezenberger 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 *ē*, *\*ō̄*. 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. *steegē*, *seese*, *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.*

<sup>14</sup> In other words, the fate of new *\*ū* < *\*ō̄* after LG and of new *\*ū* < *\*ō̄* after *L, G* was the same: no subsequent diphthongization took place. – *L.P.*

§ 18. In several instances Balt.  $*\bar{o}$  is reflected in Pr. Cat.  $\bar{a}$  (not after LG), cf. (III) *dāt* ‘to give’, *dātwei* ‘idem’ (cf. Lith. *dūoti*, Latv. *duôt* < Balt.  $*d\bar{o}$ -), *dāts* (III) ‘given’, *dats* (I) ‘idem’, *daeczt* (II) ‘idem’ = *dāts*. This  $\bar{a}$  came to being in the following way. The root vowel Balt.  $*\bar{o}$  was unstressed 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  $*\bar{o}$  was broad  $*\bar{o}$  and thus coincided with Balt.  $*\bar{o}$  < (=) Balt.  $*\bar{a}$ , i.e. so-called neutralization of  $*/\bar{o}/$  and  $*/\bar{o} = *\bar{a}/$  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  $*\bar{o}$ . Thus Balt.  $*d\bar{o}$ - ‘to give’ turned into WBalt.  $*d\bar{o}$  ‘idem’ > Pr. Cat. (not E!)  $*d\bar{a}$ -. At the same time the accented vowel  $*\bar{o}$  was generalized onto the whole paradigm in Eastern Baltic what caused the appearance of Lith. *dūoti*, Latv. *duôt* (cf. PEŽ I 181 s.v. *dāt* 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)  $*\bar{o}$  (< Balt.  $*\bar{o}$ -) there, not Pr. (E)  $*\bar{o}$ , cf. PEŽ III 302 s.v. *podalis*, PEŽ 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)<sup>15</sup> in Common Baltic:

short		long	
$*i$	$*u$	$*\bar{i}$	$*\bar{u}$
		$\emptyset$	$*\bar{o}$
$*e$	$*a (= *o)$	$*\bar{e}$	$*\bar{a} (= *\bar{o})$

<sup>15</sup> Vowels are classified according to place of their articulation: (Balt.) front */e/, /ē/, /i/, /ī/* vs. back */a/, /ā/, /ō/, /u/, /ū/* (correlation in zone), low */e/, /ē/, /a/ (/ɔ/), /ā/ (/ɔ̄/)* vs. middle */ō/* vs. high */i/, /ī/, /u/, /ū/* (correlation in rise of tongue). The sign  $\emptyset$  marks absence of a correlate (see table) – *L.P.*

I consent to the opinion of Girdenis l. c. that the above shown vowels *\*a* (= *\*ɔ*) and *\*ā*(= *\*ɔ̄*) 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 forward-zone correlate of *\*ō* could not be stable. For this reason the opposition Balt. *\*/ō/ : \*/ā (= \*ɔ̄)/* began to be neutralized as *\*/ā (= \*ɔ̄)/* 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* (= *\*ɔ̄*) than the EBalt. *\*ō* – cf. § 18.

§ 20. Diphthong Pr. *\*ai* is spelled *ai* and *ay* in written documents, cf. *ains* (III) ‘one’, *snaygis* (E) ‘snow’. Diphthong Pr. *\*ei* is spelled *ei* and *ey* in written documents, cf. *Deiws* (III) ‘God’, *Deiwis* (III) ‘idem’. For accented circumflex diphthongs and their phonetic quality cf. § 4.

### Consonantism

§ 21. Balt. *\*i* > Pr. *\*j*. The latter is spelled with the letters *i* and *y* (1x: *yous* 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. *crauyo* (E) ‘blood’, *krawia* (III) ‘idem’, acc. *kraugen* (I) ‘idem’ etc. Pr. *\*j* is not marked after the letter *i*, e.g.: (III) *biātwei* = *\*bijātwei* ‘to be afraid’, *cixtia* = *\*krikstija* ‘I baptize’, (E) *kalabian* = *\*kalabijan* ‘sword’, *claywio* = *\*klaivijō* < *\*kleivijō* ‘flank (meat)’ (for this *\*-ijā* cf. PEŽ 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* disappeared, *L* turning into palatal *L'*, e.g. (III) *etwerpe* ‘forgives’ = *etwerp'a* < *\*-pja*. The segment *-my-* in (E) *samyen* ‘earth’ seems to reflect a palatal *\*-m'-*, cf. PEŽ IV 60; cf. also (E) *peuse* ‘pine-tree’ with its *pe-* coming from Pr. *\*p'a-* < *\*pja-* (*\*pjausē*) with all probability, cf. PEŽ 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', *cixtiānai* (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.

§ 26. Balt. *\*u* > Pr. *\*v*. This Pr. *\*v* is spelled with the letter *w* in most instances in written documents, cf. *Deiws* (III) 'God', *Deywis* (E) 'idem'. Accidental spellings with the letter *u* reflect its non-syllabic pronunciation, i.e. *\*u* or *\*-(u)u* (cf. Endzelins SV 34 f.), e.g.: (I) gen. *Deiuas* 'idem', acc. *Deiuan* 'idem', (E) *preartue* 'reutel, plough-knife' (PEŽ III 346), *schutuan* 'twisted yarn' (PEŽ IV 88).

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 *\*ś* (> 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. *\*ś* cf. *sunis* (E) 'dog' (cf. Lith. dial. *šunìs* 'dog') etc.

For Pr. *\*z* cf. *semo* (E) = *\*zēmō* 'winter' < *\*zēimō* < *\*žeimā* etc.

Pr. \*s has been turned into \*š under German influence sometimes, in following compositions:

a) *sp* – *schpartina* (III, beside *spartint* III), *schpāndimai* (III, cf. PEŽ I 122 s.v. *auschpāndimai*);

b) *sk* – *schkellānts* (III, beside *skellānts* III), *schkūdan* (III, beside *skūdan* III), *schklāits* (III, beside *sclaits* III);

c) *sl* – *schlūsitwei* (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. Endzelīns 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.

Cf. Pr. \**dl, \*tl* preserved in words *addle* (E) ‘fir-tree’, *ebsentliuns* (III) ‘having marked’.

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:

-*ts* – *dāts* (III) ‘given’, *dats* (I) ‘idem’,

-*tz* – *ketwirtz* II ‘fourth’,

-*czt* – *bylaczt* (II) ‘he told’, and even

-*tzt* – *enquoptzt* (II).

For this varying in spelling cf. Endzelīns FBR XV 92.



## 2. ABOUT NOMINAL DERIVATION

### *Compounds*

§ 31. Compounds with (*i*)*a*-stem nouns as first components: *dagagaydis* (E) ‘spring wheat’ = \**dagagaidīs* (PEŽ I 172), *cariawoytis* (E) ‘military conference’ = \**kar’avāitīs* (PEŽ II 123 f.), *crauyawirps* E ‘bleeder’ = \**kraujavirp(a)s* (PEŽ II 261 f.), *laucagerto* (E) ‘partridge’ (“field hen”) = \**laukagertō* (PEŽ III 48), *malunakelan* (E) ‘mill-wheel’ = \**malūnakelan* (PEŽ III 107), *malunastab[is]* (E) ‘millstone’ = \**malūnastab(a)s* (PEŽ III 107), *piwamaltan* (E) ‘malt’ = \**pīvamaltan* (PEŽ III 289), *wissaseydis* (E) ‘Tuesday’ (“joint session”) = \**visasēdīs* (PEŽ IV 251 f.), acc. *grēiwakaulin* (III) ‘rib’ = \**krēivakaulin* (PEŽ I 404 f.) etc.

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

§ 32. Compounds with *ā*-stem nouns as first components: *gertoanax* (E) ‘hawk’ = \**gertōṽnaks* < \**gertōvanag(a)s* (PEŽ I 357).

§ 33. Compounds with *ē*-stem nouns as first components: *apewitwo* (E) ‘osier (willow)’ = \**apēvītvō* (PEŽ I 87), *pelemaygis* (E) ‘windhover’ = \**pelēmaigīs* (PEŽ III 249), *pettegislo* (E) ‘shoulder artery’ = \**petēgīslō* (PEŽ III 276 f.).

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

§ 35. A sample of an archaic compound is *waispattin* (III) ‘mistress’ = \**vaispatin* (cf. PEŽ 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 tāws* ‘pater familias, father of the house’ = \**butitāvs* beside *butta tawas* ‘idem’ = \**butatāvas* (E *buttan* ‘house’), cf. Lith. *šonīkaulis* / *šonākaulis* (: *šonas*),

*blauzdīkaulis / blauzdākaulis* (: *blauzdā, blauzdas*) etc.; cf. also PEŽ I 168). Pr. (E) *lapiwario* ‘wicket-gate’ (“fox’s gate”) = \**lapivartō* (: E *lape* ‘fox’ = \**lapē*) seems to be of this kind too. The connecting vowel \*-i- emerged on place of older \*-ē- (PEŽ III 44).

§ 37. There also existed compounds with inflected forms as first components in Prussian. Usually these were genitive singular or genitive plural forms, e.g.: (III) *buttas tapali* ‘house table (plate)’ = \**butastapali* (with gen. sg. *buttas* ‘house’, cf. PEŽ I 168), (E) *silkasdrūb* ‘silk pall’ = \**silkasdrimbīs* (with gen. sg. *silkas* ‘silk’, cf. PEŽ IV 108), (top.) *Wilkaskaymen* “Wolf’s Village” = \**Vilkaskaims* (with gen. sg. *wilkas* ‘wolf’), (top.) *Sawliskresil* “Sun’s Chair” = \**Sauliskrēslan* (with *ē*-stem gen. sg. \**saulīs* < \**saulēs* ‘sun’, cf. PEŽ IV 77), (top.) *Tlokunpelk* “Bears’ Marsh” = \**Tlōkunpelkī* (with *īa*-stem gen. pl. \**tlōk’un* ‘bears’, cf. PEŽ II 220 ff. s.v. *clokis*).

### **Reduplicated stems**

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

§ 38. *bebrus* (E) ‘beaver’ – this word, together with Lith. *bēbras / bebrūs* ‘idem’, Latv. *bebrs* ‘idem’, Bulgarian *beber* ‘idem’ etc., provides reconstruction Balt.-Sl. \**bebrus* (\**bebras*) ‘idem’ < IE \**bhebh-* ‘brown; beaver’ (Pokorny IEW 136);

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

§ 40. *gegalis* (E) ‘diver’ – together with Lith. *gaĩgalas* ‘drake’, Latv. *gaĩgals* ‘diver’, *gaĩgala* ‘idem’, Rus. *золоть* ‘golden-eye’ etc., comes from (onomatopoeic) interj. Balt.-Sl. \**ge(i)g-* (PEŽ I 335 f.) < IE \**ghe(i)gh-* (Pokorny IEW 407);

§ 41. *geguse* (E) ‘cuckoo’ – together with Lith. *gegužė*, Latv. *dzeguze* ‘idem’, ORus. *жууж-уля* ‘idem’, comes from Balt.-Sl. \**geguž-* ‘idem’ originating in (onomatopoeic) interj. Balt.-Sl. \**gegu-* (PEŽ I 337 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. *nepeneĭ* ‘idem’ etc.), implies reduplicated stem WBalt.-Sl. *\*pelpel-* ‘idem’ (cf. PEŽ III 254 f. with bibl.). Pr. (E) *pepelis* ‘bird’ = *\*pipelis* (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. *tētervas* ‘idem’, Latv. *teteris* ‘idem’, Russian *memepew* ‘idem’ etc., comes from Balt.-Sl. *\*teter(e)va-* ‘idem’, i.e. a reduplicated (onomatopoeic) stem (cf. Trautmann BSW 320 f., Pokorny IEW 1079);

§ 44. *werwirsis* (E) ‘skylark’ comes from Balt. dial. *\*vivirsīs* ‘idem’ (> Lith. Sam. *vivirsỹs* ‘idem’, Lith. *vieversỹs*, *voversỹs* ‘idem’) of a reduplicated (onomatopoeic) stem, cf. Fraenkel 1247 with bibl.;

§ 45. *weware* (E) ‘squirrel’ = *\*vēvarē* – together with Lith. consonant-stem *vėvaris* (*voveris*) ‘idem’, Latv. *vāvere* ‘idem’ (= Lith. *voverē*), ORus. *въвѣрѹца* ‘idem’, implies a reduplicated consonant stem Balt.-Sl. *\*vēver-* ‘idem’, cf. Fraenkel 1233 f. with bibl., PEŽ IV 243 with bibl.

## Suffix derivation

### Vocal suffixes

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

a) *a*-stems (masc., neut.) – *cawx* (E) ‘devil’ < *\*kaukas* (PEŽ II 149 f.), *Deiws* (III) ‘God’ = *Deywis* (E) ‘idem’ < *\*Deivas* ‘idem’ (< IE *\*deiuos*), *golis* (E) ‘death’ < *\*galas* (PEŽ I 320), *dagis* (E) ‘summer’ < *\*dagas* (PEŽ I 172) etc.;

<sup>16</sup> 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/* : *\*/e/*) 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)’ = \**dāngō* (PEŽ 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’ (PEŽ I 88 ff.), *dangus* (E) ‘sky’ (PEŽ I 177 ff.), *camus* (E) ‘bumble-bee’ = \**kamus* (PEŽ II 107 ff.), *salus* (E) ‘brook (rill)’ (PEŽ 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 *ja*-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. PEŽ I 343 f. s.v. *geyty[s]*, PEŽ III 282 f. s.v. *pintys*), see further. Nevertheless the word *pentis* (E) ‘heel’ seem to be a derivative with a suffix *-i-* (cf. PEŽ III 255 f.).

§ 49. (*i*)*ē*-stem nouns are well attested: *same* (E) ‘earth’, *semē* (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. \**-j* having vanished before front vowels very early in all Baltic languages, \**-jē* turned into \**-ē*, although it was the genitive plural where this \**-j-* survived for a long time, i.e. Pr. (\**-jē* + *-ōn* -->) \**-jun*, cf. Lith. dial. *žemju* ‘(of) lands’ beside nom. sg. *žēmė* ‘land’ (< \**žemjē*).

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

#### Suffixes with a consonant -v-

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

extended with other suffixes in the 3rd Catechism. Cf. acc. *drūctaw-ingiskan* ‘stern’ (coming from adj. *\*drūktavas* ‘stern’ beside adj. *\*drūkta-‘idem’*, cf. Endzelīns SV 44), *stūrnaw-ingisku* ‘seriously’ and *stūrnaw-ingiskan* (coming from adj. *\*stūrnawas* PEŽ IV 164), *trintawinni* ‘avengeress’ (cf. PEŽ IV 200, but Endzelīns SV 53), av. *garrew-ingi* ‘hot’ (PEŽ I 328), *glandew-ingei* ‘consolably’, *nirīgew-ings* ‘non-shrewish’, *niseilew-ings* ‘insensitive’ etc. (cf. also Endzelīns l.c.).

Besides said adjectives with a suf. *\*-ava-/avā-*, there existed adjectives with a suf. *\*-īva-/īvā-* (extended with other suffixes) in the 3rd Catechism too. Cf. *auschādīw-ings* ‘reliable’ (for *-ī-* cf. if. *auschādī-twei* ‘to rely upon’), *klausīw-ingis* ‘listener (confessor)’ (cf. if. *klausī-ton* ‘to listen’), *poseggīw-ingi* ‘subordinately’ (cf. if. *seggī-t* ‘to do’) etc. cf. OSI. aj. *ljubivō* (if. *ljubi-ti*); see Endzelīns l.c.<sup>17</sup>

#### Suffixes with a consonant *-n-*

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

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

<sup>17</sup> All these samples should not tempt us to see here a stem-ending (*\*-a/\*-e, \*-ī*) + the single suffix *\*-v-*. Suffixes adj. *\*-ava-/avā-*, *\*-eva-/evā-* 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.) *Deīwas* < IE *\*dei-uo-(s)* <- *\*dī-eu-(s)* / *\*dī-ūō-(s)*. As for Pr. suf. *\*-īva-/īvā-* in connection with infinitives in *-ī-*, this seems to be one of later generalizations. For IE pairs *\*dī-eu-(s)* / *\*dī-ūō-(s)* cf. the name of Zeus: Gk. nom. Ζεύς, gen. Διός. For the thematizing of IE athematic stems cf. also athematic Gk. nom. πούς (= Lat. *pēs* < *\*ped-s*), gen. ποδός ‘foot’ --> thematic Gk. nom.-acc. neut. πέδον ‘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. Palmitis 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-mmai*]. Athematic are root stems or suffixal stems to which an inflection is added directly, without a thematic vowel [cf. v. 1 pers. pl. (*as-)**mai*]. 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. *kárta* etc.). Cf. more detailed in PEŽ II 131–134. Pr. (E) *gle[u]ptene* ‘mouldboard’ = *\*gl’aubtenē* or *\*gl’aubtinē* arose in the same way (PEŽ II 275 f.).

For Pr. suf. *\*-īnā* cf. krixtiēno (E) ‘earth-swallow’ = *\*krīkstīnō* (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.)<sup>18</sup>.

§ 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. *mīlinan* (III) ‘blot’ (PEŽ III 140), *aulinis* (E) ‘(boot’s) leg’ (PEŽ I 118), *drawine* (E) ‘hollow-tub’ (PEŽ I 223 f.), *plauxdine* (E)

<sup>18</sup> 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. *\*ples-*, 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.

<sup>19</sup> Suf. *\*-in-*, *\*-īn-* 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. *kaimīnan* (III) ‘neighbour’. This root (similarly to Lith. *kāimas* ‘village’, *kiēmas* ‘farm, yard’, Latv. *ciems* ‘idem’) represents a “centum” exception of satemization in a “satem” language – cf. its regular “satem” counterpart Pr. *seimīns* III, Lith. *šeimà*, Latv. *saimē*, ORus. *сьмья*. For regular correspondences in “centum” languages cf. Go. *haims* ‘village’, Gk. *κώμη* ‘idem’. Lith. *kāimas* is considered to be

‘feather-bed’ (PEŽ III 292), *sompisinis* (E) ‘bread of coarse-ground flour’ (PEŽ IV 140) etc<sup>19</sup>.

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

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

Note: The Germans (resp. Germanized Prussians) could confuse spellings *-ain-* and *-ein-* in Prussian texts (especially in Catechisms).

§ 58. Suf. *-ūn* was used to form substantives from verbs and (substantivized) adjectives, cf. Pr. acc. *maldūnin* ‘youth’ < Pr. adj. *\*maldūna-* ‘youthful’ (PEŽ III 104 f.), Pr. *percunis* (E) ‘thunder’ < Balt. adj. masc. *\*perkūnas* ‘related to *\*perkus* “oak-tree”’ (PEŽ III 265), Pr. *alkunis* (E) ‘elbow’ = *\*alkūnīs* < Balt. adj. *\*alkūna-/elkūna-* ‘having a bend’ (PEŽ I 67 f.), Pr. *waldūns* (pl. *weldūnai*) (III) ‘inheritor’ < Pr. *\*veldūnas* ‘idem’ < Pr. *\*veld-* ‘inherit’ (PEŽ IV 229), Pr. *malunis* (E) ‘mill’ < Pr. *\*malūnas* ‘idem’ < Polish *młyn* + Pr. *\*mal-* ‘to mill’ (PEŽ III 107 f.)<sup>20</sup>.

---

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 *\*kaimas!*). 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.

Nevertheless some nouns, derived with a suf. *-in*, seem to be of archaic Baltic-Slavic origin, e.g. part of those which mark male animals in respect to basic feminine appellative, cf. Pr. (E) masc. *awins* ‘ram’, Lith. masc. *āvinas* ‘idem’, Latv. masc. *āuns* ‘idem’, OSl. *ovbŋō* ‘idem’ vs. Lith. fem. *avīs* ‘sheep’, OLatv. fem. *avs* ‘idem’, OSl. “dimin.” *ovb-ca* ‘idem’. – *L.P.*

<sup>20</sup> Such words as Pr. *waldūns* (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. *pērķūns*, or Pr. *alkunis* (E) – cf. Lith. *alkūnė*, Latv. *ļlkuonis* – *L.P.*

§ 59. Suf. \*-ōn was used to form consonant-stem nomina agentis. This may be traced in Pr. (III) *perōni* ‘community’ < Pr. \**perōnē*, the latter having been derived from a deverbal consonant-stem substantive \**perōn* ‘pressing smth. together by means of whipping’, which had been derived in its turn from Balt. v. \**per-* ‘to whip’ with Balt. suf. \*-ōn (for another explanation cf. PEŽ III 267 f. and § 60).

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

§ 60. Suf. \*-ān is traced in Pr. (E) *medione* ‘hunt(ing)’ = \**med’ōnē* (PEŽ III 122)<sup>21</sup>.

§ 61. Suf. \*-snā and b) \*-senā /-senis (for -is cf. Endzelīns SV 47) are widely represented in the Catechisms. They derive verbal substantives from infinitive stems, e.g.: a) *aumūsnan* ‘washing off’, *biāsnan* ‘fearing’, acc. *etskāsnan* ‘resurrection’, nom. *etwerpsnā* ‘forgiveness’, *girsnan* ‘praising’, *rickaūsnan* ‘governing’, *segisna* ‘doing’, etc.; b) nom. *atskisenna* ‘resurrection’, acc. *etwerpsennian* ‘forgiveness’, *-gimsennien* ‘birth’, *cixtissennien* ‘baptizing’. For origin of the suf. \*-snā and \*-senā /-senis (as well as for Pr. E \**lauk-snā* ‘star’) cf. PEŽ I 151–153 (s.v. *bousennis*) and PEŽ III 53 (s.v. *lauxnos*)<sup>22</sup>.

<sup>21</sup> There is a “suf. -jān” in the author’s original text of HGOP, p. 28. But cf. PEŽ III 122: “Pr. \**med’ōnē* < \**medjānē* is derived from Pr. v. \**medjā-(tvei)* ‘to hunt in a forest (E *median*)’ with a suf. \*-(ā)nē”. Since -ja is a stem ending in the word *median* < \**medjan*, one could see lengthening in verbal stems like \**medjā-(tvei)* – cf. also a precise parallel Lith. dial. *medžiōnē* ‘hunting’ < v. *medžioti* < \**medjāti*. In this case suffixes \*-ānē in Pr. *mediane*, Lith. *medžiōnē*, *abejōnē*, *svajōnē* etc. in palatal stems, Lith. *raudōnē*, *vakarōnē* etc. in hard stems, are complex. They were derived with lengthening of a stem vowel in verbs (infinitives) \*-(i)a > \*-(i)ā + suf. \*-nē. Cf. § 52 f. and Skardžius ŽD, p. 272, 276. – L.P.

<sup>22</sup> J. Endzelīns l.c. considers suf. -senis < \*-senīs to be an innovation in accordance with such verbal substantives as Pr. ja-stem *kirtis*, *īdis*.

V. Mažiulis derives suffixes Pr. -sena, Lith. -sena, Latv. -šana from Balt. adj. masc., neut. \*-sjena (> \*-sena) / \*-sjana, but fem. \*-sjenā (> -senā) / \*-sjanā. He considers segment \*-sĵ- 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. -snā, 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’ (PEŽ IV 102), acc. *asman* III ‘eighth’ (PEŽ I 103), *pirmas* I ‘first’ (PEŽ III 284).

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

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

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

§ 63. Pr. suf. (*a-lā-*stem) adj. *\*-ōma-* (cf. nom. pl. *tickrōmai* ‘rightful’, *-tickrōms* ‘righteous’) may be reconstructed as a composition of (consonant-stem nominative) *\*-ōn-* + *\*-ma-*, cf. Lith. *\*mažō(n)* + *\*-ma-* > adj. *\*mažuoma-* --> subst. *mažúom-enė* ‘minority; pauperdom’ (for another view cf. Skardžius ŽD 237, Ambrazas DDR II 60 with bibl.).

Suffixes with a consonant *-l-*

§ 64. Pr. suf. *\*-el-l-al-* is well attested in (E), cf. *areli[s]* ‘eagle’ = *\*arelīs* (PEŽ I 90). It is diminutive in *patowelis* ‘stepfather’ = *\*patōwelīs* (PEŽ III 234), *podalis* ‘(worthless) pot’ < *\*pōdalis* (PEŽ III 302).

Pr. suf. *\*-il-* is represented in (E): *sirsilis* ‘hornet’ = *\*sirsilīs* (PEŽ IV 116 f.), *wobilis* ‘clover’ = *\*(v)ōbil’is* (PEŽ IV 259).

§ 65. With Pr. suf. *\*-ail-* resp. *\*-eil-* are derived (E): *scritayle* ‘rim’ = *\*skritailē* (PEŽ IV 124 f.), *[c]rupeyle* ‘frog’ = *\*krupeilē* (PEŽ 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. PEŽ I 153. Nevertheless the difference between *\*-senā* and *\*-snā* may have originated in binomial relation between barytone and oxytone forms in Western Baltic (not in Prussian itself!). – *L.P.*

With Pr. suf. *\*-ōl-* and *\*-āl-* are derived *gramboale* (E) ‘beetle’ < *\*grambōlē* (PEŽ I 395), *peisālei* (III) ‘letter, scripture’ (PEŽ III 242 f.)<sup>23</sup>.

Pr. suf. *\*-ul-* is represented in *wadule* ‘shaft of a wooden plough’ = *\*vadulē* (PEŽ IV 212), *weydulis* ‘(eye’s) pupil’ = *\*veidul<sup>i</sup>s* (PEŽ IV 228).

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

§ 66. Pr. suf. *\*-tl-* resp. (*\*-tl-* >) *\*-kl-* is represented in nouns (adjectives and substantives): adj. acc. *dirstlan* (III) ‘firm’ (PEŽ I 207 f.), subst. *\*zentla-* ‘sign’ [: *esbentliuns* ‘(one who has) marked’] (PEŽ I 245), *abstocle* (E) ‘lid (of a pot)’ = *\*abstōklē* (PEŽ I 47), *auclo* (E) ‘(horse) halter’ = *\*aukl<sup>5</sup>* (PEŽ I 113), *gurcle* (E) ‘throat’ = *\*gurklē* (PEŽ I 425 ff.), *piuclan* (E) ‘sickle’ = *\*pjūklan* (PEŽ III 288), *riclis* (E) ‘loft’ = *\*rīklīs* (PEŽ IV 27), *spertlan* (E) ‘ball of the toe’ = *\*spertlan* (PEŽ IV 145), *stacle* (E) ‘support (abutment)’ = *\*staklē* (PEŽ IV 149), *-tinklo* ‘net’ = *\*tinkl<sup>5</sup>* (PEŽ IV 68 f. s.v. *sasintinklo*)<sup>24</sup>.

#### Suffixes with a consonant *-k-*

§ 67. Suf. *\*-ika-*<sup>25</sup> had several functions in Prussian. First, it was used to derive agent nouns, cf. (masc.): *mynix* (E) ‘tanner’ = *\*mīnik<sup>i</sup>s* (= Lith. *mynikas* ‘idem’, PEŽ III 141), *genix* (E) ‘woodpecker’ = *\*genik<sup>i</sup>s* (PEŽ I 350 f.), *schuwikis* (E) ‘shoemaker’ = *\*šūvik<sup>i</sup>s* (cf. Lith. *siuvikas* ‘tailor’, PEŽ IV 88), *\*vīdik(a)s* ‘witness = seeing’ (PEŽ IV 235 s.v. *widekausnan*), (fem.) *grandico* (E) ‘plank (board)’ = *\*grandik<sup>5</sup>* (PEŽ I 396 ff.)<sup>26</sup>.

<sup>23</sup> Pr. *peisālei* is a “hyper-correction” of *\*peisāli* due to generalizing of the unaccented counterpart of alternation *-ēi / -ē* (accented) vs. *-ei / -e* (unaccented) – cf. fn. 12.

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

<sup>24</sup> All these nouns have been derived from infinitive stems (PEŽ l.c., cf. modern Lith. *rašỹ-klē* derived from if. *raš-ỹ-ti*). Substantives with this suffix usually meaning “a tool”, the suffix should have been productive in Prussian. – *L.P.*

<sup>25</sup> *\*-ika-* means a thematic (*a*-stem) form of *\*-ik-*. For the term *thematic* cf. fn. 17. – *L.P.*

<sup>26</sup> 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) = \**gunzik*<sup>i</sup>s ‘swelling (bump)’ (PEŽ I 422 f.), *instixs* (E) ‘thumb’ = \**instik*<sup>i</sup>s (PEŽ II 29 f.), *kuliks* (E) ‘(small) pouch’ = \**kulik*<sup>i</sup>s (PEŽ II 299 ff.).

Thirdly, it could mark male animals in respect to basic feminine appellative, cf. *lonix* (E) ‘bull’ = \**lōnik*<sup>i</sup>s (derived from a polonism fem. \**lānī* ‘doe’, cf. PEŽ III 79 f.).

Finally, with this suffix were derived substantives from adjectives, cf. acc. pl. *swintickens* (III) ‘saints’ = \**svintikans* (from adj. \**svinta*- ‘holy’, cf. PEŽ IV 177), *prēisiks* (III) ‘enemy’ = \**prēisik*<sup>i</sup>s (PEŽ III 351 f.).

It was Pr. suf. \*-*īk* (> \*-*īk* in an unstressed position) with which diminutive forms of substantives were derived in dialects of the Catechism, cf.: acc. *gannikan* (III) ‘woman’ (PEŽ I 323), *malnijikix* (III) ‘child’ = \**malnīkik*(a)s (PEŽ III 106), acc. *wijrikan* (III) ‘man’ = \**vīrikan* (PEŽ IV 246), acc. *grīmikan* (III) ‘song’ (PEŽ I 410), acc. *madlikan* (III) ‘prayer’ (PEŽ III 94), *stūndiks* (III) = \**stūndik*(a)s ‘while (moment)’ (PEŽ IV 163).

§ 68. There are also diminutive forms with a suf. -*uk*- in Prussian: *gaylux* (E) ‘ermine’ = \**gailuk*<sup>i</sup>s (PEŽ I 315 f.), *wosux* (E) ‘he-goat’ = \*(v)šzuk<sup>i</sup>s (PEŽ IV 265 f.), *mosuco* (E) ‘weasel’ = \**mazuk*š (PEŽ III 152).

§ 69. It was Pr. suf. -*inīk*- / \*-*enīk*- (= 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. *auschautenīkamans* (III) ‘debtors’ = \**aušautenīkamans* (PEŽ I 121), *balgniniks* (E) ‘saddle-maker’ = \**balgninik*<sup>i</sup>s (PEŽ I 131), dat. pl. -*algenīkamans* (III) ‘(day-)labourers’ = \**algenīkamans* (PEŽ I 188 s.v. *deināalgenīkamans*), *grīkenix* (III) ‘sinner’ < \**grīkenīk*(a)s (PEŽ I 409), *laukinikis* (E) ‘landowner’ = \**laukinīk*<sup>i</sup>s (PEŽ III 48), *medenix* (E) ‘woodman’ = \**medenīk*(a)s (PEŽ III 118 f. s.v. *medenixtaurwis*), *pogalbenix* (III) ‘helper’ = \**pagalbenīk*(a)s (PEŽ III 305), *stubonikis* (E with -*o*- instead of -*e*-) ‘barber-surgeon’ = \**stubenīk*<sup>i</sup>s;

b) from adjectives, cf. *maldenikis* (E) = \**maldenīk's* (PEŽ III 106 f.);

c) from verbs, cf.: *scalenix* (E) 'hound' = \**skalenīks* (PEŽ IV 118), *crixtnix* (III) 'baptizer' = \**krikst(i)nīk(a)s* (PEŽ II 279 f.), acc. *retenīkan* (III) 'Saviour' = \**retenīkan* (PEŽ IV 20 f.), nom. pl. masc. *-wēldnikai* '(co-)heirs' < \**-vēldnīkai* (PEŽ IV 99 f. s.v. *sendraugiwēldnikai*), acc. *schlūsnikan* (III) 'servant' < nom. sg. \**šlūz(i)nīk(a)s* (PEŽ IV 86), dat. sg. *klausīweniki* 'confessor' < nom. sg. \**klausīvenīk(a)s* with a complex suffix \**-īvenīk-* [< \**-īva-* (cf. § 51) + \**-enīk-*] from if. *klausī-* 'to hear' (PEŽ II 213 f.).

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

a) from substantives, cf.: acc. *prūsiskan* (III) 'Prussian', nom. sg. fem. *kērmeniskai*<sup>27</sup> (III) 'carnal' (PEŽ II 167 f.), nom. sg. masc. *crīstīāniskas* (III) 'Christian', acc. *tawiskan* (III) 'fatherly' etc.

b) from adjectives, usually together with additional suffixes before this *-isk-* (*-ing-* was mostly frequent among them), cf.: acc. *laimiskan* (III) 'rich' (: *-laims* 'idem', cf. PEŽ III 24 f.), acc. *deineniskan* (III) 'daily' (: *deininan* 'idem', cf. PEŽ I 189 f.), acc. *deiwūtiskan* (III) 'blissful' (: nom. *deiwuts* 'idem', cf. PEŽ I 193), acc. *swītwēiskan* (III) 'wordly' (PEŽ IV 180), acc. *tīkrōmiskan* 'righteous' (PEŽ IV 193), acc. *drūcktawīngiskan* 'stern' (PEŽ I 230), acc. *kalsīwīngiskan* (III) 'sonorous' (PEŽ II 95 f.), *noseilewīngiskan* (III) 'spiritual' (PEŽ III 197), *nīteisīngiskan* (III) 'unhonourable' (PEŽ III 190) etc.

§ 71. Adjectives with a suffix fem. *-iskā-* undergoing substantivization (cf. Lith. *jaun-iškė* 'youth', see Ambrazas DDR II 47), many *ā-*stem adjective abstracts with this suffix came into being, cf.: acc. *ginniskan* 'friendship' (PEŽ I 336), *labbīsku*<sup>28</sup> (III) 'kindness' (PEŽ III 10

<sup>27</sup> Pr. *kērmeniskai* is a "hyper-correction" of \**kērmeniska* due to generalizing of the unaccented counterpart of alternation *-āi / -ā* (accented) vs. *-ai / -a* (unaccented) – cf. ftn's 12, 23. – *L.P.*

<sup>28</sup> nom. sg. fem. (unaccented) *-isku* < \**-iskū* < \**-iskā* after a guttural *k*, cf. §§ 16, 17, 5 – *L.P.*

f.), acc. *prābutskan* (III) ‘eternity’ < *\*prābūtiskan* (PEŽ III 339 f.), acc. *teisiskan* (III) ‘honesty’ and *teisīwingiskan* (III) ‘idem’ (PEŽ IV 190), *swintiskan* (III) ‘holiness’ (: *swints* ‘holy’) etc.

#### Suffixes with a consonant -g-

§ 72. Pr. suf. *\*-agā* is represented in (E) *karyago* ‘military campaign’ = *\*kar’agō* (PEŽ II 121 f.), *witwago* ‘water-hen’ = *\*vitvagō* (PEŽ IV 256), but Pr. suf. *\*-igā* is represented in (E) *wedigo* ‘adze’ (PEŽ 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. *gėdingas* ‘shameful’, PEŽ III 188), (*ni*) *quāitings* ‘(not-)wishful’ = *\*kwāitings* (PEŽ III 189), *ragingis* (E) ‘deer’ < *\*ragīngas* ‘idem’ (< ‘horned’, PEŽ IV 7);

b) adjectives, cf.: *labbīngs* (III) ‘good’ (: *labs* ‘idem’, PEŽ III 10), *naunīngs* (III) ‘novice’ (: *nauns* ‘new’, PEŽ III 172), *wertīngs* (III) ‘worthy’, *wertīwings* ‘idem’ – the latter having a complex suffix *\*-īving-* (PEŽ IV 231), etc.;

c) verbs, cf.: *aulāīkings* (III) ‘restrained’ (PEŽ I 116), *pometīwingi* (III) ‘subordinately’ with a complex suffix *\*-īving-* (cf. above and PEŽ 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’ (PEŽ I 80), *\*aukta-* ‘high’ (PEŽ I 113 s.v. *auctairikijskan*), *meltn* (E) ‘meal (flour)’ = *\*miltan* (PEŽ III 125 f.), *sosto* (E) ‘bench’ = *\*sōstō* (PEŽ 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. *gyvatà* ‘idem’, PEŽ I 376), *bruneto* (E) ‘hazel-hen’ = *\*brūnetō* (PEŽ I

159), *melato* (E) ‘(black) woodpecker’ = \**melat̃s* (PEŽ III 112 f.), *kamato* (E) ‘dill (Fenchel)’ = \**kamat̃s* (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’ = \**krīkait̃s* (PEŽ II 272 f.), *sliwaytos* ‘plums’ = \**slīvait̃s* (PEŽ IV 131), *wisnaytos* (E) ‘cherries’ = \**vīsnait̃s* (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* ‘finger-nail’ = \**nagutīs* (: OSl. *nogotb* ‘idem’), cf. Lith. *krauj-ūtis* ‘milfoil’ (Skardžius l.c.).

§ 78. Pr. suf. \*-āt- occurs in nouns: *deiwuts* (Cat.) ‘blissful’ < \**deiwātas* ‘devout’ (= Lith. *dievōtas*, PEŽ I 193), *nagotis* (E) ‘(iron) cauldron with legs’ = \**nagot̃is* (PEŽ III 168), *sarote* (E) ‘carp’ = \**zarot̃ē* <--adj. \**zārāta-* ‘(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)tē, e.g.: *trumpstis* (E with *t-* = *c-*) ‘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)’ (-> acc. *kailūst-iskun*<sup>29</sup> III ‘health’), cf. PEŽ II 73 f.

§ 82. Pr. suf. *\*-ist-* was used to derive diminutives (of the neuter gender): *eristian* (E) ‘lamb’ = *\*(i)ērist’an* (= *ērisčias* ‘idem’ PEŽ I 284), *gertistian* (E) ‘chicken’ = *\*gertist’an* (PEŽ I 356), *\*wo[s]istian* (E) ‘goatling’ = *\*(v)ōzist’an* (PEŽ IV 262), *\*wersistian* (*werstian* E) ‘calf’ = *\*versist’an* (PEŽ IV 231), *\*parsistian* (*prastian* E) ‘pig’ = *\*parsist’an* (PEŽ III 334 f.); cf. also Endzelīns SV 53.

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

§ 83. Pr. suf. *\*-t(u)v-* [= *\*-t(u)u-*] 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’ = *\*prēi(j)art(u)vē* (PEŽ III 346), neut. *schutuan* (E) ‘twisted yarn’ = *\*šūt(u)van* (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. *\*-tāja-*, *\*-ēja-*, *\*-ija-* (i.e. masc. *\*-tājas*, *\*-ējas*, *\*-ijas*) agent nouns were derived, cf. Pr. (E) *artoyas* ‘ploughman’ = *\*artōj<sup>a</sup>s* (PEŽ I 93), *gewineis* ‘(unskilled) worker’ < *\*gevinēj<sup>a</sup>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. *\*-užē* seems to have been used to derive diminutives, cf. Pr. (E) *geguse* ‘cuckoo’ = *\*geguzē* < Balt. *\*gegužē* ‘idem’. The same may be seen in Pr. (Gr) spelling *merguss* ‘maiden’ = *\*merguzē* ‘idem’ – see Endzelīns SV 54, PEŽ III 134 with bibl., Ambrazas DDR II 98.

<sup>29</sup> With the ending *-un* in accordance with nom. *\*kailūstisku* < *\*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 Catechisms.

§ 87. Although Pr. *wijrs* (III) ‘man’ is an *a*-stem substantive (cf. acc. sg. *wijran*, acc. pl. *wīrans* etc.), its *i*-stem forms occur occasionally, cf. (III) acc. sg. *wijrin*, acc. pl. (*sallubai*)*wīrins*, 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*<sup>30</sup> 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. *quāitan* arose beside *i*-stem nom. sg. *quāits* ‘will’ (with its *-s* < \**-is*, cf. PEŽ II 324 and § 126)<sup>31</sup>. Similarly, translators of the catechisms produced innovative *a*-

---

<sup>30</sup> This *-s* being of different origin there, i.e. < \**-as* and \**-is* respectively. – *L.P.*

<sup>31</sup> 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 Catechisms. This possibly points to a printer’s mistake. On the other hand, acc. sg. *quāitan* (instead of *quāitin*) 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 (*quāitan*) to be a fact of the living Samlandian speech (not a translator’s mistake!) in PEŽ II 324 (cf. also *a*-stem *Etneiwwings labs quāits* III 51<sub>20</sub>). 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)<sup>32</sup>.

§ 88. In the same way were produced innovative *a*-stem forms of a numeral Pr. (Cat.) card. acc. sg. *\*-an* (*desimton* III 27<sub>1</sub> ‘ten’ used as a nominative), acc. pl. *\*-ans* (*dessimtons* III 67<sub>3</sub>). 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 *\*-is* (< *\*-as*), e.g.: *Deywis* ‘God’,

---

Finally, 2 *i*-stem occurrences among all 3 occurrences of accusative singular even do not suffice to reconstruct *i*-stem at all (in spite of its possibility) when confronted to 7 instances of nom. sg. masc. (!) *quāits* (or *quāits*) in the Catechisms. An *a*-stem form (masc. *\*kwāitas*) seems to be no less regular than an *i*-stem form (masc. or fem. *\*kwaitis*) – cf. Lith. *a*-stem nom. sg. masc. dial. *kañdas* vs. *i*-stem fem. *kandis*. Pr. nom. sg. *quāits* being undoubtedly masculine (*twais quāits*), an assumption of the *i*-stem should contradict to regular feminine occurrences of *i*-stem abstracts in Lithuanian. Therefore the opinion of PEŽ II 324 still seems to be more plausible: the spelling *quāitan* corresponded to living spoken Prussian. – *L.P.*

<sup>32</sup> 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 *īa*-stem forms (strongly mixed with *i*-stem forms) as well as a doubtful difference between *īa*-, *i*- and *e*-stem accusatives [uniformly spelled as *-ian(s)* / *-ien(s)* / *-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. fn. 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 fn's 48 and 8], such instances as *a*-stem acc. pl. *kaūlins* (III) should have arisen as a regular result of the said neutralization – cf. Palmaitis BGR 77 and *Borussica: 3. Über die Herkunft der Form kaūlins in der preußischen Katechismensprache* / Baltistica XXVI (1) 20–22. – *L.P.*

*dumis* = \**dūm<sup>i</sup>s* ‘smoke’, *caymis* = \**kaim<sup>i</sup>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<sub>14</sub>), *tawas* (III 47<sub>2,10</sub>)<sup>33</sup>.

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. *krěslo* ‘idem’), *lunkan* ‘bast’ (cf. OSl. *lyko*), etc.

Cf. fewer in the Catechisms: *buttan* (III) = *buten* (II) ‘house (home)’, *gīwan* (III) ‘life’, *wargan* (III) ‘evil’, *testamentan* (I) ‘testament’ vs. masc. *testaments* (III) ‘idem’, etc.

§ 91. **Gen. sg. (masc., neut.)** \**-as* is attested in all Catechisms, e.g. (III): *Deiwas* ‘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, (*Deiw*)-*as* goes back to WBalt. \**-as(i)a* (van Wijk Ap. St. 77, Trautmann AS 216, Endzelīns 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*

<sup>33</sup> Cf. also adj. nom. sg. masc. *-skas* (*isarwiskas* III, etc.), not shortened due to difficulty in pronouncing complex *°-sks*, or ord. *pīrms* (I, Gr) ‘first’, not shortened because of the complex *°-rms*. 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 (Palnaitis BGR 115). For the purpose of shortening Pr. nom. \**-as* > *-s* cf. also ftn. 47.

<sup>34</sup> 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 Palnaitis BGR 40/41, 78 f., and even 19 years earlier in Палнмайтис М.Л. *Индоевропейская апофония 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)<sup>34</sup>. Cf. also further.

§ 92. Rosinas BİM 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. *\*-ā* [= Lith. (*vil̃k*)-*o* etc.] turned into Pr. *\*-ā̃*. 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. *silkasdrīb*’ (E 484, see PEŽ 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, PEŽ 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. (*būt*)-*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 PEŽ 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. *\*-ās*) beside acc. sg. *-ān* (< Balt. *\*-ān*) that contributed to the presense 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.*

<sup>35</sup> 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 (*silkasdrīb*’, *Wilkaskaymen* etc.). – *L.P.*

(not *-s* as in nom. sg. masc.) beside acc. sg. *-ān* (“casus generalis”)<sup>35</sup>.

§ 93. **Acc. sg. masc., neut.** Balt. *\*-an* (< IE *\*-ōm*) > Pr. *\*-an* (: Lith. *-q*, Latv. *-u*), e.g.: (masc.) *Deiwan* (III), *Deywan* (II), *Deiuan* (I) ‘God’, *tāwan* (III), *thawan* (II, I) ‘father’, etc.; (neut.) *buttan* (I, III), *butten* (II with *-en* instead of *-an*) ‘house (home)’, etc.

§ 94. **Dat. sg. masc., neutr.** ends in *-u* which is attested in following instances: a) (III) *grīku* ‘sin’, *malniku* ‘child’, *waldniku* ‘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 97<sub>15</sub>, 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* (*stūrnavingisku prei sīru* III 115<sub>19</sub>) 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. *\*-ṽ* (= *\*-ā*) < unstressed Balt. *\*-ō* (cf. § 19, § 163)<sup>36</sup>.

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

<sup>36</sup> V. Mažiulis speaks about *a*-stem dat. sg. masc., neut. *-u* < *\*-ō*, 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* = *\*-ṽ* < generalized *\*-ṽ* < 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 *stūrnavingisku* (III 115<sub>19</sub>) immediately, i.e. *°sīra* = *a*-stem v. 1 pers. sg. ps. *as cixtia* III 129<sub>10</sub> < *\*-a* < *\*-ā* = *\*-ṽ* < 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* = *\*-ō̄* > *-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 *\*ō̄* in the middle (> Cat. *\*-ō-*, cf. *perōni* III) and in the final (> Cat. *\*-u*, cf. *sīru* III) positions. – *L.P.*

<sup>37</sup> 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 I. 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. *-iẽ* (*nam-iẽ*, *or-iẽ*), cf. BS 127 ff., Rosinas *Baltistica* XXXIV 179<sup>37</sup>.

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. PEŽ 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<sub>1</sub>, I 5<sub>1</sub>) ‘commandments’ with an accented final circumflex \*-āi rendered as *-aey* (i.e. reflecting a lengthened first component of the diphthong, cf. PEŽ III 215, as well as § 4). For the *a*-stem (i.e. *a/e*-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) *-ō* = \*-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. PEŽ IV 226 f. The same should be said about Pr. (E) *slayo* ‘sledge’, cf. PEŽ IV 126 f. (s.v. *slayan*) and bibliography<sup>38</sup>. In spite

---

even in separate dialects” (ibid. p. 178). However Common Indoeuropean was not any “standard Latin” but a sum of related dialects. The same is true for Common Baltic. Thus WBaltic and EBaltic were independent dialects of late Indoeuropean (WBaltic shared some isoglosses with Slavic and not shared them with EBaltic). Therefore, the “secondary cases”, including the paradigmatic locative, were formed in EBaltic separately, as it has been showed in BS – cf. e.g. “loc.” Pr. (*bīt*)-ai ≠ Lith. \*-ei in (*nam*)-ie. Rosinas, ibid. p. 178–180, applies B. Comrie’s and S. Lauraghi’s rules of syncretism of cases to an epoch when cases were on the initial stage of formation. – *L.P.*

<sup>38</sup> In spite of predicative neutral adjectives (used adverbially) and neuter-gender pronouns, there is no grammatical neuter gender in Eastern Baltic. The presence of this gender in Prussian (as well as orientation toward traditional comparative studies) led to a wide-spread opinion that the neuter gender vanished in EBaltic. Nevertheless, one finds no plural neuter forms in Prussian. A hypothesis (PEŽ I. c.) that *a*-stem neuter plural forms first were re-interpreted as singular forms of abstract *ā*-stem substantives but later turned into collective nouns, does not convince. The development of plural originates in grammaticalizing forms of nouns with a collective meaning (cf. Palmaitis BGR 97–99 and especially 235–237 about absence of number in the 3rd “person” of Baltic verb as an implication of the absence of neuter gender). It is difficult to image a “degrammaticalization” of one case of a paradigm into some lexical meaning. – *L.P.*

of attempts to regard Pr. *malnijkiku* (III 47<sub>13</sub>, 113<sub>14-15</sub>) to be an *a*-stem neutral plural form (Trautmann AS 218, Endzelīns 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)<sup>39</sup>.

§ 98. **Gen. pl. (masc.)**. An allomorphy *-an* / *-un* is apparent in this case, cf.: *grīkan* (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), *noūson* (III) ‘our’, *ioūsan* (III) and *ioūson* (III) ‘your’, *stēisan* (III) and *stēison* (III) ‘these’, etc. Pronouns in *-an* may have a possessive meaning (Endzelīns SV 89).

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

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

<sup>39</sup> 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. *sīrisku* (1x III) ‘heartily’ instead of *śīriskai*, as a usual manifestation of the allomorphy of alternating pairs Pr. (Cat.) *āi* / *ā* (accented), *ai* / *a* (generalized, unaccented), cf. fn’s 12, 23, 27. Such pairs as *malnijkiku* / *malnijkikai*, *sīrisku* / *śīriskai*, or nom. sg. fem. *deiwūtisku* / *deiwūtiskai* (cf. further fn. 43) show that this allomorphy arose before the epoch of transition *\*ā̄* > *ū* 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. *nidruwīngin* III 121<sub>5</sub>) came into being.

§ 100. **Acc. pl. (masc.)** Pr. \*-*ans* (with undoubtful -*ān*) is attested in the Catechisms, cf.: *Deiwans* (I, II, III) ‘deities’, *tāwans* (III) ‘fathers’, etc., adj. *maldans* ‘young’, etc. This -*ans* cannot be easily put into connection with EBalt. acc. pl. -*us* (Lith. *tėvus* = Latv. *tėv-us*), plg. Būga III 703 (although the problem of Pr. -*ans* is not discussed), Endzelīns BVSF 117, Stang Vergl. Gr. 186, Kazlauskas LKIG 176.

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

1) as an accented Balt. \*-*ōns* > EBalt. \*-*ōs*<sup>40</sup> > Lith.-Latv. -*us* (cf. Endzelīns l. c., Stang l. c., Kazlauskas l. c.), and

2) as an unaccented Balt. \*-*āns* > WBalt. \*-*āns* > Pr. -*ans* (cf. Stang l. c.). This WBalt. \*-*āns* coincided with WBalt. acc. pl. fem. \*-*āns*<sup>41</sup> which had replaced an older WBalt. \*-*ās* < Balt. \*-*ās* (> Lith.-Latv. -*as*), cf. BS 185 ff., 311 f.

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

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

<sup>41</sup> The assumption of this secondary acc. pl. fem. \*-*āns* in Western Baltic had to explain the survival (due to systemic reasons) of acc. pl. masc. \*-*āns* 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. <sup>o</sup>-as (not -ans) is attested. As for the reasoning, it is not sufficient in its turn, e.g.:

a) the main (first) argument of gen. sg. *sounons* (1x I) as if ending in <sup>\*</sup>-qs (with a nasal <sup>\*</sup>-q-, Rosinas BĪM 82 ff.) is not correct because the spelling (*soun*)-ons (II 11<sub>14-15</sub>) is nothing but a mistake instead of (*soun*)-os [= (*sun*)-os (I 11<sub>13</sub>) = Pr. (Cat.) gen. sg. <sup>\*</sup>-ūs, cf. more in § 135;

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

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

d) similarly, one cannot assume the same “nasal” <sup>\*</sup>-j in (III) *kīrki* and *kīrkin* because *kīrki* (III 109<sub>10</sub>) is a mistake instead of gen. sg. *kīrkis* (cf. PEŽ II 193);

e) -a in the 4th hapax *winna* (III) is not any “nasal” <sup>\*</sup>-q: probably it is an occasional mistake either instead of <sup>\*</sup>-ā = <sup>\*</sup>-an (Endzelīns FBR XV 102), or as a result of dissimilation instead of <sup>\*</sup>-an.

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

§ 103. **Dat. pl.** -mans characterizes the entire system of Prussian declension in the Catechisms (cf. *waikammans* ‘servants’ etc.). Beside this, an allomorph -mas occurs among personal pronouns there, cf. 2 pers. pl. *ioumas* beside *iōūmans*, 1 pers. pl. *noumans* etc. The origin of the allomorphs -mans and -mas is regarded to be unclear, cf. Trautmann AS 220, Endzelīns 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. *\*-mō* 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 BİM 45 consented in principle. Nevertheless it is difficult to believe his reconstruction Balt. dat. pl. *\*-mōs*, not *\*-mōns*. Cf. also § 166.

#### *ā*-stems

§ 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) *\*-ō* = (conventionally) *\*-ā* < Pr. *\*-ā* (= *\*-ō*), which turned into Pr. (Cat.) *-ū* (cf. *mergu* III, *widdewū* III ‘widow’) after the labials and gutturals, but

<sup>42</sup> It was the quality Pr. *\*ō* 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* (= *\*ō*) is attested on place of Cat. *ā* just as in (E), cf. top. *Byoten* and *biātwei* (III), *Būga* III 106. Beside the transition *\*ō* > *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/ *Seppothem* 1494, *ibid.* 151. This means that *\*ō* 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 *\*ō* had time to turn into *ū* after *L, G*, but afterwards (*\*ō*) 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 *\*ō* into *ā* “downwards from above” had to run almost simultaneously to an opposite transition *\*ē* > *ī* “upwards from below”! Since therefore the transition *\*ō* > *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)<sup>42</sup>.

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

Pr. (E, Cat.)  $*-ā$  (=  $*-ō$ ) < Balt.  $*-ā$  (=  $*-ō$ ) (IE <  $*-ā$ ), as well as Lith. (*rank*)- $à$  = Latv. (*rùok*)- $a$ .

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’), *crixtisnai* ‘baptism’ (beside *crixtisna* ‘idem’) etc. This  $-ai$  possibly comes from adj. / pron.  $-ai$  (cf. Trautmann AS 223, Endzelīns SV 62)<sup>43</sup>.

§ 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)  $*-ā$  =  $*-ō$  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.  $*ō$  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](http://www.eidem.lt/dialangn.htm) (2002–2004). – L.P.

<sup>43</sup> 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.)  $āi$  /  $ā$ ,  $ēi$  /  $ē$  (all accented), as well as at the end of words  $-āi$  /  $-ā$ ,  $-ēi$  /  $-ē$  (accented),  $-ai$  /  $-a$ ,  $-ei$  /  $-e$  (generalized, unaccented). For the origin of this allomorhism cf. fn. 12. Cf. also fn’s 23, 27, 39, 89, 92.

For a more risky (“new and interesting”) my earlier explanation of (*mens*)- $ai$  / (*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  $*-\bar{s} > *-\bar{u}$  after *L, G* did not occur, cf. *ālgas* III (not  $^{\circ}\bar{a}lgus$ ) or a reduced ending in *menses* II (beside *mensas* III) – Endzelīns SV 62, Stang Vergl. Gr. 197, 293.

§ 107. **Dat. sg.** Pr. (adj., subst.) *-āi* < Balt.  $*-\bar{a}i$ : *tickray* ‘right’, *alkīniskai* ‘trouble, hunger’. Forms (III) *kanxtisku, spartisku* etc. cannot be datives<sup>44</sup> (thus Trautmann AS 225, Stang Vergl. Gr. 199) – cf. Endzelīns SV 63, PEŽ II 112 f. (s.v. *kanxtisku*), PEŽ IV 143 (s.v. *spartisku*).

§ 108. **Acc. sg. (fem.)** Pr. *-an* =  $*-\bar{a}n$  < Balt.  $*-\bar{a}n$ : *deinan* ‘day’, *rankan* ‘hand’, *aumūsnan* ‘washing (off)’.

Such forms as *mergwan* ‘maiden’ (I, II) have *-wan* instead of *-an* (cf. *mergan* III), cf. Endzelīns SV 63, PEŽ 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, Endzelīns SV 63 with bibl., PEŽ II 275 s.v. *cixtiāniskun*<sup>45</sup>.

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

Forms (*stai gennai* (III) ‘women, wives’, *preibillīsnai* (III) ‘promises’) are innovations in accordance with the *a*-stem pattern nom. pl. (masc.) *-ai*, cf. Trautmann AS 228, Endzelīns SV 63<sup>46</sup>.

§ 110. **Gen. pl.** ends in  $*-un$  as in *a*-stems (cf. § 98): *menschon* (1x I 910) =  $*menson$  =  $*mensun$  ‘bodies’.

<sup>44</sup> Why not! Cf. fn’s 39, 43. – *L.P.*

<sup>45</sup> Forms acc. sg. fem. *mergwan, cixtiāniskun* point to nom. sg. fem. *mergu, \*cixtiānisku* with their *-u* <  $*-\bar{u}$  <  $*\bar{a}$  after *L, G*, plg. *gallū* (III) <  $*galwū$  <  $*galwā$  ‘head’ beside *galwo* (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.*

<sup>46</sup> A mistake (not an innovation) is credible, especially in *preibillīsnai*. Nevertheless for the plausibility of *stai gennai* as a collective form (cf. Greek nom. pl. fem.!) see fn. 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’, *mergūmans* ‘maidens’, *widdewūmans* ‘widows’.

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

#### *īa-* and *ija-*stems

§ 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 (*īa*-stem) *\*-’an* in (E): *median* ‘forest’ (= *\*med’an*), *eristian* ‘lamb’ (= *\*īērist’an*, PEŽ I 284), *wargien* ‘copper’ (= *\*var’an*, PEŽ IV 221), etc.

**Nom.sg.masc.** occurs with following inflections in (E): a) an *īja*-stem *\*-īs*, cf. *rikis* ‘lord’ (= *\*rīkīs*), and b) (*i*)*īja*-stem *\*-īs*, cf. [*c*] *juylis* ‘boar’ (= *\*kuilīs*), *kadegis* ‘juniper’ (= *\*kadegīs*), *angurgis* ‘eel’ (= *\*angur’īs*, PEŽ I 79), etc. In the Catechisms the *īja*-stem inflection *\*-īs* was shortened into *\*-īs*, if the stress had been retracted from it to the stem: *bousennis* (III) ‘position (situation)’ (= *\*būsenis* with the 1st syllable stressed, cf. spelling *-ou-*!), *nosēilis* (III) ‘spirit’ (= *\*nōsēilis* with the main stress on the 1st syllable and the secondary occasional stress on the 2nd syllable, cf.

<sup>47</sup> One should reconstruct: Baltic *īja*-stem nom. sg. (masc.) *\*(dag)īja-s* ‘thistle’ (borrowed into Estonian *takijas!*), *īa*-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. *vīrā-*, 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. *Общенигоевропейская, 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. *dagys* ‘thistle’, Pr. *rikīs* ‘lord’). Since as a result the morphological contrast between nom. *\*-īs* and acc. *\*-ijan* became unclear, the latter form was replaced with acc. *\*-īn* > *\*-in* which coincided with the *i*-

PEŽ III 198). The *ija*-stem inflection *\*-īs* was not shortened if the word was oxytone and the stress was not retracted: *rickis* ‘Lord’ (= *\*rikīs* < *\*rikīs* with the stressed ending, cf. PEŽ IV 24 ff.)<sup>47</sup>.

§ 114. **Acc. sg.** inflections are:

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

a *ja-/ija*-stem *\*-’an* – cf. *tawischan*, *tawischen* (III) ‘neighbour’ with *-schan* < *\*-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<sup>48</sup>.

§ 115. **Gen. sg.** inflections are:

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

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

an *ja-/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. *-is* (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 *ja*-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. *svėčias* ‘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.*

<sup>48</sup> A trend of generalizing acc. *-in* in all palatal stems. Cf. *ftn's* 49, 54. – *L.P.*

<sup>49</sup> 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 (*kau*)*lei* is a result of reduction in an unstressed position (§ 116). Cf. even the 3rd explanation for the SAME *-lin(s)* in *grėiwakaulin* 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. *ftn's* 32 and 8, 48, 54. – *L.P.*

this is not an *iā*-stem form (thus: Trautmann AS 238, Endzelīns l.c.), but an *a*-stem form *\*kaulai*, which was barytone (cf. Lith. *káulai*, Latv. *kaūls*). As a barytone form, it ended in unstressed *\*-ai*, spelled as *-ei* (PEŽ II 143, Schmalstieg OP 45)<sup>49</sup>.

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

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

*\*-’ans* in the (*i*)*iā*-stem word *bousenniens* ‘positions’ with *-niens* = *\*-n’ans*,

*\*-īns* in (III) *bīskopins* ‘bishops’, *predickerins* ‘church rectors’, etc., which is borrowed from *i*-stems to replace former acc. pl. masc. *\*-ans* (Trautmann AS 239, Endzelīns l. c.), cf. (III) acc. sg. *wjrin* ‘man’ instead of *wiran*, cf. § 87<sup>50</sup>.

Pr. (III 101<sub>13-14</sub>) *grēiwakaulin* ‘rib’ ending in *-in* may be a genitive plural (= accusative singular!), i.e. an innovative *i*-stem “general case” (*casus generalis*) form, cf. Endzelīns l. c.<sup>51</sup>

#### *ī / iā*-stems

§ 118. This type of declension of feminine substantives is very archaic, cf. e.g. Lith. nom. *mar̃t̃* ‘bride’ < *\*-ī* / gen. *mar̃čiō̃s* < *\*-iās* etc. beside OInd. nom. *devī* ‘goddess’ / gen. *devyās* 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 *\*-ī* – in the Elbing Vocabulary: *asy* ‘boundary’ = *\*azī* (< *\*ezī* ‘idem’) *crausy* ‘pear-tree’ = *\*krausī* (nom. pl. *ē krausios* ‘pears’ < *\*-iās*), *mary* ‘sea’ = *\*marī*, *nozy* ‘nose’ = *\*nāsī*, *pelky* ‘marsh’ = *\*pelkī*, *sansi* ‘goose’ etc.; cf. PEŽ II 184 f. (s.v. *kexti* and bibliography), Kaukienė LKK XXXVI 87 ff. (and bibliography). These (E) words are of different age and origin (cf. Kaukienė l. c.), there are even borrowings among them, e.g. *dusi* (E) ‘soul’ = *\*dūsī*, a slavism.

<sup>50</sup> *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 *bīskopins*, it was a foreign word too. – L.P.

<sup>51</sup> Cf. fn. 49. – L.P.

$\bar{e}$ -stems

§ 119. **Nom. sg. (fem.)** Balt.  $*-\bar{e}$  produced in Prussian Catechisms 1) accented  $*-\bar{e}$  (e.g. *semmē* III ‘earth’), 2) and unaccented ( $*-\bar{e}$  >  $*-\bar{i}$  >)  $*-\bar{i}$  (e.g. *kurpi* III ‘shoe’, cf. Lith. *kūrpė*).

Rare forms (only in III) are *giwei* ‘life’ (cf. Latv. *dzīve* ‘idem’) and *peisālei* ‘letter, scripture’ with nom. sg. *-ei* in accordance with  $\bar{a}$ -stem nom. sg. *-ai* beside nom. sg. *-a*, cf. § 104 and Endzelīns SV 64<sup>52</sup>.

In the Elbing Vocabulary both accented (e.g. *wosee* ‘goat’) and unaccented (likely *kurpe* ‘shoe’) variants of  $\bar{e}$ -stem nominative singular inflection  $*-\bar{e}$  (cf. Endzelīns l. c.) come from Balt.  $*-\bar{e}$ . The latter originates in  $*-\bar{i}\bar{e}$  (> Lith. *-ė*, Latv. *-e*) which still seems to be of unclear provenance (one of more or less interesting hypotheses belongs to Stang Vergl. Gr. 201 ff.)<sup>53</sup>.

§ 120. **Gen. sg.** III  $*-\bar{i}s$  comes from unaccented (and therefore shortened)  $*-\bar{i}s$  (cf. III  $\bar{a}$ -stem gen. sg. *ālgas* with *-as* <  $*-\bar{a}s$  due to retraction of stress onto the 1st syllable, § 106) <  $*-\bar{e}s$  < Balt.  $*-\bar{e}s$  (> Lith. *-ės*, 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  $*-\bar{i}s$  (<  $*-\bar{i}s$ ) or  $*-\bar{i}s$  from  $*-\bar{e}s$  (PEŽ IV s.v. *Sawliskresil*), cf. Endzelīns SV 64.

§ 121. **Dat. sg.**  $*-ei$  (*semmei* I, *semmiei* II ‘earth’) reflects Pr. (Cat.)  $*-\bar{e}\bar{i}$  < Balt.  $*-\bar{e}\bar{i}$  (Lith. > *-ei*).

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

<sup>53</sup> Balt.  $*-\bar{e}$  “at least partly” <  $*-\bar{i}\bar{a}$  according to Stang l.c. Even (Common) Baltic provenance of  $*-\bar{e}$  is problematic, cf. OSl. *zemlja* <  $*-\bar{i}\bar{a}$  < probably Balt.-Sl.  $*-\bar{i}\bar{a}$  > Balt.  $*-\bar{i}\bar{e}$  > Pr., Lith., Latv.  $*-\bar{e}$  (Pr. *semme*, Lith. *žėmė*, Latv. *zeme*). For  $*-\bar{i}\bar{a}$  >  $*-\bar{e}$  cf. also PEŽ II 311 s.v. *kurpe* with a reference to Jerzy Kuryłowicz in Acta Baltico-Slavica III 83 ff. – L.P.

<sup>54</sup> Cat. acc. sg. *-in* is a usual  $\bar{e}$ -stem ending (ca. 70x vs. ca. 20x *-ien*). Because of the neutralization of /a/ : /e/, and since not a single spelling *-ian* (all being *-ien*) is found for the  $\bar{i}\bar{a}$ -stem accusative singular, any spelling *-ien* cannot be regarded reflecting  $\bar{e}$ -stem Pr. acc. sg.  $*-en$ . In the Catechisms both  $\bar{i}\bar{a}$ - and  $\bar{e}$ -stems’ accusatives have the same soft ending, contaminated with  $\bar{i}$ -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’, *perōnien* III ‘community’ with *-i-* marking palatalization of *w*) = Pr. *\*-en* < Balt. *\*-ēn* (Lith. > *-ę*). An innovative (thus also Endzelīns SV 64 f.) ending is *-in* (*perōnin* III ‘community’) <sup>54</sup>.

§ 123. **Nom. pl.** (E) *-es* reflects Pr. *\*-ēs* (e.g. *raples* ‘tongs’, cf. Lith. *rėplės*). This form is not attested in the dialect of the Catechisms, in which it should have been *\*-īs* < (unaccented) *\*-ēs* (cf. Lith. nom. pl. *žėmės* ‘lands’, *kātės* ‘cats’, etc.; Endzelēns 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. *kùrpėms* – with *\*-i-* < *\*-ī-* < *\*-ē-*) and *\*zemėmans* ‘lands’ (an oxytone form – cf. nom. sg. *semė* 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 Endzelīns SV 65. It seems doubtful whether the spelling *kīrkis* III 131 <sub>16</sub> ‘church’ reflects accusative plural (thus Bezzenberger KZ XLI 81, Toporov PJ V 13), cf. PEŽ II 193 with bibl., Endzelīns l. c.

#### *i*-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. *\*-ijas* > Pr. (E) *\*-īs* is spelled there (*kadagis* ‘juniper’ etc.). The latter belongs to *ija*-stems (cf. Lith. *kadugỹs* ‘idem’ and § 113).

In dialects of the Catechisms *i*-stem Pr. nom. sg. *\*-is* (being unaccented) turned into *-s* (cf. § 87), but *ija*-stem Pr. nom. sg. *\*-īs* turned into (unaccented) *\*-īs* (cf. § 113). Both transitions took place simultaneously, both nominative forms being finally opposed to the same accusative form *i*-stem *-in* = (*i*)*ija*-stem *-in* <-- (replaced) *\*-'an* (§ 114), cf. Lith. *i*-stem acc. (*āv*)-*i* ‘sheep’ = *ija*-stem acc. (*dag*)-*i* ‘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. \*-īs was produced (probably by Abel Will) beside nom. sg. \*-īs (< \*-īš, cf. § 113) according to equation

a-stem nom. sg. -**s** : acc. sg. -**an** : gen. sg. -**as** =

i-stem nom. sg. -**s** : acc. sg. -**in** : gen. sg. *X* =

(i)ja-stem nom. sg. -**is** : acc. sg. -**in** : gen. sg. *Y*,

i.e.  $X = Y = *-is$ .

With this innovative  $Y = \text{Pr. (Cat.) gen. sg. } *īs$  (probably attested in *wyszenmukis* ‘almighty’ II, cf. also § 148 further) an old *i*-stem Pr. gen. sg. \*-eis (cf. BS 263 ff.) was replaced<sup>55</sup>. 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. \*-īs, cf. (i)ja- or *a*-stem dat. sg. *klausīweniki* (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<sup>55</sup>.

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. \*-ei/\*-i<sup>55</sup>, cf. BS 288 f., Rosinas Baltistica XXXIV 179, Stang l. c.

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

<sup>55</sup> BS 271 explains distribution of  $i_1$ -,  $u_1$ -stems (originally “active”, i.e. fientive) and  $i_2$ -,  $u_2$ -stems (originally “inactive”) in later EBalt. gen. sg. \*-eis, \*-aus, but WBalt. gen. sg. \*-is, \*-us. Cf. also BS 288 f., Palmaitis 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*-, *ā*-, *e*-stem datives as well as to all other cases with vocal inflections. – L.P.

<sup>56</sup> These variants seem to have been allomorphs of the same soft ending, cf. fn. 54. – L.P.

*in* (> Lith. *-į*) beside Pr. (Cat.) *\*-en* (nautien etc.), which was an innovation borrowed either from the *ē*-stem, or from the *i/īā*-stem (if not even *īa*-stem) paradigm into the *i*-stem paradigm<sup>56</sup>. Cf. Endzelīns SV 66 and bibl.

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

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

§ 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.

§ 132. **Acc. pl.** ends in Pr. (Cat.) *-ins* (*ackins* ‘eyes’, *āusins* ‘ears’ *nautins* ‘troubles’, etc.) = *\*-īns* < WBalt. *\*-īns* < Balt. *\*-īns* > EBalt. *\*-īns* (> *\*-īs* > Lith. *-is*); 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. *\*-īns* did not undergo denasalization.

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

#### *u*-stems

§ 134. **Nom.-acc. sg. neut.** ends in *-u* (E *alu* ‘mead’, *meddo* ‘honey’ with *-o*) = Pr. *\*-ū* (cf. OInd. *mādhu* ‘sweet drink’, honey’).

**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. *\*-īs* (= E *geytys*) > (Cat.)

<sup>57</sup> Cf. an alternative reconstruction WBalt. gen. sg. *\*-us* in BS 271; cf. fn. 55. – L.P.

\*-s (III *geits*), see §§ 87, 126.

§ 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.)<sup>57</sup>.

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<sub>13</sub>) *sunos* ‘son’ = \*-*us*. Therefore, a segment *-ons* (cf. a separate opinion of Rosinas BİM 82) in spelling (II 11<sub>14-15</sub>) *sounons* 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<sub>13</sub>) *sohns* ‘son’ on original *-os* (= *sunos* I 11<sub>13</sub>) = Pr. (Cat.) \*-*ūs*, under which the spelling *sounons* 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. *andangonsyn* ‘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’ = \**br̥tē*, *mothe* ‘mother’ = \**m̥tē* and (III) *mūti* ‘idem’ (with *-ū-* < \**-ō-* = 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*<sup>58</sup>.

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. *mótė*, acc. sg. *móterį* vs. Latv. nom. sg. *māte*, gen. sg. *mātes*)<sup>59</sup>.

Pr. (E) *smoy* ‘man’ = \**zmōj* (: Lith. dial. \**žmuōj* ‘idem’ < *žmuō* ‘idem’) imply Baltic *n*-stem nom. sg. \**žmō* ‘idem’ < \**žmōn* ‘idem’; cf. Endzelīns 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. Endzelīns l. c., PEŽ II 36 ff. with bibl.<sup>60</sup>.

§ 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*), *skellānts* ‘owing (indebted)’ < Pr. \**skelāntis* [cf. Lith. (*bėga*)-*ntis*]; (*emprijki*)*sins* ‘being (in front), (*prae*)*sens*’ < \**sens* ‘being’ (PEŽ I 257, as in Lat. *ab-sens* ‘not-being, absent’) < (Cat.) \**sents* < Pr. \**sentis* ‘idem’ (cf. Lith. *ėasantis* ‘idem’),

<sup>58</sup> 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. fn. 54. – *L.P.*

<sup>59</sup> 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<sub>5</sub>) *bratrikai* ‘brothers’ (nom. pl. masc.) with the *a*-stem suf. dimin. *-īk(a)-*. – *L.P.*

<sup>60</sup> V. Mažiulis reconstructs an *ā*-stem \**irmō*, cf. l. c. – *L.P.*

*smunents* ‘man’ (= \**zmūnents* < Pr. \**žmōnentis*, PEŽ IV 135), (*emm*)*ens* ‘name’ = (*kērm*)*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* (Endzelīns SV 67, 126; cf. also Stang Vergl. Gr. 219 for another opinion. Up to now it has not been taken into consideration that Pr. (Cat.) nom. sg. *geits* ‘bread’ (as well as E *geity[s]* = \**geitis* ‘idem’) and nom. sg. *quāits* ‘will’ are *i*-stem forms having their Pr. (Cat.) nom. sg. *-s* from *i*-stem Pr. nom. sg. \**īs*, cf. PEŽ I 343 (s.v. \**geity:s*) and PEŽ II 324 (s.v. *quāits*) respectively; cf. also §§ 87, 126.

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

Cf. also (*C*-stem = *i*-stem) **acc. pl.** Pr. (Cat.) \**-ins* (= III *smunent-ins* ‘people’ etc., cf. Endzelīns SV 67) < Balt. \**-īns* (§ 132)<sup>61</sup>.

Acc. sg. (III) *kermenen* ‘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[e]n-* (for another opinion cf. Endzelīns l. c.). As for innovations acc. sg. (III) *kērmenan*, *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 *kermenes* ‘body’), which is usually considered to be an archaic (*n*-stem) inflection Balt. \**-es* [> Lith. (*akmen*)-*ès*], cf. van Wijk Apr. St. 75, Endzelīns l. c., idem BVSF 140, Stang Vergl. Gr. 220, Kazlauskas LKIG 253, BS 246, Zinkevičius LKIG 243, Rosinas BĮM 83. However there is no ground to assume that (III *-es*) was accented (Stang Vergl. Gr. 297). The genitive singular of

<sup>61</sup> V. Mažiulis considers *C*-stem Balt. acc. pl. \**-īns* 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.*

<sup>62</sup> 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. fn. 55, 63. – *L.P.*

any declension was unaccented in the Catechisms, cf. even 1)  $\bar{a}$ -stem *ālgas* III ‘salary’ with unaccented  $-ā\bar{s}$  < original accented Pr.  $*-\bar{a}s$  (= Lith. *algōs*), or 2)  $\bar{e}$ -stem *teisis* III ‘honour’ with unaccented  $-ī\bar{s}$  < original accented Pr.  $*-\bar{i}s$  <  $*-\bar{e}s$  (under the stress the final  $*-\bar{e}s$  should not have turned into  $*-\bar{i}s$  > III  $-ī\bar{s}$  at all). On the other hand, (*kermen*)-*es* could not come from unstressed  $*-\bar{e}s$  since then the latter should have been reduced into  $*-\bar{s}$ <sup>62</sup>.

I think that *kermenēs* ‘body’ has an innovative (*i*-stem) gen. sg.  $-es$  = Pr. (III)  $*-\bar{i}s$  [= (*niaubillīnt*)-*is* (III) ‘not speaking’], which appeared here in the same way as  $-en$  = Pr. (III)  $*-\bar{i}n$  in acc. sg. *kermenēn* (III, see above).

§ 142. **Dat. sg.** has  $-ei$  (*nautei* III ‘trouble, misery’ beside acc. sg. *nautin*) = *i*-stem  $-ei$  < Balt.  $*-ei$  (> Lith. dial.  $-ie$ ), what implies an alternative Balt. dat.  $*-i$  too. Cf. BS 288 f., Rosinas Baltistica XXXIV 179, but Stang Vergl. Gr. 227 f.

§ 143. **Acc. pl. masc., fem.** has  $-ins$  (*smunentins* 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’ (PEŽ II 198), *sywan* ‘(in) grey’ (PEŽ IV 117) etc. For neut. III (pron.) *wissan* ‘all’ and (pron.) *wissa*<sup>63</sup> ‘idem’ (cf. Lith. *visà*), as well as Gr *salta* ‘cold’ (cf. Lith. *šalta* Paulauskienė LKM 211 ff.) see PEŽ 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’ (PEŽ III 238 f. s.v. *paustocatto*), *tickra* III ‘right’ (PEŽ IV 192), (pron.) *wissa* ‘all’, *peronisku* ‘common’, *swintai* ‘holy’ (cf. III *mensai* ‘meat’ beside *mensā* ‘idem’)<sup>64</sup> etc.

### § 145. **Nom. pl.:**

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

<sup>63</sup> Cf. ftn. 62. – *L.P.*

<sup>64</sup> Pr. *kai stāi Swintai bousei bhe niebwinūtei* III 103<sub>13-14</sub> is translated from *das sie Heilig sey vnd vnstrefflich* III 102<sub>11-12</sub> either in adverbial meaning “sacredly and inaccusably”, cf. PKP 200<sup>598</sup>, or with pronominalized forms (cf. further § 152) in accordance with previous pronominalized form pron. *stai* < \**stāji*, cf. further § 158. For *mensai* / *mensā* cf. ftn. 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.** *dūrai* III ‘timorous’ with an ending *-ai* came into being (apparently produced by Abel Will himself), cf. § 109.

(i)ja-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’ (PEŽ IV 254).

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

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

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

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

These forms imply nom. sg. masc. *-ingis* with an (i)ja-stem \**-is* < \**-īs* [similarly to Lith. (*a*-stem *-ingas* -->) *ja*-stem *-ingis*, cf. Skardžius ŽD 121], not an *i*-stem \**-is* (thus Kaukienė LKK XXXVI 95). A conjecture of Kaukienė l. c. that the ending *-is* even in E *gaylis* might belong to the *i*-stem \**-is*, is not grounded (cf. PEŽ 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*)*polijgu* III, cf. Endzelīns Sv 71, PEŽ III 316.



§ 150. For *C*-stem adjectives (participles), which belonged to the *(i)īa*-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* < *\*pirmūj* < Pr. *\*pirmāji* ‘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. *\*(j)is* ‘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. PEŽ III 219 (s.v. *pansdaumannien*), PEŽ IV 218 (s.v. *walnennien*)<sup>65</sup>.

#### Degrees of comparison

§ 153. A word *muisieson* III 69<sub>20</sub> ‘größern’ with all probability means Pr. acc. sg. ‘bigger’ with *-on* = *-an* (for *muis-* cf. PEŽ III 154 f. with

<sup>65</sup> 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* [*\*panzdaum(a)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): *dengnennisis* ‘celestial’ (cf. PEŽ I 196) = possibly Pr. (Cat.) *\*dengininis* < Pr. *\*(i)jā*-stem *\*dengininis* + *\*jis*.

For pronominalized adjectives cf. Lith. (non-pron.) nom. *gėras*, gen. *gėro*, dat. *gerám*, acc. *gėrą*, etc. vs. (pron.) nom. *geràsis*, gen. *gėrojo*, dat. *gerájam*, acc. *gėrąj* (cf. Lith. *jis*, *jō*, *jám*, *jį*), or Rus. (already in basic sense only) *хорону-уū*, *хорону-ею*, *хорону-емя*, etc. – L.P.

bibl.). 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. *\*mūsjesnan*, 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. *toūls* 'more' (< *\*tūlis*) 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. PEŽ I 243), *dessimpts* II and *dessempsts* I ‘ten’ = Pr. (Cat.) \**desimts* < Pr. \**desimtis* (cf. § 88) < Balt. \**dešimtis* (> Lith. *dešimtis*) an *tūsimtōns* 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. *dešimtū* beside *i*-stem *dešimčių*<sup>66</sup>), cf. Stang Vergl. Gr. 280. As for ‘thousand’, the word *tūsimtōns* III implies Pr. (Cat.) *i*-stem nom. sg. \**tūsimts* < Pr. \**tūsimtis* (cf. Lith. *tūkstantis*); cf. PEŽ 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. *pirmas*), pron. masc. *pirmois*, fem. *pirmoi* ‘that first’, cf. PEŽ III 284 f.;

*antars* ‘second’ = \**ant(a)ras*, fem. *antrā* < Balt. \**antaras* ‘idem’ (> Lith. dial. *añtaras* > *añtras* ‘idem’), \**antarā* respectively, cf. PEŽ I 84<sup>67</sup>;

*tirtis* / *īrts*, fem. *tirti* ‘third’ maybe coming from Balt. \**tritjas* ‘idem’ --> EBalt. \**tretjas* ‘idem’ (> Lith. *trėčias* ‘idem’), cf. PEŽ IV 194 f.;

*kettwirts*, fem. *ketwirta* ‘fourth’ < Balt. \**ketvirtas* ‘idem’ (> Lith. *ketviřtas* ‘idem’, etc.), derived with suf. \*-*ta*- from the stem of cardinal ‘four’, cf. PEŽ II 177 f.;

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

<sup>66</sup> Lith. *č* usually comes from \**tj* + “back vowels” in native words. Thus *i*-stem gen. pl. Balt. \**dešimtejon* > EBalt. \**dešimtiun* > Lith. *dešimčių* (for the inflection cf. BS 299). – *L.P.*

<sup>67</sup> 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. *āntran* = *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.*

*usts / uschts*, fem. *uschtai* (for *-ai* cf. *swintai* § 144) ‘sixth’, having its *š* (spelled *sch*) from card. ‘six’ (with *\*-š-* < *\*-sj-*), implies Pr. *\*ustas* ‘sixth’, derived with suf. *\*-ta-* from WBalt. *C*-stem card. *\*ves-/us-* ‘six’ (2 apophonically alternating stems) < indeclinable Balt.-Sl. *\*sveś* ‘idem’ < IE *\*suek’s* ‘idem’. Cf. Lith. *šeši* < *\*seši* < *\*sveś*;

*sepmas* (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. *sepmas* and Lith. *sėkmas* < *\*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.;

*asmus* ‘eighth’ = Pr. nom. sg. masc. *\*asms*<sup>68</sup> (cf. acc. *asman* III) < *\*asmas* < Balt. *\*aśmas* ‘idem’ (> Lith. *āšmas* ‘idem’), derived with suf. *\*-ma-* from Balt. card. *\*ašt-* ‘eight’ (cf. Balt. *\*septmas*), cf. PEŽ I 103;

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

*dessīmts* ‘tenth’ < Balt. *\*dešīmtas* ‘idem’ (with a circumflex *\*-im-* as in Lith. *dešiūntas*) < IE *\*dek’mtos* ‘idem’, derived with IE suf. *\*-to-* from card. IE *\*dek’m̥* ‘ten’, cf. PEŽ I 198.

---

<sup>68</sup> 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<sup>69</sup>) 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 *stā* III) beside *stai*, which is easy to derive from a pronominalized Pr. *\*stājī* (thus also Rosinas BİM 86; otherwise Endzelīns 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, Endzelīns l. c.), this *st-* comes from a suppletion of stems *\*sa-/\*ta-*. However it is not easy to consent to this opinion: Pr. *stas* with all probability comes from Pr. *\*sitas* (: Lith. *šitas*) < Pr. *\*si-* ‘this’ (see further) + Pr. *\*tas* < Balt. *\*tas*, cf. Stang Vergl. Gr. 232, Kuzavinis Kalbotyra VII 217 f., Mažiulis Baltistica XXVI 27, and especially Rosinas BĮ 208 with bibl. Balt. (masc.) *\*tas* (fem. *\*tā*, neut. *\*tā*) was common to all Balts (> Lith. *tas*, Latv. *tas*) having developed from IE suppletive pron. *\*so-/\*to-*.

---

<sup>69</sup> A controversy 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. *steison*) reveal a syntactic function of artoïd *stas* in differentiating cases, what is a feature of analytism in Samlandian of the Catechisms, cf. Palmaitis 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.cidem.lt/dialangn.htm* (2002–2004). – L.P.

§ 160. **Acc. sg. masc., fem.** *stan*. For a spelling *sten* cf. Endzelīns SV 78. Pr. (Cat.) masc. *stan* comes from Balt. *\*tān*, but fem. *stan* comes from Balt. *\*tān*.

§ 161. **Gen. sg. masc., neut.** *stesse* (etc.) is obscure in its turn. It may be derived from WBalt. *\*tesja* (*\*tesje*), i.e. from a / e-stem *\*tes*, extended with a formant *\*-ja* (*\*-je*), cf. Endzelīns 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. *\*tesja* (*\*tesje*) had been associated with a / e-stems adjectives and pronouns, it could produce Pr. gen. masc. *\*tesja-* and gen. fem. *\*tesjā-*.

§ 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. *\*stās-jā*, fem. *stās-jā* respectively (Rosinas BĪM 86, Girdenis, Rosinas GL 17, No 1, 1). 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)<sup>70</sup> and is not any “morphological borrowing” (sic Rosinas BĪM 84). A plenty of forms with stem-vowel *-e-*, *stesse*, *stessei*, etc., as well as dat. *stesmu*, *stessei*, etc. (except *stasma* 2x I, for which Endzelīns SV 77<sup>71</sup>) point to WBalt. a / e-stem pron. *\*tes-* (--> *\*stes-*, cf. Stang Vergl. Gr. 240, BS 93 ff., Baltistica XVI 23), not to Pr.

<sup>70</sup> The reader should understand as if gen. sg. *stessias* III 125<sub>6</sub> (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 Endzelīns I. 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.

<sup>71</sup> J. Endzelīns explains *a* as a broad *e*. However not only was /e/ broad, but its opposition against /a/ was neutralized, cf. *stasma* on the same place in (I). For *stasma* I = *\*st'asm̃* [(with not fully finished *\*̃* > *\*ū* after *L, G* in (I)] cf. Comments (No 88) in the Reconstruction by M. Klosse in: *CATECHISMUS IN PREUßNISCHER SPRACH, UND DAGEGEN DAS DEUDSCHE*. First published: 1545. 6th reprint: Vilnius 1995. Introduction, text, philological comments, reconstruction. / In: Bibliotheca Baltica. Vilnius: Pradai 1995, p. 107. – L.P.

\**stas-*. In addition, when inquiring into the origin of Pr. *-es-* (*stesse* etc.), one should not ignore the segment *-es-* in OSlav. gen. *česo* ‘what’<sup>72</sup>.

Note: forms sg. *steises*, *steismu*, etc. got their *-ei-* from the genitive plural (cf. Endzelīns 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. \**-ō* < Balt. \**-ō* (Rosinas B1M 85). Pr. (Cat.) *stesmu* (*stesma*) < WBalt. \**tesmō* <-- Balt. \**tamō* (cf. BS 163 ff.). See also § 94.

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

A relic of **instr. sg.** is adv. *stu* ‘so’ < Pr. (accented) \**stō* < Balt. \**tō* (> Lith. *tuō*) in expression *stu ilgimi* ‘so long as’. In another expression, *ste mijls* ‘the more willingly’, the word *ste* = Pr. \**stē* shows that there existed an alternant instr. sg. \**tē* beside \**tō* in Baltic<sup>73</sup>.

<sup>72</sup> Some comparative-historical ruse is necessary to ground the reconstruction *stesse* < \**tesja* (\**tesje*), e.g. either \**tesja* > \**tešja* > \**teše* --> \**tese* (similarly Endzelīns l. c.), or \**tesja* > \**tesje* > \**tese*. In any case the transition \**sja* > \**sje* (usually speaking – Baltic-Slavic \**Tjā* > \**Tjē*, cf. fn. 53) is hardly imaginable on Prussian level: Pr. gen. masc. \**tesja-* and gen. fem. \**tesjā-* should have turned into masc. \**teša-*, fem. \**tešā-* respectively, not into \**tese-*, \**tesē-* (?). (Not to mix up with spellings *-sia-* = *-sie-*, which reflect neutralization of phonemes /*al* : /*el*, in Samlandian of the Catechisms! This dialect had nothing to do with Baltic \**tes-*).

Quite convincible, simple and sufficient explanation of the origin of Pr. *stesse* is given by Mažiulis BS 93 ff.: 1) Pr. gen. sg. masc. subst. \**-as* and pron. \**-es-* are of the same IE origin with apophonic Balt. \**a* / \**e* (IE \**o* / \**e*), e.g. Pr. (*deiw*)-*as* = Hit. (*ešh*)-*aš* = Go. (*wulf*)-*is* < \**-es-* = Pr. (*st*)-*ess-e* = OSl. (*č*)-*es-o*; 2) difference in final vowel between Pr. (*stess*)-*e* and OSl. (*čes*)-*o* is also apophonic. Palmaišis 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. *ó*, Go. *sa*. – *L.P.*

<sup>73</sup> 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 fn. 37. – *L.P.*

§ 164. **Nom. pl. masc.** *stai* (III), *staey* (I, II with *-aey* = circumflex *-āi*, § 96) ‘those; these’ = Pr. (Cat.) *\*stāi* ends in *-ai* which is a nominal (subst.) inflection. This inflection replaced original pron. *\*-ei* (cf. e.g. gen. pl. *stēison* with this archaic *\*-ēi*, Endzelīns 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 (Endzelīns SV 79), is incorrect (cf. also Rosinas BĪM 88)<sup>74</sup>.

§ 165. **Gen. pl. masc., neut.** *stēison* (4x), *steison* (8x), *stēisan* (1x) reflect allomorph alternants Pr. (Cat.) *\*stēisun* // *\*stēisan* (with a circumflex *\*-ēi-*) < Pr. *\*tēisun* // *\*tēisan*. These form were also **femine** (Endzelīns SV 79).

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

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

Pr. *stēimans* (with a circumflex *\*-ēi-*) comes from Pr. *\*tēimāns* < Balt. *\*tēimōns* (for *\*-mōns* see § 103). The circumflex *\*-ēi-* was replaced with an acute one when Balt. *\*-ēi-* turned into *\*-ĕ* [cf. Lith. *tīemus*, Latv. *tiēm(s)*].

It seems that the segment *\*tēi-* in Balt. *\*tēimōns* is of the same origin as Balt. nom. pl. masc. *\*tēi* ‘those, these’ with a circumflex *\*-ēi*. The latter was replaced with an acute *\*-ĕ* (*\*tēi* > *\*tĕ*, cf. Latv. *tiē*, although Lith. *tiē*<sup>75</sup>) at the same time as *\*tēi-* > *\*tĕ-* in *\*tēimōns*.

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

<sup>74</sup> For a form of collectivity in *-ai* cf. fn. 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. *tuõs*<sup>75</sup>). Cf. also § 100 f. For the origin of the segment -*ans* in Pr. acc. pl. fem. *stans* from Balt. \*-*ās* 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.** \**šī* (> Lith. *ši*)], or it is misspelled instead of \**schis* with initial *š*- reflecting a non-nominative stem Balt. \**šjā*- (cf. Lith. *šiõs*).

Declensional forms of Pr. \**sis* are discussed in PEŽ 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 BĮM 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. *šī*).

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. \**sei* > Lith. *šiē*.

§ 171. **Gen. pl.** *schīēison* (1x III 111<sub>14</sub> used as genitive singular!) = Pr. (Cat.) \**šēīsun* < Pr. \**sēīsun*, which arose according to pattern \**tēīsun* (\**tēīsan*) ‘those’, cf. § 165.

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

<sup>75</sup> 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 PEŽ IV 81).

*tāns* ‘he’

§ 173. **Nom. sg. masc.** is *tāns* (III, very frequent) ‘he’ = *tāns* < \**tanas* (with a short accented \**ā* in the 1st syllable<sup>76</sup>).

**Nom. sg. fem.** is *tannā*, *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. \**tanas*, fem. \**tanā* come from the composition of stems Pr. \**ta-* ‘that’ (§ 158) + \**ana-* ‘that there’ (= Lith. *anàs*), cf. van Wijk Apr. St. 115 ff., Endzelīns l. c., *Stang* Vergl. Gr. l. c.

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

*-din* ‘him, her’

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

§ 176. Pr. *-din* etc. < Balt. (dial.) \**-din* ‘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

<sup>76</sup> 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.

cautiously), cf. Toporov l. c. with bibl., Mažiulis *Baltistica* XXVII 95 f.). 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. (dial.) acc.-nom. sg. *\*-di*, acc. sg. *\*-din* etc.; b) Iran. acc.-nom. sg. *\*-di*, acc. sg. *\*-dim* etc.

*kas* ‘who’, *ka* ‘what’

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

a) pron. interr. ‘who? what?’, e.g.: *Kas pogaunai* [...] *wertīwings?* ‘Who gets [...] worthy?’ (III 77<sub>9-10</sub>), *Ka ast sta billiton?* ‘What is that (what is) said?’ (III 27<sub>8</sub>);

b) pron. relat. ‘who, what’, e.g.: *Tāwa Noūson kas tu essei Endangon* ‘Our Father who art in Heaven’ (III 47<sub>6</sub>), *Wissan ka prei kermenēs* ‘All what [belongs] to body’ (III 53<sub>11</sub>).

§ 178. It is an undoubtful archaism that Pr. pron. interr., relat. *kas / ka* earlier had no plural form and two genders (masculine-feminine and neutral), Rosinas BĮ 191 ff., PEŽ 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 enj. *kan* (III 105<sub>2</sub>) ‘while, as’. The latter meaning developed under the influence of innovative pron. **relat. neut. \*kan**, which occasionally replaced original *ka*, cf. PEŽ II 110 s.v. *kan*). This facilitates understanding the origin of innovative pron. **relat. acc. pl. kans** (1x III 65<sub>18</sub>: *stans kans*).

Pr. adv. *ku* (III) ‘as, how’ (PEŽ II s.v. *kudesnammi, kuilgimai*) is a relic of Pr. instr. sg. *\*kū* < *\*kū* < Balt. *\*kō*<sup>77</sup> (> Lith. *kuō*), cf. *stu* (§ 163).

<sup>77</sup> Cf. fn. 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)-iẽ* ‘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.

§ 181. Archaic Pr. pron. *kas* / *ka* implies Balt. *\*kas* / *\*ka*, but the latter implies even older Balt. masc.-fem. *\*kas* / neut. *\*ki* in its turn, cf. PEŽ II 137, 205 ff. (s.v. *kittan*), Mažiulis l. c. (§ 180).

*kawīds* ‘which’, *stawīds* ‘such’

§ 182. Pr. (III) pron. interr./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. *vėidas* ‘face, appearance’. Cf. Endzelīns SV 84 f., Stang Vergl. Gr. 238, Rosinas BĮ 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. fem.** *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<sub>3</sub>, not 83<sub>3</sub> 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. *wsъb* ‘all, whole’, comes from Baltic-Slavic adjective *\*‘increasing’* etc. The latter was an inflectional derivative from Balt.-Sl. *\*vis-/\*veis-* ‘to increase’ (PEŽ IV 228 f. s.v. *wėisin*); for all this cf. Rosinas Baltistica XX 52, idem BĮ 196, PEŽ IV 249.

*ains* ‘(some)one’

§ 186. For declensional forms of Prussian pronoun, article<sup>78</sup> and cardinal number (Cat.) *aina-* ‘one’ cf. PEŽ I 56 f. It comes from Pr. pron., num. card. *\*aina-* ‘one’ < Pr. *\*eina-* ‘idem’ < Balt.-Sl. *\*eina-* ‘idem’ (cf. Rosinas BĪ 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 *\*ui-* ‘idem’ (cf. Pokorny IEW 1175 f. s.v. *\*uī*). 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.** *subbans* 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. PEŽ 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

§ 189. **Nom. 1 pers.** *as* (46x I, III), *es* (2x II) ‘I’, together with Lith. *aš*, OLith. doc., dial. *eš* (Zinkevičius LKIG II 45), Latv. *es*, < Balt. *\*eś* < IE *\*eg-* (> Lat. *eg-o* etc.).

<sup>78</sup> Pr. *ains* was used beside *stas* (under German influence) similarly to *stas* (ftn. 69). – L.P.

**Nom. 2 pers.** *toū* (III), *tou* (10x II), *thou* (10x I), *tu* (III) ‘thou’ reflects Pr. \**tū* and \**tū̃* (the latter coming from \**tū* in enclisis) which originate in Balt. accented \**tū* / unaccented \**tū̃* [> Lith. *tu* (Sam. *tə*), Latv. *tu*] < IE \**tu* / \**tū* > OSl. *ty*, Gk. (Dor.) *τυ*, Lat. *tū* 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. Endzelīns SV 87, Rosinas BĪ 47 f. In spoken Prussian had to exist non-possessive genitives 1 pers. \**mene*, 2. \**teve*, refl. \**seve* (Rosinas BĪM 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<sup>79</sup>.

**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. *mānie* / *māni* as well as *tāvie* / *tāvi*, *sāvie* / *sāvi* 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.** \**sei* / \**si*, inherited from Common Baltic<sup>80</sup>.

§ 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 \**mīn*, \**tīn*, \**sīn* (Endzelīns SV 87 f. with bibl., idem BVSF 162), is not plausible, because tautosyllabic \**ī* should have been shortened in such an instance. Even less plausible is an opinion, as if these spellings should be read as \**mjen*. \**tjen*, \**sjen* (Stang Vergl. Gr. 248): \**j* before \**-en* should have had disappeared in much earlier epoch.

<sup>79</sup> A “Slavic” (not “Lithuanian”!) character of Prussian non-gender pronominal system (cf. correspondences of Pr. singular dat. *mennei*, *tebbei*, *sebbei* to Slavic *мнѣ*, *тебѣ*, *себѣ*, plural 1 pers. nom. Pr. *mes* – Sl. *my*, Pr. 1 pers. dat. *noūmans* – Sl. *намъ*, 2 pers. acc. Pr. *wans* – Sl. *васѣ*) 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. Palmaidis BGR 118, 132. – *L.P.*

<sup>80</sup> Since enclitics dat. \**mei*, \**tei*, \**sei* are reflected in Sl. *mi*, *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<sup>81</sup>, which reflect Pr. \**mēn*, \**tēn*, \**sēn*. The latter come from Balt. acc. \**mē*, \**tē*, \**sē* (cf. Rosinas BĪM 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*.

§ 193. Baltic enclitic pron. \**mei* (\**mi*), \**tei* (\**ti*), \**sei* \**si*) produced possessive pron. WBalt. \**meja-*, \**teja-*, \**seja-* > Pr. \**maja-* (*mais* ‘my’), \**tvaja-* (*twais* ‘thy’), \**svaja-* (*swais* ‘one’s’); cf. also Rosinas BĪ 172 f.

§ 194. A relic of the **instrumental** case may be seen in 1 pers. sg. (used as dative) *māim* (III 107<sub>15</sub>) ‘to me’ and (used as instrumental) *sen māim* (III 79<sub>19</sub>), *sen maim* (III 81<sub>19</sub>) ‘with me’<sup>82</sup>. Many assumptions and

<sup>81</sup> Such marking of palatals points to Polish influence, cf. Polish spellings *mie*, *cie*, *się*. – *L.P.*

<sup>82</sup> 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. \**-ěxъ* < \**-ois-u*; cf. also V. Toporov’s term “casus indefinitus”, Toporov B.H. *Локатив в славянских языках*. Москва 1961, p. 349). Cf. earlier fn. 73. For the term *thematic* cf. fn. 17.

To show that dat. *māim* is instr. *manim* (an opinion of Endzelīns) in phrase *As N. imma tin N. māim prei ainan Salubin* (III 107<sub>15</sub>) “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*, i.e. for one letter more, on line III 107<sub>15</sub>, and there was much place for *n* on line III 81<sub>19</sub>, 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. *teikūsā* = *teikūsān* III 39<sub>19</sub> 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 *maim* 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. Endzelīns 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 BĪM 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-*) *manimì* > *maniñ*, *tavimì* > *taviñ*, *savimi* > *saviñ* and Latv. *manim* (on place of older *\*men-*), *tevim*, *sevim*<sup>83</sup>.

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

#### Plural

§ 195. **Nom. 1 pers.** *mes* (62x II, III), *mas* (1x I) = Pr. *\*mēs* ‘we’ < Balt. *\*mēs* ‘idem’ (> Lith. *mēs*, Latv. dial. *mes* ‘idem’) with *\*m-* on place of older Balt. *\*v-* (Endzelīns BVSF 163). **2 pers.** *ioūs* etc. = Pr. *\*jūs* ‘ye’ < Balt. *\*jūs* ‘idem’ (> Latv. *jūs*, Lith. *jūs* ‘idem’)<sup>84</sup>.

§ 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.

<sup>83</sup> This explanation still is not enough convincing, especially when as if a new and no more paradigmatic Pr. *māim* is compared with paradigmatic Latv. *manim*, *tevim*, *sevim* 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. *maimì* (Lazūnai), *tajiñ*, *sajiñ* (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 Indoeuropean (+ the 7th ablative!), cf. previous ftn. – *L.P.*

<sup>84</sup> 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. *noūson / noūsan*, **2.** *iouson / ioūsan* (with the inflection *\*-un/\*-an* < *\*-ōn* in both instances, cf. § 98) imply WBalt. *\*nūsōn*, *\*jūsōn* respectively (cf. Endzelīns BVSF 163, Stang Vergl. Gr. 255); see Mažiulis l. c.

§ 198. **Dat. 1 pers.** Pr. *noūmans* etc., **2.** *ioūmans* etc. imply Baltic *\*nōmōns*, *\*vōmōns* 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. Endzelīns SV §§ 111, 191, Stang Vergl. Gr. 185, 255. The newest hypothesis (Rosinas BĪM 82), as if both *-mans* and *-mas* reflect *\*-mąs* with a nasal vowel *\*-q-*, is not plausible. I consider:

a) Pr. *-mans* to have originated in *\*-māns* < *\*-māns* < Balt. *\*-mōns*;

b) Pr. *-mas* to have originated in *\*-mās* < *\*-mās* = dual. *\*-mā* (< Balt. *\*-mō*) + pl. *\*-s*; see § 103 with bibl.

**Acc. 1 pers.** *mans* (I, II, III) ‘us’ < *\*nāns* (Endzelīns SV 90) < *\*nāns* < Balt.(-Sl.) *\*nōns*; **2.** *wans* (I, II, III) ‘you’ < *\*vāns* < Balt.(-Sl.) *\*vōns*.

The fate of these Balt.(-Sl.) *\*nōns* / *\*vōns*, (for their inflection *\*ōns* cf. § 103) in Eastern Baltic is analysed by Mažiulis l. c.<sup>85</sup>

<sup>85</sup> V. Mažiulis l. c. reveals the history of the distribution of plural stems and their vocalism Balt.-Sl. 1 pers. *\*nō*, 2 pers. *\*īū*, *\*ūō* 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 weakness of Balt. *\*ū* before *\*ō* (as well as Sl. *\*i* before *\*y*). The presence of Pr. *\*ū-* in the accusative *wans* and its presence in all forms of the 2nd person pl. in Slavic allow to reconstruct Pr. *\*ū-* also in the genitive and dative. There was initial Pr. (Balt.) *\*ī* in the nominative. This suppletion allowed Pr. *\*ū* to vanish before *\*ō* in the genitive (*\*ūōsōn*) and dative (*\*ūōmōns*): the *\*ō* was accented there. In the atonic (one-syllable) accusative there had been *\*ā* on place of *\*ō* already (*\*ūāns*), therefore *\*ū* did not vanish in the accusative. *\*ū* having vanished in the genitive and in dative, these forms had to appear without root. Therefore the root *\*īū* was borrowed from the nominative: nom. *\*īūs*, gen. *\*īūsōn*, dat. *\*īūmōns*, acc. *\*ūāns*. Further, the 1 pers. gen., dat. *\*nō* was accommodated to the vocalism in the paradigm of the 2 pers. gen., dat. *\*īū* : *\*nū*, but 1 pers. acc. *\*nāns* > *\*māns* (with its *\*m-* from the nominative *\*mes*) remained parallel to 2 pers. *\*ūāns*. – L.P.

## Possessive pronouns

§ 199. **Nom. sg. masc.** Pr. (Cat.) *mais, twais, swais*, as well as **fem.** *maia, twajā, swaia*, ‘my’, ‘thy’, ‘one’s’ < WBalt. masc. *\*majas, \*tvajas, \*svajas*, fem. *\*majā, \*tvajā, \*svajā* (cf. OSi. *mojь / moja, tvojь / tvoja, svojь / svoja*), but Pr. (Cat.) nom. sg. masc. *\*noūs* etc. ‘our’ = *\*nūss, ioūs* etc. ‘your’ = *\*jūss* < WBalt. *\*nūsas* etc., *\*jūsas* etc. respectively (§§ 193, 202); cf. Endzelīns SV 90 f.

§ 200. **Gen. sg.** are Pr. (Cat.) *maisei, twaisei, swaisei* < Pr. *\*majase, \*tvajase, \*svajase*, see Endzelīns l. c.

§ 201. **Dat. sg.** *twaiśmu* (1x III), *swaiśmu* (3x III) are rare. More frequent are (for all genders, III): *maiāśmu* (2x), *twaiāśmu* (3x), *swaiāśmu* (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, twaian, swaian* 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. *\*-mōns*, § 103).

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

The relic of **instr. sg.**<sup>86</sup> may be *swaieis* (corrected by Endzelīns SV 91 into acc. pl. *swaiens*) in a phrase *sen wissan swaieis* (III 119<sub>15-16</sub>). Here *-eis* = Balt. *\*-ais*, see BS 234 ff.); cf. also Trautmann AS 272, Stang Vergl. Gr. 178, Schmalstieg OP 131.

§ 204. **Gen. pl.** *noūson, ioūson* were used to produce declinable forms nom. sg. masc. *ioūs* (< *\*jūsas*), fem. *nousā, iousa*, dat. sg. *noūsesmu, noūsmu, ioūsmu*, acc. pl. *noūsons, ioūsons*. Cf. also Endzelīns SV 91.

<sup>86</sup> 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, Endzelīns SV 104). As for *asmu* (2x), it apparently has a mixed ending, Pr. *\*-ū* (< *\*-ū* < *\*-ō*) having been transferred from the thematic paradigm and having replaced original final vowel of the athematic inflection. Cf. Lith. *esmù* ‘idem’ beside original athematic *esmì* (as well as fully thematized literary *esù*), Latv. *esmu* ‘idem’<sup>87</sup>.

§ 206. However the origin of *asmai* (10x) is problematic too. According to a traditional hypothesis, *asmai* (< *\*esmai*) replaced original athematic *\*esmi* in accordance with *\*vaid(m)ai* ‘I know’. The latter came into being as a result of contamination of “perf.” *\*vaidai* ‘I know’ (= OSl. *vědě* ‘idem’) and ps. *\*vai(d)mi* ‘idem’ (= OSl. *věmь* ‘idem’). See Endzelīns 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. *\*-mã* beside 2 pers. pl. *\*-tē* originally. According to pattern 1 pers. sg. *\*-mi*, the inflection *\*-mã* was reshaped into *\*-mai* and then ousted both older inflections, i.e. *\*-mi* and *\*-mã*. I have slightly reinterpreted this contamination in *Baltistica* I Priedas, 97<sup>88</sup>.

§ 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

<sup>87</sup> For the terms *thematic*, *athematic* cf. fn. 17. – L.P.

<sup>88</sup> 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 / \*-mǎ* (< *\*-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. Endzelīns SV 105, Zinkevičius LKIG II 81 f.)<sup>89</sup>.

§ 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) ‘gives’, *ēisei* (1x) ‘goest’, *waisei* (1x), *waisse* (1x) ‘knowst’, *gīwassi* (1x), *giwassi* (2x if not reflexive) ‘lives’, *druwēse* (2x) ‘believest’, *seggēsei* (1x) ‘doest’, *etskāsai* (1x) ‘standst up’, *postāsei* (2x) ‘wilt become’, *quoitūlaisi* (5x) ‘wouldst’. Spellings *-sei*, *-se*, *-si* reflect Pr. *\*-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

<sup>89</sup> 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, secondly, 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* / *-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 37<sub>12</sub> ?) < *\*asm̃* = 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 diphthong 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.  $-\mu\alpha\tau$ ) < *\*-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*), *ēit* ‘goes’ (= Lith. dial. *ēī*, Latv. *iēt*<sup>90</sup>), *dāst* ‘gives’ (= OLith. *duosti*).

Forms of the 3rd person are extended with the formant *-ts* sometimes: *astits* ‘ist 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<sup>91</sup>.

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

§ 211. **2 pers. pl.** possesses morphs *-ti* (ca. 80x; spelled also *-ty*), *-tei* (9x), *-tai* (8x), *-te* (4x), *-ta* (1x), e.g. *asti*, *estei*, *astei* ‘ye are’, *seiti* ‘be!’, *laikūtai* ‘ye keep’ (in imperative sense), *turriti* ‘have!’, *imaiti* ‘take!’, *edeitte* ‘eat!’, *nidrausieiti* ‘do not forbid!’, *rikauite* ‘dominate!’, *seggīta* ‘do!’. The morph *-te* seems to have appeared on place of *-tei*<sup>92</sup>. 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*)<sup>93</sup>.

<sup>90</sup> Here Latvian acute differs from Lithuanian and Prussian circumflex. – *L.P.*

<sup>91</sup> If (*asti*)-*ts* = (*ist*) *es*, why (*imma*)-*ts* = (*nahm*) *er*? What anaphora can be seen in *nostan kai tans sparts astits prei paskuliton* (III 87<sub>10</sub>) = *auff das er mechtig sey zu ermanen*? Why is anaphoric *\*tas* used in the nominative when corresponds to a direct object: *limatz bha daitis* 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.*

<sup>92</sup> Here V. Mažiulis de facto recognizes alternation Pr. (Cat.) *-ei / -e* (cf. fn’s 12, 23, 27, 39, 43, 89, 109). – *L.P.*

<sup>93</sup> 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 accommodated 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, fn. 89). As for spellings *-tai*, *-ta*, they may reflect Pr. (Cat.) *\*-t’ai / \*-t’a* (= *\*-tei / \*-te*) without the letter *i* as usual mark of palatalization (<sup>o</sup>-*tiai*, <sup>o</sup>-*tia*). – *L.P.*

§ 212. Note. 1 pers. pl. *giwammai*, *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. *wīrstmai* ‘we become’ (: 3 pers. *wīrst*), *dīnkaumai* ‘we thank’, *massimai* ‘we can’ (: 3 pers. *massi*), *grīkimai* ‘we sin’ (: 3 pers. *grīki-si*), *schlūsimai* ‘we serve’, *waitiāmai* ‘we speak’ (: 3 pers. *en-waitia*), *druwēmai* ‘we believe’ (: 3 pers. *druwē*), *seggēmai* ‘we do’ (: 3 pers. *seggē*), *etwērpimai* ‘we forgive’ (: 1 pers. = 3 pers. *etwerpe*), *girrimai* ‘we praise’ etc.; cf. Endzelīns SV 106.

### *Tense and mood*

§ 213. 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 druwē* (III) ‘I believe’, *thou tur* (I), *tou tur* (II) ‘thou shalt’. This seems to be a fault of translators (Endzelīns 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<sup>94</sup>.

<sup>94</sup> Having in mind Prussian and Slavic isomorphism (cf. fn. 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. *gīwu* III 85<sub>14</sub> beside *gīwasi* III 95<sub>3</sub>) 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 tī[e]n* III 107<sub>15</sub> ‘I take thee’, and of Baptism *As Crixtia tien* III 129<sub>10</sub> ‘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 make 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](http://www.eidem.lt/dialangn.htm)). Cf. also fn. 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, asse, 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. *ēisei* ‘goest’; 3 pers. *ēit* ‘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. PEŽ II 329 f. with bibl.

b) *ā*-stems

§ 215. Prussian *ā*-stem presence corresponds to *ā*-stem infinitive in case of the *ī*-stem correspondence in Eastern Baltic, e.g. beside ps. *lāiku* ‘keeps’ (< \**-ā*, see further), there is an if. *laikūt* ‘to keep’ (with *-kū* < \**-kā*) vs. Lith. *laikyti* = Latv. *lāicīt*; see Endzelīns l. c. with bibl., Kaukienė LVI I 190. A word *maisotan* E 466 ‘gemengt’ < ‘mixed’ implies Pr. if. *maisāt* ‘to mix’ beside ps. \**maisā* ‘mixes’ (PEŽ III 99), cf. Lith. *maišyti* (= Latv. *māisīt*), ps. *māšō*<sup>95</sup>;

*perbānda* ‘tempts’ (= Lith. *pérbando*, if. *pérbandyti*, cf. PEŽ III 258) beside if. \**perbandāt* ‘to tempt’ (implied by verbal noun *perbandāsnan* ‘temptation’);

*lāiku* ‘keeps’ (= Lith. *laiko*, Latv. *lāika*), 1 pers. pl. *lāikumai* (: Lith. *laikome* = Latv. *lāikām*), 2 pers. pl. *lāikutei*, if. *laikūt* (see over);

*bia* ‘is afraid’ = \**bijō*, if. *biātwei* (= Lith. *bijoti*, Latv. *bijāt*).

<sup>95</sup> But cf. if. *giwīt* < \**gīwīvei* (?) beside ps. (2 sg. = 3 pers.) *gīwu* (< \**gīwū* < \**gīwā*), 3 pers. *giwa* (with *-a* generalized due to “Systemzwang”?), 1 pl. *giwammai* (with a generalized *-a*?). – L.P.

c) *i*-stems

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

It seems that 1 pers. pl. *kīrdimai* ‘we hear’ (beside if. *kirdūt* ‘to hear’) with  $\bar{i}$  < \*- $\bar{e}$ -) implies an *i*-stem present form too, see Endzelīns 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. *immatī* (= Lith. *imate*), 1 pers. pl. *immimai* [with *-i(mai)* under the influence of *i*-stems]; *ebimmai* ‘we embrace’ (possibly an optative form); see Endzelīns SV 114 with bibl., cf. Stang Vergl. Gr. 361 with bibl.

Note: for the fate of Balt. *a*-stem 1 pers. sg. \*- $\bar{o}$  in Prussian see Mažiulis Baltistica I Priedas 95 ff.<sup>97</sup>;

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

1 pers. pl. *perweckammai* ‘we scorn’, cf. PEŽ III 275.

<sup>96</sup> Pr. (III) 3 pers. *turri* cannot come directly from \**turi* because of the non-reduced final *-i*. Differently from *-a* in *cixitia* (see fn. 97), there was no ground for *-i* to survive in *turri*. This form can be either a result of generalizing of the  $\bar{i}$  $\bar{a}$ -stem ending *-i* < \*- $\bar{i}$  $\bar{j}$  = \*- $\bar{i}$  < \*- $\bar{i}$  $\bar{j}$  $\bar{a}$ , which ‘restored’ original \*- $\bar{i}$ , or it was directly a parallel  $\bar{i}$  $\bar{a}$ -stem (cf. Lith. *trūni* / *trūnija*), or a  $\bar{i}$  $\bar{a}$ -stem (cf. Lith. *kōri* / *kōria*) form, cf. Palmaitis BGR 212, as well as further § 221 about Pr. (Cat.) \**giri* < \**girja*. – *L.P.*

<sup>97</sup> There, and much more clear – in BS 22 (cf. fn. 94), V. Mažiulis shows that Pr. (Cat.) *imma* (with its *-ā* < \*- $\bar{o}$  < \*- $\bar{o}$ ) 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. *wīrst* < \**vīrsta*) – cf. 3 pers. (III) *senrīnka*, *ertreppa*, *kniēipe*, *gēide* 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](http://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 PEŽ I 227 s.v. *enterpen*.

§ 218. b) *va*-stem forms are: 2 pers. sg. *giwassi* ‘thou livest’, 3 pers. *giwa* ‘lives’ (cf. Latv. dial. *dzīvu* ‘I live’, OS. *živø* ‘idem’); 1 pers. pl. *giwammai* and *giwemmai* ‘we live’ (with *-e-* on place of *-a-*, cf. Stang Vergl. Gr. 520)<sup>98</sup>.

§ 219. c) *sta*-stem forms are: 1 pers. pl. *poprestemmai* ‘we understand’ (for the segment *-te-* instead of *-ta-* cf. Stang Vergl. Gr. 30) = *\*pa-* + *\*presta-mai* < *\*pret-sta-* (PEŽ III 327, PEŽ II 49); *wīrst* ‘becomes’ (very frequent) < pr. *\*vīrsta* (with *-a* lost due to auxiliary usage) < Balt. *\*vīrt-ta* > Lith. *viřsta* ‘idem’, Latv. *virst* ‘idem’ (PEŽ IV 247 f.); on the basis of this shortened form innovations 1 pers. pl. *wīrstmai*, 2 pers. pl. *wīrstai* came into being (Endzelīns SV 109)<sup>99</sup>;

d) a form with an affix *-n-* is attested in 3 pers. *polīnka* ‘remains’ = Pr. *\*pa-* + *\*līnka* = Lith. dial. *liñka* (if. *līkti*) ‘idem’ (PEŽ III 318), see also

<sup>98</sup> 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. *gīwu* (III) (which is regarded to be an *āja*-stem by Endzelīns SV 178, but now is written off as a mistake by Mažiulis § 228 contrarily to PEŽ I 377),

2) 3 pers. *giwa* (as if corresponding to an unattested if. *\*gīlwei* = OS. *žiti*, PEŽ I 375, = Lat. *vīvere*, Endzelīns J. *Latviešu valodas gramatika*. Rīgā 1951, § 610) and

3) if. *giwīt* < as if *\*gīvētwei*, PEŽ I 376 with the 3rd pers. *giwe* (< *\*gīvēja*, see § 224)!

Since *gīwīt* is the single infinitive form attested for the verb ‘to live’ in Catechisms, a comparison with EBalt. if. Lith. (*dar*)-*yti*, Latv. (*dar*)-*it*, 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 *\*gī-* was stressed. For *-a-* instead of expected *-u-* (*-ū-*), and more, cf. fn. 95. – *L.P.*

<sup>99</sup> 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. *wīrsmō* < *\*wīrt-mi*, 2 pers. sg. *wīrsei* < *\*wīrt-sei*, 3 pers. *\*wīrsti* < *\*wīrt-ti* > Pr. (Cat.) *wīrst* (= *as-t*) with a regular generalization of the latter on all persons in singular [cf. *\*(as) tur, turri; (tū) tur, turri; (tāns) tur, turri*, see fn. 94] and later ousting of original 1 pl. *\*wīrsmai* by an innovative *wīrstmai* due to the 2 pl. *\*wīrstei* and all other persons *wīrst*. Thus Pr. (Cat.) *wīrst* (similarly to *waīst* ‘to know’?) appears to be a “semi-athematic” verb. – *L.P.*

Endzelīns SV 109, Stang Vergl. Gr. 339, Kazlauskas LKIG 317, Kaukienė LVII 57.

§ 220. e) *na*-stem forms are: opt. 3 pers. *pogāunai* (= *\*pogaūnai*) in the indicative meaning ‘gets’ (cf. Lith. *gāuna*) – for this form, as well as for 1 pers. pl. *pogaunimai*, cf. Endzelīns l. c., Stang Vergl. Gr. 352; for opt. 3 pers. *postānai* ‘becomes’ and 1 pers. pl. *postānimai* see Endzelīns SV 110, Stang Vergl. Gr. 352 f., PEŽ III 331<sup>100</sup>.

§ 221. f) *ia*-stem forms are: 3 pers. *gēide* (*gēidi*) ‘awaits’ < Pr. *\*gēid’a* < Pr. *\*gēidja* ‘idem’ = Lith. *gēidžia* ‘thirsts for’ (see PEŽ I 338 ff.), cf. also Lith. (*ia*-stem) ps. *láuikia* : if. *láukti* : Pr. ps. *\*geidja* : if. *\*geistvei*;

1 pers. pl. *girrimai* ‘we praise’ (if. *girtwei*, cf. Lith. *gīria-me*) is an innovation according to 3 pers. *\*giri* < *\*girja* ‘praises’ (Endzelīns l. c.);

3 pers. *kniēipe* ‘scoops’ < probably *\*kneipja* ‘idem’ (Endzelīns l. c., Stang Vergl. Gr. 453, PEŽ II 232 f.), cf. also Lith. (*ia*-stem) *sēmia* ‘idem’;

3 pers. *etwerpe* ‘looses (forgives)’ (1 pers. pl. *etwērpimai*) < *\*-verpja*, cf. Lith. dial. 3 pers. *verpja* ‘spins’, cf. PEŽ I 307 f. (see also Endzelīns l. c., Stang l. c.).

3 pers. *kūnti* ‘protects’ < *\*kuntja* (Endzelīns l. c., Stang l. c., PEŽ II 302).

§ 222. e) *auja*-stem forms are: 3 pers. (in the meaning of the 1 pers. sg.<sup>101</sup>) *dīnkama*, *dīnckama* (III) = *\*dīnkauiā* ‘thanks’; 1 pers. pl. *dīnkaumai*, *dīnkaumai* are innovations according to 3 pers. *\*dinkau(i)* (< *\*-auja*) (§ 212); cf. Endzelīns l. c., PEŽ I 204;

<sup>100</sup> Great prussologists could not resist the temptation to compare Pr. III (*postān*)-*ai* with Gk. opt. (πατθεύ)-οι as well as Pr. III *poklausīmanas* (1x!) with Gk. part. pt. pass. (πατθεύ)-όμενος (thus already Brugmann KGr. 316; first denied by Mažiulis PKP II 297<sup>165</sup>). Unfortunately, Prussian “optative” forms in *-ai* are used in an indicative meaning (such optative meaning as *postānai* ‘werde’ III 48<sub>3</sub> corresponds to cases when indicative is used for optative). Thus they appear to be the same forms in *-a* (in the *na*-stems, *postānai*, as well as in the other, *ina*-stems: *ebsignai* / *ebsigna*, *mukinna*, *wartinna*, *swintina*), i.e. they occurred due to alternation *-ai* / *-a*: (*ni*)*swintinai* III 51<sub>15</sub> = *swintina* III 45<sub>17</sub>, cf. Palmaitis BGR 224, as well as fin’s 12, 27, 39, 43, 89. – L.P.

<sup>101</sup> Cf. fin’s 97, 99.

3 pers. *pogerdawie* ‘narrates’ (= \*-*auja*) and *pogerdawi* ‘promises’ (PEŽ III 306 and 349 respectively);

3 pers. *rickawie* ‘governs’ (= Lith. *rykáuja* ‘idem’), cf. Endzelīns l. c., PEŽ IV 21; *persurgauī* ‘provides’, cf. Endzelīns l. c., PEŽ III 272.

The same is to be said about 3 pers. *wēraui* ‘lasts’, *wūkawi* ‘calls’. Unattested forms of this kind are implied by if. *grīkaut* ‘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*, Endzelīns SV 111 wonders at the absence of the stem-ending Pr. \*-*ō-* beside Pr. *-au-*. I think that the Prussians had only *-au-*, cf. BS 44<sup>6</sup> etc.<sup>102</sup>

§ 223. f) *īia*-stem forms are: 3 pers. (in the meaning of the 1 pers. sg.) *crixtia* ‘baptizes<sup>101</sup>’ (for *-a* cf. Mažiulis Baltistica I Priedas 97)<sup>101</sup> = \**kriksīja* (cf. Lith. *krīkštija*, *krīkštyja* ‘idem’, Latv. *kriksīju* ‘idem’) beside if. *crixtiw(e)i*; 3 pers. refl. *grīki(-si)* ‘sins’ having *-i* < \*-*īja*; 1 pers. pl. *grīkimai* (with stem vocalism accomodated to 3 pers. *grīki-*, § 212); in a similar way arose 3 pers. *madli*, *schlūsi* as well as 1 pers. pl. *madlimai*, *-schlūsimai* respectively. Cf. also Endzelīns l. c.

§ 224. g) *ēia*-stem forms are:

3 pers. *budē* ‘is awake’, cf. Lith. dial. *budēja* (on place of original *i*-stem *būdi* ‘idem’) beside if. *budēti* : OSl. *bǫdēti* ‘idem’ etc.;

3 *dergē* ‘hates’, cf. Lith. dial. *dėrgėja* beside if. *dėrgėti* ‘to make dirty’, cf. PEŽ I 197;

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

<sup>102</sup> On the basis of Jerzy Kuryłowicz’s conclusion about “mythologic” character of reconstructing Indo-European alternation *ou* : *ōu*, as a source of Lith. *au* : *uo*, V. Mažiulis has shown that *uo* (< \**ō*) 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.*

<sup>103</sup> Cf. fn. 97.

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

3 pers. *giwe* ‘lives’ (if. *giwīt* having *-ī-* < *\*-ē-*), if not a mistake instead of *giwa* (Stang Vergl. Gr. 452), < *\*gīvēja* ‘idem’ (Endzelīns SV 111, Stang I. c., PEŽ I 376 with bibl.); cf. Lith. *gvvėja* ‘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.)<sup>105</sup>;

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

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

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

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

3 pers. *auschaidē* ‘trusts’ (if. *auschaidītwei* ‘to trust’) ends in *-ē* < *\*-ēja* (Endzelīns I. c., PEŽ I 120 f. with bibl.);

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

<sup>104</sup> Cf. fn. 12. – L.P.

<sup>105</sup> Cf. fn. 98. – L.P.

3 pers. *enwackē* (with  $-\bar{e} < *-\bar{e}i < *-\bar{e}ja$ ), *enwackēi* ( $*-\bar{e}i < *-\bar{e}ja$ ) ‘calls’ were basic forms for innovations 1 pers. pl. *enwackēmai* and *enwackēimai* respectively (§ 212)<sup>106</sup>, cf. PEŽ I 278 f. with bibl.

3 pers. *wargē* ‘arouses pain’ (if.  $*wargītwei < *-\bar{e}twei$ ) ends in  $-\bar{e} < *-\bar{e}ja$ , cf. Endzelīns l. c., PEŽ IV 221.

§ 225. 3 verbs possess two parallel present forms each, i.e. in  $-\bar{e}$  and in  $-\bar{a}$ :

3 pers. *billē* ‘speaks’ (ending in  $-\bar{e} < *-\bar{e}ja$ ) has a parallel form *billā* ‘idem’ (ending in  $-\bar{a} < *-\bar{a}ja$ ). According to 3 pers. *billē*, an innovation 1 pers. pl. *billēmai* was produced (§ 212); if. *billīt* with  $-\bar{i} < *-\bar{e}$ . 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.  $*quoitīt$  (with  $-\bar{i} < *-\bar{e}$ ) is implied in part. pt. pass. nom.-acc. neut. sg. *paquoitīton* ‘(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. *stallīt* with  $-\bar{i} < *-\bar{e}$ . There is also a parallel present form in  $-i$ : 3 pers. *stalli* (cf. above 3 pers. *billi*).

§ 226. Discussed present forms in  $-\bar{e} (< *-\bar{e}ja)$  and in  $-\bar{a} (< *-\bar{a}ja)$  correlate in the same way as Latv. *guod-ēju* and *gùod-āju*, cf. Endzelīns l. c., van Wijck Apr. St. 21 f., otherwise Berneker PS 214 f.<sup>107</sup>

<sup>106</sup> Here one sees origin of the alternation  $(-)\bar{e}i / (-)\bar{e}$  [generalized  $(-)\bar{e}i / (-)\bar{e}$ ], cf. fn. 12 etc. However in such cases as 1 pers. pl. *enwackēimai* or pc. ps. act. acc. pl. *waitaintins* a syncopation may be assumed too, e.g.  $*-\bar{e}jimai > -\bar{e}imai$ ,  $*-\bar{a}jant- > *-\bar{a}int-$ . – L.P.

<sup>107</sup> Cf. also Lith. *siáu-ėja / siáu-oja*. Such correlates occur in different dialects. Even if A. Will was accustomed to  $*kvaītīt$ , but P. Megott used  $*kvaītāt$ , 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 *billā* reflect the same ps. (= pt. *billai* III)  $*bil'āi / *bil'ā$ , what means  $*bilēj < ps. *bīlēja$  (pt.  $*bīlējā$ ) because of the if. *billīt*, not  $*billā!$  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. Palmitis BGR 222 f. – L.P.

§ 227. One can assume together with Endzelīns SV 102, 112 f. that there were also such parallel forms, as *\*-inēja* (cf. Lith. frequ. *kand-inėja* ‘frequent bites’) and *\*-ināja* in Prussian:

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

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

3 pers. *powaidinnei*, *powaidinne* ‘shows’ possibly has *-innei*, *-inne* < *\*-inēja*<sup>108</sup>.

§ 228. h) *āja*-stem forms are:

3 pers. *kelsāi* / *kaltzā* ‘sounds’ = *\*kalsāi* / *kalsā* (PEŽ II 99 s.v. *kaltzā*) with *-āi* / *-ā* < *\*-āja* (PEŽ I. c. with bibl.)<sup>109</sup>;

3 pers. *maitā* ‘nourish’ [*maitātunsin* ‘to feed (upon)’] with *-ā* < *\*-āja*, cf. Endzelīns SV 113, PEŽ III 99 f.;

3 pers. *peisāi* ‘writes’ [: part. pt. pass. *peisāton* ‘(what is) written’] with *-ā* < *\*-āja*, cf. PEŽ III 243 f. with bibl., Kaukienė LVI I 204);

3 pers. *enwaitia* ‘accosts’ (in an optative meaning, PEŽ 278) with *-a* = *-ā* < *\*-āja*, cf. OSl. *věštaję* ‘I speak’; 1 pers. pl. *waitiāmai* is an innovation accommodated to 3 pers. *enwaitia* (§ 212);

<sup>108</sup> Then such verbs should have corresponding 1) infinitives in *°-inūt* < *\*-inēt*. 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 *°potaukinnisnas*, 3) of the past participle passive: *potaukinton*, not *°potaukinnitan*; *enlaipints*, not *°enlaipinnits*, 4) of the past participle active: *(po)taukinnons*, not *°(po)taukinniwuns*. 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 *°-ņja*, not *\*-na*).

As for Endzelin’s assumption of the existence of Latvian-like verbs with a suffix *°-ināja* 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. fn. 112. – *L.P.*

<sup>109</sup> Here V. Mažiulis de facto recognizes alternation Pr. (Cat.) *-āi* / *-ā* (cf. fn’s 12, 23, 27, 39, 43, 89, 92). – *L.P.*

3 pers. *dwigubbū* ‘doubts’ (in the meaning of the 2nd person in singular<sup>110</sup>) with *-ū* < *\*-ū* (after a labial consonant) < *\*-ā* < *\*-āja*;

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

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

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

### *The future tense*

§ 230. A form 2 pers. sg. *postāsei* occurs twice in the meaning ‘du wirst’ (III 105<sub>3</sub>) and ‘du werdest’ (III 105<sub>15-16</sub>) beside 3 pers. ps. *postānai* ‘becomes’ (in an optative sense; for the latter cf. Stang Vergl. Gr. 352). Thus Pr. (III) *postāsei* may be a 2nd pserson of the future tense in singular: ‘thou wilt become’, which is comparable with Lith. 2 pers. sg. fut. *stósi* ‘idem’ = Latv. *stā-si*, see. Endzelīns SV 115, Stang Vergl. Gr. 397, 442 ff., Schmid Verb. 52, Kazlauskas LKIG 365 ff.

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

<sup>110</sup> Any inflection, which may show person, has been lost here due to shortening *\*-āja* > *-āj*, therefore such forms are not more the 3rd, than the 2nd or the 1st person in singular. – L.P.

<sup>111</sup> See fn. 98. – L.P.

<sup>112</sup> Why then the infinitive is not *\*swintināt* (cf. Latv. *sveicināt*), but *swintint*? Why its past participle is not *\*swintināwuns* (cf. Latv. *sveicinājis*), but *swintinons*? Cf. fn's 100, 108. – L.P.

<sup>113</sup> 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:

§ 231. a) *ā*-stem forms are: *kūra* ‘created’, *prowela(din)* ‘betrayed (Him)’, *lymucz* (II, with *-u-* < \**-ā-*), *limatz* (I, with *-a-* possibly on place of *-u-*<sup>114</sup>), *līmauts* (III with *-au-* instead of *-u-*, see van Wijk Apr. St. 43) ‘broke’, cf. Schmalstieg Balt. Verb. 45.

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

§ 233. From Pr. pt. \**-ājā* (: Lith. *-ójo*, if. *-óti*) come 3 pers. pt. *-āi*, *-ā*, *-ū*, see Stang Vergl. Gr. 375, e.g.:

*dai*, *daitis* ‘gave’ imply Pr. \**dājā* ‘idem’, coming from \**dō* of the aorist origin + *-jā* (cf. also Stang Vergl. Gr. 391; for Pr. *ā* < \**ō* see § 18);  
*signai*, *eb[s]ignā* ‘blessed (“marked”, “crossed”’) (: if. *signāt*, cf. Lith. if. *žegnóti*, ps. *žegnójo*);

*postāi* ‘began, started’ (: if. *postāt*, cf. Lith. if. *stóti*, pt. *stójo*);

*billai*, *billā*, *billāts* ‘spoke’ (: ps. *billā*<sup>115</sup>, cf. Lith. if. *bylóti*, pt. *bylójo*);

*widdai* ‘saw’ (PEŽ IV 234);

*teikū* (< \**-ā*) ‘made’ (: if. *teickut* ‘to make’);

*poglabū* (< \**-ā*) ‘embraced, caressed’ (cf. Lith. dial. if. *glabóti* ‘to caress by embracing’, pt. *glabójo*; cf. also PEŽ III 307).

---

<sup>114</sup> Since preterite stem ending was shortened at the end of the word \**-(ij)ā* > *-(ij)a*, 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* < \**-ī* < \**-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. fn. 94 and [www.eidem.lt/dialangn.htm](http://www.eidem.lt/dialangn.htm). – *L.P.*

<sup>115</sup> For Pr. (Cat.) ps., pt. *billai*, *billā*, *billā* = *billē* < ps. \**bīlēja*, pt. \**bīlējā* cf. fn. 107. – *L.P.*



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

Balt.-Sl. *\*bē-/ \*bī-* was derived from IE v. *\*bhū-* ‘to be’ (Lith. *būti*, etc.) with apophonic correlating suffixes *\*-jē-/ \*-ī-*, i.e.:

a) IE *\*bhū-* + *\*-jē-* > *\*bh(ū)jē-* > Balt.-Sl. *\*bē-* (with *\*-j-* having regularly disappeared before *\*-ē-*) and

b) IE *\*bhū-* + *\*-ī-* > *\*bh(u)ī-* > Balt.-Sl. *\*bī-*.

For Prussian (Cat.) stems and forms of the past tense cf. Kaukienė 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!’, *sēiti* ‘be!’, cf. Stang Vergl. Gr. 437, 439, Endzelīns SV 120 with bibl.

Imperative (optative) forms of this kind were supported by *īa*-stem imperatives with [*\*-(ī)ai->*] *-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. *gērbt* ‘to speak’, sg. *immais*, pl. *immaiti* ‘take!’ (: if. *īmt* ‘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. *nesēte* (with *-ě-* < *\*-oi-* = Balt. *\*-ai-*) beside 2 pers. sg. *nesi* (with *-i* < *\*-ei-*, not *\*-oi-*, cf. BS 172) ‘carry!’, cf. Endzelīns l. c. – cf. Lithuanian *īa*- and *i*-stem imp. refl. 2 pers. sg. *-ies* < *\*-ei-* (*sukičs*, *baričs*, 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)<sup>116</sup>.

§ 237. Pr. *inā*-stem imperative forms are attested sufficiently: *kackinnais* ‘let have!’ (: if. *kackint*, PEŽ II 83 ff.), *smuninais* ‘honour!’ (: if. *smūnint*), *klumstinaitai* ‘knock!’, *mukinaiti* ‘teach!’ (: 3 pers. ps. *mukinna*), *erpilninaiti* ‘fill!’, *tickinnaiti* ‘do!’ (: if. *tickint*), *tūlninaiti* ‘multiply!’; spellings with *-ei-* may be errors instead of *-ai-* (Stang Vergl. Gr. 439): *mukineyti* ‘teach!’, *laustineiti* (*wans*) ‘humiliate (yourself)!’, *poauginneiti* ‘bring up!’, *powaidinneiti* ‘show!’.

§ 238. Pr. *ja*-stem imperative forms have *-ei-* < \**-jai-*: *draudieiti* ‘forbid!’ (cf. Lith. 3 pers. ps. *draūdžia*), *poieiti* ‘drink!’, *etwerreis* ‘open!’ (cf. Lith. *vėria*), *etwerpeis* ‘forgive!’ (cf. Lith. *veřpia*, PEŽ I 307 f.), *pokuntieis* ‘protect!’ (for this verb see PEŽ II 302 s.v. *kūnti*), *tensieiti* ‘drag!’ (cf. Lith. 3 pers. ps. *tęsia*, PEŽ IV 192 s.v. *tiēnstwei*).

§ 239. Imperative forms of Pr. *ā*-stems were derived from corresponding infinitive stems: 2 pers. sg. *dais*, 2 pers. pl. *dāiti* ‘give!’ (: if. *dātwei* ‘to give’), frequent 2 pers. sg. *ettrais*, 2 pers. pl. *attrāiti* ‘answer!’; cf. Stang Vergl. Gr. 437, Endzelīns l. c.

§ 240. Imperative correspondences of the *ī*-stem infinitives (the same whether this *-ī-* < \**-ī-*, or < \**-ē-*) end in sg. *-īs*, pl. *-īt(e)i*: *crixity* [with *-(t)i-* < \**-ī-*], *crixteiti* (with *-ei-* < \**-ī-*) ‘baptize!’, *madliti* ‘pray!’ (: if. *madlit* ‘to entreat’ with *-i-* < \**-ī-*), *engraudīs* ‘have mercy!’ (possibly with *-ī-* < \**-ī-*, not \**-ē-*), *endirīs* ‘discern!’ (possibly with *-ī-* < \**-ē-*, cf. PEŽ I 264), 2 sg. *mijlis*, 2 pl. *milijti* ‘love!’ [with *-ī(s)-*, *-ij-* < \**-ī-* < \**-ē-* with all probability, cf. PEŽ III 138 f.], etc.

§ 241. Imperative forms of Pr. *au*-stems were derived from corre-

<sup>116</sup> 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 *wedeyis* (1x II), *weddeis* (1x III) reflect an *a*-stem form \**vedais*. Cf. spellings *key* (I) vs. *kay* (I), *mukinaity* (I) vs. *mukineyti* (II) and many similar variations so much expectable in an unstressed position (the formant of imperative was unstressed, when not an *ā*-stem like *signā[t]s*, cf. *kīrdeiti*, *tūlninaiti*). 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.

sponding infinitive stems: *gerdaus* ‘tell!’ (: if. *gerda[u]t* ‘to tell’), *dīnkauti* ‘thank!’ (: if. *dīnkaut* ‘to thank’), cf. Stang Vergl. Gr. 440.

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*, *boūse* ‘let ... be!’, *audasei* ‘let (it) happen!’, *dase* ‘let (him) give!’, *galbse* ‘let (him) help!’, *pareysej* ‘let ... come!’ *tussise* ‘let (her) be silent!’, *wirse* ‘let become!’, *pokūnsi* ‘let (him) protect!’. It seems that the origin of Prussian permissive 3 pers. *-sei* is connceted with an optative *-s-* form of the future tense, cf. Stang Vergl. Gr. 442 f., Endzelīns SV 122 f. with bibl.<sup>117</sup>

§ 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) boūlai* III 113<sub>23-27</sub> ‘when ... would (not) be’, *ickai ainonts ... tur̄ilai* III 99<sub>11</sub> ‘if anybody ... had’, *quai niturr̄ilai* III 103<sub>12</sub> ‘which should not have’, *madlimai ... kai stas ... perēilai* III 49<sub>18</sub> ‘we pray ... that it ... come’, *Tou quoit̄ilaisi* III 79<sub>14-15</sub> ‘Thou wouldst wish’, *enkasmu mes ... turr̄ilimai boūt* III 113<sub>21-23</sub> (with *-limai* < *\*-laimai*) ‘in what we ... should be’, *quoit̄ilaiti* III 67<sub>14-15</sub> ‘ye would wish’, etc.

§ 244. An attempt to derive Prussian formant *-lai*, together with Lith. prtc. *lāĩ*, Laty. prtc. *laĩ*, from v. *\*laid-/ \*leid-* ‘to let’ (e.g. Fraenkel 329 with bibl., cf. Endzelīns SV 124 with bibl.) was strictly criticized by Būga 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. Endzelīns l. c., Stang Vergl. Gr. 443). This opinion of K. Būga has been supported and proved by Toporov PJ IV 418–436 (with bibl.).

<sup>117</sup> Cf. also: “kann ... angenommen werden, daß sich auch im Westbaltischen kein sigmatisches Futur entwickelt hatte und daß die prußischen Formen der 3. Person auf *-sei* als ein “embryonäres, nichtparadigmatisches “Futur” aufzufassen sind [Palmais 1981, vgl. Iwanow 1981, 195 f.], d.i. hier liegt ein “futuraler” (oder “resultativer”) Optativ vor” (Palmais L. Optativ und Personalendungen im Prußischen / Baltistica XXI (2) 160); Palmais 1981: *От греческой системы к славянской* / Вопросы языкознания, No 4; Iwanow 1981: *Славянский, балтийский и ранне-балканский глагол*. Москва: Наука. More detailed: Palmais BGR 239–241. – L.P.

## *Infinitive 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 *-twei* (*-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(v)ei* [*< \*-tu + \*(e)i*] 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-tų < \*-tun*).

## *Participles*

### Active present

§ 248. This participle is derived with suf. *-nt-*: *skellānts* ‘owing’, gerund *giwantei* ‘while living’, *dīlants* ‘working’ (PEŽ I 200), *nidruwīntin* gen. sg. ‘not believing’, *niaubillīnts* ‘not speaking, mute’, acc. sg. *rīpīntin* ‘following’, (*emprijki*)-*sins* ‘(against)-being’ (possibly with *-in-* on place of *-en-*) *<* (Cat.) *\*sents* ‘being’ *< \*sentis* ‘idem’ (PEŽ I 257).

§ 249. **Nom. sg. masc.** Ending *-nts* in forms *skellānts* (of an *a*-stem verb) and *dīlants* (of an *ā*-stem verb) comes from *\*-ntis* (cf. attributive and enough old Lith. *sūkantis* ‘spinning’) with an *i*-stem inflection nom. sg. *\*-is >* Pr. (Cat.!) *-s* (see § 139 and PEŽ 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. PEŽ 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.

*vėrd-antis* = Latv. dial. *veřd-uots*), see § 139, cf. Endzelīns SV 126. It seems that an older inflection of this participle was (?) Balt.-Sl. *\*-ōn* (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* (Endzelīns SV 127), cf. PEŽ I 227 f. (woth bibl.).

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

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

§ 253. Gerunds *giwāntei* ‘while living’, *stānintei* and *stāninti* ‘by standing’ reflect archaic *C*-stem dative inflection *\*-ei* / *\*-i*, cf. BS 248 ff.

§ 254. **Acc. sg.** *nidruwīntin* ‘not believing’ and *rīpintin* ‘following’ have an *i*/*C*-stem inflection *-in*, cf. van Wijk Apr. St. 36, Endzelīns l. c. (cf. Lith. *tỹl-intĩ*).

§ 255. **Nom. pl. masc.** *skellāntei* and *skellāntai* ‘owing’ are innovations ending in a pronominal *-ei* and nominal *-ai* respectively (cf. § 145). Original Balt. nom. pl. masc.-fem. *\*-es* [cf. Lith. (*móter*)-*es* ‘women’] vanished in Prussian as well as in all Baltic dialects.

§ 256. **Acc. pl. masc.** forms (*wargu*)*seggēintins* III 93<sub>1-2</sub> ‘(maliciously) doing’ < *\*segējantins* and (*emprijki*)*waitiantins* III 87<sub>12</sub> ‘speaking (against)’ (with *waitiantins* to be corrected into *\*waitiantins*, Endzelīns l. c.) end in *i*- (*C*-)stem inflection Pr. acc. pl. masc.-fem. *-ins* < Balt. masc. *\*-īns*, fem. *\*-īs*, cf. § 132 (with bibl.)<sup>118</sup>.

<sup>118</sup> Endzelīns l. c. points to A. Bezenberger who was the first to correct *waitiantins* into *\*waitiantins*. As for J. Endzelīns himself, he on the contrary, points to no less possible comprehension of this form as of an *āia*-stem = OS. *věščajō*, which in its full shape could be Pr. *\*waitiaiantins*. Why should Bezenberger’s correction be accepted? Not because of finite plural forms in which as if the 3rd person is generalized (*druwē-mai*, *waitiā-mai*): it is namely 3 pers. *enwackēimai* which points to a possible syncope, similar to *waitiantins*, cf. fn. 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 \**paklausīmenās* (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.<sup>119</sup>

## Active past

§ 258. **Nom. sg. masc.** ends in *-uns* (e.g.: *īduns* ‘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. Endzelīns 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. *gīmusi*, OSl. *nesōšb* ‘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* < \*-usīs (cf. Lith. dial. *sūkusys* ‘having spun’), what is an *i*-stem innovation on place of original *C*-stem form (see further).

<sup>119</sup> A brilliant career of Prussian *poklausīmanas* > *ποκλαυσίμενος* from hapax legemnon 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 *-usins* (\**aulāuusins* ‘dead, having died’, spelled *aulauūsins* 1x, as well as *aulausins* 1x, *aulaunsis* 1x II) and in *-usens* < *-usins* (*aulauwussens* 1x I), i.e. has a suf. *-us-* and (*C-* >) *i-* stem inflection *-ins* (§ 143).

§ 262. Prussian and Baltic active past participle possessed a *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. \**-uns* and EBalt. nom. sg. \**-ens* (= \**-ēns*, not \**-ēns*, because of the circumflex, not acute, tone in Lith. *-ęs*) come from Balt. \**-vens* with *-n-* borrowed from the paradigm of corresponding present participle. Balt. \**-vens* comes from apophonic Balt. \**-ves* (: \**-us-*), cf. Endzelīns l. c., Stang l. c. A dilemmic assumption of Stang l. c. that Pr. *-uns* (: *-us-*) could come from IE \**-uōs* (: \**-us-*) cannot be proved on the material of Baltic and Slavic languages. The latter shows the existence of Balt. \**-ves* (: \**-us-*) < IE \**-ues* (: \**-us-*) parallel to IE \**-uōs* (: \**-us-*) in other dialects (for the latter see Szemerényi Einf. 294).

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

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

<sup>120</sup> Does this mean an existence of unattested nom.-acc. neut. \**dāwusī* (§ 126) > Pr. (Cat.) \**dāwus* (not any \**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 PEŽ, what means that Balt. \**-ans*, \**-vens* were “active” (> masculine-feminine), but \**-an*, \**-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 fn. 38. – L.P.

## Passive present

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

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

**Nom. sg. fem.:** *imtā* (III) ‘taken’ (: if. *īmt* ‘to take’).

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

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

*isrankūt* III 113<sub>17</sub> ‘rescued’ (< *\*izrankūt-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 *-ei*<sup>121</sup>) 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.

<sup>121</sup> 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. *labaĩ* (Latv. *labi*), *skĩstai* ‘purely’ (<-- adj. *skĩsta-* ‘pure’), *kānxtai* ‘decently’ (<-- adj. *kanxta-* ‘decent’), *tēmprai* ‘dearly’ (<-- adj. *tēmpira-* ‘dear’), etc.

Many of them have suf. *-iska*, e.g. *prūsiskai* ‘in Prussian’ (<-- adj. *prūsiska-* ‘Prussian’), *deiwutiskai*, *deiwūtiskai* ‘blissfully’ (<-- adj. *deiwūtiska-* ‘blissful’), *arwiskai* ‘truly’ (<-- adj. *arwiska-* ‘true’), etc.

As for adv. *deinenisku* (beside *deineniskai*) ‘daily’, *laimisku* (beside *laimiskai*) ‘richly’, *etnīwingisku* (beside *etnīwingiskai*) ‘graciously’, etc. with final *-u* of an unclear origin (cf. Endzelīns 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. *ainawidiskan*<sup>122</sup>.

A nominative-accusative form of an adjective functions in adverbial meaning too, e.g.: *labban* (beside *labbai*) ‘good’, *skijstan* (beside *skĩstai*) ‘purely’, etc., as well as adv. *ilga* (beside *\*ilgai*) ‘long time’<sup>123</sup> – cf. Lith. *gēra* (beside *gerai*) ‘good’, *māža* (beside *mažai*) ‘little’, Polish *dobre*, (beside *dobrze*) ‘well’<sup>124</sup>, etc.

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

<sup>122</sup> Cf. fn. 44. – L.P.

<sup>123</sup> This form cannot be directly derived from Pr. *\*ilg-a* = Lith. (*gēra*)-*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. fn’s 12, 23, 27, 39, 43, 89, 109. – L.P.

<sup>124</sup> 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 gēra* ‘I feel myself well’ = ‘it is good for me’, i.e. the subject is defined, vs. *jis dirba gerai* ‘he works well’, i.e. a verbal predicate is defined. Cf. also Polish *bardzo dobrze!* ‘very well!’ vs. *wiem to dobrze* ‘I know this well’, although today one says *mnie jest dobrze* = Lith. *man gerai* instead of *man gēra*. – L.P.

Adv. *etkūmps* ‘again’ seems to be of the adjective origin too (cf. PEŽ I 296).

Finally adverbial forms of the comparative grade, derived from adjectives, should be mentioned, i.e.: *mijls* ‘more kindly’, *tālis*, *tāls* ‘further’ and *toūls* ‘more’ (cf. PEŽ IV 181 f. s.v. *tālis*).

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

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

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

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

### ***Prepositions and prefixes***

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

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

§ 273. Both prepositions and prefixes are: *en / an* ‘in’ (PEŽ I 257–263), *er* ‘till, up to’ (PEŽ I 282 f.), *is* ‘from’ (PEŽ III 39), *na / no* ‘on’ (PEŽ III 162, 191 ff.), *pa / po* ‘under, after, according to’ (PEŽ III 297 f.), *per /*

*par* ‘for’ (PEŽ III 256 ff.), *pra / pro* ‘through’ (PEŽ III 338 f.), *prei* ‘at, by’ (PEŽ III 347 ff.), *sen / \*san* ‘with’ (PEŽ IV 98 f.), *sur(gi)* ‘around’ (PEŽ 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 (PEŽ III 181).

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

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

Prof. Dr. Habil. Vytautas MAŽIULIS

urodził się 20 sierpnia 1926 r. we wsi Rokėnai na północnym wschodzie Litwy. Po zakończeniu szkoły w Rakiszkach (Rokiškis) niedługo był on klerykiem według litewskiej tradycji wśród dostatnich rodzin gospodarskich oddać jednego obdarzonego chłopka do seminarium duchowego. Zapoznanie się z językiem łacińskim, tyle podobnym do litewskiego pod wielu względach, przebudziło w nim interes do językoznawstwa porównawczego. W latach 1947–1952 on studjuje filologię klasyczną na uniwersytecie wileńskim. Jak postępowy student został proponowany do doktorantury na katedrze językoznawstwa porównawczo historycznego uniwersytetu moskowskiego. Po obronieniu dysertacji o historii litewskich liczebników otrzymał stopień doktora w 1956 r. Akademska działalność na uniwersytecie wileńskim, rozpoczęta w 1955 r., trwała 43 lata. W latach 1968–1973 V. Mažiulis kieruje katedrą języka litewskiego na uniwersytecie wileńskim. Habilituje w 1969 r., profesor od 1969 r. To było czasem jego owocnej współpracy ze znacznym językoznawcą litewskim Jonaszem Kazlauskasem (1930–1970), którzy wprowadził metody współczesnego językoznawstwa do porównawczo historycznych badań nad językami bałtyjskimi. Razem z J. Kazlauskasem V. Mažiulis rozwinął i udowodnił ideę Christiana Stanga (1942) o zmianie IE \**ō* zarówno w bałt. \**ō* jak i w \**ā*: zostało określone 2 allofona bałtyjskiego \**ō*, od których akcentowany i wąskszy allofon rozwinął się w pr. \**ō*, lit., łot. *uo*, lecz nieakcentowany i szerszy allofon rozwinął się w \**ō̄* zbiegając się z szerokim bałt. \**ā* (\**ō̄*) niskiego głosu. W paradygmatach z ruchomym akcentem w języku pruskim został uogólniony szerszy allofon bałtyjskiego \**ō̄* (\**dō̄twei*) zbiegając się z pr. \**ā* (\**mō̄tē*), tymczasem w językach litewskim i łotewskim został uogólniony wąskszy allofon (lit. *dūoti*, łot. *duōt*). Lecz w nieakcentowanych pozycjach ciągłego nieruchomego akcenta nieakcentowany bałtyjski allofon \**ō̄* zmienił się w litewski *o* (*viļko*) i zbiegł się z bałt. \**ā* > *o* (lit. *mōtē*). Ta koncepcja jest wyznana jak hipoteza Kazlauskasa–Mažiulisa. Razem z J. Kazlauskasem, V. Mažiulis inicjował wydanie w Wilnie międzynarodowego czasopisma *Baltistica* (od 1965 r.). Już po śmierci J. Kazlauskasa on założył katedrę filologii bałtyjskiej w 1973 r. Dłużej niż 20 lat V. Mažiulis kierował tą katedrą, która stała się internacjonalnym ośrodkiem studii bałtyjskich i organizatorem międzynarodowych kongresów bałtystów. Wyjaśnienie formy lit. gen. sg. (*viļk*)-*o* miało szerokie indoeuropejskie implikacje. Doprowadziło do wniosku o pochodzeniu formy *o*-tematowego IE celownika, która okazała się “wydłużonym tematem”, identycznym litewskiemu dial. dat. (*viļk*)-*uo* < \**ō̄*. Tym samym wreszcie nie tylko ukazała się możliwość

zakwestionować mit ogólnie-IE dat. \*-ōi, ale i stworzyć nową teorię deklinacji indoeuropejskiej. Teoria została wyłożona w monografii “Stosunki bałtyjskich i innych indoeuropejskich języków” (1970). Gdy IE mianownik, biernik i dopełniacz były produktami przeformującej się ogólnie-IE struktury przedakuzatywnej, przypadki poboczne powstały w poszczególnych IE dialektach poszczególnie, ale przez różną paradygmatyzację tych samych elementów okolicznikowego (przysłówkowego) znaczenia. To obalił mit 7 przypadków “ogólnie-IE” deklinacji. Dialekci bałtyjskie występują jak archaiczne reprezentanci wcześniejszego “oceanu IE dialektów”, od którego słowiańskie dyferencjowały się jedne z ostatnich po dialektach germańskich. W monografii w pierwszy raz została sformułowana idea wykształcania się słowiańskiego w zonie tych samych peryferyjnych bałto-słowiańskich dialektów, wśród których kształtowały się następne dialekty zachodniobałtyjskie. To było czasem bliskiej współpracy słynnych indoeuropeistów, bałtyistów i sławistów z katedrą V. Mažiulis. Wtedy Wiktor Martynow opublikował teorię słowiańskiego jak najpierw italizowanego, lecz potem iranizowanego bałtyjskiego, ale Wolfgang Schmid określił bałtyjski jak centrum kontinuum indoeuropejskiego, dlatego różnica między tym centrum i byle którą inną grupą indoeuropejskich języków jest zawsze mniejsza niż różnica obojętnie których innych grup pomiędzy sobą. Problem stosunków bałto-słowiańskich a też zachodniobałtyjskiego jak kontynuacji tych samych peryferyjnych dialektów pobudził szczególny interes V. Mažiulis do języka pruskiego. Ten interes owocnym sposobem zbiegł się z interesem do języka pruskiego słynnego rosyjskiego indoeuropeisty a sławisty Władimira Toporowa, który też był wniósł udział do wyżej wspomnianych teorii. W. Toporow jest autorem niedokończonego Słownika języka pruskiego – wielkiej filologicznej encyklopedii stosunków kulturalno lingwistycznych między Prusami a sąsiednim regionem i całym indoeuropejskim światem w ogóle. W 1966 r. V. Mažiulis opublikował faksymile wszystkich piśmiennych staropruskich zabytków, ale w 1981 r. on opracował i opublikował ich transliterację i tłumaczenie filologiczne. Wreszcie w latach 1988–1997 on wydał swoją główniejszą pracę – 4 tomy Etymologicznego słownika języka pruskiego, który przedstawi głęboką analizę słowotwórstwa pruskiego i bałtyjskiego. Ta praca będzie pozostała niezbędna dla przyszłych generacji prusologów.

V. Mažiulis jest członkiem Litewskiej Akademii Nauk, Akademii Nauk i Literatury Mainz. Przedstawiona Gramatyka historyczna języka pruskiego jest jego nowiejszym wkładem do badań nad językiem pruskim.

Prof. Dr. Hab. Vytautas MAŽIULIS

was born on 20 August 1926 in Rokėnai, Lithuania. After finishing a high-school in Rokiškis, for a short time he was a student of theological seminary, as it was almost a tradition for gifted children from well-to-do farmers' families in Lithuania. Acquaintance with Latin language, so similar to Lithuanian in many aspects, arouse in him interest in linguistics and comparison of languages. In 1947–1952 he studies classical philology at Vilnius university. As an advanced student he was recommended to write doctor theses at the Chair of Comparative Historical Linguistics at Moscow university. With a research of Lithuanian numerals he acquired the degree of Dr. Phil. in 1956. His academic activities at Vilnius university began in 1955 and lasted 43 years. In 1968–1973 he headed Chair of Lithuanian Language at Vilnius university and habilitated in 1969 (professor since 1969). This was time of his fruitful cooperation with outstanding Lithuanian linguist Jonas Kazlauskas (1930–1970) who introduced methods of modern linguistics into comparative historical studies of Baltic languages. Together with J. Kazlauskas, V. Mažiulis developed and grounded an idea of Christian Stang (1942) concerning transition of IE \*ō both into Baltic \*ō and \*ā: 2 allophones of Balt. \*ō were defined, of which an accented and narrow one developed into Pr. \*ō, Lith., Latv. *uo*, but an unaccented and broader one developed into \*ō̄ coinciding with a broad Baltic \*ā (\*ō̄) of the low timbre. In paradigms with the mobile accent the broader allophon of Baltic \*ō was generalized in Prussian (\**dōtwei*) and coincided with Pr. \*ā (\**mōtē*), while the narrower allophon was generalized in Lithuanian (*dūoti*) and in Latvian (*duōt*). However in stable unaccented positions an unstressed Balt. allophone \*ō turned into Lithuanian *o* (*vilko*) and coincided with Balt. \*ā > *o* (Lith. *mótē*). This concept is known as Kazlauskas'–Mažiulis' hypothesis. Together with J. Kazlauskas, V. Mažiulis initiated Vilnius international journal for Baltic linguistics *Baltistica* (since 1965), but he established Chair for Baltic philology in 1973 after the death of J. Kazlauskas. More than 20 years Prof. Mažiulis headed this Chair which became an international centre of Baltic studies and organizer of international congresses of the baltists. An explanation of Lith. gen. sg. (*vil̃k*)-*o* had wide Indoeuropean implications. It led to a conclusion about origin of *o*-stem IE dative which appeared to be “a lengthened stem”, identical with Lith. dial.

dat. (*vil̃k*)-uo < \**ō*, but this finally allowed to question not only the myth of Common-IE dat. \**-ōi*, but to create a new theory of Indoeuropean declension. This theory is set forth in the monograph “Relations of Baltic and other Indoeuropean languages” (1970). When nominative, accusative and genitive were products of reshaping pre-accusative Common-Indoeuropean structure, the secondary cases formed in separate IE dialects separately, although by different paradigmizing of the same elements of adverbial meaning. Thus the myth of the 7-cases “Common-IE” declension was ruined. Baltic appeared to be an archaic representative of former “ocean of Indoeuropean dialects”, from which Slavic dialects differentiated among the last after the Germanic dialects. In the book for the first time was set forth an idea of the formation of Slavic amid the same peripheral Baltic-Slavic dialects, where future West-Baltic dialects were formed. This was a period of a very close cooperation of outstanding Indoeuropeanists, Baltists and Slavists with the Chair of V. Mažiulis. Then Victor Martynov published his theory of Slavic as first italicized and then iranized Baltic but Wolfgang Schmid defined Baltic as a centre of IE continuity, so that a difference between this centre and any other IE group is always smaller than between any other groups among themselves. The problem of Baltic-Slavic relations and Western Baltic as a continuation of the same peripheral dialects stimulated V. Mažiulis’ interest in Prussian. This interest in a fruitful way coincided with the interest in Prussian of an outstanding Russian Indoeuropeanist and Slavist Vladimir Toporov who had also contributed to the development of all mentioned ideas. V. Toporov is author of an unfinished Dictionary of Prussian which is a huge philologic encyclopedia of cultural linguistic relations of Prussian with the neighbouring region and all Indoeuropean world. In 1966 V. Mažiulis published facsimile of all Prussian written documents, but in 1981 he published transliteration and philological translation of these documents. Finally, in 1988–1997 he published his main work: 4 volumes of Prussian etymological dictionary, which presents the deepest linguistic analysis of Prussian and Baltic word derivation. This work will remain indispensable for future generations of prussologists. V. Mažiulis is a member of Lithuanian Academy of Sciences, of Mainz Academy of Science and Literature. This grammar is his newest contribution into the study of the Prussian language.