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**Abbreviations**

**A. Sources and bibliography**


Baltistica – Baltistica. Vilnius, 1965–.


ESSJ – Этимологический словарь славянских языков. Под ред. О.Н. Трубачева. Москва, 1974–. Вып. 1–.


Kalbotyra – Kalbotyra. Vilnius, 1958–.


LKK – Lietuvių kaibotyros klausimai. Vilnius, 1957–.

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


Paulauskiene LKM – Paulauskiene A. Lietuvių kalbos morfologija. Vilnius, 1994–.


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


T. 1–2.

B. Languages and dialects

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

C. Other abbreviations

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

One must know how to read and understand examples from Baltic and Slavic languages. The letters ď, š,  şi mean ch, sh, zh (French j) correspondingly (Polish cz, sz, z, ć, ś, ẓ correspondingly mean: ch, sh, zh, palatal c, palatal s, palatal z. Polish rz equals to ż).

Lithuanian letters à, æ, á, ø (as well as Polish à, æ) 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, ĩ, ū in the literary language.

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

The letter ė means long narrow ē, but the letter y means long ĩ 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 ē!).

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

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

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

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

The research of Old Prussian¹ 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” (Prûsø kalbos etimologijos žodynas. Vilnius 1988–1997 = PEŻ) and on works, referred to in this Dictionary. I do not discuss problems of Prussian syntax which is enough Germanized in attested documents.

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

The Prussian language really belongs not to the Germanic but to the Baltic group of Indo-european languages and is kinderred to living Lithuanian and Latvian languages. The Baltic group of languages in its turn is closest to the Slavic group of languages (Czech, Serbian, Polish, Russian etc.). The latter, together with the Baltic group, are closest to the Germanic group of 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 Satom). 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 Pomezanian dialect.

– L.P.
1. PHONETICS

Accent and Tones

§ 1. The accent in Prussian (similarly to Lithuanian) was free, and this is apparent in the 3rd Catechism in which the stressed length is marked over vowels in most cases. Cf.: mûti ‘mother’ (< *mātē ‘idem’ = Lith. dial. mótē ‘idem’), f. antrā ‘the second’ (= Lith. antrà < *antrā), kaimīn̄an (= Lith. kaimyńa), turī ( = Lith. turētī) 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):


b) in the acute diphthongs (their second component being lengthened), e.g.: āīnan ‘one’ ( < ēīnan : Lith. v-ienq, Latv. v-ienu), kaūlins ‘bones’ ( : Lith. kāulus, Latv. kaūlus), pogaūt ‘to receive’ ( : Lith. gāuti, Latv. gūt), steīmans ‘to those’ ( : Lith. tiems, Latv. tiēm) etc.

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

In the Baltic languages the tone may differentiate meaning of similar words sometimes, cf. Lith. rūgsta ‘sours’ vs. rūksta ‘smokes’, Latv. lūoks ‘leek’ vs. luoks ‘bow’, Pr. baytan = *sātān ‘sieve’ vs. (larga - = *linga)sātān ‘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 Bezzenberger KZ XLIV 315 ff., Girdenis KD I 318 ff.

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

§ 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 §₁ = II §₁), 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. dalgis) = Pr. E) *dōlgis = i.e. *dālgis (the lengthened *ā correlating with the short *ā, cf. §19)³, moasis ‘bellows’ = (Pr. E) *mōsas < *mōisas = i.e. *māisas (= Lith. maĩšas), semo ‘winter’ = (Pr. E) *zēmō < *zēimā (the latter being barytone⁴ with all probability) = i.e. *zēimā (= Lith. žiemā) etc. Diphthongs of the acute origin are hidden in the Elbing Vocabulary in their turn without any doubt. I do not undertake tracing them today.

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

³ The signs *a, *ā mark short and long back vowels a, ā of a low timbre correspondingly. – L.P.

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

⁵ For this cf. fin. 13. – L.P.
Vocalism

a) Short vowels

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

§ 7. It is Baltic *ũ in which Pr. u, Lith. u and Latv. ū originate, cf.: Pr. duckti ‘daughter’ (E) < *duktė (PEŻ I 235) – Lith. duktė; Pr. budė ‘(they) are awake’ (III) – Lith. budėti, buđinti 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 1 c.), e.g.: Pr. meddo ‘honey’ (E) < *medu (the final inflection *ũ being unstressed, cf. PEŻ III 118) – Lith. medûs, Latv. medus; Pr. prusnan / prosninan ‘face’ (III) – Lith. prusnâ ‘snout’, Latv. (pl.) prusnas ‘lips, mouth’ (PEŻ III 361); druwe (III) / drowy (II) ‘(I) believe’. One should also pay attention to frequent rendering of ũ 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), bûton ‘to be’ (III), pûton ‘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. *ė comes from Balt. *ę < IE *ē and corresponds to Lith. e

---

6 More precisely: camstian = *kamst’an or (sometimes supposed by Mažiulis earlier) *kamstjan < *kamistjan, werstian = *verst’an or werstjan < *versistjan – L.P.
and Latv. e, cf.: Pr. meddo ‘honey’ (E) – Lith. medūs, Latv. medus; Pr. median ‘forest’ = *med’an7 – 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.)8.

§ 9. Balt. *a (more precisely Balt. *o --＞ WBalt. *o, cf. § 19) produced Pr. *a (resp. o), Lith. a, Latv. a, e.g.: golis ‘death’ (E) < *galas (i.e. *golās) ‘idem’ = (III) acc. sg. gallan (PEŽ I 319 ff.); assis ‘axle’ (E) – Lith. asīs, Latv. ass; (III) acc. sg. naktin ‘night’ – Lith. naktis, Latv. naks etc.; cf. the same with an inflectional -a: Pr. (III) adv. ilga ‘long (time)’ (PEŽ II 23), polīnka ‘(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. isrankūms) 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 *-j (e.g. Deywis ‘God’, dumis ‘smoke’ etc.) in dialects of the Elbing Vocabulary9.

7 Or *median, cf. the previous fn. – L.P.
8 When speaking about neutralization of phonemes, a position of neutralization should be defined. In Lithuanian dialects this is the initial (weak – not a single contrasting pair exists!) position in which the phonemes /e/ and /a/ may be neutralized (their opposition being absent in the other positions because [e] palatalizes previous consonants and turns into [a] after the palatals). If the variation of the initial e- and a- (ast / est, cf. also the spelling aast II 713) 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. *ladis < Balt. *ledas vs. Saml. *l’ads < Balt. *ledas (but Pomez. *[pēdas] = Saml. *pēdei], cf. (E) peadey, § 14) – L.P.
9 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) gêide = *gêid’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), widdewû ‘widow’ (PEŽ IV 234), (E): tresde ‘thrush’ (PEŽ IV 199), wessis ‘sledge’ (PEŽ IV 232)10.

b) Long vowels

§ 11. The dialect of the Elbing Vocabulary is more archaic than dialect(s) of the Catechisms in respect to the fate of Baltic long vowels, whether accented or unaccented. The fate of the final lond *-ê 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 = *mëtê (the ending is long!) vs. (III) mûti (the ending is short!) < *mûtî < *mëtê (for these û resp. î see further §§ 13, 15).

§ 12. Balt. *î --> WBalt. *î produced Pr. (E) *î, spelled as i, y and ie, e.g.: Pr. (E) giwato ‘life’ (cf. Lith. gyvatâ), ylo ‘awl’ (cf. Lith. ñla, Latv. ñlens ‘idem’), liede ‘pike’ (cf. Lith. lydës, Latv. ñidaka). The same WBalt. *î is spelled as i, î, 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 < *-âs). Nevertheless this process (known as reduction of the final vowels) is not attested in the Elbing Vocabulary – cf. antis (not ‘ants), wosee. This shows that the inflection nom. sg. masc. -is (with its i reduced) instead of *-as hardly can be explained as a result of purely phonetic shortening (no shortening took place!). Therefore, the inflection nom. sg. masc. -s as well in the dialects of the Catechisms may be older than the reduction of the final vowels there and may have been caused by the same grammatical (not pure phonetic) reasons as in the dialects of the Elbing Vocabulary (cf. here §§ 89, 91–92). – L.P.

10 Spelling a as e reflects the reduction of a in the unstressed position and shows the strength of the dynamic accent in Prussian. Therefore this was namely the strong accent which caused reduction of the final (unstressed) vowels in the dialects of the Catechisms. As for mixing a and e after palatals and j, this reflects the absence of the phonematic opposition between laJ and leJ in all positions except initial – cf. ftm. 8. – L.P.
‘life’ there: nom. sg. neut. giwan, gen. gīwas, acc. gijwan, geiwan, geiwin (geywien) 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.


§ 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, sociétén (saōnan) ‘son’, if. būton, bōton (bāton) ‘to be’. The spellings ou, au correspond to (accented) diphthongoid *aū (cf. Stang Vergl. Gr. 50) which (as well as *ī, cf. § 12) did not exist in E.

§ 14. Balt. *ē produced Pr. (E) *-ē-, e.g.: semen = *sēmen ‘seed’ (cf. Lith. sēmenys), wetro = *vētra ‘wind’ (cf. Lith. vētra ‘storm’, Latv. vētra ‘idem’), wosee = *vāze ‘she-goat’ etc. The same Pr. (E) *ē is reflected in pleynis = *plēnis ‘meninx’ (cf. Lith. plēnis ‘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 = *gēsnīs ‘snipe’ (PEŽ I 332), peadey = *pēd’ai ‘socks’ (PEŽ III 240), seabre = *zēbre ‘vimba’ (PEŽ IV 88 f.)\[
\]

§ 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. ēda ‘eats’, PEŽ II 17), turryetwey (II) ‘to have’ (-ye- meaning *ī) and turritwey (III) ‘idem’ (= -īvei < *ēvei, cf. Lith. turēti ‘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,\[
\]
\[\text{11 Cf. ftn. 13. – L.P.}\]
III appeared “because translator of I was not a native Samlandian but was possibly a Natangian”.

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

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

---

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

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

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

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

\(^{13}\) One should pay attention to striking parallelism in spelling “broadened” ea (cf. § 14) = *ē and not-“broadened” e or ee, beside “broadened” o and (III) ō in the Elbing Vocabulary: seabre – steege, peadey – seese, teansis – peempe, and even seams – semo < *ēm! beside soalis – wosee, moazo – sosto, doalgis – dongo, and even moasis < *ēimē! (2x) – grossis. Why were *ē- < *ē and *ē- < *ēm uniformly broadened? What was the reason of broadening *ē- in seams = *ēmēs < *ēimē and not broadening *ē- in semo < *ēimē? 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, oo, 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. podēčs < puodēlis on the one hand (Zinkevičius Z., Lietuvių diakalektologija, 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. vāči < vāči (ibid. 51 with the reference to Bezzenberger about similar fate of the stressed long ā in Prussian Lithuanian). Therefore I should like to explain (E) ea, oo as under the stress diphthongized ē, *ē. This in its turn allows to define place of the accent in words (E) seabre, peadey, teansis, seams, soalis, moazo, doalgis, moasis with the stressed stem vs. seexe, seese, peempe, semo, wosee, sosto, dongo, grossis with the stressed ending (cf. Klusis M. Prūsų kalba, I, Vilnius 1989, 22–23). If so, the spelling peempe reflects lengthened first component of the tautosyllabic -em- in unstressed position (the ending *ē being stressed). – L.P.

\(^{14}\) In other words, the fate of new *ū < *ē after LG and of new *ū < *ē after L, G was the same: no subsequent diphthongization took place. – L.P.
§ 18. In several instances Balt. *ô is reflected in Pr. Cat. ā (not after LG), cf. (III) dät ‘to give’, dätevi ‘idem’ (cf. Lith. dúoti, Latv. duöt < Balt. *dê–), däts (III) ‘given’, dats (I) ‘idem’, daetz (II) ‘idem’ = däts. This ā came to being in the following way. The root vowel Balt. *ô was un-stressed in oxytone forms of this verb [the verb belonged to mobile type of accentuation, of what the “broken” tone in Latvian is the best evidence – L.P.]. As unstressed, this *ô was broad *É and thus coincided with Balt. *É (II) ‘idem’, *É (I) ‘idem’ = *dê. This came to being in the following way. The root vowel Balt. *ô was un-stressed in oxytone forms of this verb [the verb belonged to mobile type of accentuation, of what the “broken” tone in Latvian is the best evidence – L.P.]. As unstressed, this *ô was broad *É and thus coincided with Balt. *É (II) ‘idem’, *É (I) ‘idem’ = *dê. Thus Balt. *dô– ‘to give’ turned into WBalt. *dê‘idem’ > Pr. Cat. (not E!) *dā-. At the same time the accented vowel *ô was generalized onto the whole paradigm in Eastern Baltic what caused the appearance of Lith. dúoti, Latv. duöt (cf. PEŽ I 181 s.v. dät with bibl.); cf. also § 19. It is not easy however to define the phonetic quality of the vowels -ô-, resp. -oa- in words (E) podalis, woasis: it might have been Pr. (E) *ô (cf. PEŽ III 302 s.v. podalis, PEŽ IV 259 s.v. woasis). Cf. also § 94 (sîru).

§ 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) in Common Baltic:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>short</th>
<th>long</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>*i</td>
<td>*ê</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*u</td>
<td>*ã (= *ô)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*ô</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>*ã (= *ô)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

15 Vowels are classified according to place of their articulation: (Balt.) front /el, ĝel, ĝi, ĝi/ vs. back /lêl, lêl, lêl, lûl, lûl (correlation in zone), low /el, ĝel, ĝe (e), lêl (i/lêl) vs. middle lôl vs. high /il, ĝil, ĝil, ĝil, lûl, lûl (correlation in rise of tonge). The sign Ø marks absence of a correlate (see table) – L.P.
I consent to the opinion of Girdenis l. c. that the above shown vowels *a (= *ā) and *ā(= *ā) were of low timbre near to the timbre of labialized vowels of the back zone. On the other hand, the sub-system of the long vowels without the foward-zone correlate of *ō could not be stable. For this reason the opposition Balt. */öl/: */āl(= *ā)/ began to be neutralized as */āl(= *ā)/ in unstressed morphemes (cf. Kazlauskas LKIG 144 f.). In Eastern Baltic such neutralization was impeded by developing a correlate to EBalt. *ē, 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 (= *ā) than the EBalt. *ō – cf. § 18.


Consonantism

§ 21. Balt. *j > 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’, crixtia = *krikstija ‘I baptize’, (E) kalabian = *kalabijan ‘sword’, claywio = *klaivijā < *kleivijā ‘flank (meat)’ (for this *-ijā cf. PEŻ II 208) etc.

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

§ 23. In the same way Pr. *j disappeared after dentals (D) which
became palatalized \((D')\), spelled as -\(ti\), -\(di\), e.g.: median (E) ‘forest’, 
cristi\(\u0155\)nai (III) ‘Christians’ etc. Pr. g\(\u0103\)ide (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’ (PE\(\u0103\) II 119), angurgis ‘eel’ (with -\(rg\)- = Pr. *-r’-) etc., kelian ‘lance’ (with -\(li\)- = Pr. *-l’-), ansalgis ‘welt’ (with -\(lg\)- = Pr. *-l’-, cf. PE\(\u0103\) I 81), saligan ‘green’ (with -\(lg\)- = Pr. *-l’-, cf. PE\(\u0103\) 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. *\(y\*) > 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. *y* or *-(u)y* (cf. Endzel\(\u0103\)ns SV 34 f.), e.g.: (I) gen. Deiuas ‘idem’, acc. Deiuas ‘idem’, (E) preartue ‘reutel’, plough-knife’ (PE\(\u0103\) III 346), schutuan ‘twisted yarn’ (PE\(\u0103\) IV 88).

Letters -\(ff\)- in spelling dróffs ‘faith’ render the same spirant Pr. *-v-*. 

Prothetic Pr. *v- \([*\(y\*)-\)] is not rare, cf. woasis (E) ‘ash-tree’ (PE\(\u0103\) IV 259), wosux (E) ‘he-goat’ (PE\(\u0103\) IV 265 f.), wuschts (I) ‘eighth’ etc.

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

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

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

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

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

For Pr. *z* cf. semo (E) = *zēm\(\u0103\) ‘winter’ < *zēim\(\u0103\) < *źeim\(\u0103\) etc.
Pr. *s has been turned into *š under German influence sometimes, in following compositions:

a) sp – schpartina (III, beside spartint III), schpändimai (III, cf. PEŽ I 122 s.v. auschpändimai);

b) sk – schkellänts (III, beside skellänts III), schkûdan (III, beside skûdan III), schkläits (III, beside sclaits III);

c) sl – schlüsitwei (III);

d) rs – kirscha (III, beside kirsa III).

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

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


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

§ 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.),

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

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

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

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

Compounds

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

dagagaydis (E) ‘spring wheat’ = *dagagaidīs (PEŻ I 172), cariawoytis (E) ‘military conference’ = *kar’avātīs (PEŻ II 123 f.), crauyawirps E ‘bleeder’ = *kraujavirp(a)s (PEŻ II 261 f.), laucagerto (E) ‘partridge’ (‘field hen’) = *laukagertī (PEŻ III 48), malunakelan (E) ‘mill-wheel’ = *malūnakelan (PEŻ III 107), malunastab[is] (E) ‘millstone’ = *malūnastab(a)s (PEŻ III 107), piwamaltan (E) ‘malt’ = *pīvamaltan (PEŻ III 289), wissaseydis (E) ‘Tuesday’ (‘joint session’) = *visasādis (PEŻ IV 251 f.), acc. grēivakaulin (III) ‘rib’ = *krēivakaulin (PEŻ I 404 f.) etc.

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

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

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

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

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

§ 36. In Prussian dialects there were compounds with a connecting vowel -i- on place of some other older vowel, e.g.: (III) butti tāws ‘pater familias, father of the house’ = *buttitāvs beside butta tawas ‘idem’ = *buttatāvas (E buttan ‘house’), cf. Lith. šonikaulis l šonākaulis (: šonas),

Reduplicated stems

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

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

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

§ 40. *gegalîs (E) ‘diver’ – together with Lith. gaîgalas ‘drake’, Latv. gaîgals ‘diver’, gaîgala ‘idem’, Rus. eôôîn ‘golden-eye’ etc., comes from (onomatopoetic) interj. Balt.-Sl. *ge(i)g- (PEŻ I 335 f.) < IE *ghe(i)gh- (Pokorny IEW 407);

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

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


**Suffix derivation**

Vocal suffixes

§ 46. This old type of various epochs is represented by many derivatives with suffixes -a- (< IE *-o16) and -ā- (= -ā-) in written documents of Prussian. Cf. substantives and adjectives:

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

---

16 The reader should not understand IE *-o- etc. as a reconstruction of any real phonetic quality *[o] etc. Such symbols are only traditional conventional signs showing phonologic units as members of concrete phonologic oppositions (e.g. */al : */el/ 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 */al/ : */el/ 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. deīnan (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 įa-stem) paradigms in many instances. Although the words geyty[s] (E) ‘bread’, pintys (E) ‘tinder’ are i-stems undoubtedly, they seem to be derivatives with a suffix -ti-, not -i- (cf. 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. (į)iेठ-stem nouns are well attested: same (E) ‘earth’, semmē (III) ‘idem’ = *semē, berse (E) ‘birch’ = *berzē, kurpe (E) ‘shoe’, kurpi (III) ‘idem’ < *kurpē, teisi (III) ‘honour’ < *teisē, wosee (E) ‘she-goat’ < *(v)ōzē etc. *-i having vanished before front vowels very early in all Baltic languages, *-iē turned into *-ē, although it was the genetive plural where this *-i- survived for a long time, i.e. Pr. (*-iē + -ōn -->) *-iun, cf. Lith. dial. žemju ‘(of) lands’ beside nom. sg. žēmē ‘land’ (< *žemjē).

§ 50. įa-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 < ] *-iis < *-i(j)as in the nominative singular.

Suffixes with a consonant -v-

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

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

Suffixes with a consonant -n-

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

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

17 All these samples should not tempt us to see here a stem-ending (*-a/*-e, *-i) + 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.) Deivas < IE *dei-uo-(-s) <-- *di-uo-(-s) / *di-uo-(-s). As for Pr. suf. *-îva/-îvā- in connection with infinitives in -î-, this seems to be one of later generalizations. For IE pairs *di-uo-(-s) / *di-uo-(-s) cf. the name of Zeus: Gk. nom. Zeûς, gen. Διός. For the thematizing of IE athematic stems cf. also athematic Gk. nom. ποῦς (= Lat. pēs < *ped-s), gen. ποδός ‘foot’ --> thematic Gk. nom.-acc. neut. πέδων ‘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. Palmaïtis 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-mma]. 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. kārti 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. *-ēnā cf. krixtieno (E) ‘earth-swallow’ = *krikštīnā (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)’ = *sēmenā < adj. (fem.) *sēmenā ← subst. *sēmen- ‘sowing, seed’ (PEŽ IV 96 f.), schumeno ‘wax-end’ = *šūmenā (PEŽ IV 87 f.), plasmeno ‘resting basis of the foot’s sole’ = *plasmenā (PEŽ III 290), sealtneno ‘oriole’ (PEŽ IV 89 f.), (Cat.) kērmens ‘body’ (PEŽ II 168 ff.)18.

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

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

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

There are also derivatives with a suffix *-în in Prussian, e.g.: adj. alkîns (III) ‘hungry’ (PEŢ I 66), subst. acc. sg. kaimîn (III) ‘neighbour’ (PEŢ II 75 f.), subst. seimîns (III) ‘family’ (PEŢ IV 93).

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


---

a borrowing from Prussian because of irregular correspondence of tone in Pr. kâma(l)uke ‘visits’ (= Pr. caymis E = acute *kaim(a)s, not circumflex ‘coymis!’ – see § 4 and fn. 2) vs. Lith. acute kâmas ‘village’ (not circumflex as in kiêmas = Latv. ciems, i.e. not *kaïmas!). 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.


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

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

§ 60. Suf. *-ān is traced in Pr. (E) medione ‘hunt(ing)’ = *med’ānë (PEŽ III 122)21.


21 There is a “suf. -jān” in the author’s original text of HGOP, p. 28. But cf. PEŽ III 122: “Pr. *med’ānë < *medjānë is derived from Pr. v. *medjā-(tvei) ‘to hunt in a forest (E median)’ with a suf. *-āmē”. 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. medžiõnë ‘hunting’ < v. medžioti < *medjāt. In this case suffixes *-ānē in Pr. mediane, Lith. medžiõnë, abejõnë, svajõnë etc. in palatal stems, Lith. raudõnë, vakarõnë etc. in hard stems, are complex. They were derived with lengthening of a stem vowel in verbs (infinitives) *-(į)a > *-(į)ā + suf. *-nē. Cf. § 52 f. and Skardžius ŽD, p. 272, 276. – L.P.

22 J. Endzelîns l.c. considers suf. -senis < *-senis 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. *-siena (> *-sena) / *-sjanā, but fem. *-sjenā (> -senā) / *-sjanā. He considers segment *-sje- 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’ (PEŻ IV 102), acc. asmans III ‘eighth’ (PEŻ I 103), pirmas I ‘first’ (PEŻ III 284).

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

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

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

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

Suffixes with a consonant -l-

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

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

§ 65. With Pr. suf. *-ail- resp. *-eil- are derived (E): scritayle ‘rim’ = *skritailê (PEŻ IV 124 f.), [c]rupeyle ‘frog’ = *krupeilê (PEŻ II 287 f.).
With Pr. suf. *-öl- and *-ål- are derived gramboale (E) ‘beetle’ < *grambölë (PEŻ I 395), peisälei (III) ‘letter, scripture’ (PEŻ III 242 f.)²³.

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

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

§ 66. Pr. suf. *-tl- resp. (*-tl- >) *-kl- is represented in nouns (adjectives and substantives): adj. acc. dîrstlan (III) ‘firm’ (PEŻ I 207 f.), subst. *zentla- ‘sign’ [: ebsentluns ‘(one who has) marked’] (PEŻ I 245), abstoclé (E) ‘lid (of a pot)’ = *abstôklë (PEŻ I 47), auclo (E) ‘(horse) halter’ = *auklô (PEŻ I 113), gurcë (E) ‘throat’ = *gurklë (PEŻ I 425 f.), piuclan (E) ‘sickle’ = *pjûklan (PEŻ III 288), rîklís (E) ‘loft’ = *rîklîs (PEŻ IV 27), spertlan (E) ‘ball of the toe’ = *spertlan (PEŻ IV 145), stacle (E) ‘support (abutment)’ = *staklë (PEŻ IV 149), -tinklo ‘net’ = *tinklô (PEŻ IV 68 f. s.v. sasintinklo)²⁴.

Suffixes with a consonant -k-

§ 67. Suf. *-ika²⁵ had several functions in Prussian. First, it was used to derive agent nouns, cf. (masc.): mynix (E) ‘tanner’ = *mînikis (= Lith. mynïkas ‘idem’, PEŻ III 141), geniç (E) ‘woodpecker’ = *genikis (PEŻ I 350 f.), schuwikis (E) ‘shoemaker’ = *šuvikis (cf. Lith. siuvïkas ‘tailor’, PEŻ IV 88), *vidik(a)s ‘witness = seeing’ (PEŻ IV 235 s.v. widekausnan), (fem.) grandico (E) ‘plank (board)’ = *grandikô (PEŻ I 396 ff.)²⁶.

23 Pr. peisälei is a “hyper-correction” of *peisâli due to generalizing of the unaccented counterpart of alternation -ei / -ê (accented) vs. -ei / -e (unaccented) – cf. ftn. 12.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

a) from other substantives, cf.: dat. pl. auschautenîkamans (III) ‘debtors’ = *aušautenîkamans (PEŻ I 121), balgniniks (E) ‘saddle-maker’ = *balgnînik's (PEŻ I 131), dat. pl. -algenikamans (III) ‘(day-)labourers’ = *algenîkamans (PEŻ I 188 s.v. deināalgenikamans), grîkenix (III) ‘sinner’ < *grîkenîk(a)s (PEŻ I 409), laukinikis (E) ‘landowner’ = *laukinîk's (PEŻ III 48), medenix (E) ‘woodman’ = *medenîk(a)s (PEŻ III 118 f. s.v. medenixtaurwis), pogalbenix (III) ‘helper’ = *pagalbenîk(a)s (PEŻ III 305), stubonikis (E with -o- instead of -e-) ‘barber-surgeon’ = *stubenîk's;
b) from adjectives, cf. *maldenikis (E) = *maldenîk’s (PEŻ III 106 f.);


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


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

---

27 Pr. *kçrmeniskai is a “hyper-correction” of *kærmeniska due to generalizing of the unaccented counterpart of alternation -aû / -û (accented) vs. -aû / -a (unaccented) – cf. ftm’s 12, 23. – L.P.
28 nom. sg. fem. (unaccented) -isku < *-iskû < *-iskâ after a guttural k, cf. §§ 16, 17, 5 – L.P.
§ 72. Pr. suf. *-agā is represented in (E) karyago ‘military campaign’ = *kar’agā (PEŻ II 121 f.), witwago ‘water-hen’ = *vitvagā (PEŻ IV 256), but Pr. suf. *-igā is represented in (E) wedigo ‘adze’ (PEŻ IV 228).

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

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


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

Suffixes with a consonant -t-

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

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

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

§ 77. Pr. suf. *-utis/*-ütis 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’ = *lukutis < *‘light-coloured fish’ (PEŻ III 78 f.), cf. Lith. lauk-ūtis ‘horse with a white spot on the forehead’ (Skardžius ŽD 363); nagutis ‘fingernail’ = *nagutis (: OSl. nogūtì ‘idem’), cf. Lith. krauj-ūtis ‘milfoil’ (Skardžius l.c.).

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

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

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

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

Pr. subst. gen. sg. etnīstis (III), if an i-stem (Endzelīns SV 53, PEŻ I 298), has a suf. *-sti-. However considered to be an ē-stem, it should have a suf. *-stē-, cf. Endzelīns l. c., PEŻ, l. c.
§ 81. Pr. suf. *-ūst- is found in adj. *kailūsta- ‘sound (healthy)’ (-> acc. kailūstiskun²⁹ III ‘health’), cf. PEŻ II 73 f.

§ 82. Pr. suf. *-īst- was used to derived diminutives (of the neuter gender): eristian (E) ‘lamb’ = *(j)ērist’ān (= ērisčias ‘idem’ PEŻ I 284), gertistian (E) ‘chicken’ = *gertišt’ān (PEŻ I 356), *wō[s]įstian (E) ‘goatling’ = *(v)ōzist’ān (PEŻ IV 262), *wersistian (werstian E) ‘calf’ = *versist’ān (PEŻ IV 231), *parsistian (prastian E) ‘pig’ = *parsist’ān (PEŻ III 334 f.); cf. also Endzelîns SV 53.

With Pr. suf. *-īst- an abstract name cristionisto (E) ‘Christianity’ = *krist’ōnīstī was derived (PEŻ II 280 f.).

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

§ 84. With Pr. suf. *-taja-, *-ēja-, *-ija- (i.e. masc. *-tājas, *-ējas, *-ijas) agent nouns were derived, cf. Pr. (E) artoys ‘ploughman’ = *artōj’s (PEŻ I 93), gewineis ‘(unskilled) worker’ < *gevinēj’s (PEŻ I 360), medies ‘hunter’ = *medīs < *medijas ‘idem’ (PEŻ III 120 f.) – see Skardžius ŽD 80, 83 f., 86 f., Urbutis ŽDT 256, Ambrazas DDR I 116, II 134.

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

²⁹ 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 (substan-
tives, adjectives and numerals) are attested in written documents: a) 3
genders (masculine, feminine, neuter), b) 2 numbers (singular and plu-
ral), 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 Cat-
echisms.

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

---

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

\(^{31}\) Pr. acc. sg. *wijrin* (with -i- instead of -a-) is the single occurrence among 5 instances of this form
in the Catechisms, while *geitan* (with -a- instead of -i-) is the single occurrence among 10 (!)
instances of this form in the Carechisms. This possibly points to a printer’s mistake. On the other
hand, acc. sg. *quaïtan* (instead of *quaïtin*) 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 *(quaïtan)* to be a fact of the living Samlandian speech (not a
translator’s mistake!) in PEŽ II 324 (cf. also a-stem *Emeîwings labs quaïts* III 51\(^{20}\)). Otherwise
why does V. Mažiulis still keep speaking about innovations and not about mistakes even here
in HGOP? What “innovation” can produce a foreigner except a mistake? – L.P.
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. (soûn)-s (an u-stem form in Pr. Cat. -s < Pr. *-us, cf. § 134) = (deiw)-s (an a-stem form)\(^32\).

§ 88. In the same way were produced innovative a-stem forms of a numeral Pr. (Cat.) card. acc. sg. *-an (desimto III 27, ‘ten’ used as a nominative), acc. pl. *-ans (dessimtons III 67). 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. tûsimtons ‘thousands’ = *tûsimtans should be treated as an innovative a-stem instead of original i-stem, Pr. (Cat.) nom. *tûsimts ‘thousand’ < *tûsimtis (cf. Lith. tûkstantis ‘idem’). Cf. also § 156.

\[\text{a-stems}\\
\]

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

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

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

In the Catechisms an ending -s is usual, e.g.: Deiws (III) ‘God’, tāws (III) ‘father’, wijrs (III) ‘man’ etc. Three times an ending -as occurs: Deiwas (III 99 14), tawas (III 47 2, 10)33.

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

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


§ 91. Gen. sg. (masc., neut.) *-as is attested in all Catechisms, e.g. (III): Deiwas ‘God’, buttas ‘house (home)’, giwas ‘life’, grikas ‘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, Endzelîns SV 58, Stang Vergl. Gr. 181, Kazlauskas LKIG 173 f., Gamkrelidze–Ivanov I 387 f.).

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

33 Cf. also adj. nom. sg. masc. -skas (isarwiskas III, etc.), not shortened due to difficulty in pronouncing complex *-skas, or ord. pirmas (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 (Palmaitis BGR 115). For the purpose of shortening Pr. nom. *-as > -s cf. also fnn. 47.

34 Thematization (sic! BS 247) of IE consonant-stem (“athematic”!) *-es f*-*os (with the same usual vowel-gradation *e f*-*o, as in gen. sg. masc. Pr. -as = Grmc *-es) was first explained in Palmaitis BGR 40/41, 78 f., and even 19 years earlier in Палмайтис 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). 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. (vilk)-o etc.] turned into Pr. *-ā. Translators of the Catechisms replaced it with (Cat.) -as under the influence of German morph gen. sg. -(e)s; this was the source of 50 times used gen. sg Deiwas “God” = Germ. Gottes ‘idem’.

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

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

35 Thus V. Mažiulis has showed that A. Rosinas’ hypothesis was neither new (it was stated with the help of A. Girdenis in GL 1977), nor interesting, i.e. neither the same translators (“editorial board”) for all 3 Catechisms ever existed, nor this hypothesis was worth mentioning at all since it demonstrated ignorance of primitive prussologic facts (silkasdrūb’, Wilkaskaymen etc.). – L.P.
(not -s as in nom. sg. masc.) beside acc. sg. -ēn ("casus generalis")\(^{35}\).

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page</th>
<th>Line</th>
<th>Text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>(\text{Acc. sg. masc., neut.} ) Balt. <em>-an</em> (&lt; IE <em>-ōm</em>) &gt; Pr. <em>-an</em> (: Lith. -ą, Latv. -ū), e.g.: (masc.) Deiwan (III), Deywan (II), Deiuan (I) ‘God’, täwan (III), thawan (II, I) ‘father’, etc.; (neut.) buttan (I, III), butten (II with -en instead of -an) ‘house (home)’, etc.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

§ 94. **Dat. sg. masc., neutr.** ends in -u which is attested in following instances: a) (III) grīku ‘sin’, malnīku ‘child’, waldniku ‘ruler’, pīru ‘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 pīru may have arisen under the influence of steismu (piru) ‘to that (community)’ III 97\(^{15}\), i.e. due to attraction in Abel Will’s speech (for my earlier a bit other explanation cf. PEŻ III 284). It was a similar attraction, by which such instances as sīru (stūrnawingisku prei sīru III 115\(^{19}\)) arose. The final -u (I, II), at least the pronominal [(stes)mu] 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. *-ē* (= *-ā*) < unstressed Balt. *-ō* (cf. § 19, § 163)\(^{36}\).

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

\(^{36}\) V. Mažiulis speaks about a-stem dat. sg. masc., neut. -u < *-ū, which cannot be -u < *-ū < *-ō after a labial or a guttural consonant (cf. § 17), cf. sīru, pīru with their -u after -r. In this instance *-a < *-ā < *-ē < generalized *-ē < unstressed *-ō (cf. § 19) should be expected according to the theory of V. Mažiulis. Allusions to “attraction” cannot help already because in case of attraction at least one “unattracted” instance with -a should be expected, e.g. when the word sīru does not follow the word stūrnawingisku (III 115\(^{19}\)) immediately, i.e. "sīra = a-stem v. 1 pers. sg. ps. as crixtia III 129\(^{10}\) < *-a < *-ā = *-ē < 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 = *-ū > -ū, i.e. dat. Pr. *sērā > (Cat.) sīru (BS, ibid.) = stu (ilgimi) (cf. § 163). Thus the theory of V. Mažiulis should be supplemented with a description of differences in the fate of Prussian stressed *-ō in the middle (> Cat. *-ō-, cf. perōn III) and in the final (> Cat. *-u, cf. sīru III) positions. – L.P.

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

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

§ 96. Nom. pl. masc. Balt. *-ai > Pr. *-ai, cf.: wijrai (III) ‘men’, tawai (III, voc. pl.) ‘fathers’, grîkai (III) ‘sins’. The same Pr. -ai is reflected in pallapsaey (II 51, I 51) ‘commandments’ with an accented final circumflex *-āi rendered as -aey (i.e. reflecting a lengthened first component of the diphthong, cf. PEŻ III 215, as well as § 4). For the a-stem (i.e. ale-stem) inflection Balt. (pron. adj.) *-ei cf. BS 170 ff., as well as § 164.

§ 97. Nom.-acc. pl. neut. inflection is usually seen (due to OSl. nom.-acc. pl. neut. vrat-a < IE *-ā) in Pr. (E) warto ‘door’ (e.g. Endzelîns SV 59, Stang Vergl. Gr. 301) with Pr. (E) -ā = *-a. Nevertheless it is not easy to say whether there still existed an a-stem neutral plural form of nominative-accusative in the time of (E) in Prussian, or it had already turned into a collective noun, i.e. into an ā-stem feminine singular form, cf. PEŻ IV 226 f. The same should be said about Pr. (E) slayo ‘sledge’, cf. PEŻ IV 126 f. (s.v. slayan) and bibliography. In spite 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 isolglosses 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.

38 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 (PEŻ. l. 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. Palmaitys 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\(_{13}\), 113\(_{14-15}\)) to be an a-stem neutral plural form (Trautmann AS 218, Endzelîns l. c., cf. Stang op. cit. 184), this seems to be a mistake with -u instead of nom. pl. masc. -ai (cf. PKP II 128, PEŻ III 106)\(^{39}\).

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

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

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

\(^{39}\) The same mistake in the same word (3x only!) on 2 different places of the same text is possible but nevertheless doubtful. I propose to explain nom. pl. malnijkiku instead of malnijkikai, as well as adv. sîrisku (1x III) ‘heartily’ instead of *sîriskai, as a usual manifestation of the allomorphism of alternating pairs Pr. (Cat.) ai / *a (accented), ai / a (generalized, unaccented), cf. fn’s 12, 23, 27. Such pairs as malnijkiku / malnijkikai, sîrisku / *sîriskai, or nom. sg. fem. deiwûtisku / deiwûtiskai (cf. further fn. 43) show that this allomorphism arose before the epoch of transition *â > û 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” \( \textit{casus generalis} \) (acc. sg. = gen. pl.). It was the latter \textit{a}-stem pattern, according to which an innovative \textit{i}-stem gen. pl. (Cat.) *-\textit{in} (cf. \textit{nidruwîngin} III 121) came into being.

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

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

1) as an accented Balt. *-*\textit{ôns} > EBalt. *-*\textit{ôs} \textsuperscript{40} > Lith.-Latv. -\textit{us} (cf. Endzelīns l. c., Stang l. c., Kazlauskas l.c.), and

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

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

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

\textsuperscript{41} The assumption of this secondary acc. pl. fem. *-*\textit{āns} in Western Baltic had to explain the survival (due to systemic reasons) of acc. pl. masc. *-*\textit{āns} in spite of its redundant -\textit{n} (BS ibid.). For an alternative view of -\textit{n} formally transferred into Prussian masculine and feminine plural in accordance with the pattern *-*\textit{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. *-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!) as if ending in *-q* as (with a nasal */-q/, Rosinas BİM 82 ff.) is not correct because the spelling (soun)-ons (II 11, 14-15) is nothing but a mistake instead of (soun)-os [= (sun)-os (I 11, 13) = Pr. (Cat.) gen. sg. *-ūs, cf. more in § 135;

b) the 2nd hapax, referred to by Rosinas (BİM), is dat. sg. schisman (1x III) ‘this’ in which the segment -an is not any nasal */-q/, but a mistake by Abel Will who added an -n to this word due to attraction to other wors in -n in sentence III 125.4-5;

c) the 3rd hapax gubas (1x III) does not show the same “nasal” */-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” */-i/ in (III) kīrki and kīrkin because kīrki (III 109) is a mistake instead of gen. sg. kīrkis (cf. PEŽ II 193);

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

Thus I cannot find any evidence of nasal */q, *q, *i/ etc. in the Catechisms. Therefore I cannot consent to Rosinas (BİM) that a nasal */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. ioûmas beside ioûmans, 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. *-móns. 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. *-mô which manifested in 2 variants as (an accented) Balt. *-mā and as (an unaccented) Balt. *-mā > Pr. -mā in its turn. The dual number vanishing in some later epoch, this Pr. -mā was pluralized according to the pattern dat. pl. *-māns, i.e it was supplemented with final -s as mark of the plural. In this way dat. pl. Pr. (III) -mas (in pronouns only!) came into being beside older -mans (I, II, III).

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

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

42 It was the quality Pr. *ó 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 (= *ó) is attested on place of Cat. ā just as in (E), cf. top. Byoten and biātwē (III), Būga III 106. Beside the transition *ó > ū (after L, G), a transition *ē > ū is attested in (II, III). First records of Samlandian toponyms come from the 13th c., but many were recorded later, cf. Krome 1463, Gerullis ON 73, or Sapoten 1402/ Seppothenn 1494, ibid. 151. This means that *ó still had not turned into ū 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 *ó had time to turn into ū after L, G, but afterwards (*ó) had time to turn into ū in other positions? In 1545 (II) *ē had already turned into ā, but this means that the transition of *ó into ū “downwards from above” had to run almost simultaneously to an opposite transition *ē > ā “upwards from below”! Since therefore the transition *ó > ū in one of the mostly archaic Baltic languages (which are very
it turned into Pr. (Cat.) -ā (cf. spīgsnā III ‘widow’) in other positions (not after the labials and gutturals)\(^{42}\).

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

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

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

§ 105. Note. A conjecture (Endzelins 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 = *-ū 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.


conservative, cf. the same dialects ourdays and in the 16th c. in Lithuania) appears to be doubtful chronologically as well as phonologically, I proposed to treat the language of Catechisms with their ā on place of Pr. *ā as Sudovian or as a mixed Sudovian slang of Sudovians, 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. Grammatical Incompatibility of 2 Main Prussian “Dialects” as Implication of Different Phonological Systems / donelaitis.vdu.lt/prussian [2002–2021], further Diallang, here ftm. 69, 94, 97, 114. – L.P.

\(^{43}\) These instances hardly can be separated from such “hyper-correction” as giwē = *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.) āī l ā, ēī l ē (all accented), as well as at the end of words -āī l -ā, -ēī l -ē (accented), -aī l -a, -ei l -e (generalized, unaccented). For the origin of this allomorhism cf. ftm. 12. Cf. also ftm’s 23, 27, 39, 89, 92.

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

§ 107. **Dat. sg.** Pr. (adj., subst.) -äi < Balt. *-äi: tickray ‘right’, alkîniskai ‘trouble, hunger’. Forms (III) kanxtisku, spartisku etc. cannot be datives\(^{44}\) (thus Trautmann AS 225, Stang Vergl. Gr. 199) – cf. Endzelîns SV 63, PEŻ II 112 f. (s.v. kanxtisku), PEŻ IV 143 (s.v. spartisku).

§ 108. **Acc. sg. (fem.)** Pr. -an = *-än < Balt. *-än: deinan ‘day’, rankan ‘hand’, aumîsnan ‘washing (off)’.

Such forms as mergwan ‘maiden’ (I, II) have -wan instead of -an (cf. mergan III), cf. Endzelîns SV 63, PEŻ III 133 (s.v. mergo); otherwise Stang Vergl. Gr. 39. Similarly, (III) krixtiäniskun ‘Christianity’ (beside chrístiäniskan) etc. have -un instead of -an; cf. Trautmann AS 226, Endzelîns SV 63 with bibl., PEŻ II 275 s.v. crixtiäniskun\(^{45}\).

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

Forms (stai) gennai (III) ‘women, wives’, preibillîsnai (III) ‘promises’ are innovations in accordance with the a-stem pattern nom. pl. (masc.) -ai, cf. Trautmann AS 228, Endzelîns SV 63\(^{46}\).

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

---

\(^{44}\) Why not! Cf. fn’s 39, 43. – L.P.

\(^{45}\) Forms acc. sg. fem. mergwan, crixtiäniskun point to nom. sg. fem. mergu, *crixtiänisku with their -u < *-û < *-ã after L, G, plg. gallû (III) < *galwû < *galwå ‘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.

\(^{46}\) A mistake (not an innovation) is credible, especially in preibillîsnai. Neverthess for the plausibility of stai gennai as a collective form (cf. Greek nom. pl. fem.!l) see fn. 43 and Palmaitis M.L. Bòrussica: 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) gennâmans ‘wives’, mergiûmans ‘maidens’, widdewûmans ‘widdows’.


**iâ- 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. Endzelîns SV 60 ff., Stang Vergl. Gr. 191 f., 194 f.), see further.

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

**Nom. sg. masc.** occurs with following inflections in (E): a) an ija-stem *-îs, cf. rikîs ‘lord’ (= *rikîs), and b) (i)ja-stem *-îs, cf. [c]uilîs ‘boar’ (= *kuilîs), kadegîs ‘juniper’ (= *kadegîs), angurgîs ‘eel’ (= *angurgîs, PEŻ I 79), etc. In the Catechisms the ija-stem inflection *-îs was shortened into *-î, if the stress had been retracted from it to the stem: bousennis (III) ‘position (situation)’ (= *bûsenis with the 1st syllable stressed, cf. spelling -ou!), nosëlis (III) ‘spirit’ (= *nösëlis with the main stress on the 1st syllable and the secondary occasional stress on the 2nd syllable, cf.

47 One should reconstruct: Baltic ija-stem nom. sg. (masc.) *(dag)-ija-s ‘thistle’ (borrowed into Estonian takijas!), ija-stem – *(svet)-ja-s ‘alien’, i-stem – *(vag)-i-s ‘thief’ (cf. Kazlauskas LKIG 178 ff.). Nom. sg. masc. a-stem *as should have lost its accent in oxytone nouns (Olnd. vîr³-, but Pr. Cat. wîjs) 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. Общееевропейская, 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 > *-îs (cf. Lith. dagîs ‘thistle’, Pr. rikîs ‘lord’). Since as a result the morphological contrast between nom. *-îs and acc. *-îjan became unclear, the latter form was replaced with acc. *-in > *-in which coincided with the i-
PEŻ III 198). The ėja-stem inflection *-īs was not shortened if the word was oxytone and the stress was not retracted: rickīs ‘Lord’ (= *rikīs < *rikīs with the stressed ending, cf. PEŻ IV 24 ff.)47.

§ 114. Acc. sg. inflections are:

an ėja-stem -ijan – cf. (III) rickijan ‘Lord’ (for variation in spelling cf. PEŻ IV 25 f.),
a āl ėja-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 § 12948.

§ 115. Gen. sg. inflections are:

an ėja-stem -ijas – cf. (III) rickijas ‘Lord’,
a āl ėja-stem *-’as – cf. tawischas (III) ‘neighbour’ with -schas < *-s’as, and

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

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

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

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

49 Further in § 117 acc. pl. (III) kaulins is omitted. It is not enough clear why in the latter instance the final -lin(s) is a translator’s mistake in accordance with a (rare!) i-stem pattern (§ 117 and § 87 referred), but in the former instance the final (kaulei) is a result of reduction in an unstressed position (§ 116). Cf. even the 3rd explanation for the SAME -lin(s) in grēiwakaulin 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 Klaipėdškiai) in Lithuanian dialects of Lithuania Minor. Cf. fin’s 32 and 8, 48, 54. – L.P.
this is not an *ija-stem form (thus: Trautmann AS 238, Endzelîns l.c.), but an *a-stem form *kaulai, which was barytone (cf. Lith. kâulai, Latv. kaâls). As a barytone form, it ended in unstressed *-ai, spelled as -ei (PEŻ II 143, Schmalstieg OP 45)\(^{49}\).

\[\text{§ 117. Acc. pl. masc.} \text{ is attested with following inflections:}\]
- *-ijans in the *ija-stem word rikijans (III) ‘lords’,
- *-’ans in the (i)ja-stem word bousenniens ‘positions’ with -niens = -n’ans,
- *-ïns in (III) bîskopins ‘bishops’, predickerins ‘church rectors’, etc., which is borrowed from *-stems to replace former acc. pl. masc. *-ans (Trautmann AS 239, Endzelîns l.c.), cf. (III) acc. sg. wijrin ‘man’ instead of wiran, cf. \[\text{§ 87}\]^{50}.

Pr. (III 101\(_{13-14}\)) grëiwakaulin ‘rib’ ending in -in may be a genitive plural (= accusative singular!), i.e. an innovative *-stem “general case” (casus generalis) form, cf. Endzelîns l.c.\(^{51}\)

\[\text{i} / \text{iâ-stems}\]

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

\(^{50}\) predickerins is a German word ending in -er. Its r after a front e may be perceived as palatal – cf. ftn’s 48, 49. Similar rendering of unstressed German or English -er is a norm in Lithuanian, cf. Hitleris, Himleris, makleris, etc. As for bîskopins, it was a foreign word too. – L.P.

\(^{51}\) Cf. ftn. 49. – L.P.
ê-stems

§ 119. **Nom. sg. (fem.)** Balt. *-ê* produced in Prussian Cat-
echisms 1) accented *-ê* (e.g. semmê III ‘earth’), 2) and unaccented (*-ê >
*-i*) (*-ê* (e.g. kurpi III ‘shoe’, cf. Lith. kürpê).

Rare forms (only in III) are giwei ‘life’ (cf. Latv. dzîve ‘idem’) and
peisâlei ‘letter, scripture’ with nom. sg. -ei in accorda
nce with ä-stem nom. sg. -ai beside nom. sg. -a, cf. § 104 and Endzelîns SV 64. 52

In the Elbing Vocabulary both accented (e.g. wosee ‘goat’) and un-
accented (likely kurpe ‘shoe’) variants of ê-stem nominative singular in-
flection *-ê* (cf. Endzelîns l. c.) come from Balt. *-ê*. The latter origi-
nates in *-jê* (> Lith. -ê, Latv. -e) which still seems to be of unclear pro-
venance (one of more or less interesting hypotheses belongs to Stang Vergl.
Gr. 201 ff.) 53.

§ 120. **Gen. sg.** III *-iš* comes from unaccented (and therefore
shortened) *-iš* (cf. III ä-stem gen. sg. ālgas with -as < *-aš due to retraction
of stress onto the 1st syllable, § 106) < *-ëš < Balt. *-ëš (> Lith. -ës, Latv.

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

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

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

53 Balt. *-ê* “at least partly” > *-ijâ according to Stang l.c. Even (Common) Baltic provenance of
*-ê* is problematic, cf. OSl. zemîa < *-îâ < probably Balt.-Sl. *-jâ > Balt. *-jê > Pr., Lith., Latv.
*-ê* (Pr. semmê, Lith. žêmê, Latv. zeme). For *-jâ > *-ê cf. also PEŽ II 311 s.v. kurpe with a
reference to Jerzy Kuryłowicz in Acta Baltico-Slavica III 83 ff. – L.P.

54 Cat. acc. sg. *-in is a usual ê-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 jâ-stem accusative
singular, any spelling *-ien cannot be regarded reflecting ê-stem Pr. acc. sg. *-en. In the Cat-
echisms both jâ- and ê-stems’ accusatives have the same soft ending, contaminated with i-stem
acc. -in, which tends to be generalized in all palatal stems. Spellings acc. *-en, *-ian, *-in corre-
spond to 2 allomorphs of the soft ending: acc. *-an and *-in. Cf. ftν’s 32, 48, 49. – L.P.
§ 122. **Acc. sg.** -ien (*geywien* II ‘life’, *peronien* III ‘community’ with -i- marking palatalization of w) = Pr. *-en < Balt. *-ēn* (Lith. > -e). An innovative (thus also Endzelēns SV 64 f.) ending is -in (peronin III ‘community’)

§ 123. **Nom. pl.** (E) -es reflects Pr. *-ēs* (e.g. *raples* ‘tongs’, cf. Lith. *rëplës*). This form is not attested in the dialect of the Catechisms, in which it should have been *-ēs* < (unaccented) *-ēs* (cf. Lith. nom. pl. žemës ‘lands’, kätës ‘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. *kùrpëms* – with *-i-* < *-* < *-* and *zemêmans* ‘lands’ (an oxytone form – cf. nom. sg. *semmë* III – with preserved *-*). For dat. pl. -mans cf. § 103.

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

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

In dialects of the Catechisms i-stem Pr. nom. sg. *-is* (being unaccented) turned into -s (cf. § 87), but i*a*-stem Pr. nom. sg. *-īs* turned into (unaccented) *-* (cf. § 113). Both transitions took place simultaneously, both nominative forms being finally opposed to the same accusative form *i*-stem -in = (i)a-stem -in <-- (replaced) *-* (§ 114), cf. Lith. i-stem acc. *(āv)-i* ‘sheep’ = (i)a-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
§ 127. **Gen. sg.** is not attested in (E) and is not clearly presented in (Cat.). I assume that in the Prussian Catechisms an innovative (i)ja-stem gen. sg. *-*is was produced (probably by Abel Will) beside nom. sg. *-*is (< *-*is, cf. § 113) according to equation

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

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

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

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

Similarly to processes described in § 127, an innovative dat. sg. *-*i could be produced (with all probability by same Abel Will too) beside innovative Pr. (Cat.) (i)ja-stem gen. sg. *-*is, cf. (i)ja- or a-stem dat. sg. klausîweniki (III) ‘confessor’ (Endzelêns 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\(^55\).

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

§ 129. **Acc. sg.** ends in Pr. (Cat.) -in (nautin ‘trouble’) < Balt. *-
in (> Lith. -i) beside Pr. (Cat.) *-en (nautien etc.), which was an innovation borrowed either from the e-stem, or from the uļā-stem (if not even ja-stem) paradigm into the i-stem paradigm. Cf. Endzelīns SV 66 and bibl.

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

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

§ 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.) = *-iš < WBalt. *-iš < Balt. *-ēns > EBalt. *-iš (> *-iš > 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. *-iš did not undergo denasalization.

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

**u-stems**


**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) *-uš, cf. i-stem nom. sg. *-iš (= E geytys) > (Cat.)

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

This (innovative) Pr. (Cat.) *-ūs replaced original Pr. *-aus < Balt. *-aus (> Lith. -aus, cf. BS 263 ff.). The innovative form is evident in spelling Pr. (I 11_13) sunos ‘son’ = *-us. Therefore, a segment -ons (cf. a separate opinion of Rosinas BÎM 82) in spelling (II 11_14-15) sou nons 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_13) sohns ‘son’ on original -os (= sunos I 11_13) = Pr. (Cat.) *-ūs, under which the spelling sou nons appeared; similarly also van Wijk Apr. St. 74, 76, cf. Endzelîns l. c. and BS 269 ff.

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

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

§ 137. **Loc. (iness.) pl.** is attested in a fragment of prayer of the beginning of the 15th c., i.e. andangonsvn ‘in heaven’, which was translated from Latin pl. in coelis (Mikalauskaitë 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. Endzelîns 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’ (PEŻ IV 95 f.), *seyr* ‘heart’ = *sēr* (PEŻ IV 95 f.).

**Nom. sg. masc., fem.:** (E) *brote* ‘brother’ = *brūtē*, *mothe* ‘mother’ = *mōtē* and (III) *mūti* ‘idem’ (with -ū- < *-ū- = Balt. *-ā- and with *-ī < *-ī < *-ē*). In the Catechisms is attested a corresponding innovative **acc. sg. -in:** *mūtin* (III, spelled 1x *muttin* in I) ‘mother’ < *i*-stem *-īn*, beside ē-stem acc. sg. *-en:* *mūtien* (III, *mutien* I) ‘idem’ = *mūten*.58


Pr. (E) *smoį* ‘man’ = *zmōj* (: Lith. dial. *žmuőj* ‘idem’ < *žmuō* ‘idem’) imply Baltic n-stem nom. sg. *źmó* ‘idem’ < *źmôn* ‘idem’; cf. Endzelīns SV 67, PEŻ 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., PEŻ II 36 ff. with bibl.60.

§ 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, *desempts* I) ‘ten’ = Pr. (Cat.) *desimts* < Pr. *desimtis* (cf. Lith. *dešimtės*), *skellānts* ‘owing (indebted)’ < Pr. *skelāntis* [cf. Lith. *(bėga)-ntis*]; *(emprijki)sins* ‘being (in front), *(prae)sens* < *sens* ‘being’ (PEŻ 1 257, as in Lat. *ab-sens* ‘not-being, absent’) < (Cat.) *sents* < Pr. *sentis* ‘idem’ (cf. Lith. *ēsantis* ‘idem’),

---

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

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

60 V. Mažiulis reconstructs an ū-stem *irmū*, cf. l. c. – L.P.
smunents ‘man’ (= *zmūnents < Pr. *zmõnentis, PEŻ 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 (Endzelîns SV 67, 126; cf. also Stang Vergl. Gr. 219 for an another opinion. Up to now it has not been taken into consideration that Pr. (Cat.) nom. sg. geits ‘bread’ (as well as E geyty[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. *iš, cf. PEŻ I 343 (s.v. *geytys) and PEŻ 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. -i): (III) smunentin ‘man’, -gimmusin ‘born’ (PEŻ I 52 s.v. ainangimmusin), cf. Lith. acc. sg. (móter)-i = (āk)-i.

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

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

---

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

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

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


§ 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’ (PEŻ II 198), sywan ‘(in) grey’ (PEŻ IV 117) etc. For neut. III (pron.) wissan ‘all’ and (pron.) wissa<sup>63</sup> ‘idem’ (cf. Lith. visą), as well as Gr salta ‘cold’ (cf. Lith. šáltaPaulauskienė LKM 211 ff.) see PEŻ IV 50 f.

c) **fem.** ends in (E) -o = *-ō (III -a < *-ā and (after labials and gutturals) -u < *-ū < *-ā, cf. pausto E ‘wild’ (PEŻ III 238 f. s.v. paustocatto), tickra III ‘right’ (PEŻ 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: maldai 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. ftm. 62. – L.P.

<sup>64</sup>Pr. kai stāi Swintai housei 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>98</sup>, or with pronominalized forms (cf. further § 152) in accordance with previous pronominalized form pron. stai < *stājī, cf further § 158. For mensai / mensā cf. ftm. 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’;


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)jā-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 paradidm over the *(i)jā*-stem paradigm, e.g.:

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

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

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

These forms imply nom. sg. masc. -*ingis* with an *(i)jā*-stem *-is* < *-īs* [similarly to Lith. (a-stem -ingas -->) .Performative -ingis, cf. Skardžius ŽD 121], not an i-stem *-is* (thus 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)polījgu III, cf. Endzelīns Sv 71, PEŽ III 316.
§ 150. For C-stem adjectives (participles), which belonged to the (i)ja-stem in the Catechisms. cf. § 139.

Pronominalized adjectives

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

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

According to this pattern, an innovation **nom. sg. masc.** *pirmūjis = pirmois (II, III) ‘the first’ was produced. A pron. adj. pirmonnis ‘the first’ comes from Pr. (Cat.) *pirmūnis (with -ũ- 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. *-jis ‘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).

Degrees of comparison

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

---

65 V. Mažiulis reconstructs pronominalized acc. sg. *panzdauman′an, *waln’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. *panzdaumanis [∗panzdaum(a)s + *jis] ‘last-that = the last’, *walnanis [∗waln(ajs + *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. *dengininis = (i)ja-stem *dengininis + *jis.

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

This time I propose a new hypothesis: muisieson may be corrected into *muisiesnon (with an occasional or dissimilative loss of *-n-) < Pr. (dialect.) acc. sg. *mūisjesnan, 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, PEZH IV 203 s.v. tūlan), maldaisin ‘younger’ etc. Cf. also Endzelīns l. c., Stang l. c. PEZH 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 desempts I ‘ten’ = Pr. (Cat.) *desimts < Pr. *desimtis (cf. § 88) < Balt. *dešimtis (> Lith. dešmintis) an tūsimtons III ‘thousands’.

Baltic numeral ‘ten’ was an i-stem, but its declension had alternating C-stem forms too (cf. C-, i.e. t-stem Lith. gen. pl. dešimtū beside i-stem dešimčiūt") (66), cf. Stang Vergl. Gr. 280. As for ‘thousand’, the word tūsimtons 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. pūrmas), pron. masc. pirmois, fem. pirmoi ‘that first’, cf. PEŽ III 284 f.;

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

tirtis / tīrts, fem. tīrti ‘third’ maybe coming from Balt. *trītās ‘idem’ --> EBalt. *trėtās ‘idem’ (> Lith. trēčias ‘idem’), cf. PEŽ IV 194 f.;

kettwirts, fem. ketwirta ‘fourth’ < Balt. *ketvirtas ‘idem’ (> Lith. ketvirūtas ‘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. peņktas ‘idem’, etc.), derived with suf. *-ta- from the stem of card. ‘five’, cf. PEŽ III 254;

66 Lith. ė usually comes from *į + “back vowels” in native words. Thus i-stem gen. pl. Balt. *dešimtējon > EBalt. *dešimtuon > Lith. dešimčiūt (for the inflection cf. BS 299). – L.P.

67 Segment -ar- in Pr. (Cat.) nom. sg. antars can be directly compared with *-ar- in the reconstruction Balt. *antaras only because of dat. antersmu III = *āntarsmu. Otherwise one could explain nom. sg. antars as having arisen in the same way as nom. sg. tickars III ‘right’ instead of *tikrs (to avoid difficulty in pronouncing *krs), cf. III acc. 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.

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. sēkmas < *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.;


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


⁶⁸ Pr. asmus = *asms*s with an auxiliary labialized (after m) vowel to enable pronouncing complex *sms, cf. ft'n'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 69) 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 BĪM 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-/sta-. However it is not easy to consent to this opinion: Pr. stas with all probability comes from Pr. *sitas (: Lith. ūtas) < 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 BĪ 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-.

69 A controversary 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. Isufficient 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. stesison) reveal a syntactic function of artroid 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 Diallang. – L.P.

§ 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. Endzelins SV 75 f. with bibl., idem BVSF 167, Stang Vergl. Gr. 240, cf. also Schmalstieg OP 124, BS 93 ff., Gamkrelidze–Ivanov 378 f. After this WBalt. *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 l, l). True this hypothesis does not seem to be reliable. Beside sigmatic pronominal forms of this pronoun, there is also a sigmatic nominal *a*-stem gen. sg. form in *-as, which evidently comes from Balt. (dial.) *-as (§ 92)" and is not any “morphological borrowing” (sic Rosinas BĪM 84). A plenty of forms with stem-vowel *-e-, stesse, stessei, etc., as well as dat. stesmu, stessie, etc. (except stasma 2x I, for which Endzelins SV 77) point to WBalt. *a / e*-stem pron. *tes- (-> *stes-, cf. Stang Vergl. Gr. 240, BS 93 ff., Baltistica XVI 23), not to Pr.

---

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

71 J. Endzelins explains *a as a broad e. However not only was *lel broad, but its opposition against *lal was neutralized, cf. stasmas on the same place in (1). For *stasma I = *st’asmā [(with not fully finished *₅ > *₅ after L, G in (1)] 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’\(^{72}\).

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 B|M 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\(^{73}\).

\(^{72}\) 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 > *sie (usually speaking – Baltic-Slavic *Tijā > *Tīē, cf. fttn. 53) is hardly imaginable on Prussian level: Pr. gen. sg. masc. subst. *-*as and pron. *-*es- are of the same IE origin with apophonic Balt. *a jē* (IE *o jē*), e.g. Pr. (deiw)-as = Hit. (ešēh)-aš = Go. (wulf)-is < *-*es- = Pr. (*st)-ess-e = OSl. (*Č)-es-; 2) difference in final vowel between Pr. (stess)-e and OSl. (*čes)-o is also apophonic. Palmaitis BGR 47–54, 82 explains this final vowel as relic of Proto-IE vocalisation of the inflection -s < deictic *-*sole, cf. IE pronoun OInd. nom. sā, Gk. ὁ, Go. *sa.

\(^{73}\) This contradicts to Mažiulis BS, which is a theory of Baltic (and Indoeuropean) declension. Contrarily to tradition, BS shows that Indoeuropean “secondary cases”, especially locative and instrumental, were formed in different IE dialects by different paradigmatising of often the same adverbial stems (not the adverbs might be relics of “Common-IE” cases which as if differently vanished in various groups due to “syncretism”). Thus Greek appears to have had 4-cases paradigms from the very beginning. Of course, Prussian instrumental may be discussed in frames of BS. However dative, instrumental and locative alternants (the same form often appearing in different cases) even in Lithuanian dialects make their paradigmatic (not adverbial) provenance impossible. BS does not allow to reconstruct 6-cases paradigms neither in Common Indoeuropean (7-cases), nor in Common Baltic. To speak about “Baltic instrumental”, whether in 2 forms, means to assume paradigmatic instrumental, locative, etc. in Baltic. Cf. also fttn. 37. – L.P.
§ 164. Nom. pl. masc. stai (III), staey (I, II with -aey = circumflex -ėi, § 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) 74.

§ 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 feminine (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), steîmans (2x probably a mistake instead of stēimans or steimans, cf. Endzelīns l. c.).

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

It seems that the segment *tēi- in Balt. *tēimôns is of the same origin as Balt. nom. pl. masc. *tēi ‘those, these’ with a circumflex *-ēi. The latter was replaced with an acute *-ē (*tēi > *tē, cf. Latv. tiē, although Lith. tīē75) at the same time as *tēi- > *tē- in *tēimôns.

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

74 For a form of collectivity in -ai cf. ftn. 46. Typologically cf. Polish “forma mianownika rzeczowa” (this does not imply a similar paradigmatic form in Prussian). – L.P.
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(> Pr. stans) but the second was generalized in EBaltic (> Latv. tuōš, although Lith. tuōš\(^\text{73}\)). Cf. also § 100 f. For the origin of the segment -ans in Pr. acc. pl. fem. stans from Balt. *-̱ás see § 112.

schis ‘this’

§ 168. Pr. (Cat.) nom. sg. masc. schis = *šis begins with š- (on place of original *sīs). 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. *šis < Balt. nom. sg. masc. *šis [neut. *šī, fem. *šī (> Lith. šī)], or it is misspelled instead of *schis with initial š- reflecting a non-nominative stem Balt. *šjā- (cf. Lith. šīōš).


§ 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. šīq).

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

§ 171. Gen. pl. schēison (1x III 111\(_1\)) used as genitive singular!) = Pr. (Cat.) *šēisun < Pr. *sēisun, which arose according to pattern *tēisun (*tēisan) ‘those’, cf. § 165.

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

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

\[ t\ddot{a}ns \quad \text{‘he’} \]

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

**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.** tennesei (beside tanassen),
- **dat. sg. masc.** tenessei,
- **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. Endzelēns SV 81, Stang Vergl. Gr. 253 f.) see what has been said about pron. stas correspondingly.


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

\[ -\text{din} \quad \text{‘him, her’} \]

§ 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

\[^{76}\] This *̯istributor underwent circumflex lengthening (cf. § 4) in a tautosyllabic diphthong an (> ān) which arose due to a syllable closed with the formant -s < *-as. – L.P.
An enclitic IE *-di should have existed which was morphologically neutral. It became morphologized in some Indo-European 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. interrg. ‘who? what?’, e.g.: Kas pogaunai [...] wertīwings? “Who gets [...] worthy?” (III 77\(^9\)\(^{-10}\)), Ka ast sta billīton? “What is that (what is) said?” (III 27\(^8\));

b) pron. relat. ‘who, what’, e.g.: Tāwa Noūson kas tu essei Endangon “Our Father who art in Heaven” (III 47\(^6\)); Wissan ka prei kermenes “All what [belongs] to body” (III 53\(^1\)\(^1\)).

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

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

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

Pr. acc. masc.-fem. *kan (cf. Lith. kā) is reflected in cnj. kan (III 105\(^2\)) ‘while, as’. The latter meaning developed under the influence of innovative pron. relat. neut. *kan, which occasionally replaced original ka, cf. PEŢ II 110 s.v. kan). This facilitates understanding the origin of innovative pron. relat. acc. pl. kans (1x III 65\(^1\)\(^8\) : stans kans).

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

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


kawïds ‘which’, stawïds ‘such’

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

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

wissa ‘all’

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

§ 185. Pr. wissa- implies Baltic collective pron. *visa- ‘all’ (> Lith. vïsas, Latv. vis), which, as well as OSl. vïs ‘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. wëisin); for all this cf. Rosinas Baltistica XX 52, idem BĮ 196, PEŽ IV 249.
§ 186. For declensional forms of Prussian pronoun, article\textsuperscript{78} and cardinal number (Cat.) \textit{aina-} ‘one’ cf. PEŽ I 156 f. It comes from Pr. pron., num. card. *\textit{aina-} ‘one’ < Pr. *\textit{eina-} ‘idem’ < Balt.-Sl. *\textit{eina-} ‘idem’ (cf. Rosinas BĮ 197). From the latter also comes EBalt. *\textit{v-eina-} ‘idem’ (Lith. > \textit{vienas} = Latv. \textit{viēns}) with a prothetic \textit{v}- of unclear origin (Stang Vergl. Gr. 276). This *\textit{v-} originates in some particle, i.e. *\textit{ve} (Fraenkel 1239), or probably Balt. *\textit{vi} (Endzelïns l. c., idem BVSF 155) = Balt. adv. *\textit{vi}- ‘separately, particularly, namely’ < IE *\textit{uī}- ‘idem’ (cf. Pokorny IEW 1175 f. s.v. *\textit{uī}). In this case EBalt. pron., num. card. *\textit{eina-} > EBalt. num. card. *vi-eina- ‘exactly one’ > *\textit{veina-} ‘one’. The latter, after having ousted an older EBalt. pron., num. card. *\textit{eina-}, turned into EBalt. pron., num. card. *\textit{veina-} ‘one’.

\textit{ains} ‘(some)one’


§ 188. Pr. *\textit{suba-} ‘(one)self’ comes from WBalt. *\textit{sv(e)ba-} ‘one’s own’, which was derived from pron. *\textit{s(e)v(e)-} ‘one’s own’ (related with Pr. \textit{swais} ‘one’s own’) with suf. *\textit{-ba-} (< IE *\textit{-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. \textit{pats} ‘(one)self’ comes from Balt. subst. *\textit{pat(is)}, i.e. it is not of pronominal origin.

\textbf{Non-gender (personal) pronouns}

\textbf{Singular}


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

§ 190. Gen. 1 pers. misei ‘my’, 2. twaise ‘thy’, refl. swaise, swaisei ‘his, her, their, one’s’ are genitive singular forms of possessive
pronouns (§ 200), cf. Endzelîns SV 87, Rosinas Bl 47 f. In spoken Prus-
sian had to exist non-possessive genitives 1 pers. *mene, 2. *teve, refl.
*seve (Rosinas BÌM 35) < Balt. *mene, *teve, *seve which was later
used for the accusative too. In this way arose Lith. (dial.) acc. manë, tavë,
savë still used as genitives in some dialects79.

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. mânë / mâni as well as
tâvie / tâvi, sâvie / sâvi with v which had replaced original *b in them.

§ 191. There were also enclitic (atomic) personal pronouns in Prus-
/ *si, inherited from Common Baltic80.

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

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

80 Since enclitics dat. *mei, *tei, *sei are reflected in Sl. mì, tì, sì, 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, which reflect Pr. *mēn, *tēn, *sēn. The latter come from Balt. acc. *mē, *tē, *sē (cf. Rosinas BIM 36) extended with a formant acc. -n. The reason of this extension was that the segment *ē in *mē, *tē, *sē was identical to the same segment *ē in orthotonic gen.-acc. *menē, *tevē, *sevē.

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


§ 194. A relic of the instrumental case may be seen in 1 pers. sg. (used as dative) māim (III 107ₐ) ‘to me’ and (used as instrumental) sen māim (III 79₁₀) sen maim (III 81₁₀) ‘with me’. Many assumptions and

---

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

82 Here (see the end of § 194) a paradigmatic instrumental case is reconstructed not only for Baltic, but even for Baltic-Slavic (in this case such contradictions should be explained as e.g. between thematic forms Balt. instr. pl. *-ais and Sl. loc. pl. *-ēxă < *-ois-u; cf. also V. Toporov’s term “casus indefinitus”, Топоров В.Н. 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 Endzelins) in phrase As N. imma tin N. māim prei ainan Salubin (III 107ₐ) “I N. take thee N. to me for a spouse”, one must first explain a corresponding reading. The latter may be justified only in case if a dash over ā in māim marks omission of following n. This is impossible since: 1) shortening by omitting vowels was usual in manuscripts to save place and paper; it occurred in any position, not in some specific words (such might be only sacred taboo or frequent and well-known shortenings, not an informative pronoun); 2) in print, as e.g. in the 3rd Catechism, such shortening could occur only occasionally, once or twice in different words, or when it was necessary to find room for a sentence on one line; 3) there was enough place for n on line III 81₁₀, not to say that there were entirely no reason to evade moving a word to next lines (20) on pages III 79 and 81 (cf. teikūsnā = teikūsnan III 39₁₀ due to centering lines!); 4) one can hardly imagine shortening by omitting a letter (so rare in print) 3 times in the same word, which does not occur without shortening at all (as if a sacred taboo); 5) on page III 81 there is no dash-marking of as if omitted n in māim at all; 6) a dative form may express instrumental in many languages, however it seems incredible that an instrumental form could express dative at the desire of A. Rosinas. As for Latv. manim, formally instrumental, it is really used to express dative in Latvian. This was a reason for J. Endzelins 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. Palmažaitis BGR 111–112. – L.P.
hypotheses concern the origin of this māim (see bibl. in Endzelīns SV 88 f., Rosinas B|M 35 f.). An opinion of Endzelīns (FBR XI 83) is especially worthy: Pr. māim (III) should be read manim and connected with the instrumental case Lith. manim(i) = Latv. manim (see also Rosinas l. c.). Then a question arises, “how an instrumental form with the stem man- could coexist beside a dative form with the stem men- in Prussian?” (Endzelīns SV 89, as well as Palmaitis Baltistica XII 160). However it seems that the form instr. *manim, when no more paradigmatic (in dialect of III) and having an unstressed -a- with all probability, had just arisen from Pr. *menim < *menimi; cf. Lith. (with an unstressed -a-) manimi > manim, tavim > taviım, savimi > saviım and Latv. manim (on place of older *men-), tevim, sevim.

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

Plural


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

---

83 This explanation still is not enough convincible, especially when as if a new and no more paradigmatic Pr. māim is compared with paradigmatic Latv. manim, 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. maim (Lazūnai), tajiım, sajiım (Zietela) in Lithuanian dialects od Belorussia (Zinkevičius Z. Lietuviø 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 fn. – L.P.

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

§ 198. **Dat. 1 pers.** Pr. noûmans etc., **2. ioûmans etc.** imply Baltic *nömôns, *vömôns 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 BĀM 82), as if both -mans and -mas reflect *-más with a nasal vowel *-q-, is not plausible. I consider:

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

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

**Acc. 1 pers.** mans (I, II, III) ‘us’ < *nâns (Endzelīns SV 90) < *nâns < Balt.(-Sl.) *nôns; **2. wans (I, II, III) ‘you’ < *vâns < Balt.(-Sl.) *vôns.**

The fate of these Balt.(-Sl.) *nôns / *vôns, (for their inflection *ôns cf. § 103) in Eastern Baltic is analysed by Mažiulis l. c.85

---

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


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

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

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

In plural only dative and accusative forms are attested.

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

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

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

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

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

Verbum finitum

§ 205. Ps. 1 pers. sg. is attested in athematic verb of the root *es- ‘to be’: asmai (10x), asmu (2x), asmau (1x) ‘am’. Only the first of these forms is really athematic. The last, asmau, occurs only once and therefore is not reliable: its segment -au may be a mistake instead of -u (cf. Trautmann AS 273, 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 esmi (as well as fully thematized literary esù), Latv. esmu ‘idem’.

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

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

---

87 For the terms thematic, athematic cf. ftn. 17. – L.P.
88 In this article V. Mažiulis assumes a development in direction singular --> plural. – L.P.
new form 1 pers. sg. *(es)-mei underwent contamination with athematic and thematic 1 pers. pl. *-mē l*-mā (< *-mē l*-mā) and turned into Balt. (dialect) athematic and thematic 1 pers. pl. *-mei l*-ma. The latter produced athematic and thematic Pr. 1 pers. pl., sg. -ma, as well as Lith.-Latv. (dialect) 1 asm. pl. *-mei > *-mie (for the latter cf. Endzelūns SV 105, Zinkevičius LKIG II 81 f.)\textsuperscript{89}.

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

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

\textsuperscript{89} As Mažiulis l. c. emphasizes, the coincidence Pr. 1 sg. = 1 pl. -mai was a recent innovation. The origin of pl. -mai seems to be connected with Lith. dial. 1 pl. (neša)-mies, 2 pl. (neša)-ties (Zinkevičius l. c.) < *-mei, *-tei. First, the presence of a diphthong is important, not relations to singular (and even not the quality -ai or *-ei) because, similarly to Lithuanian, a diphthong is attested in Pr. 2 pl. -tei too (see § 211). Therefore, seconly, inflections 1, 2 pers. pl. with a diphthong may be treated as a Common Baltic (“dialectal”) feature. Not trying to explain the origin of Pr. 1 pl. -mai, 2 pl. -tei [l -te in accordance with usual alternation Pr. (Cat.) -ei / -e, see further], I only should present a simple explanation of Pr. (Cat.) 1 sg. asmai. The latter is nothing else but a well-known Baltic “thematized” form *asma = Pr. (Cat.) asmu < *asmū (= oxytone asmau III 37\textsuperscript{12} ?) < *asma = 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. -ματι) < *-mi + medial-perf. *-ai, which could exist independently. For this cf. OLith. 1 sg. refl. (dilo)-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(j). – L.P.
Baltic languages (Lithuanian, Latvian). Athematic verbs ended in Pr. -t (<*-ti): *ast ‘is’ (= Lith. ėsti), ĕit ‘goes’ (= Lith. dial. eît, Latv. iêt 90), dāst ‘gives’ (= OLit. 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. Endzelins SV 105 91.

§ 210. **1 pers. pl.** is attested with the morph -mai (see §§ 206, 207) in all types of stems. e.g.: asmai ‘we are’ perēmai ‘we come’, giwammai ‘we live’, 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), turri ‘have!’, immaiti ‘take!’, edeitte ‘eat!’, nidrausieiti ‘do not forbid!’, rikauite ‘dominate!’, seggīta ‘do!’. The morph -te seems to have appeared on place of -tei 92. The latter has its -tei in accordance with pattern 2 sg -sei, while -ai in -tai came from 1 pl. -mai; the spelling -ta (1x) seems to be a mistake. For all this cf. Endzelins SV 105 f. with bibl. The most frequent (ca. 80x) -ti is authentic < Pr. *-tē (Endzelins l. c.) < Balt. *-tē (> Lith.-Latv. *-tē > -te) 93.

90 Here Latvian acute differs from Lithuanian and Prussian circumflex. – L.P.

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

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

93 V. Mažiulis’ samples show 2 pl. -ti being typical for the imperative mood. Balt. 2 pl. *-tē was possibly ousted from the indicative by innovative *-tei. If the latter had been really accomodated to 2 sg. Balt. *-ei, not necessarily to athem. *-sei, its diphthong could occasionally provoke diphthongization of 1 pl. too (for *-tei cf. EBaltic facts, ftm. 89). As for spellings -tai, -ta, they may reflect Pr. (Cat.) *-t’ai / *-t’a (= *-tei / *-te) without the letter i as usual mark of palatalization (*-tiai, *-tia). – L.P.
§ 212. Note. 1 pers. pl. giwammai, läikumai, turrmai etc., 2 pers. pl. turrri etc., beside 3 pers. giwa, läiku etc., could be comprehended as if derived from the 3rd person. Due to this reason such innovations could arise as 1 pers. pl. wîrstmai ‘we become’ (: 3 pers. wîrst), dînkaumai ‘we thank’, massimai ‘we can’ (: 3 pers. massi), grîkimai ‘we sin’ (: 3 pers. grîki-si), schlûsimai ‘we serve’, waitâmai ‘we speak’ (: 3 pers. en-waitia), druwêmai ‘we believe’ (: 3 pers. druwê), seggêmai ‘we do’ (: 3 pers. seggê), etwêrpmîmai ‘we forgive’ (: 1 pers. = 3 pers. etwerpe), girrimai ‘we praise’ etc.; cf. Endzelîns 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 druwê (III) ‘I believe’, thou tur (I), tou tur (II) ‘thou shalt’. This seems to be a fault of translators (Endzelîns SV 102 f.), but possibly not only theirs (cf. Mažiulis Baltistica I Priedas, 95–100). An authentic form of the 1st person is that of the verb ‘to be’ (see § 205 ff.); for 2 sg. -si, -sei, -sai see § 208.94

94 Having in mind Prussian and Slavic isomorphism (cf. ftn. 79), one really could expect an inflection 2 sg. *-sei, ‘borrowed’ from the athematic paradigm, as this possibly took place in Slavic (*-sei, not the “primary” *-si!). However forms without this -sei (cf. giw III 85, beside gîwasi III 95) are also attested. What “translators” could then make such terrible mistakes? Who can believe that priest Abel Will did not know how to say corresponding verbs in the 2nd person or even in the 1st person singular? The formulas of Matrimony As imma ti[en] III 107, ‘I take thee’, and of Baptism As Crixtia tien III 129, ‘I baptize thee’, were used by priests throughout all Prusa (Baltic Prussia), first translated by native-speaking “Tolkers”. Such “Tolker” was also Paul Megott, helper of A. Will (P. Megott could not 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)j was added, arose Pr. 2 sg. -a + s(e)j > -a-s(e)j, cf. Pr. giw-a-ssî”. 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. *-Ô > Pr. *-Ô > 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. Diallang. Cf. also ftn. 114. – L.P.
Present stems

a) athematic stems

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

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

b) ā-stems

§ 215. Prussian ā-stem presence corresponds to ā-stem infinitive in case of the ā-stem correspondence in Eastern Baltic, e.g. beside ps. 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’ (PEŻ III 99), cf. Lith. maišyti (= Latv. màisīt), ps. maišo95;

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

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

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

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

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

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

d) a-stems

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

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

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

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

96 Pr. (III) 3 pers. turri cannot come directly from *turi because of the non-reduced final -i. Differently from -a in crixtia (see ftn. 97), there was no ground for -i to survive in turri. This form can be either a result of generalizing of the īja-stem ending -i < *-īj = *-ī < *-ijā, which “restored’ original *-ī, or it was directly a parallel īja-stem (cf. Lith. trūni / trūnija), or a īa-stem (cf. Lith. kūri / kūria) form, cf. Palmaitis BGR 212, as well as further § 221 about Pr. (Cat.) *girī < *girja. – L.P.

97 There, and much more clear – in BS 22 (cf. ftn. 94), V. Mažiulis shows that Pr. (Cat.) imma (with its -ā < *-ā < *-ō) was a regular 1 pers. sg. form, not any form “in the meaning of the 1st person”. Even more, it is not on the contrary obvious, how imma could be a 3rd person form with its short unstressed -ā not reduced to zero at the end of the word (cf. 3 pers. wîrst < *vîrsta) – cf. 3 pers. (III) senrīnka, ertyreppa, kniēpe, 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 Diallang). – 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.


§ 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); wîrst ‘becomes’ (very frequent) < pr. *vîrsta (with -a lost due to auxiliary usage) < Balt. *vîr-ta > Lith. viðsta ‘idem’, Latv. virst ‘idem’ (PEŽ IV 247 f.); on the basis of this shortened form innovations 1 pers. pl. wîrstmai, 2 pers. pl. wîrstai came into being (Endzelīns SV 109)99;

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

---

98 It seems to be hardly credible that verbs of different stems were used for the SAME meaning ‘to live’ in such a considerably small document as the 3rd Catechism, cf.:

1) 2 sg. = 3 pers. gîwu (III) (which is regarded to be an āga-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. *gîtwei = OSl. źiti, PEŽ I 375, = Lat. vîvere, Endzelīns J. Latviešu valodas gramatika. Rīgā 1951, § 610) and

3) if. giwît < as if *gîvçsi, PEŽ I 376 with the 3rd pers. giwe (< *gîvëja, see § 224)! Since giwît is the single infinitive form attested for the verb ‘to live’ in Catechisms, a comparison with EBalt. if. Lith. (dar)-yţi, 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 *gi- was stressed. For -a- instead of expected -u- (-ū-), and more, cf. fttn. 95. – L.P.

99 Not an absence of -a in the 3rd person but its presence needs explanations (cf. fttn. 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. vîrsm5 <— *vîrst-mi, 2 pers. sg. vîrsei < *vîr-t-sei, 3 pers. *vîrsto < *vîr-t-ti > Pr. (Cat.) wîrst (= 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 fttn. 94] and later outing of original 1 pl. *vîrsmai by an innovative wîrstmai due to the 2 pl. *vîrstei and all other persons wîrst. Thus Pr. (Cat.) wîrst (similarly to waîst ‘to know’?) appears to be a “semi-athematic” verb. – L.P.

§ 220. e) na-stem forms are: opt. 3 pers. pogëunai (= *pogaûnai) in the indicative meaning ‘gets’ (cf. Lith. gûna) – for this form, as well as for 1 pers. pl. pogaunimai, cf. Endzelëns l. c., Stang Vergl. Gr. 352; for opt. 3 pers. postânai ‘becomes’ and 1 pers. pl. postanimai see Endzelëns SV 110, Stang Vergl. Gr. 352 f., PEŻ III 331.100

§ 221. f) ja-stem forms are: 3 pers. gëide (gëidi) ‘awaits’ < Pr. *gëid’a < Pr. *gëidja ‘idem’ = Lith. geidzëa ‘thirsts for’ (see PEŻ I 338 ff.), cf. also Lith. (ja-stem) ps. lâukia : if. lâuki : Pr. ps. *geidja : if. *geistvei;

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

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

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

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

§ 222. e) auja-stem forms are: 3 pers. (in the meaning of the 1 pers. sg.101) dënkama, dëncama (III) = *dinkauia ‘thanks’; 1 pers. pl. dënkaunimai, dënkaumai are innovations according to 3 pers. *dinkau(i) (< *-auja) (§ 212); cf. Endzelëns l. c., PEŻ I 204;

100 Great prussologists could not resist the temptation to compare Pr. III (postân)-ai with Gk. opt. (παϊδεύ)-οι as well as Pr. III poklausimananas (1x!) with Gk. part. pt. pass. (παϊδευσ-)-όμενος (thus already Brugmann KGr. 316; first denied by Mažiulis PKP II 297). Unfortunately, Prussian “optative” forms in -ai are used in an indicative meaning (such optative meaning as postânai ‘werde’ III 485 corresponds to cases when indicative is used for optative). Thus they appear to be the same forms in -a (in the na-stems, postânai, as well as in the other, ina-stems: ebsignai / ebsigna, mukina, wartina, swintina), i.e. they occurred due to alternation -ai l -a: (ni)swintinai III 515 = swintina III 455, cf. Palmaitis BGR 224, as well as fin’s 12, 27, 39, 43, 89. – L.P.

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

3 pers. rickawie ‘governs’ (= Lith. rykáuja ‘idem’), cf. Endzelüns l. c., PEŻ IV 21; persurgauï ‘provides’, cf. Endzelüns l. c., PEŻ 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, Endzelüns SV 111 wonders at the absence of the stem-ending Pr. *-ô- beside Pr. -au-. I think that the Prussians had only -au-, cf. BS 44⁶ etc.¹⁰²

§ 223. f) ūa-stem forms are: 3 pers. (in the meaning of the 1 pers. sg.) crixtia ‘baptizes’¹⁰¹ (for -a cf. Mažiulis Baltistica I Priedas 97)¹⁰¹ = *kriksčia (cf. Lith. kríkščia, kríkštyja ‘idem’, Latv. kriksčiju ‘idem’) beside if. crixtitw(e)i; 3 pers. refl. grīki(-si) ‘sins’ having -i < *-ţja; 1 pers. pl. grīkimai (with stem vocalism accommodated to 3 pers. grīki-), § 212); in a similar way arose 3 pers. madli, schlûsi as well as 1 pers. pl. madlimai, -schlûsimai respectively. Cf. also Endzelüns l. c.

§ 224. g) ëja-stem forms are:

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

3 dergê ‘hates’, cf. Lith. dial. dergėja beside if. dergêti ‘to make dirty’, cf. PEŻ I 197;

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

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

¹⁰³ Cf. ftn. 97.
in singular\(^{103}\); forms 6 pers. sg. *druwēse*, 2 pers. pl. *druwētei* are innovations according to pattern 3 pers. *druwē* (§ 212); (II) *drowy* (2x) (with \(-y = *-i- < *-i\)) beside (I) *drowe* (2x) (with \(-e = *-ė\)) came into being due to accommodation to inf. *druwīt* with *i- < *-ė\(^{104}\), see PEŻ I 234, cf. Endzelîns SV 108, 111. Prussian verb ‘to believe’ was derived from a substantive ‘faith’ (PEŻ 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’ (Endzelîns SV 111, Stang l. c., PEŻ I 376 with bibl.); cf. Lith. *gyvēja* ‘comes to live’ as well as (for the meaning) Lith. *gūti* ‘to live’ and *gūtī* ‘to convalesce’ (for these words see Skardþius ŽD 458 f.)\(^{105}\);


3 pers. *segge* ‘does’ (: if. *seggīt*), 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. PEŻ 91 f. with bibl.);

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

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

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

\(^{104}\) Cf. ftn. 12. – *L.P.*

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

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

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

3 pers. *billē* ‘speaks’ (ending in \(-ē < *-ēja\)) has a parallel form *billā* ‘idem’ (ending in \(-ā < *-āja\)). According to 3 pers. *billē*, an innovation 1 pers. pl. *billēmai* was produced (§ 212); if . *billīt* with \(-ī- < *-ē-\). There is also a parallel present form in \(-i:\) 3 pers. *billī* (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 \(-ī- < *-ē-\)) is implied in part. pt. pass. nom.-acc. neut. sg. *paquoitītōn* ‘(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 \(-ī- < *-ē-\). There is also a parallel present form in \(-i:\) 3 pers. *stallī* (cf. above 3 pers. *billī*).

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

---

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

\(^{107}\) Cf. also Lith. *siuaut-ēja* / *siuaut-oja*. Such correlates occur in different dialects. Even if A. Will was accustomed to *kvaitīt*, but P. Megott used *kvaitār*, 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. ftm. 32). This means that spellings *billē* and *bilā* reflect the same ps. (= pt. *billai* III) *bil’āi / *bil’ā*, what means *bilėj < ps. *būłęja* (pt. *būļėjā*) because of the if. *billīt*, not *bīlāt*! If one could spell *kaulei* and *kaulai* (cf. spellings of illiterate Lithuanians *akei = akiai, žvakiai = žvačekai*), what was the same, then the same were spellings *bille(i)* and *billai* too. The same is true for *stallē, stallā = *stal’ā < *stalėja*, cf. Palmaitis 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. kandi-neja ‘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 < *-inēja108.

§ 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.)109;

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. vēštajo ‘I speak’; 1 pers. pl. waitiāmai is an innovation accomodated to 3 pers. enwaitia (§ 212);

108 Then such verbs should have corresponding 1) infinitives in *-inēt < *-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 ‘potaiikinnisnas, 3) of the past paticiple passive: potaukinton, not ‘potaukinnitian; enlaipints, not ‘enlaipinnits, 4) of the past paticiple active: (po)taukinnwuns, 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 pogauina; otherwise the stem should be -na, 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. ftu. 112. – L.P.

109 Here V. Mažiulis de facto recognizes alternation Pr. (Cat.) -āi / -ā (cf. ftu’s 12, 23, 27, 39, 43, 89, 92). – L.P.
3 pers. dwigubbû ‘doubts’ (in the meaning of the 2nd person in singular\textsuperscript{10}) with -ū < *-ū (after a labial consonant) < *-ā < *-āja;

3 pers. gīwu ‘lives’ (in the meaning of the 2nd person in singular\textsuperscript{10}) is a hapax legomenon (PEZ I 377) and may be a misspelling instead gīwa ‘idem’ (cf. Stang Vergl. Gr. 452), not any āja-stem\textsuperscript{11}.

§ 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. mokīna), see Stang Vergl. Gr. 370 f., for mukinna cf. Endzelīns SV 114\textsuperscript{12}.

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\textsubscript{3}) and ‘du werdest’ (III 105\textsubscript{15-16}) 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. stōsi ‘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\textsuperscript{13}: wîrst ‘becomes, become’ + part. pt. act., e.g.: wîrst boûuns ‘becomes been = will be’, pergubuns wîrst ‘being come becomes = will come’ etc.

\textsuperscript{10} 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.

\textsuperscript{11} See fn. 98. – L.P.

\textsuperscript{12} Why then the infinitive is not *swintināt (cf. Latv. sveicināt), but swintint? Why its past participle is not *swintināwuns (cf. Latv. sveicinājīs), but swintinons? Cf. fn’s 100, 108. – L.P.

\textsuperscript{13} In spite of precise semantic and etymologic correspondence between Germ. wird and Pr. wîrst, 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)’, lymuczt (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: weddç(din) ‘took (her)’, ismigē ‘fell asleep’, pertraũki (with -i < *-ē unstressed) ‘pulled on’, jmmitz, ymmits (I, with -i < *-ē unstressed), ymmeits, ymmeyts (II, with -ei- possibly on place of *-i- < *-ē-) ‘took’, cf. Endzelīns SV 118.

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

dai, dai ts ‘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, ebs[i]gnā ‘blessed (“marked”, “crossed”)’ (: if. signāt, cf. Lith. if. žegnōti, ps. žegnōjo);
postāi ‘began, started’ (: if. postāt, cf. Lith. if. stōti, pt. stōjo);
billai, billa, billats ‘spoke’ (: ps. billā<sup>115</sup>, cf. Lith. if. bylōti, pt. bylōjo);
widdai ‘saw’ (PEŽ IV 234);
teikū (< *-ā) ‘made’ (: if. teickut ‘to make’);
poglabū (< *-ā) ‘embraced, caressed’ (cf. Lith. dial. if. glabōti ‘to caress by embracing’, pt. glabōjo; cf. also PEŽ III 307).

<sup>114</sup> Since preterite stem ending was shortened at the end of the word *-i(j)ā > -(j)ā, 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 Diallang – L.P.

<sup>115</sup> For Pr. (Cat.) ps., pt. billai, billa = bilē < ps. *bīlēja, pt. *bīlējā cf. fn. 107. – L.P.
§ 234. Pr. (III) pt. 3 pers. bēi (also spelled beī and bhe) ‘was’ is particularly archaic. It implies Pr. *bē-īdēm’ (Stang Vergl. Gr. 460) which, together with OSl. aor. bē ‘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 -i- < *-ī-) etc., see Stang Vergl. Gr. 429, Kazlauskas LKIG 293 ff.

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

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

b) IE *bhū-- + *-ē- > *bh(ū)ē- > 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 įa-stem imperatives with [*-jai-] -ei- (see further).

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

sg. gerbaiš, 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 -ē- < *-oi- = Balt. *-ai-) beside 2 pers. sg. nesi (with -i- < *-ei-, not *-oi-, cf. BS 172) ‘carry!’, cf. Endzelīns l. c. – cf. Lithuanian įa- and i-stem imp. refl. 2 pers. sg. -ies < *-eī- (sukiēs, bariēs, 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)[116].

§ 237. Pr. inā-stem imperative forms are attested sufficiently: kackinnaïs ‘let have!’ (: if. kackint, PEŻ II 83 ff.), smuninaïs ‘honor!’ (: if. smûnint), klumstinaïtai ‘knock!’, mukinaïtai ‘teach!’ (: 3 pers. ps. mukinnna), erpilinaïtai ‘fill!’, tickinnaïtai ‘do!’ (: if. tickint), tûlninaïtai ‘multiply!’; spellings with -ei- may be errors instead of -ai- (Stang Vergl. Gr. 439): mukineytai ‘teach!’; laustineiti (wans) ‘humilate (yourself)’!, poauginneiti ‘bring up!’; powaidineiti ‘show!’.

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

§ 239. Imperative forms of Pr. ā-stems were derived from corresponding infinitive stems: 2 pers. sg. dais, 2 pers. pl. d`iti ‘give!’ (: if. dûtwei ‘to give’), frequent 2 pers. sg. ettrais, 2 pers. pl. attr`iti ‘answer!’; cf. Stang Vergl. Gr. 437, Endzelîns l. c.

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

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

[116] More likely (than 2 different suffixes for the same form) is that -ai-, -ey-, -ei- are allographs of *-ai-; i.e. both wedais (1x I) and wedeys (1x II), weddeis (1x III) reflect an a-stem form *wedais. Cf. spellings key (I) vs. kay (I), mukinaitai (I) vs. mukineytai (II) and many similar variations so much expectable in an unstressed position (the formant of imperative was unstressed, when not an ā-stem like signâ/[ts], cf. kîrdeiti, tûlninaïtai). 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.

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, boûse* ‘let ... be!’, *audasei* ‘let (it) happen!’; *dase* ‘let (him) give!’, *galbse* ‘let (him) help!’, *pareysey* ‘let ... come!’; *tussîse* ‘let (her) be silent!’, *wirse* ‘let become!’; *pokûnsi* ‘let (him) protect!’.

It seems that the origin of Prussian permissive 3 pers. *-sei* is connected with an optative *-s-* form of the future tense, cf. Stang Vergl. Gr. 442 f., Endzelîns SV 122 f. with bibl. 17

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

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

---

Infinite verbs

Infinitive

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

§ 246. In all Catechisms infinitive forms with endings -twei (-twyey) 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-tu < *-tun).

Participles

Active present

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

§ 249. Nom. sg. masc. Ending -nts in forms skellânts (of an a-stem verb) and dîlants (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 PEŻ I 343 f. s.v. *geytys). The ending -ens in Pr. (II) syndens ‘sitting’ reflects *-ans < *-ants, but the ending -ats in Pr. (I) sindats ‘idem’ should be corrected into *-āts = *-ants < *-antis (for all this cf. PEŻ IV 109 f. with bibl.). Both instances represent a form of a n-infixed a-stem verb with above discussed final segment Pr. (Cat.) *-ants < *-antis. The latter possibly implies Pr. *-antis (: Lith.
vérd-antis = Latv. dial. 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. PEŻ I 227 f. (woth bibl.).

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

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


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

§ 255. **Nom. pl. masc.** skellîntei and skellântai ‘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)seggiëntins III 93

118 Endzelīns l. c. points to A. Bezzenberger who was the first to correct waitiaintins into *waitiantins. As for J. Endzelīns himself, he on the contrary, points to no less possible comprehension of this form as of an āja-stem = OSl. vēščajo, which in its full shape could be Pr. *waitiaiantins. Why should Bezzenberger’s correction be accepted? Not because of finite plural forms in which as if the 3rd person is generalized (druwē-mai, waitīā-mai): it is namely 3 pers. enwackēimai which points to a possible syncope, similar to waitiaintins, cf. ftm. 106. – L.P.
Passive present

§ 257. Nom. pl. fem. Pr. (1x III) *poklausimanas (< *-ās) ‘listenable’, because of its segment -amanas, is traditionally compared with formant Gk. pc. ps. pass. -μενο-/ -μενη- etc. and, therefore, derived from WBalt. *-mana-/*-manā-, cf. bibl. apud PEŻ 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. *poklausimanas is not any present participle. It is an adjective *paklausimenas (its *-e- was spelled as -a- in III), derived with a suf. *-enā- (cf. also enimunne, PEŻ I 267) from Pr. pc. ps. pass. *(pa)klauima-/*(pa)klauimā- ‘(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. PEŻ III 310 f., Ambrazas l. c.¹¹⁹

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. pergūbons, sīdans, etc.). The latter appeared on place of -uns possibly under the influence of pc. ps. act. -ants (< -ants), cf. Endzelins SV 128, PKP II 252 f.). For the origin of Pr. pc. ps. pass. -uns see further.

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

§ 260. Nom. pl. masc. [immus ‘having taken’, aupallus ‘having found’, refl. embaddusisi ‘having stuck themselves’ (PEŻ 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).

¹¹⁹ A brilliant career of Prussian poklausimanas > ποξλαυσίμενος from hapax legomenon to Brugmann’s Bible of comparativists (cf. Kurze Vergleichende, § 387, 3) reveals accuracy with which classical truths of Indoeuropean linguistics were grounded. One should not forget that these are, among others, a seven-case declension, or Common-IE paradigmatic aorist, which just represent these truths. – L.P.
§ 261. **Acc. pl. masc.** ends in -usins (*aulauwusins ‘dead, having died’, spelled aulauusins 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. -ēs) 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 *-yes (="*-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. -ēs (Latv. -īs), e.g. būv-ēs, nēš-ēs.

Balt. (e.g. a-stem) pc. ps. act. *-ans (="Lith. -q") : *-an (="Lith. -q"), 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. -q", e.g. nēšē etc.), cf. Stang Vergl. Gr. 267\textsuperscript{120}.

\textsuperscript{120} Does this mean an existence of unattested nom.-acc. neut. *dāwusi (§ 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 PEŻ, 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.” -q 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 ftm. 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.:** crixtits ‘baptized’ (: Lith. krìkštytas, Latv. krikstīts), laikūts ‘kept’ (with -ū- < -ā-; if. laikūt ‘to keep’), mukints ‘taught’ (with -ū- < -ā-; if. mukint ‘to teach’), enimts ‘taken’ (: if. ĭmt ‘to take’), dāts (III), daetcz (II) = *dāts (§ 18) ‘given’ (: if. dātwei / dāt ‘to give’) etc.

**Nom. sg. fem.:** ĭmtā (III) ‘taken’ (: if. ĭmt ‘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.;

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

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

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

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

---

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

Adverbs

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

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

with final -u of an unclear origin (cf. Endzelîns SV 92, Stang Vergl. Gr. 276, BS 170), these are not any old forms of adverbs but innovations of translator (instead of -ai) with all probability, see PKK II 167, PEŻ I 55 s.v. ainawidiskan122.


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

122 Cf. ftn. 44. – L.P.
123 This form cannot be directly derived from Pr. *(ilg)-a = Lith. (gêr)-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 I -ai, cf. ftn’s 12, 23, 27, 39, 43, 89, 109. – L.P.
124 These pairs are not fully synonymous at least on diachronic level: adverbs derived from neutral forms originate in nominal predicates of the neutral meaning. Cf. Lith. man gêra ‘I feel myself well’ = ‘it is good for me’, i.e. the subject is defined, vs. jis dirba geraï ‘he works well’, i.e. a verbal predicate is defined. Cf. also Polish bardzo dobre! ‘very well!’ vs. wiem to dobrze ‘I know this well’, although today one says mnie jest dobrze = Lith. man geraï instead of man gêra. – L.P.
Adv. etkûmps ‘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’, tâlis, tâls ‘further’ and toûls ‘more’ (cf. PEŽ IV 181 f. s.v. tâlis).

§ 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, tît ‘so’ (PEŽ IV 195), quei ‘where’ (§ 180).

Adv. schai ‘here’ was derived form 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 Endzelîns 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. dâbar ‘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), pagâr ‘beside’ (PEŽ III 206 f.), schlâit / sclait ‘without, except’ (also used as a conjunction, PEŽ IV 123 s.v. sclait), kirschâ ‘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 Kaukienë 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).
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